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to have an effect on it. In some cases, we expect the accuracy of recall of our psychological measure, than a variable we expect the same construct that can be used in another construct. If we choose statements, it is clear that the statements in a construct are psychologically relevant, we expect the statements in a construct, then the statements to the statements in another construct, thus if these other than they are to the statements in another construct. If these other than they are to the statements in another construct, we mean that the statements in a construct are more related or connected to each other than they are to the statements in another construct.

When we say that story, statements cluster into constructs, we mean

I will return to the setting plot distinction later. First, I will focus on these attempt constructs on the plot, but goal. Then, I will focus on these attempts constructs on the plot, we attempt constructs or constructs of a plot seem to be the attempts to attain the character's various attempts to achieve some goal. Hence the basic sub-structure that a story has a setting and a plot, a plot then typically describes a what are these constructs? The distinction of one distinction that comes to mind is the precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.

The precendent of the next, etc.
outcome. A short/long version where the first attempt has only the four target actions and both the first and second attempts have only the four target actions and episodic storiers, each story had each version. A short/long version where

In the first experiment, 32 Stanford students read four such two-

Job.

target then ends with the Graduated attaining the overall Goal of getting a
adds the filler actions to the target actions and outcome. This second
version with four target actions and an outcome, and a long version which
throughout the factor's contacts. Again these attempt constructs here a short
agey strategy fails, so next our Graduated decides to try getting a job
as you can see from the "no Job" outcome in the figure the employment
the four target actions.

Filler actions (the second row of phases in the figure) interspersed with
as the target actions. The long version of the attempt then has five more
Figure I illustrates this short version by the first row of phrases labeled
of the attempt mentions only four target actions together with the outcome.
outcome, or no actions and an outcome. In particular, the short version
meant agencies attempts, the story explicitly states either four actions and an
Figure I on the first page of the handout illustrates how we designed
a recent college graduate who is trying to get a job (the goal of the story).
the story materials used in the experiments. The example story is about

Figure I on the first page of the handout illustrates how we designed
did not affect the recall of the statements in the other constructs.
affected the recall accuracy of the statements in that construct, but
constructivist notion would be if the number of statements in a construct
the number of statements in the construct, hence a validation of our
Attempts do indeed seem to be constitutents of the stories. Independence property is expected for different constituents, so these target actions in the other attempt. Hence these attempts further the recall of the target actions in that attempt, but had no effect on the recall of the (82% versus 83%). Hence adding the filler actions affected the recall of the constituents. The length of the other attempt had no significant effect.

Recall was on the average 89% of the target actions. The 10% difference is recalled on the average 99% of the target actions. Where there was an attempt was short, the subjects we see that when an attempt was short, the subjects recalled on the average the handful of the results. Looking error at the bottom row of the table, the recall of the outcome of the story of the episodes, that recall accuracies provide a way to compare the versions. Since the target actions are common to both the short and long versions of each story.

Then were cued with the story titles (e.g., "Jobs") and were a free recall. Subjects read the four stories, they performed a 20-minute intelligence task, across subjects each story appeared in each of the four versions. After the actions a given subject read one story in each of the four versions. An outcome and a long/short version where both attempts have target and filler actions. But the second attempt has only the target actions and the filler actions, but the second attempt has both target and filler actions. A long/short version were the first attempt has both target and filler actions and outcome, but the second attempt has only the filler actions.
means in that constituent.

To a story constituent will improve the memory for the more important
actions at significantly more important to the story than the filler actions.

Hence, we now have a new hypothesis that adding repeated unimportant
actions will improve the memory.

Thus, the subjects rated the filler
actions received an average rating of 3.26. Thus, the subjects rated the filler
actions were on the average given a 4.31 rating, whereas the filler actions only
were on the average given 4.71 rating. The filler actions only

Seven means very important and one mean unimportant. The filler actions
were how important each of the target and filler actions were for the story.

To help answer this question, we had another group of students
be remembered.

memory improved rather than determined with the addition of more actions to
memory. Hence, we are left with the question of why
revisited the target actions. Hence, we are left with the question of why

But, as Table 1 shows, adding the filler actions to the experiments improved the

people to remember, the less accurate will be their memory for any given item.

There is one of the most curious aspect of our recall accuracy results

on this separation.

that there are no separate settings and plot constituents, it does cast doubt
recall accuracy of the setting statements. While this result does not prove

the case the number of setting statements did affect the recall accuracy.

In this experiment we varied a setting constituent and a plot constituent. In this experiment we varied

We also conducted a similar experiment to test the idea that there is
increase the recall probabilities of the important actions in a constituent, supported by supporting action case, that addressing unimportant actions divide actions. Hence we have validated our hypotheses, at least for the virtually all (98%) of the supporting actions with six supporting support actions with three supporting support actions, but they recalled the number of supporting actions. The subjects recollected 80% of the super- the average recall accuracies of the supporting actions as a function of the cues after a 20-minute intervening task. Table 3 on the handout gives Stanford students read four of these stories, then free recalled them to version of the long version (1850 words) version (the short version) (750 words) and another three (the short version) to support a supporting action. We read the stories and the stories used before so that now each supporting action would increase the recall probability of the corresponding action. We conducted another experiment to see whether increasing the number of ultimately he was able to look through their job titles etc.

action are "he had to pay a fee", "He filled out a valuable form of forms", supported by supporting actions for this "tried a local employment agency" supported by supporting actions. We called that detailed further specifications of them "supporting actions". Some attempt to call supporting actions "This statement summarizes the entire attempt in the job search contains the following statement: "Therefore the actions in the attempts to which they belong. For example, the first best five on our seven point scale. These actions are supported by action statements that always received a high importance rating (i.e., at least five on our seven point scale). "Therefore the study examines the intradual career action patterns we discovered one type
Thus, from these results, we conclude that stories have a goal that further specifies them.

Supporting this, our results are consistent with the number of supportive actions that increased the accuracy of the original action, we then hypothesized in another experiment by showing that the recall probability of hypotheses in another experiment, by showing that the recall accuracy of the original action, we then hypothesized.

An unexpected result, however, was that adding more actions to an attempt in the actions in that constituent, but not in the other constituent, showing that the number of actions in an attempt affects the separate attempts to attain the goal of a story.

To summarize, then, we first demonstrated that the actions that form
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Subordinate Actions</th>
<th>Three Subordinate Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piller Actions</th>
<th>Target Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1 = Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Attempt</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Same Attempt</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Same Attempt</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Same Attempt</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percent Recall Accuracy for Target Actions
Figure 1
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## Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Attempt Length</th>
<th>Target Actions</th>
<th>Percent Accuracy</th>
<th>Percent Action</th>
<th>Percent Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percent Recall Accuracy for Target Actions

## Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fill Actions</th>
<th>Target Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percent Target Action Recall

(1 = Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)

## Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Supplementary Actions</th>
<th>Three Supplementary Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>