Control Condition

Given the improvements found in Study 1a, we tested participants in a control condition to determine if exposure alone could account for the observed reduction in error. This experiment was identical to Experiment 1a, but participants did not receive feedback during the training block. If error decreased post-training, this would suggest that mere exposure or familiarity with the faces could improve judgments of intensity. However, lack of improvement would be consistent with the view that the corrective feedback is a critical component of the training.

Method. Thirty-two participants participated (M_{age} = 19 years, 8 months, SD = 1 year, 7 months; 63% female; 16% Asian, 3% Indian, 81% White). Given the calculated effect size from experiment 1a (d = .36), a power analysis indicated a sample size of 32 would be sufficient to find such an effect size with power of .9. This sample size is also commensurate with related research (Penton-Voak et al., 2013; Stoddard et al., 2016) so we ensured all subsequent experiments had a minimum of 32 participants. Stimuli and procedures were identical to Experiment 1a with the one exception being that the training block did not include any feedback.

Results. Results reveal no significant changes in error from baseline to post-training (b = -0.354, $\chi^2(1) = 1.792$, p = 0.181, 95% CI [-0.873, 0.164]) and this did not differ by the emotion of the face, as evidenced by a lack of interaction between Time (baseline, post-training) and Emotion (b = 0.371, $\chi^2(1) = 0.493$, p = 0.483, 95% CI [-0.666, 1.408]).