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Participant characteristics
The 20 participants (10 female, mean age 36 years, SD = 10.33, range 22 - 69) reported high levels of belief in precognitive dreaming (mean Belief score 10.85, SD = 1.93, theoretical range of scoring 3-15), and of experience of precognitive dreaming (mean Experience score 11.8, SD = 2.12, theoretical range 3-15). All participants had experienced at least one precognitive dream; 50% less than once per year, 35% once per year, 10% once in six months, and 5% once per month approximately. Most (80%) participants reported recalling their dreams at least several times a week. Therefore these participants clearly met the study inclusion criteria. The mean age at which participants reported having their first precognitive dream experience was 14.9 years (SD = 6.02), and just over half of the participants (50%) characterised this as a very vivid dream, with an additional 5% indicating they felt it was as vivid as real life. The majority (80%) of participants reported that the topic of their first precognitive dream was personal pertaining to themselves or a significant other, and the majority attributed their views on precognitive dreaming either to personal experience (73.75%) or to hearing about another person’s experience (11.25%).

Dream Precognition Study Results Summary

Participants' dream characteristics. Every participant reported at least one dream during the study, and most (70%) participants recalled from 4 to 7 dreams (modal response = 4). The transcripts of the participants' dreams and associations ranged in length from 153 words to 2073 words (mean transcript word length = 1035.4, SD = 574.3).

Participants' ratings. No correlation was found between participants' prior precognitive dream belief and experience and the rating that they gave to the target (belief Spearman's rho = .169, p = .475; experience Spearman's rho = .067, p = .779).

Judge agreement. Judge 2's ratings were used to provide a measure of inter-judge agreement. On the seven trials where at least one judge scored a direct hit, both identified the same target on three trials. If we adopt the definition of a 'hit' that was used in the Maimonides studies, the judges agreed on 14 out of 20 trials (70%).

Precognitive dreaming. Judge 1 scored 6 direct hits in 20 trials (30% hitrate). As planned, to assess Hypothesis 1 a CR(z) statistic was calculated based on the summed target rankings for Judge 1. The summed target ranks equalled 50 (= MCE) therefore CR(z) = 0, giving no support for Hypothesis 1 that the participants' dream transcripts and associations would resemble the randomly-designated target to a degree greater than chance expectation.

There was no significant correlation between the judge's target ranking and participants' prior precognitive dream experience (Hypothesis 2) and belief (Hypothesis 3), although the correlation was in the expected direction with greater target-dream similarity corresponding with greater precognitive dream belief and experience: experience Spearman's rho = .334, p = .150; belief rho = .239, p = .309.

Sensory Incorporation Study Results Summary
Data was unavailable for 11 sensory incorporation trials, because the participants were woken by the sound (5 trials), had no dream recall (2 trials), remembered hearing the sound (1 trial), were awoken prior to final REM period (2 trials), or technical problems meant no sound was played (1 trial). The analyses, based on the remaining nine trials, are under-powered.

Precognitive dream experience did not significantly correlate with the target clip rank (Spearman rho = .630, p = .069, two-tailed), though the correlation was in the expected direction (greater sensory incorporation associated with greater precognitive dream experience). Hypothesis 1 was therefore not supported.

Precognitive dream belief did not significantly correlate with the target clip rank (Spearman rho = .247, p = .523, two-tailed). Hypothesis 2 was therefore not supported.

The audio clip target ranking did not significantly correlate with the video clip target ranking (Spearman rho = .533, p = .140, two-tailed) therefore Hypothesis 3 was not supported.