

KPU Registry ID Number: 1037. Date this summary of results was received: 24th September 2018. This information on the results of a study registered at the KPU Registry was provided by the experimenter and has not been evaluated by KPU Registry personnel.

Summary of Results for the KPU Study Registry

PRECOGNITIVE PRIMING OF COMPOUND REMOTE ASSOCIATES: USING AN IMPLICIT CREATIVE INSIGHT TASK TO ELICIT PRECOGNITION

Dr David Vernon

Email: david.vernon@canterbury.ac.uk

Results

A total of 158 participants each completed a total of 40 trials. This was made up of the 20 trials in the main compound remote associates task (10 of which were primed and 10 unprimed) followed by the 10 priming trials which were repeated (i.e., a total of 20 trials).

The main dependent measure was 'level of accuracy', which was counted as the number of items (out of 10) from the compound remote associate task (CRAT) correctly answered within 15 seconds. The correct answer was taken as the 'solution' provided by Bowden and Jung-Beeman (2003b).

The confirmatory hypothesis tested whether the level of accuracy for correctly completed compound remote associates that were *primed* would be higher than those that were *unprimed*. This was examined using a repeated measures t test with 2 conditions: primed CRAT vs. unprimed CRAT. The statistics test was 2-tailed to allow for the possibility that post-completion repetition of the solutions *could* impair performance (see, Ritchie et al., 2012).

The results showed that the score for *primed* CRAT items was **not** significantly higher than for *unprimed* $t(157)=0.503, p=0.616, 95\% \text{ CI } (-0.27, 0.46), d = 0.04$ (see Table 1).

Table 1. Showing mean (and standard deviation) *Primed* and *Unprimed* scores for the CRAT.

CRAT Accuracy		
	Mean	SD
Primed	4.46	2.26
Unprimed	4.37	2.00

Discussion

Data show no evidence of a precognitive priming effect when using a compound remote associates task. The lack of such an effect, could parsimoniously be interpreted as suggesting that precognition is impossible. However, there remain many positive effects reported in the literature. Hence, a plausible alternative explanation is offered that suggests the context (lab based vs. on-line) of the research may influence the outcome.