

Accuracy analyses

Accuracy results are shown in Table S1. For the *orientation* items, there were no effects of Condition on accuracy and there was positive evidence for the null hypothesis (Experiment 1: $F(1,48)=0.231$, $p=.633$, $\eta^2_p=.005$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_0|\text{D})=.851$; Experiment 2: $F(1,40)=0.966$, $p=.332$, $\eta^2_p=.024$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_0|\text{D})=.817$; Experiment 3: $F(1,84)=0.060$, $p=.807$, $\eta^2_p=.001$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_0|\text{D})=.901$). For the *shape* items, there were small effects (2-3%), yielding weak to positive evidence for the alternative hypothesis (Experiment 1: $F(1,48)=5.696$, $p=.021$, $\eta^2_p=.106$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_1|\text{D})=.715$; Experiment 2: $F(1,40)=8.210$, $p=.007$, $\eta^2_p=.170$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_1|\text{D})=.893$; Experiment 3: $F(1,84)=7.061$, $p=.010$, $\eta^2_p=.077$, $p_{\text{BIC}}(\text{H}_1|\text{D})=.787$).

Table S1: Accuracy (%)

Type	Experiment	Match	Mismatch
Orientation	1 (naming)	95 (0.7)	95 (0.6)
	2 (verification)	97 (0.5)	98 (0.4)
	3 (imagery + naming)	96 (0.4)	96 (0.4)
Shape	1 (naming)	91 (1.0)	88 (1.0)
	2 (verification)	97 (0.6)	95 (0.7)
	3 (imagery + naming)	92 (0.7)	90 (0.7)

Note. Standard errors of the means are indicated between brackets.