# 12.5 Appendix - Results

## 12.5.1 Correlation analysis of AC and RT scores

To ensure RT does not depend on more or less accurate hand recognition, RT and AC scores are correlated (Pearson). If there is a correlation with lower AC producing faster RT, then the results might reflect a trade off. This is not supported by the results.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RT correlation with AC |  |  |
| Paired Sample T-test  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | Correlation n | Significance (2.-tailed) |
| Left hand | Neutral Simple | 23 | -0,141 | 0,521 |
|  | Neutral Complex | 23 | -0,305 | 0,157 |
|  | Enlarging Simple | 23 | -0,408 | **0,053** |
|  | Enlarging Complex | 23 | -0,021 | 0,925 |
|  | Without Simple | 23 | -0,280 | 0,195 |
|  | Without Complex | 23 | -0,337 | 0,116 |
| Right hand | Neutral Simple | 23 | -0,454 | **0,030** |
|  | Neutral Complex | 23 | -0,186 | 0,395 |
|  | Enlarging Simple | 23 | -0,159 | 0,467 |
|  | Enlarging Complex | 23 | -0,265 | 0,221 |
|  | Without Simple | 23 | 0,122 | 0,578 |
|  | Without Complex | 23 | -0,124 | 0,574 |

 **Scatter plot and linear trend**

Figure 12.5.1b. Correlation between RT and AC for right hand Neurtral mirror Complex task condition. There is a significant negative correlation (r = -0,454, p = 0,03). The scatter plot shows that when accuracy increases, RT decreases, therefore lower RT should not be saused by more random guessing.

Figure 12.5.1a: Correlation between RT and AC for *left hand* Enlarging mirror Simple task condition. There is a significant negative correlation (r =-0,408, p = 0,053). The scatter plot shows that when Accuracy increases the RT decreases, therefore lower RT should not be caused by more random guessing.

## 12.5.2 Correlation analysis of ownership ratings and RT

It is wanted to investigate if the degree of experienced ownership has an impact on the effectiveness of MVF using a Pearson’s correlation. No significant correlations are found between ownership ratings and RT.

|  |
| --- |
| Ownership correlation with RT: Paired Sample Correlation |
| condition |  | **N** | **Correlation** | **Significance** |
| Neutral simple | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | 0,086 | 0,695 |
| Neutral complex | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | -0,249 | 0,252 |
| Enlarging simple | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | -0,101 | 0,646 |
| Enlarging complex | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | -0,132 | 0,548 |
| Without simple | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | 0,222 | 0,308 |
| Without Complex | Mean Ownership vs RT | 23 | -0,306 | 0,155 |

## 12.5.3 Correlation analysis of agency ratings and RT

It is investigate if the degree of experienced agency has an impact on the effectiveness of MVF effectiveness using a Pearson’s correlation. No significant correlations are found between agency ratings and RT.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| condition |  | N | Correlation | Significance |
| Neutral simple | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | 0,019 | 0,932 |
| Neutral complex | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | -0,136 | 0,536 |
| Enlarging simple | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | -0,293 | 0,174 |
| Enlarging complex | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | -0,114 | 0,984 |
| Without simple | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | -0,151 | 0,492 |
| Without Complex | Mean Agency vs RT | 23 | -0,151 | 0,492 |