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Previous Findings

- Letters in words are read faster than letters in random sequences (Cattell, 1886; Erdmann & Dodge, 1898)
- Target letters are found faster in words (Kreuger, 1970)
- Letters in words are more accurately perceived than individual letters (Reicher, 1969; Wheeler, 1970)
- Letters in pronounceable non-words (pseudowords) are more accurately perceived than unpronounceable sequences of letters.
- Letters in pseudowords are more accurately perceived than single letters (Aderman & Smith, 1971; Baron & Thurston, 1973; Carr, Davidson, & Hawkins, 1978; McClelland & Johnston, 1977)
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What’s missing?

▶ There is little evidence of the word superiority effect from the response time domain, and even evidence of word inferiority (e.g., Massaro & Cohen, 1994; Allen & Emerson, 1991).
There is little evidence of the word superiority effect from the response time domain, and even evidence of word inferiority (e.g., Massaro & Cohen, 1994; Allen & Emerson, 1991).

Even in the accuracy domain, there is some disagreement about the nature of the word superiority effect:

- The surprise *inefficiency* in the accuracy domain. (Pelli et al., 2003)

Models of word recognition that are independent and parallel but still account for the word superiority effect are possible.
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The Task  Adapted from Goldstone (2000) and Blaha and Townsend (Under Revision)

- The string task
  - Control for guessing
    - Both target and distractors are same class
  - Ensure each character is (at least partially) perceived
    - One distractor for each position

- The single character task
  - Used to determine processing rates of characters in isolation
  - Stimuli are briefly shown and participant must identify whether it is a target or distractor.
  - High contrast, post-masking, 100ms presentation time.
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\[ P\{RT_{\text{care}} \leq t\} = P\{RT_c \leq t, RT_a \leq t, RT_r \leq t, RT_e \leq t\} \]

- If we assume unlimited capacity, independent, parallel processing of letters (UCIP),

\[
F_{\text{care}}(t) = F_c(t)F_a(t)F_r(t)F_e(t)
\]

\[
\ln(F_{\text{care}}) = \ln(F_cF_aF_rF_e)
\]

\[
= \ln(F_c) + \ln(F_a) + \ln(F_r) + \ln(F_e)
\]

\[
K_{\text{care}} = K_c + K_a + K_r + K_e
\]

\[
C(t) = \frac{K_c + K_a + K_r + K_e}{K_{\text{care}}} = 1
\]

\[
C(t) = \sum \frac{K_{\text{character}}}{K_{\text{string}}}
\]
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The Interpretation

Workload capacity coefficients different from 1 imply a violation of at least one of the assumptions of the UCIP model.

- Independence
  - Inhibitory interaction leads to lower values
  - Facilitatory interaction leads to higher values

- Parallel
  - Serial leads to lower values
  - Coactive leads to higher values

- Unlimited Capacity
  - Limited resources lead to lower values
  - More resources for more processes leads to high values

(Townsend & Wenger, 2004)
## The Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distractors</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pseudoword</th>
<th>Random</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>care</td>
<td>lerb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rlkf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare</td>
<td>nerb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vlkf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cure</td>
<td>larb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rtkf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cave</td>
<td>lemb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rlhf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card</td>
<td>lerf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rlkj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```plaintext
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Mean Level Results

- Significant effect of condition on accuracy and correct RT ($p < .001$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W (P R)</td>
<td>W P R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W P R</td>
<td>(P W R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(W R P)</td>
<td>(W P) R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(W P R)</td>
<td>(W P R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W P R</td>
<td>W P R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W P R</td>
<td>(W (P) R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W (P R)</td>
<td>W P R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(W P) R</td>
<td>(P W) R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(P W) R</td>
<td>(W (P) R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W (R P)</td>
<td>(W (R) P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W P R</td>
<td>W (P R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(W P) R</td>
<td>(W P) R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>(W (R) P)</td>
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- This does not imply an ordering of efficiency (some letters may be faster than others)
Individual Data: Graphic
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Legend:
- Green: Word
- Red: Pseudo
- Blue: Random
- Black: Unlimited
Group Data: Graphic

Word

Pseudo

Random

C(t)

Time

C(t)

Time

C(t)

Time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Word}}$</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Pseudo}}$</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Random}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.47 ***</td>
<td>2.40 *</td>
<td>3.91 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.44 ***</td>
<td>2.36 *</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.874</td>
<td>10.5 ***</td>
<td>4.43 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.84 ***</td>
<td>8.33 ***</td>
<td>3.60 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35 ***</td>
<td>5.54 ***</td>
<td>-3.67 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0 ***</td>
<td>8.99 ***</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.62 ***</td>
<td>4.38 ***</td>
<td>-2.68 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.98 ***</td>
<td>11.0 ***</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.1 ***</td>
<td>13.9 ***</td>
<td>5.24 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6 ***</td>
<td>9.43 ***</td>
<td>3.89 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.89 ***</td>
<td>8.89 ***</td>
<td>-0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-3.70 ***</td>
<td>-5.33 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $< .025$; ** $< .005$; *** $< .0005$
## Z Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Word}}$</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Pseudo}}$</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{Random}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.47 ***</td>
<td>2.40 *</td>
<td>3.91 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.44 ***</td>
<td>2.36 *</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.874</td>
<td>10.5 ***</td>
<td>4.43 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.84 ***</td>
<td>8.33 ***</td>
<td>3.60 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35 ***</td>
<td>5.54 ***</td>
<td>-3.67 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0 ***</td>
<td>8.99 ***</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.62 ***</td>
<td>4.38 ***</td>
<td>-2.68 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.98 ***</td>
<td>11.0 ***</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.1 ***</td>
<td>13.9 ***</td>
<td>5.24 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6 ***</td>
<td>9.43 ***</td>
<td>3.89 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.89 ***</td>
<td>8.89 ***</td>
<td>-0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-3.70 ***</td>
<td>-5.33 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Word > Random *****
- **Pseudoword > Random *****
- **Pseudoword > Word**

* $< .025$; ** $< .005$; *** $< .0005$
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Response Time Word Superiority Effect

- We have ruled out the unlimited capacity, independent parallel model of word processing (for most participants)
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving letters in words than individually
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving words than non-words
Conclusions

Response Time Word Superiority Effect
- We have ruled out the unlimited capacity, independent parallel model of word processing (for most participants)
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving letters in words than individually
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving words than non-words

Response Time Pseudoword Superiority Effect
- Unlimited capacity, independent parallel model was also falsified for most participants on pseudowords.
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving letters in words than individually
  - Participants are more efficient at perceiving pseudowords than non-words
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Thank you!
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The Details

- 12 participants, 10 Females and 2 Males, Ages 19-34, native English speakers
- Participants reported
  - No problems reading English
  - No reading disorders
  - Normal or corrected to normal vision
- 10 Sessions, 2 of each condition, lasting between 45 and 60 minutes
- Each block begins with 40 practice trials, then 100 targets and 100 distractors were presented in random order.
- The character or characters were written in black in 29pt Courier onto a gray (200) background, then doubled in size.
- Stimuli shown for 100ms followed by a mask.


Cattell, J. M. (1886). The time it takes to see and name objects.


