



ORTHOGRAPHIC DISTINCTIVENESS IN MIXED LISTS

LINH LAZARUS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORTHOGRAPHIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND RECALL PERFORMANCE



ORTHOGRAPHIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND THE TCE

McDaniel et al. (2011)



ORTHOGRAPHIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND THE TCE



Experiment 2







Error bars are bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals

WHAT ABOUT MIXED LISTS?

METHODS

	McDaniel et al. (2011)	Control	Distinct
•	4 lists	amplification	afghan
	• 8 words per list	bison	fjords
•	Delayed free recall	eraser	khaki
	30-second distractor	parachute	alfalfa
•	Words presented in lowercase	ruler	hyena
	Presentation rate: 1500 ms • ISI: 200 ms	kennel	lymph
		refinement	crypt
		cedar	asphyxiation

BEHAVIORAL RESULTS: OVERALL RECALL

	n	Control (<i>M</i>)	Distinct (<i>M</i>)	_
McDaniel et al. (2011)	36	.51	.66	*
MSU (Fall 2020)	270	.48	.47	
MSU (Spring 2021)	203	.51	.51	
Prolific (Spring 2021)	279	.51	.56	***

p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. SD range : .15 - .20

BEHAVIORAL RESULTS: LAG-CRP



Error bars are bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals

META-ANALYSES



Error bars are bootstrapped 99% confidence intervals

CONCLUSION

- Distinct words DO NOT eliminate temporal contiguity
- Orthographic distinctiveness has different effects in pure and mixed lists
 - Our findings regarding its effects on temporal contiguity partially support the item-order account of McDaniel et al. (2011)
 - Our mixed-list studies with college students failed to replicate the recall advantage for orthographically distinct items