**Dissociating speed and accuracy in absolute identification:
The effect of unequal stimulus spacing.**

Christopher Donkin¹, Scott D. Brown¹, Andrew Heathcote¹ & A. A. J. Marley²

1. University of Newcastle
Newcastle, Australia

2. University of Victoria
British Columbia, Canada

Word Counts:

Body: 3632 (including captions and footnotes)

Abstract: 142

References: 28

Address correspondence to:

Chris Donkin

School of Psychology

University of Newcastle

Callaghan NSW 2308

Australia

Email: christopher.donkin@newcastle.edu.au

Identification accuracy for sets of perceptually discriminable stimuli ordered on a single dimension (e.g., line length) is remarkably low, indicating a fundamental limit on information processing capacity. This surprising limit has naturally led to a focus on measuring and modeling choice probability in absolute identification research. We show that choice response time (RT) results can enrich our understanding of absolute identification by investigating a dissociation between RT and accuracy as a function of stimulus spacing. The dissociation is predicted by the SAMBA model of absolute identification (Brown et al., 2008), but cannot easily be accommodated by other theories. We show that SAMBA provides an accurate, parameter free, account of the dissociation that emerges from the architecture of the model and the physical attributes of the stimuli, rather than through numerical adjustment. This violation of the pervasive monotonic relationship between RT and accuracy has implications for model development, which are discussed.

In many choice paradigms, more accurate responses are associated with faster response times, and vice versa: e.g., in Stroop-interference tasks (e.g. Kane & Engle, 2003; Wuehr & Frings, 2008), various naming tasks (Duyck, Lagrou, Gevers & Fias, 2008; Roelofs, 2006) and absolute identification (Kent & Lamberts, 2005; Lacouture & Marley, 1995, 2004; Petrov & Anderson, 2005). As a result, it might be thought that models predicting choice probability can also account for RT through a simple monotonic transformation (e.g., inversion). In this paper, we focus on the relationship between RT and accuracy in the absolute identification of unidimensional stimuli, where, on each trial, participants identify a randomly chosen stimulus from a set of stimuli varying on only one dimension. For example, the stimuli might be a set of 10 lines of varying lengths which are given the labels #1 through #10 from shortest to longest.

We expand upon a previous finding that RT is not always a simple monotonic function of accuracy in absolute identification, when stimulus spacing is manipulated (Lacouture, 1997). We demonstrate the reliability of this result, and show that it provides a powerful test of different theoretical accounts of absolute identification. This dissociation is predicted by the SAMBA theory (Brown, Marley, Donkin & Heathcote, 2008), which models both choice probability and choice response time. SAMBA predicts the violation of the pervasive negative correlation between RT and accuracy because of one of its components – the mapping model developed by Lacouture and Marley (1995). We show that SAMBA accounts for the dissociation without parameter adjustment, because its account emerges from the architecture of the model and the physical attributes of the stimuli.

There are numerous benchmark phenomena for the absolute identification of unidimensional stimuli, when the stimuli are equally spaced. For instance, when mean RT and accuracy are plotted as functions of each stimulus' ordinal position within the set, one observes the ubiquitous “bow effect” – a U-shape for accuracy and an inverted U for RT. In such plots,

stimuli associated with shorter RTs are always associated with higher accuracy, and vice versa. The inverse relationship between accuracy and RT is also observed in many other kinds of plots of absolute identification data, for example, if accuracy and mean RT are plotted as functions of: the difference between successive stimuli; the number of trials that have intervened since the current stimulus was last presented; or the number of stimuli within the set (Brown et al., 2008; Kent & Lamberts, 2005; Lacouture & Marley, 1995, 2004).

Brown et al. (2008) developed SAMBA to account for the benchmark empirical choice and RT phenomena. SAMBA was intended to be a complete account of absolute identification, one that included all stages from a psychophysical stimulus representation through to response selection, and one that modeled all of the important benchmark phenomena from the field. Brown et al. also pointed out that SAMBA makes some surprising and testable predictions, including that increasing the space between two adjacent stimuli will result in increased accuracy for those two stimuli, but will have little impact on RT. In the following sections we first provide a brief overview of SAMBA, followed by a detailed account of this particular prediction. We then examine data from Lacouture (1997) that confirm the prediction, and show SAMBA's fit to the data. We conclude by discussing the implications of these results for theoretical development in the field of absolute identification.

SAMBA

SAMBA (Brown et al., 2008) is composed of three stages: the selective attention stage, the mapping stage and the decision stage. The selective attention stage of SAMBA begins with a relatively impoverished psychophysical representation of a stimulus and produces an estimate of its magnitude. This estimate is constructed using Marley and Cook's (1984, 1986) theory, which posits that stimulus magnitudes are judged relative to a context defined by upper and lower

“anchors”, which are long term memories for the magnitudes of very large and very small stimuli (call these L and U). On each trial, the magnitude of the stimulus is judged relative to the overall context, producing a noisy estimate. This magnitude estimate falls in the interval $[0,1]$, and the average magnitude estimate for any given stimulus (over repeated presentations) is given by the linear function which maps the interval $[L,U]$ onto the interval $[0,1]$. For example, in an experiment with ten equally spaced stimuli, if stimulus #5 were presented, a magnitude estimate of close 0.45 might be expected, but on any given trial the estimate will vary somewhat from this average. The context used to judge stimuli is maintained by the observer using a noisy memory rehearsal process. The noise in this process is one of the key elements that introduces inaccuracy into SAMBA’s predicted responses.

SAMBA’s mapping stage transforms the magnitude estimate produced by the selective attention stage into response strengths, one for each possible response. It operates like a highly constrained set of tuning curves, where each curve produces a response strength that depends on how closely the observed magnitude estimate matches a referent for the given response. SAMBA assumes the referents are obtained by averaging magnitude estimates associated with repeated presentations of each stimulus. The mapping phase operates similarly to all tuning systems, in that the largest response strength is always assigned to the response whose referent most closely matches the observed magnitude estimate. For example, a magnitude estimate of 0.45 might be closest to the long Ω term referent for stimulus #5 and so the largest response strength will be assigned to response #5. The outputs from the mapping phase are used as inputs for the decision stage of SAMBA, which uses a set of ballistic accumulators, one for each possible response (Brown & Heathcote, 2005). The ballistic accumulators instantiate a noisy max-picking algorithm. The chosen response will usually be the one with largest response strength (from the mapping stage), but not always. Larger response strengths are associated with faster responses,

and bigger differences between response strengths are associated with more accurate “pick-the-max” behaviour.

In addition to these basic elements, SAMBA also includes mechanisms for sequential effects. For example, activity in the ballistic accumulators in the decision phase is assumed to decay slowly between trials. Amongst other things, this means that the response selected on the previous trial will have an advantage on the current trial, as observed in data. However, for our purposes the critical element of SAMBA is the bow mapping phase. Lacouture and Marley (1995) developed the mapping from a theoretical viewpoint. That is, they started out with a list of mathematical properties that any reasonable set of tuning curves should have. For example, for any reasonable set of tuning curves the greatest response strength should always assigned to the response whose long-term referent most closely matches the incoming magnitude estimate. Obviously, a great variety of tuning curves would satisfy this property, so other properties were included to constrain and simplify the solution, including: all response strengths should always be positive; the tuning curves should use the simplest functional form possible – a straight line; and the set of curves should be symmetric, as long as the referents are symmetric. Lacouture and Marley developed their bow mapping as a set of linear tuning “curves” which satisfied all these constraints. Their solution was very powerful because it was also parameter free, being entirely specified by the values of the long term referents for each stimulus’ average magnitude estimate. The mapping solution also predicted the ubiquitous bow effects observed in both response time and accuracy for absolute identification, even though these properties were not included as constraints for its development.

Of course, other solutions to the basic tuning curve problem could be developed. In particular, one may relax the simplifying constraints imposed by Lacouture and Marley (1995), by allowing more complex nonlinear forms for the tuning curves. Such solutions would probably

also be able to accommodate the peculiar accuracy-RT dissociation we discuss below, but it is difficult to justify their extra complexity. From this point of view, one may consider the bow mapping as the simplest and most constrained set of tuning curves available, with the added benefit that they allow our model to accommodate all the required empirical data.

SAMBA's Predictions for Unequally Spaced Stimuli

SAMBA makes the prediction that if the spacing between two adjacent stimuli is increased, with other stimulus spacings unchanged, then these particular stimuli are identified with higher accuracy, but RT is relatively unaffected. This prediction is a consequence of Lacouture and Marley's (1995) mapping solution. When stimuli are unequally spaced, the long-term referents (average magnitude estimates) that define the mapping stage will reflect the unequal spacing. For example, first consider a standard absolute identification experiment with 10 equally spaced stimuli, and suppose that participants place their lower and upper anchors at a distance equivalent to one stimulus separation above and below the stimuli at the upper and lower end of the range, respectively. In this case, the selective attention phase of SAMBA produces average magnitude estimates given by the linear mapping of the stimulus magnitudes onto the unit interval, namely: $\{\frac{1}{11}, \frac{2}{11}, \dots, \frac{10}{11}\}$. However, now imagine that a set of 10 unequally spaced stimuli is constructed by first taking 14 equally spaced stimuli, then removing the central four. This stimulus set has a large central gap between stimuli #5 and #6. The selective attention phase of SAMBA then produces average magnitude estimates that respect the unequal stimulus spacing, namely $\{\frac{1}{15}, \frac{2}{15}, \dots, \frac{5}{15}, \frac{10}{15}, \dots, \frac{14}{15}\}$. Since the average estimates define the mapping solution, the spacing of the stimulus set is naturally encoded into the operation of the model.

On each trial of an absolute identification experiment, the selective attention phase produces a noisy magnitude estimate, say z . The mapping solution transforms this estimate into a

response strength R_j for each of the j possible responses according to the formula

$R_j = (2Y_j - 1)z - Y_j^2 + 1$. The function is completely defined by Y_j , which is the average magnitude

estimate for the j th stimulus – the long term referent for response j . Figure 1 illustrates the

mapping solutions that arise from both the equally spaced and unequally spaced sets of ten

stimuli. In both cases, the mapping supports the basic property, that if the observed magnitude

estimate is close to the average magnitude estimate for stimulus j , the highest response strength

will be assigned to response j . For example, suppose on a particular trial stimulus #5 is presented,

and the selective attention phase produces a magnitude estimate of .45 units. In both the equal and

unequal cases, the large black dot shows that the greatest response strength in this case is assigned

to response #5 (i.e., the highest line above $x=.45$ is the one corresponding to the fifth response). It

may strike the reader as surprising, on first glance, that the greatest response strength for each

response is always assigned at one extreme or the other ($x=0$ or 1). For example, response #5 is

the maximum-strength response at $x=.45$, but the *greatest* response strength is assigned to

response #5 when $x=0$. This property arises from the severe simplifying constraints imposed by

Lacouture and Marley (1995), in particular that the tuning curves should be linear. It is testament

to the power of their solution that it still fits the data so well, even with such constraint.

Figure 1. Mapping solution for equally spaced stimuli (left panel) and a set of ten stimuli with a central gap in stimulus spacing equivalent to four stimuli (right panel). Each line shows how the response strength varies with input magnitude estimate, for one of the 10 possible responses.

The difference in the mapping solutions for equally and unequally spaced stimuli leads to the prediction that is our focus. Consider again stimulus #5, which is adjacent to the large central gap in the unequal stimulus set (a similar argument applies to stimulus #6). In the equally spaced condition, response #5 is the maximum-strength response¹ for any magnitude estimates in the interval $z \in [\frac{4.5}{11}, \frac{5.5}{11}]$. However, in the unequally spaced condition, response #5 is the maximum-strength response for a larger range of magnitude estimates: $z \in [\frac{4.5}{15}, \frac{7.5}{15}]$. Given that the response with the largest strength is usually the response made by SAMBA's decision phase, accuracy is predicted to be higher for stimulus #5 in the unequally spaced condition than in the equally spaced condition. This is mostly due to the prediction that stimulus #5 will not often be confused with stimulus #6 (and vice versa). For example, for the unequally spaced stimuli in Figure 1, the average magnitude estimate for stimulus #5 is $\frac{5}{15}$. Due to the properties of the rehearsal stage, it is rare that if stimulus #5 were presented that the magnitude estimate would be greater than $\frac{7.5}{15}$, and hence fall in the region where response #6 would receive the largest response strength.

Turning now to predictions for response time, Figure 1 shows that the size of the response strength produced for stimulus #5 is about the same in both the equal and unequal stimulus spacing conditions. In the decision stage of SAMBA, the response strength for response #5 determines the rate of increase of activation in the corresponding ballistic accumulator. All other

parameters being equal, response time is inversely related to the response strength, so SAMBA predicts about the same response times for stimulus #5 in both the equal and unequal spacing conditions. To be numerically precise, the average magnitude estimate associated with stimulus #5 in the equally spaced condition is $\frac{5}{11}$, and this results in a maximum response strength being assigned to response #5, a strength of $(2\frac{5}{11}-1)\frac{5}{11}-(\frac{5}{11})^2+1=0.752$. In the unequally spaced case, stimulus #5 generates an average magnitude estimate of $\frac{1}{3}$, but again the maximum response strength is assigned to response #5, $(2\frac{1}{3}-1)\frac{1}{3}-(\frac{1}{3})^2+1=0.778$. Critically, in both cases, the response strengths assigned to the correct response for neighbouring stimuli is larger: when stimulus #4 is presented, the average response strength assigned to response #4 is 0.769 in the equally spaced condition and 0.804 in the unequally spaced condition. Since predicted RT is inversely related to response strength, SAMBA predicts the required dissociation, that responses to stimuli near the large gap will be more accurate than for neighbouring stimuli, but the corresponding response times will be slower.

Empirical Evidence

Several researchers have manipulated stimulus spacing, including Lockhead and Hinson (1986) and Lacouture (1997). Brown et al. (2008) demonstrated that SAMBA provides a parsimonious account of the choice probabilities of Lockhead and Hinson (RTs were not recorded). Lacouture's data set included RT measurements, allowing us to test SAMBA's prediction of the effect of stimulus spacing on both choice probabilities and RT. Participants in Lacouture's experiment spent the first hour in a standard absolute identification experiment, with

¹ It is elementary to show that responses j and $j+1$ have equal response strengths at the point that is midway between the long term referents for stimuli j and $j+1$, and this holds for both equally spaced and unequally spaced stimulus sets.

10 equally spaced stimuli. Each participant then spent a second hour in one of several conditions in which physical properties of the stimuli were manipulated. Brown et al. presented fits of SAMBA to data from the first session (equal spacing), but until now the unequal spacing conditions have never been modeled. Since Lacouture published his findings, several important, integrative theories of absolute identification have been published, some of which have even addressed the effects of unequal stimulus spacing on response choices, but none of which have addressed the effects of stimulus spacing on response times. This leaves a gap in the theoretical development, especially given that Lacouture's data present such a challenging test for models.

Participants in the second session of Lacouture's (1997) experiment experienced one of six conditions, four of which employed unequally spaced stimuli. These four conditions had larger gaps introduced either in the centre (between stimuli #5 and #6) or at the edges (between stimuli #2 and #3 and stimuli #8 and #9). The gap location was crossed with a manipulation of gap size (large or small) to create the four conditions: a large central gap (C-L); a small central gap (C-S); large extreme gaps (E-L); and small extreme-gaps (E-S). The top row of Figure 2 provides a schematic illustration of the stimuli from these four conditions (for actual stimulus lengths, see Lacouture's Table 1). The second and third rows of Figure 2 show data from the four spacing conditions, replicating Lacouture's Figure 4. The data are represented by solid circles, with error bars showing ± 1 standard errors, calculated assuming normal distributions across subjects for mean RT and binomial distributions for accuracy. In each graph, vertical arrows show the locations of the larger gaps, and the dashed lines show predictions generated by SAMBA. The second row of Figure 2 shows response accuracy separately for each response and the third row shows mean correct response times. Notice that accuracy is greater for stimuli adjacent to gaps, and the effect is more pronounced in the large spacing conditions than the small spacing

conditions. However, the improved accuracy is never accompanied by faster response times, contrary to the typical inverse RT-accuracy relationship.

Figure 2. The top row shows a schematic representation of the stimuli used by Lacouture (1997). C-L refers to the ‘large central-gap’ and C-S to the ‘small central-gap’ condition, E-L refers to the ‘large extreme-gaps’ condition, and E-S ‘small extreme-gaps’. The second row shows response accuracy and the third row shows mean RT for correct responses, both as functions of response. Data are shown with solid lines and points, and SAMBA’s fits with dotted lines.

When analyzing response choices from absolute identification tasks, it is customary to calculate sensitivity (d') instead of raw percent correct (Luce, Nosofsky, Green and Smith, 1982). Sensitivity provides a bias-free measure of how often successive pairs of stimuli are confused, that is, how often stimuli #1 and #2 are confused, and stimuli #2 and #3, and so on up to stimuli #9 and #10. For any given pair, say stimuli #4 and #5, d' is calculated in the usual manner, using hit and false alarm rates, where “hits” are defined as responses #5 or greater, when stimulus #5 is presented, and “false alarms” are defined as responses #5 or greater, when stimulus #4 is presented. To ensure that the effects observed in Lacouture’s (1997) data were not due to a

response bias effect, we calculated d' values for each stimulus pair, shown in Figure 3. Graphing the data using d' shows an even more pronounced effect of stimulus spacing – stimuli that are separated by large gaps were almost never confused with one another.

Figure 3. Sensitivity (d') for each stimulus pair in the four unequally spaced stimulus conditions from Lacouture (1997). Error bars show standard errors assuming normally distributed d' values across participants.

Figures 2 and 3 demonstrate a clear dissociation – stimuli separated by large gaps enjoy an accuracy (and sensitivity) bonus, but no corresponding RT bonus. To confirm the statistical reliability of this dissociation, we calculated binomial tests. We used binomial tests because they provide robust analyses that directly test the ordinal hypotheses we entertain, without problematic distributional assumptions. We carried out two tests, one for the dissociation of response times and raw response accuracy and the other for the dissociation of response times and d' . We examined the accuracy (or d') and RT values separately for each participant, and counted how frequently the dissociation in question was observed on a single-participant basis – that is, how often we observed increased accuracy for stimuli near large gaps (relative to neighbouring stimuli) without a corresponding increase in RT. For each of the sixteen participants in the E-S

and E-L conditions, there were two opportunities to observe the dissociation – two increased gaps stimulus gaps in each condition – and for each of the other sixteen participants in the C-S and C-L conditions there was one opportunity. For the raw accuracy data, under a null hypothesis of no relationship, the probability of observing the dissociation by chance is 1 in 16 at each opportunity, but we observed the dissociation 10 out of 48 times, significantly more than the three that would be expected by chance ($p=.0015$). For the d' data, the probability of observing the dissociative ordering by chance is 1 in 12, but we observed the dissociation 20 out of 48 times, again significantly more than would be expected by chance ($p<10^{-10}$). These tests are quite convincing, especially given the limited number of participants available (only eight in each condition) and the reduced power afforded by robust non-parametric statistical tests. Note that those participants who did *not* demonstrate the critical dissociation on single-participant level did not necessarily demonstrate the opposite (i.e., the usual inverse accuracy-RT relationship). In fact, of the 96 opportunities to observe the usual inverse relationship in these critical tests, we observed only it only once – for the other 95 opportunities, we either observed random ordering due to noise (65 times) or the accuracy-RT dissociations counted above (30 times).

Turning now to predictions from SAMBA, we can see from the dashed lines in Figures 2 and 3 that the model provides a good qualitative account of the data, capturing the observed dissociation between accuracy and RT. The model also provides a very close quantitative fit to the data, which is all the more surprising given the strong constraints we imposed on the parameters. To fit SAMBA to Lacouture's (1997) unequal spacing conditions, we began with the parameters reported by Brown et al. (2008) that were used to fit the standard (equal spacing) condition from the first session of Lacouture's experiment. Only three parameters were adjusted for the fits presented in Figure 2, and even these parameters were irrelevant in capturing the critical dissociation between accuracy and RT – all three parameters were instead related to the effects of

practice, capturing differences in the data between the first and second experimental sessions.

Firstly, we decreased the response threshold parameter for SAMBA's decision phase to be 90% of the value it took for the first experimental session, reflecting that participants may have become a little less careful in the second session of the experiment. Secondly, we had previously noted asymmetry in the data: in the first experimental session, responses were slower and less accurate for the large stimuli than the small stimuli. SAMBA accounted for the asymmetry by setting the lower anchor close to the smallest stimulus (L was set at 95% of the magnitude of the smallest stimulus) but the upper anchor quite far away from the largest stimulus (U was 62% larger than the largest stimulus). In the second experimental session the asymmetry disappeared: note that in Figure 2 accuracy and RT are about the same for the smaller stimuli as for the larger stimuli. To capture this return to symmetry, we set the lower anchor to 99% of the magnitude of the smallest stimulus, and the upper anchor to 101% of the magnitude of the largest stimulus. One possible interpretation for the change in symmetry between sessions could be improvement due to practice. Although absolute identification is mostly immune to practice effects, Rouder, Morey, Cowan and Pfaltz (2004) showed that learning in absolute identification is possible. Donkin, Dodds, Brown and Heathcote (submitted) have shown that this is especially true for lines of varying length, as used by Lacouture. This explanation is consistent with the change in parameters of SAMBA used to achieve the reported fits. The upper and lower anchors, U and L , were moved closer to stimuli #1 and #10 in the unequal spacing conditions, indicating that participants improved their knowledge of the task in the second session relative to the first.

It is notable that a single set of parameters was used to fit all four different spacing conditions. The differences between spacing conditions are completely determined by the properties of the stimulus spacing, which in turn determine the referents. For example, referents for the large central-gap condition are based on long-term averages of magnitude estimates

produced by SAMBA's selective attention phase, and these magnitude estimates naturally reflect the large gap between stimuli #5 and #6. The same mechanism applies to the other stimulus spacing conditions. Given the constraints we imposed on the model parameters, the quantitative fits are quite good, although SAMBA overpredicts the improvement in d' in the C-L condition.

Alternative Models

There are four recent models of absolute identification, besides SAMBA, that make predictions for both choice and RT. Two of these models are exemplar based accounts of general categorization behavior, applied to absolute identification, which can be seen as a special case of categorization. These two models are the exemplar-based random walk (EBRW: Nosofsky, 1997; Nosofsky & Palmeri, 1997) and the extended generalized context model for response times (EGCM-RT: Kent & Lamberts, 2005, Lamberts, 2000). Both models predict that increased accuracy should always be associated with faster RT, at least when parameters unrelated to stimulus properties are kept constant. Lacouture's (1997) dissociation of RT and accuracy was observed within blocks in which only stimulus magnitude was manipulated, so it would seem that these theories are incapable of accounting for the dissociation between accuracy and RT with unequal stimulus spacing (in particular, see Equation 5 in Nosofsky, 1997, and Equation 12 in Lamberts, 2000). The EBRW and EGCM-RT both predict the observed increase in accuracy with increased spacing between stimuli, caused by reduced similarity between stimulus representations. However, both models also predict an associated decrease in RT, which was not observed in Lacouture's data. It is possible that, with carefully chosen parameter values, these models could decrease the size of the predicted misfit. That is, there may exist parameter values that allow the models to predict increased accuracy near large gaps, accompanied by only a small

decrease in RT for those same stimuli. Even if these parameter values exist, the models still make incorrect predictions about the (statistically reliable) ordering of the data values observed above.

Another absolute identification model that predicts RT is Karpiuk, Lacouture and Marley's (1997) limited capacity, wave equality, random-walk model. This model is similar to SAMBA, in that it uses Marley and Cook's (1984) rehearsal model, but in place of SAMBA's mapping stage, Karpiuk et al. used a set of tuning curves for each response. Tuning curves, specified by free parameters, operate like SAMBA's mapping stage but with less constraint and greater flexibility. For this reason, it is quite likely that Karpiuk et al.'s model is capable of capturing (but not predicting) the observed dissociation between RT and accuracy. Lacouture and Marley's (1995, 2004) mapping model employs the same mapping functions as SAMBA, and so it also predicts the dissociation between RT and accuracy.

Ashby (2000) developed a theory of categorization that includes predictions for RT as well as choices. Other versions of this theory have been applied to absolute identification data (Ashby & Lee, 1991), although the RT-inclusive version has not. Similarly to the exemplar-based categorization models, Ashby's theory predicts a monotonic relationship between mean RT and accuracy in categorization (see, e.g., Ashby, 2000, p.321 for a summary of the extensive successes, and limited failures, of this prediction) and, therefore, does not accommodate the observed dissociation, without modification. We note also that extant absolute identification models (other than SAMBA) that predict both accuracy and RT fail to predict other key phenomena. For example, none of the models described above predict the well-known sequential effects in absolute identification data, such as assimilation and contrast.

Discussion

We have presented and tested a prediction arising from the mapping stage of SAMBA. The prediction of a dissociation between accuracy and RT is surprising due to the regularity with which a monotonic relationship has been observed. Nevertheless, SAMBA's prediction is confirmed by data from Lacouture's (1997) previously unaddressed unequal spacing experiments. SAMBA accounts for the dissociation between RT and accuracy under different spacing conditions, and provides an impressive quantitative fit, given that no parameter changes were made between conditions, and all but three parameters were fixed at values estimated using data from a different condition.

In most empirical and theoretical work on absolute identification, response times have received much less attention than response choices. Despite an empirical research history pre-dating Miller's (1956) seminal review, and theoretical accounts existing for at least 50 years, models have only begun to address RT in the last 15 years. The disinterest in RT is underlined in Stewart, Brown and Chater's (2005) model summary table (*p.*886), where only 3 out of the 14 models reviewed made predictions about RT. This neglect is most likely due the belief that RT has little utility for discriminating models, which might have been true if a systematic monotonic inverse relationship between RT and accuracy always held. However, Lacouture's (1997) results show that this is not the case, and that RT and accuracy data together provide greater model constraint than accuracy data alone. In particular, Lacouture's data provide a strong test for any theoretical account of absolute identification that attempts to account for both choice and RT. SAMBA passes this test, confirming a prediction made by Lacouture and Marley's (1995) highly constrained method of obtaining tuning curves, adopted by SAMBA. Hence, Lacouture and Marley's method, motivated entirely independently on theoretical grounds, not only predicts the

ubiquitous bow effects found in absolute identification, but also a heretofore unexplored dissociation between speed and accuracy.

References

- Ashby, F.G. (2000). A stochastic version of general recognition theory. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 44, 310-329.
- Ashby, F.G., & Lee, W.W. (1991). Predicting similarity and categorization from identification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 120(2), 150-172.
- Brown, S., Marley, A. A. J., Donkin, C., & Heathcote, A. (2008). An integrated architecture for absolute identification. *Psychological Review*.
- Brown, S., & Heathcote, A. (2005). A ballistic model of choice response time. *Psychological Review*, 112(1), 117-128.
- Brown, S.D., & Heathcote, A. (2008). The simplest complete model of choice reaction time: Linear ballistic accumulation. *Cognitive Psychology*.
- Donkin, C., Dodds, P., Brown, S., & Heathcote, A. (2008). *Revisiting the Limits of Human Information Processing Capacity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Duyck, W., Lagrou, E., Gevers, W., & Fias, W. (2008). Roman Digit Naming : Evidence for a Semantic Route. *Experimental Psychology*, 55(2), 73-81.
- Kane, M. J., & Engle, R. W. (2003). Working-Memory Capacity and the Control of Attention: The Contributions of Goal Neglect, Response Competition, and Task Set to Stroop Interference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 132, 47-70.
- Karpiuk, P., Jr., Lacouture, Y., & Marley, A. A. J. (1997). A limited capacity, wave equality, random walk model of absolute identification. In A. A. J. Marley (Ed.), *Choice, decision and measurement: Essays in honour of R. Duncan Luce* (pp.279-299). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Kent, C., & Lamberts, L. (2005). An exemplar account of the bow and set size effects in absolute identification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31, 289-305.
- Lacouture, Y. (1997). Bow, range, and sequential effects in absolute identification: A response-time analysis. *Psychological Research*, 60, 121-133.
- Lacouture, Y., & Marley, A. A. J. (1995). A mapping model of bow effects in absolute identification. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 39, 383-395.
- Lacouture, Y., & Marley, A. A. J. (2004). Choice and response time processes in the identification and categorization of unidimensional stimuli. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 66, 1206-1226.
- Lamberts, K. (2000). Information-Accumulation Theory of Speeded Categorization. *Psychological Review*, 107, 227-260.
- Lockhead, G.R., & Hinson, J. (1986). Range and sequence effects in judgment. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 40, 53-61.
- Luce, R.D., Nosofsky, R.M., Green, D.M., & Smith, A.F. (1982). The bow and sequential effects in absolute identification. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 32(5), 397-408.
- Marley, A. A. J., & Cook, V. T. (1984). A fixed rehearsal capacity interpretation of limits on absolute identification performance. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 37, 136-151.
- Marley, A. A. J., & Cook, V. T. (1986). A limited capacity rehearsal model for psychological judgments applied to magnitude estimation. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 30, 339-390.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for information processing. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-97.

- Nosofsky, R. M. (1997). An exemplar-based random-walk model of speeded categorization and absolute judgment. In A. A. J. Marley (Ed.), *Choice, decision and measurement: Essays in Honor of R. Duncan Luce* (pp. 347-365). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Nosofsky, R. M., & Palmeri, T. J. (1997). An exemplar-based random walk model of speeded categorization. *Psychological Review*, 104, 266-300.
- Petrov, A. A., & Anderson, J. R. (2005). The dynamics of scaling: A memory-based anchor model of category rating and absolute identification. *Psychological Review*, 112, 383-416.
- Ratcliff, R. (1978). A theory of memory retrieval. *Psychological Review*, 85, 59 –108.
- Roeflors, A. (2006). Functional architecture of naming dice, digits, and number words. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 21, 78-111.
- Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D., Cowan, N., & Pfaltz, M. (2004). Learning in a unidimensional absolute identification task. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 11, 938-944.
- Stewart, N., Brown, G. D. A., & Chater, N. (2005). Absolute identification by relative judgment. *Psychological Review*, 112, 881-911.
- Wuehr, P., & Frings, C. (2008). A Case for Inhibition: Visual attention suppresses the processing of irrelevant objects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 137, 116-130.

Appendix: The Latencies of Incorrect Responses

The relative speeds of correct and incorrect responses have proven very illuminating in the development of theories of choice response time (see, e.g., Brown & Heathcote, 2005, 2008). Theoretical accounts of response times in absolute identification are less well developed, so the fine model discrimination afforded by the analysis of error RT may yet be premature. Nevertheless, we note here two interesting phenomena related to incorrect RTs in Lacouture's (1997) data. Firstly, response times were slightly, but reliably, slower for incorrect responses than correct responses in the second session of Lacouture's experiment (mean difference 29msec, $t(38)=2.5$, $p<.01$). Secondly, the relative speed of correct and incorrect responses changed systematically with the stimulus magnitude. For extreme stimuli (#1 and #10), incorrect responses were much slower than correct responses (mean difference 269msec, $t(46)=7.5$, $p<.001$) but for central stimuli (#5 and #6) there was almost no difference (mean difference 10msec, $t(46)=0.3$, $p>.05$). The relative speeds of correct and incorrect responses are captured well by SAMBA – as a brief illustration, Figure A1 shows mean error response times along with SAMBA's predictions using the same format as Figure 2. The model captures the global qualitative trends in the data, but misses some of the finer quantitative properties, such as the tendency for some extreme responses to be associated with very fast errors (e.g., #1 in C-L condition and #10 in E-S and C-S).

Figure A1. Mean response times for incorrect responses, along with predictions from SAMBA.

Error bars show ± 1 standard error assuming that mean RT is normally distributed across participants.

We do not take this goodness of fit to be as impressive as SAMBA's ability to fit the effects of stimulus spacing that is our main focus. While the patterns of fast and slow errors may appear complex at first glance, they are less theoretically challenging than might be imagined. For example, incorrect response times were slower than correct response times, as predicted by SAMBA. Other models of absolute identification do not predict this in their current forms. For example, Kent and Lamberts' (2005) model uses a random walk, which is constrained to predict equal response times for correct and incorrect responses (see, e.g., Ratcliff, 1978). However, this limitation is not central to Kent and Lamberts' model, and can easily be remedied by the addition of certain variance components to its decision phase (as described by Ratcliff). Similarly, any model of absolute identification that predicts the ubiquitous bow effects – longer RT for central

responses and shorter RT for extreme responses – will also successfully accommodate our second observation. That is, error responses will necessarily be slow for extreme stimuli, because those incorrect responses are less extreme (usually #2 and #9, rather than #1 and #10, for example). For these reasons, we think that a detailed comparison of empirical results with theoretical predictions for incorrect response times may yet be premature for models of absolute identification.