

There is no *clam* with *coats* in the *calm coast*:

Delimiting the transposed-letter priming effect

Jon Andoni Duñabeitia ^a, Manuel Perea ^b and Manuel Carreiras ^{c,a}

^a Instituto de Tecnologías Biomédicas, Universidad de La Laguna

^b Universitat de València

^c BCBL, Basque Center on Cognition, Brain and Language

Short title: *Delimiting the TL priming effect*

Address for correspondence:

Jon Andoni Duñabeitia

Departamento de Psicología Cognitiva

Universidad de La Laguna

38205 - Tenerife (Spain)

phone: +34 678635223

fax: +34 922317461

email: jaduna@ull.es

Abstract

In this article, we explore the transposed-letter priming effect (e.g., jugde-JUDGE vs. jupte-JUDGE), a phenomenon that taps into some key issues on how the brain encodes letter positions and has favored the creation of new input coding schemes. However, almost all the empirical evidence from transposed-letter priming experiments comes from nonword primes (e.g., jugde-JUDGE). Indeed, previous evidence when using word-word pairs (e.g., causal-CASUAL) is not conclusive. Here, we conducted five masked priming lexical decision experiments that examined the relationship between pairs of real words that differed only in the transposition of two of their letters (e.g., CASUAL vs. CAUSAL). Results showed that, unlike transposed-letter nonwords, transposed-letter words do not seem to affect the identification time of their transposed-letter mates. Thus, prime lexicality is a key factor that modulates the magnitude of transposed-letter priming effects. These results are interpreted under the assumption of the existence of lateral inhibition processes occurring within the lexical level –which cancels out any orthographic facilitation due to the overlapping letters. We examine the implications of these findings for models of visual-word recognition.

Keywords: Transposed-letter effect; Priming; Lexicality; Letter position assignment; Orthographic encoding

There is no *clam* with *coats* in the *calm coast*:

Delimiting the transposed-letter priming effect

When reading in an alphabetic language, we do not process *wrods as a wlohe* (see Grainger & Whitney, 2004). Instead, words are processed via their constituent letters. This implies that the visual-orthographic analyzer in the brain needs to assess not only a word's letter identity, but also the relative position of the constituent letters. The issue of how letters are encoded forming meaningful strings is a crucial question for any computational model of visual word recognition (Davis & Bowers, 2006; Grainger, 2008) and is currently generating a great deal of attention (e.g., Duñabeitia, Perea, & Carreiras, 2007; Grainger, Granier, Farioli, Van Assche, & van Heuven, 2006; Guerrero & Forster, 2008; Perea & Carreiras, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c; Perea & Lupker, 2004; Rayner, White, Johnson, & Liversedge, 2006; Velan & Frost, 2007; Whitney, 2008b; White, Johnson, Liversedge, & Rayner, 2008).

To examine letter position encoding, researchers have typically employed transposed-letter stimuli. A pair of transposed-letter “neighbors” is formed by two strings that share the same letters and two of the letters are transposed (e.g., *TRIAL-TRAIL*, *COAST-COATS*, or *CLAM-CALM*). Because of linguistic restrictions –the number of transposed-letter word pairs tends to be rather small– most experiments have employed transposed-letter nonwords (e.g., *jugde*; the base word would be *judge*). There is substantial empirical evidence, obtained from different paradigms, that shows that transposed-letter nonwords tend to be misperceived as their corresponding base words (*jugde* being read as *judge*; Chambers, 1979; O'Connor & Forster, 1981; Perea & Carreiras, 2006a; Perea & Estévez, 2008; Perea & Fraga, 2006; Perea, Rosa, & Gómez, 2005).

More important for the present purposes, when the relationship between the transposed-letter nonwords and their corresponding base words is tested via a masked priming procedure (see Forster, Davis, Schoknecht, & Carter, 1987), there is a facilitative transposed-letter priming effect relative to an orthographic control (e.g., *jugde-JUDGE* vs. *jupte-JUDGE*; Christianson, Johnson, & Rayner, 2005; Duñabeitia et al., 2007; Perea & Carreiras, 2006a, 2008; Perea & Lupker, 2003a, 2003b; see also Carreiras, Vergara, & Perea, in press, Duñabeitia, Molinaro, Laka, Estévez & Carreiras, in press, and Grainger, Kiyonaga, & Holcomb, 2005, for ERP evidence; see also Johnson, Perea, & Rayner, 2007, for eye-movement evidence with parafoveal previews). The transposed-letter priming effect occurs not only for adjacent letter transpositions, but also for non-adjacent letter transpositions (e.g., *caniso-CASINO* vs. *caviro-CASINO*; Perea & Lupker, 2004; see also Lupker, Perea, & Davis, 2007; Perea & Carreiras, 2006b, 2008; Perea, Duñabeitia, & Carreiras, 2008). In sum, the transposed-letter priming effect with nonword stimuli is a solid and well-documented phenomenon.

The robustness of transposed-letter effects has posed a serious challenge for position-specific (“slot”) orthographic coding schemes (Hunter & Brysbaert, 2008), such as the Interactive Activation model (McClelland & Rumelhart, 1981), the Multiple Read-Out model (Grainger & Jacobs, 1996), the Dual-Route Cascaded model (Coltheart, Rastle, Perry, Ziegler & Langdon, 2001), or the CDP+ model (Perry, Ziegler, & Zorzi, 2007): in these models, the nonwords *jupbe* and *jugde* should exert the same influence on *JUDGE* because these nonwords share with the target only three letters in the same position. Instead, the empirical evidence from transposed-letter nonwords favors more flexible models of encoding letter position such as the SOLAR model (Davis, 1999), the SERIOL model (Whitney, 2001, 2008a), the Open-Bigram

bigram (Grainger & van Heuven, 2003) and the Overlap model (Gómez, Ratcliff, & Perea, 2008).

What we should also stress here is that the rebuttal of “slot” coding schemes is mainly based on experiments using nonword stimuli –either in a single-presentation paradigm (e.g., is *jugde* a word?) or in priming paradigms with nonword primes (e.g., comparing *jugde*-*JUDGE* vs. *jupte*-*JUDGE*). Although models of visual word recognition need to account for the reading of novel strings of letters, their main focus should be word stimuli. At an intuitive level, we may frequently experience reading *satl* as *salt*, but it may not be so common to misread *trial* with *trail*. The reason is that a transposed-letter nonword (e.g., *satl*) does not have an orthographic representation in the internal lexicon, and hence, it may be easily attracted to a more stable representation (i.e., *salt*). In contrast, a word with a transposed-letter neighbor (e.g., *trial*) has its own lexical representation, and this may prevent *trial* from activating *trail* to a large degree. Given that lexicality seems to play a role in modulating transposed-letter effects (see Gómez et al., 2008, for evidence in a forced-choice identification task), it is important to examine the presence of transposed-letter priming effects with word stimuli (e.g., *SLAT* and *SALT*, *CLAM* and *CALM*, or *TRIAL* and *TRAIL*).

The empirical evidence of transposed-letter priming effects with word primes is very scarce. Andrews (1996) employed a masked priming paradigm with a naming task in which a transposed-letter word (*SALT*) could be preceded by its transposed-letter partner (*slat*), by an orthographic nonword neighbor created by replacing one of the original letters by another (*saft*), or by an unrelated word prime that resembled the target only in the first letter (*spin*). She found that responses times were 14 ms longer when the target word was preceded by a transposed-letter prime than when the target word was preceded by an unrelated prime –the effect did not approach significance in the

item analysis ($p > .28$), though. Consistent with the general pattern of the latency data, the proportion of errors was higher in the transposed-letter priming condition than in the unrelated condition. Andrews interpreted her findings in terms of a mutual interference so that “both members of a transposed-letter pair are activated when a single transposed-letter word is presented” (pp.785-786). More recently, Castles, Davis, and Forster (2003) reported a lexical decision experiment that explored masked transposed-letter priming effects for word pairs such as *sign-SING* relative to an unrelated condition (e.g. *clap-SING*), and failed to find a transposed-letter priming effect. Interestingly, Castles et al. also conducted the experiment with 3rd and 5th grade children, and they only obtained a (facilitative) transposed-letter priming effect with word pairs for beginning (3rd grade) readers; note, however, that there was a high percentage of errors on the target items (around 32%), and this makes these data difficult to interpret (see Castles, Davis, Cavalot, & Forster, 2007). Thus, the evidence of a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes is not conclusive. Given the importance of this issue for models of visual-word recognition, the present study is aimed at studying in depth the interaction between prime lexicality and the transposed-letter priming effect.

The main goal of the present study is to investigate the relationships between transposed-letter word “neighbors” (e.g., *CAUSAL-CASUAL*) in visual word recognition. To that end, participants in the experiments were presented with transposed-letter words and their transposed-letter word mates –we used different control conditions varying from single substitution-letter controls (e.g., *CAUDAL*, flow) to double-substitution-letter controls (e.g., *CARNAL*, carnal) and completely unrelated words in a masked priming paradigm. The experiments were conducted in Spanish – note that previous research has shown a very similar pattern of masked transposed-letter priming effects in languages as different as Spanish, English, French, Basque, and

Japanese (e.g., see Lupker et al., 2008; Perea & Carreiras, 2006b; Perea & Lupker, 2004; Perea & Pérez, in press; Schoonbaert & Grainger, 2004). In the present series of experiments, we employed nonword foils that were pronounceable and orthographically legal in Spanish (e.g., *JOLAPE*), but they tended not to resemble any existing Spanish words. This way we minimized the chances that the priming effects were due to any potential task-specific checking processes that may occur when the nonword foils are too close to existing lexical representations (see Forster & Veres, 1998).

Experiments 1a and 1b

Prior research has shown that transposed-letter nonword primes facilitate the processing of their corresponding base words in a masked priming paradigm in relation to a double-letter substitution control priming condition (e.g., *jugde-JUDGE* vs. *jupte-JUDGE*; e.g., Perea & Lupker, 2003a, 2004; see also Duñabeitia et al, 2007; Perea & Carreiras, 2006a, 2006b). In Experiment 1, we simultaneously examined the transposed-letter priming effect for both word-word pairs and nonword-word pairs. To do this, we conducted two sub-experiments. In Experiment 1a, we selected a group of transposed-letter word-word pairs in which the target word could be preceded by a transposed-letter high-frequency word prime (*cerdo-CEDRO*) or by a double-substitution word prime (*censo-CEDRO*). The idea here is that the high frequency transposed-letter neighbor of a word may interfere with target recognition (*cerdo-CEDRO*), as actually happens when using substitution neighbors (see Davis & Lupker, 2006; Segui & Grainger, 1990). In Experiment 1b, we selected a group of Spanish nonword-word pairs, in which the target word could be preceded a transposed-letter nonword prime (*cetla-CELTA*) or by a double-substitution nonword prime (*cefba-CELTA*). None of the target words in

Experiment 1b had any transposed-letter neighbors. In Experiment 1b, we expected to replicate the facilitative transposed-letter priming effect which has been consistently obtained in the literature.

Thus, the critical issue was whether there is an inhibitory relatedness effect (or a reduced facilitation) from word TL-neighbors (as compared to the facilitative effect from nonword TL-neighbors) –this would be consistent with an increased lateral inhibition from transposed-letter word neighbors within the lexical level. What we should note here is that Forster and colleagues (e.g., Forster, 1987; Forster & Veres, 1998) were the first to examine the role of prime lexicality effect in masked priming – using substitution-letter primes.

Method

Participants. Thirty-two Spanish students from the University of La Laguna received course credit for participating in Experiments 1a and 1b. All of them had either normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish.

Materials. For Experiment 1a (word-word pairs), we selected a set of 36 Spanish words. The mean frequency of these words was of 3.72 appearances per million (range: 0.18-34.29), and their mean length was 5.69 (range: 4-8). All these words had a higher frequency transposed-letter neighbor and the mean number of substitution neighbors was 2.94 (range: 0-9). These words were preceded by Spanish prime words that were 1) the higher frequency neighbor by transposition (*cerdo-CEDRO*, “pig”-“CEDAR”), or 2) a double-substitution word in which the two critical letters were substituted by other letters (*censo-CEDRO*, “census”-“CEDAR”). All the prime words had higher lexical frequency than their corresponding target words (transposed-letter primes: mean=23.33, range=0.36-136.79; substituted-letter primes: mean=24.85, range=0.18-209.64), and

none of the letter transposition involved letters across morphemes (Christianson et al., 2005; Duñabeitia et al., 2007).

For Experiment 1b (nonword-word pairs), we selected a set of 36 Spanish words. These words were matched to the target words in Experiment 1a in word frequency (mean: 3.67, range: 0.18-33.75), length (mean: 5.69, range: 4-8) and number of substitution neighbors (mean: 2.66, range: 0-14). These target words did not have any transposed-letter neighbors. The target words were preceded by nonword primes that were 1) the same as the target except for the transposition of two letters (*cetla-CELTA*; *CELTA* is the Spanish for “celtic”), or that were 2) the same as the target except for the substitution of the two letters involved in the transposition (*cefba-CELTA*). None of the letter transposition involved letters across morphemes. A set of 72 nonwords (mean Coltheart’s N: 0.43, range: 0-5) was created for the purposes of the lexical decision task, paired to the target words in length (mean: 5.61, range: 4-8). The manipulation of the nonword trials was the same as that for the word trials (i.e., a transposed-letter prime vs. an unrelated prime). Two lists of materials were constructed so that each target appeared once in each list, but each time in a different priming condition (transposed-letter or replacement-letter). Different groups of participants were used for each list.

Procedure. Participants were tested individually in a quiet, well-lit room. Presentation of the stimuli and recording of response times were carried out using DMDX (Forster & Forster, 2003). The experimental trials began with the centered presentation of a forward mask of hash marks (#), followed by a 66 ms presentation of the lowercase prime and the immediate appearance of the uppercase target. We chose a 66-ms SOA because recent studies contrasting theories of letter position coding have used this prime exposure (e.g., Davis & Bowers, 2006; Grainger & Jacobs, 1996; Duñabeitia et al., 2007; Schoonbaert & Grainger, 2004; Grainger et al., 2006). Stimuli were presented in

12-pt. Courier New font. Participants had to press one of two labeled keys, to determine if the target string formed a legal word ('M' for yes and 'Z' for no). They were instructed to make these decisions as fast and as accurately as possible. They were not informed of the presence of lowercase items. Each participant received a different order of trials. Each participant received a total of 10 practice trials prior to the experimental trials. The whole experiment lasted less than 5 minutes. None of the participants reported conscious knowledge of the existence of prime words when asked after the experiment.

Results and Discussion

Incorrect responses (6.6% and 6.0% of the data in Experiments 1a and 1b, respectively) and response time beyond the 250-1500 ms cutoff values (3.5%) were excluded from the latency data. The mean latencies for correct responses and error rates are presented in Table 1. For each sub-experiment, ANOVAs based on the participant and item response latencies and error percentage were conducted based on a 2 (prime-target relatedness: transposed-letter, replaced-letter) x 2 (List: list 1, list 2) design. Prime-target relatedness was a within-subject factor, and List was a between-subject factor. List was included as a dummy variable to extract the variance due to the counterbalancing lists (Pollatsek & Well, 1995).

--- Insert Table 1 around here ---

Experiment 1a (word-word pairs)

Word data. None of the effects were significant (all $F_s < 1$).

Nonword data. None of the effects were significant (all p 's > .25).

Experiment 1b (nonword-word pairs)

Word data. Words preceded by a transposed-letter nonword prime were responded to 28 ms faster than words preceded by a double-substitution nonword prime, $F_1(1,30)=5.16$, $p < .04$, $MSE=2440$; $F_2(1,32)=4.50$, $p < .05$.

The ANOVA on the error data did not show any significant effects (all p 's > .14).

Nonword data. None of the effects were significant (all p 's > .25).

The present experiment replicated the transposed-letter priming effect with nonword primes: the transposed-letter nonword *cetla* speeded the recognition of the word *CELTA* more than the double-substitution nonword *cefba* (e.g., Perea & Lupker, 2003a; see also Perea & Carreiras, 2006b; Duñabeitia et al., 2007). In contrast, there were no signs of a transposed-letter priming effect when using word primes (see Castles et al., 2003, for a similar failure to obtain a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes).

Thus, the lexicality of the prime appears to be a determining factor for the transposed-letter priming effect. But before reaching this conclusion, it is important to show that the null effect obtained with the transposed-letter word primes in Experiment 1a was not due to the (potential) peculiarities of the selected words. To examine this possibility, in Experiment 2 we employed the same transposed-letter words as in Experiment 1a, except that we created transposed-letter (and double-substitution) nonword primes instead of transposed-letter (and double-substitution) word primes. That is, we used nonword-word pairs such as *cedero-CEDRO* and *cebaro-CEDRO*, instead of word-word pairs like *ceerdo-CEDRO* and *censo-CEDRO*.

Experiment 2

Method

Participants. Twenty-six undergraduate Spanish students from the Universidad de La Laguna received course credit for participating in the experiment. All of them had either normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish. None of them had taken part in Experiment 1.

Materials. We selected the same sets of 36+36 words from Experiment 1. Half of these words had a transposed-letter neighbor, whereas the other half had not. The only difference is that in the present experiment, the primes were always nonwords. Therefore, the 72 target words were preceded by primes that were 1) the same as the target except for a transposition of two letters (*cdero-CEDRO), resulting in orthographically related transposed-letter nonwords, and 2) the same as the target except for the substitution of the two transposed letters by two form-related letters (*cbaro-CEDRO). We also included the same set of 72 nonword targets used in Experiment 1, with their corresponding transposed-letter and double-substitution letter primes. Two lists of materials were constructed so that each target appeared once in each list, but each time in a different priming condition (transposed-letter neighbor or unrelated). Different groups of participants were used for each list.**

Procedure. This was the same as in Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

Incorrect responses (9.2% of the trials) and response times beyond 250-1500 ms (2.7% of the data) were excluded from the latency analyses. The mean response times

and error rates related to each experimental condition are presented in Table 1.

ANOVAs based on the participant and item response latencies and error percentage were conducted based on a 2 (Type of targets: words with transposed-letter neighbors, words without transposed-letter neighbors) x 2 (Type of prime: transposed-letter, replaced-letter) x 2 (List: 1, 2) design [Footnote 1].

Word data. The results showed that words preceded by a transposed-letter nonword prime were recognized faster than words preceded by a double-substitution nonword prime (23 ms), $F_1(1,24)=11.65$, $p<.01$, $MSE=1175$; $F_2(1,66)=3.07$, $p=.08$, $MSE=2989$ [Footnote 2]. No differences were found between the subgroups of target words, both $F_s<1$. The interaction between the two factors was not significant, showing that the transposed-letter effect occurred similarly for words with and without transposed-letter neighbors, both $F_s<1$.

The ANOVA on the error data did not reveal any effects that approached significance (all $p_s>.3$).

Nonword data. None of the effects were significant (all $F_s<1$).

The present results have shown a transposed-letter priming effect (around 18 ms) when the target words from Experiment 1 were preceded by a nonword prime. Thus, the null effect for word-word pairs in Experiment 1 was not due to the nature of the selected words: When these same words are preceded by a nonword prime, the transposed-letter priming effect has been reinstated. Thus, it seems that the lexicality of the prime and not the characteristics of the set of stimuli is the factor responsible for the absence/presence of the transposed-letter priming effect.

One might argue that the control condition for the word primes in Experiment 1a could have been (in part) responsible for the null effect of priming –note that the control prime for the pair *cerdo-CERDO* was a double-substitution prime (*censo-CEDRO*). When using higher-frequency substitution neighbors as primes, high frequency substitution neighbors of a word (*coat*) interfere with target recognition (*CHAT*) relative to an unrelated prime (*tree*) (see Davis & Lupker, 2006; Segui & Grainger, 1990). In Experiment 3, we investigated whether transposed-letter neighbors behave as substitution neighbors, by using unrelated word primes as controls. Specifically, a target word (*CEDRO*) was preceded by its higher frequency transposed-letter mate (*cerdo*) or by an unrelated word prime of a similar frequency to the related prime (*botón*). If transposed-letter neighbors do behave as substitution neighbors, we expected an inhibitory relatedness effect (Davis & Lupker, 2006; Segui & Grainger, 1990; see also Carreiras & Perea, 2002).

Experiment 3

Method

Participants. Forty undergraduate students from the University of La Laguna received course credit for participating in the experiment. All of them had either normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish. None of the participants had taken part in the previous experiments.

Materials. We selected a set of 42 Spanish target words. The mean frequency of these words was of 8.70 per million (range: 0.18-65; from the Sebastián-Gallés, Martí, Carreiras, & Cuetos, 2000, LEXESP database). The mean length was 5.5 letters (range: 4-9), and the mean number of substitution neighbors was 3.52 (range: 0-19; from the

Davis & Perea, 2005, B-Pal software). The target words were presented in uppercase, and could be preceded by words in lowercase that were: 1) a higher-frequency transposed-letter neighbor (*cerdo-CEDRO*, “pig”-“CEDAR”), or 2) an unrelated word (*boton-CEDRO*, “button”-“CEDAR”). The transposed-letter and unrelated primes had always a higher word frequency than the corresponding target words (mean frequency: 85 vs. 81, respectively; mean N: 4.8 vs. 4.3, respectively). An additional set of 42 legal (pronounceable) nonwords was created for the purposes of the lexical decision task. The target nonwords were matched to the target words in length (mean: 5.47, range: 4-7) and neighborhood size (mean N: 0.83, range: 0-5). The manipulation of the pseudoword trials was the same as that for the word trials (i.e., a transposed-letter prime vs. an unrelated prime). Two lists of materials were constructed so that each target appeared once in each list, but each time in a different priming condition (transposed-letter neighbor or unrelated). Different groups of participants made up each list.

Procedure. This was the same as in Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

Incorrect responses (5.5% of the trials) and response times beyond the 250-1500 ms cutoff points (5.2% of the data) were excluded from the latency analyses. The mean latencies for correct responses and error rates are presented in Table 2. Mixed ANOVAs based on the participant and item response latencies and error percentage were conducted based on a 2 (Prime-target relatedness: transposed-letter prime, unrelated) x 2 (List: list 1, list 2) design. List was included as a dummy between-subject factor.

--- Insert Table 2 around here ---

Word data. The ANOVA on the latency data did not reveal any differences between the words preceded by transposed-letter vs. unrelated primes, $F_1(1,38)=.01$, $p>.92$, $MSE=1092$; $F_2(1,40)=.21$, $p>.64$, $MSE=2729$. The ANOVA on the error data did not reveal an effect of relatedness, $F_1(1,38)=1.56$, $p>.21$, $MSE=35$; $F_2(1,40)=1.88$, $p>.17$, $MSE=31$.

Nonword data. The ANOVA on the response times did not show a significant effect of relatedness, $F_1(1,38)=.23$, $p>.63$, $MSE=1832$; $F_2(1,40)=1.41$, $p>.24$, $MSE=1992$. The ANOVA on the error data revealed that participants made less errors to nonwords preceded by transposed-letter primes than to nonwords preceded by unrelated primes, $F_1(1,38)=4.93$, $p<.04$, $MSE=10$; $F_2(1,40)=4.88$, $p<.04$, $MSE=10$.

The outcome of the experiment is clear: Again, we found no signs of inhibition in the processing of a target word when the prime was a high-frequency transposed-letter neighbor relative to an unrelated word prime (*cerdo-CEDRO* vs. *botón-CEDRO*). Unlike the usual inhibitory priming effect with higher-frequency word primes obtained with substitution neighbors (e.g., Segui & Grainger, 1990) or syllabic neighbors (Carreiras & Perea, 2002), we failed to obtain any signs of a parallel effect with transposed-letter neighbors. (We found a small, but significant, effect of transposed-letter priming on the error data for nonwords [1.6%]; however, masked priming effects for nonwords in lexical decision do not tend to be reliable –probably because they may depend on the participant’s strategies when making “no” responses; see Perea et al., 2005.)

Thus, the interim conclusion is that transposed-letter neighbors do not behave exactly as substitution neighbors. But, again, before reaching this conclusion, it is important to show that the lack of an inhibitory effect in Experiment 3 is not due to

special characteristics of the selected target words, but to the relationship between primes and targets. If this were the case, an inhibitory relatedness effect should show up when the same words are preceded by higher-frequency substitution neighbors (see Bijeljac-Babic, Biardeau, & Grainger, 1997; Segui & Grainger, 1990; Ferrand & Grainger, 1996). This is the goal of Experiment 4.

Experiment 4

The manipulation in Experiment 4 was exactly the same as in Experiment 3, except that the related primes were higher frequency substitution neighbors instead of higher frequency transposed-letter neighbors.

Method

Participants. Twenty-eight students from University of La Laguna received course credit for participating in the experiment. All of them had either normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish. None of them had taken part in the previous experiments.

Materials. We selected only those target words from Experiment 3 that had a higher frequency substitution neighbor. Eighteen words fulfilled this criterion. A post hoc analysis over these items in Experiment 3 showed no effects of transposed-letter priming (see Table 2). The 18 words had a mean frequency of 4.43 (range: 0.36-16.43) and a mean number of 5.1 letters (range: 4-7). The mean frequency of the higher frequency substitution neighbor was 31.79 per million. We also created a set of 18 unrelated word primes of the same length as the related primes (mean frequency: 30.60). Thus, each target word (e.g. *CAUSAL*) could be preceded by its higher

frequency substitution neighbor (e.g. *caudal*, “flow”) or by an unrelated word (e.g. *toalla*, “towel”). A set of 18 orthographically legal nonwords was also created for the purposes of the lexical decision task (mean Coltheart’s N: 0.89; range: 0-5; mean length=5.14, range: 4-7). The manipulation of the nonword trials was the same as that for the word trials.

Procedure. This was the same as in Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

Incorrect responses (5.7% of the word data) and responses with latencies beyond the 250-1500 cut-off points (1% of the word data) were excluded from the latency analyses. Mean reaction times and percentages of errors are presented in Table 2. ANOVAs based on the participant and item response latencies and error percentage were conducted based on a 2 (Prime-target relatedness: higher-frequency substitution neighbor, unrelated) x 2 (List: list 1, list 2) design.

Word data. Participants responded 19 ms more slowly to words preceded by a higher frequency substitution neighbor than by an unrelated word, $F_1(1,26)=4.96$, $p<.04$, $MSE=1008$; $F_2(1,16)=5.24$, $p<.04$, $MSE=695$. The ANOVA on the error rates did not show any significant difference (both $F_s<1$).

Nonword data. None of the effects were significant (all $p_s>.15$)

By using a subset of words from Experiment 3, we replicated the inhibitory relatedness effect from higher frequency substitution neighbors (*caudal-CAUSAL* vs. *toalla-CAUSAL*). Besides adding empirical evidence in favor of inhibition from higher

frequency substitution neighbors (Segui & Grainger, 1990; see also Bijeljac-Babic et al., 1997; Davis & Lupker, 2006), this finding confirms that the null transposed-letter priming effect in Experiment 3 is not due to the specific words that were selected, or the characteristics of the task, but rather to the relationship between primes and targets. Therefore, it seems that transposed-letter neighbors like *CASUAL* and *CAUSAL* are not related in exactly the same way as substitution neighbors like *CAUDAL* and *CAUSAL*.

Experiment 5a and 5b

The results from the previous sets of experiments do not show any signs of co-activation of the two members of a transposed-letter word pair. It should be noted that in Experiments 3-4, all prime words were of higher frequency than the target words. In Andrews's (1996) masked priming experiment, the two members of the transposed-letter pair were presented twice (in different blocks), so that the low frequency member acted as a prime or as a target, depending on the block. Andrews found that, irrespective of the frequency manipulation, words preceded by a transposed-letter word prime were recognized more slowly and less accurately than words preceded by an unrelated prime –note, however, that the transposed-letter priming effect was not significant in the item analyses.

In Experiment 5, and in a new attempt to examine the presence of transposed-letter priming effect with word-word pairs, we examined whether a high-frequency transposed-letter word could be influenced by its lower frequency transposed-letter mate. Note, however, that Segui and Grainger (1990), using substitution neighbors, did not find any signs of a priming effect when high-frequency target words were preceded

by lower frequency substitution neighbors (relative to an unrelated word priming condition; but see Nakayama, Sears & Lupker, in press).

In Andrews's (1996) priming experiment, the SOA employed was 56 ms. Although the SOA difference regarding our previous experiments is small (10 ms) and, on *a priori* grounds, should not be the reason for the divergent results, we wished to examine whether this potential difference played a role in the size of the priming effects. For that reason, Experiment 5 was conducted using two different samples of participants and two different SOAs: 50-ms SOA (Experiment 5a) and 66-ms SOA (Experiment 5b).

Method

Participants. A total of fifty students from the University of La Laguna received course credit for participating in these experiments. All of them had either normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish. None of them had taken part in Experiments 1-4. Twenty-six participants took part in Experiment 5a and twenty-four participants completed Experiment 5b.

Materials. We selected a set of 42 high frequency Spanish words as targets –these words had been the related primes in Experiment 3. These target words could be preceded by their corresponding transposed-letter low frequency neighbors (i.e., the target words in Experiment 3) or by an unrelated word. The unrelated word primes were matched as closely as possible to the related primes in word frequency (mean: 8.77) and number of substitution neighbors (mean: 3.4, range: 0-15). Thus, target words were preceded by primes that were 1) a transposed-letter neighbor from the target (*cedro-CERDO*, “cedar”-“PIG”), or 2) an unrelated word (*noría-CERDO*, “big wheel”-“PIG”) All the targets had higher frequencies than their corresponding primes. The same set of

nonword targets used in Experiment 3 was used in the present experiment. Two lists of materials were created for this experiment (following a counterbalanced design).

Procedure. The procedure for Experiment 5a was the same as in Experiment 1. In Experiment 5b, the procedure was the same as in Experiment 5a except that the SOA was set to 50 ms (instead of 66 ms).

Results and Discussion

Incorrect responses (0.3% of the data in Experiment 5a and 4.2% in Experiment 5b) and reaction times that fell beyond the cutoff values of 250-1500 ms (0.6% of the trials in Experiment 5a and 2.6% in Experiment 5b) were not included in the latency analyses. Mean response latencies and percentages of errors are presented in Table 3. ANOVAs based on the participant and item response latencies and error percentage were conducted based on a 2 (Prime-target relationship: transposed-letter, unrelated) x 2 (List: list 1, list 2) design.

--- Insert Table 3 around here ---

Experiment 5a

Word data. None of the effects were significant (all $F_s < 1$).

Nonword data. None of the effects were significant (all $F_s < 1$).

Experiment 5b

Word data. None of the effects were significant (all $F_s < 1$).

Nonword data. Participants recognized faster the nonwords preceded by an orthographically related prime (transposed-letter primes) than the nonwords preceded

by an unrelated prime (13 ms faster). However, this difference did not approach significance, $F_1(1,26)=1.38$, $p>.20$; $F_2(1,40)=1.62$, $p>.20$. The ANOVA on the error data did not reveal any significant effects (both $ps>.20$).

Again, there were no signs of a priming effect with transposed-letter word primes. Unlike Andrews's (1996) masked priming experiment, no signs of an inhibition effects were found when priming a transposed-letter word with its low frequency transposed-letter mate –relative to an unrelated prime. Indeed, the potential criticism that the SOA in Andrews's experiment was slightly shorter than in our previous experiments (56 vs. 66 ms) does not to apply here: the pattern of results was very much the same at the 66 and 50 ms SOAs. Thus, once more we failed to obtain a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes and, furthermore, the argument of a potential interaction between the SOA and the magnitude of priming effects cannot be applied to our data.

General Discussion

The main findings of the present series of masked priming experiments can be summarized as follows. First, transposed-letter word primes do not produce any signs of a priming effect when compared with an unrelated word condition (e.g., *causal-CASUAL* vs. *toalla-CASUAL*; Experiments 3-5). Second, the absence of a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes is irrespective of the prime/target relative frequency (Experiments 3-4). Third, there are no signs of a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes when the control condition is a double-substitution word (e.g., *causal-CASUAL* vs. *carnal-CASUAL*; Experiment 1). Fourth, there is a robust transposed-letter priming effect when the primes were nonwords (i.e., lexicality of the

transposed-letter prime is a determining factor; Experiments 1-2) –note that the lack of a transposed-letter priming effect with word primes cannot be attributed to the characteristics of the target words employed in the experiment because the same set of materials replicates other well-established masked priming effects: an inhibitory effect from higher-frequency substitution neighbors (Experiment 4), and a facilitative transposed-letter priming effect from nonword primes (Experiment 2). Taken together, the present findings have important implications for models of visual-word recognition.

As indicated in the Introduction, the strongest evidence in favor from a significant transposed-letter priming effect with word stimuli comes from the study of Andrews (1996). Andrews reported that, under masked priming conditions, responses to words preceded by a transposed-letter word prime were slowed down relative to an unrelated control prime. (Note, however, that this difference was not significant in the analysis by items, $p > .28$.) Nonetheless, Castles et al. (2003) reported a failure to replicate the masked transposed-letter priming effect with word primes in a behavioral study. Furthermore, in a recent experiment, Duñabeitia, Molinaro, Laka, Estévez, and Carreiras (in press) examined the electrophysiological correlates associated with transposed-letter word-word and nonword-word pairs in a masked priming semantic categorization task. Duñabeitia and colleagues found that words preceded by a replacement-letter nonword elicited a more negative-going waveform between 150-250 ms (characterized as the N250 component) for words preceded by a transposed-letter nonword, replicating preceding ERP evidence (e.g., Grainger, Kiyonaga & Holcomb, 2006). More importantly, the N250 effect vanished for word-word manipulations (e.g., *casual-CAUSAL* vs. *carnal-CAUSAL*). Taken together, the present findings strongly suggest that prime lexicality also has a clear impact on transposed-letter priming – importantly, masked priming effects with transposed-letter word neighbors (*trial-trail*)

behave differently from priming effects with substitution-letter word neighbors (*train-trail*; see Davis & Lupker, 2006, for extensive discussion of priming effects with substitution-letter neighbors).

Indeed, the empirical evidence of an inhibitory effect with transposed-letter neighbors (e.g., longer response times to *trail* –because of the higher frequency neighbor *trial*, relative to a matched control word with no transposed-letter neighbors) in single-presentation experiments is also scarce [Footnote 3]. For instance, Perea, Acha, and Fraga (2008) failed to find an inhibitory effect from the higher frequency transposed-letter neighbors in a lexical decision task, whereas they found a significant inhibitory effect of neighborhood frequency for addition/deletion neighbors. Furthermore, in a recent study in which the participant's eye movements were monitored, Acha and Perea (2008) found that the effect of transposed-letter neighborhood was negligible in early pass measures (e.g., first fixation durations, gaze durations) and it only appears on late measures such as the percentage of regressions back to the target word. That is, Acha and Perea found an effect of neighborhood frequency for transposed-letter neighbors, but it occurred quite late in processing (see Johnson, 2008, for a remarkably similar pattern). Interestingly, research on substitution or on addition/deletion neighbors has reported an inhibitory effect from a word's higher-frequency neighbors in earlier measures in normal silent reading (e.g., gaze durations; see Davis, Perea, & Acha, in press; Pollatsek, Perea, & Binder, 1998). Therefore, transposed-letter word neighbors do not seem to behave exactly as other types of "neighbors" (e.g., substitution neighbors, addition/deletion neighbors, or syllabic neighbors).

What are the implications of the present findings for models of visual word recognition? Activation-based accounts of masked priming (inspired by the Interactive Activation model, McClelland & Rumelhart, 1981) predict a lexical inhibition process

when word-word pairs are presented, because lexical competitors of the target would be strongly activated (Davis & Lupker, 2006, for extensive discussion). In contrast, when nonword-word pairs are presented, there would be pre-activation of the word by the nonword prime, and hence the expected effect would be facilitative because “nonwords are, by definition, not lexically represented” (Davis & Lupker, 2006, p. 668). Thus, one would predict a facilitative nonword-word transposed-letter priming effect (as actually happened) and an inhibitory word-word transposed-letter effect. This is actually the pattern of effects that occurs with substitution neighbors (Experiment 2; see also Perea & Rosa, 2000) and with syllabic neighbors (Carreiras & Perea, 2002). In the present set of experiments, we obtained a facilitative priming effect from transposed-letter nonword primes, but we failed to obtain an inhibitory effect from transposed-letter word primes. How can we explain the obtained pattern of results from an activation-based model? One possibility is that transposed-letter word pairs (e.g., *casual-casal*) will generate more orthographic activity –they share all the letters– than substitution-letter word pairs (e.g., *caudal-casal*), and hence lexical inhibition from the higher frequency word prime could be cancelled out by bottom-up activation resulting from orthographic overlap. Of course, simulations of an activation-based account (with an appropriate input coding scheme) are necessary to assess how the model can account simultaneously for an inhibitory effect of higher frequency substitution primes and a null effect of higher frequency transposed-letter primes.

In addition, activation-based models can, in principle, account for the presence of transposed-letter priming for nonword primes but not for word primes with some tweaking, considering as “neighbors” those words that are one-letter different from others –that is, one would expect some lexical competition especially between addition, deletion and substitution neighbors (Davis & Taft, 2005). The idea is that the lexical

entries that are activated when a *transposed-letter word* is presented are those one-letter-different words from the prime (e.g., the prime word *slat* would activate *flat*, *seat*, *slot*, *slap*, and other substitution or addition/deletion neighbors from it; see Figure 1). In contrast, the lexical entries that are activated when a *transposed-letter nonword* is presented would be those words that constitute all the attractors for the letter string. Therefore, a transposed-letter nonword like *satl* would activate the word unit corresponding to *salt*. In contrast, the transposed-letter word *slat* is less likely to produce a high level of activation in *salt* –given that it was its own lexical representation (i.e., its own attractor in the lexical system).

--- Insert Figure 1 around here ---

There is an alternative account of the present findings. Forster's entry opening model (Forster, 1987; Forster, Mohan, & Hector, 2003; Forster et al., 1987) is based on the 'perfect match' hypothesis in masked priming. A masked prime activates, or opens, the lexical entries of several lexical candidates that are temporarily flagged. For those candidates to be selected, a verification process must occur, and this generally happens while reading the target word. Therefore, all the flagged candidates from the prime are helpful (facilitative) in the target recognition –at least when the neighborhood density of the target is not high. The entry-opening model (as put forward by Forster & Veres, 1998) does not offer a ready explanation for the prime lexicality effect. One option to explain the presence of a null effect for transposed-letter word primes would be increasing the importance of the verification process, so that the probability of verifying the masked prime is increased. However, this account runs into difficulties when trying to (simultaneously) accommodate the inhibitory effect with higher frequency

substitution word primes found in Experiment 5 (see also Davis & Lupker, 2006; Segui & Grainger, 1990).

What are the implications of the present data for the recently-proposed input coding schemes for models of visual-word recognition? Recently proposed orthographic coding schemes such as the SOLAR model (Davis, 1999), the overlap model (Gómez et al., 2008) or the SERIOL model (Whitney, 2001) predict that a transposed-letter item is highly confusable with its transposed-letter word mate at an orthographic level (i.e., *casual* and *causal* would be perceptually similar). Clearly, these coding schemes readily capture the facilitative priming effects with transposed-letter nonword primes (see Perea & Lupker, 2004). With respect to the null priming effect with word primes, the most plausible explanation is the presence of lateral inhibition within the lexical level, which could reduce the impact of the orthographic facilitation. Of course, simulations on a specific implementation of these models are necessary to examine their predictions. For example, the SOLAR model (Davis, 1999) was able to account for Andrews's (1996) results. Simulations with the SOLAR model show an inhibitory effect from the lower frequency transposed-letter neighbors. In his simulations, Davis found that "TL [transposed-letter] similarity 'helps' low frequency words and 'hurts' high frequency words" (p. 319). However, we failed to find any signs of a transposed-letter priming effect for word primes, irrespectively of the relative prime/target frequency. Thus, the present results pose a problem for the current version of the SOLAR model, and some parameter tweaking will be necessary to account for the present findings. The SERIOL model (Whitney & Cornelissen, 2008) [Footnote 4] also predicts that a transposed-letter prime should exert a higher activation on the target than a double-substitution word/nonword prime. Even though this was the case in our study for the nonword-word pairs, Whitney and Lavidor (2005) stated that "having a transposed-letter neighbor can

be inhibitory” (p. 208). That is, in the SERIOL model, the reduced facilitation from lexical TL-neighbors (as compared to non-word TL-neighbors) would be explained by increased lateral inhibition within the lexical level. Again, specific simulations on this model are necessary to examine whether it can simultaneously accommodate the presence of a null effect of transposed-letter word primes and an inhibitory effect of substitution word primes. Finally, in the overlap model (Gomez et al., 2008), letters in the visual stimulus have distributions over positions so that the representation of one letter will extend into adjacent letter positions (i.e., a measure of “noise”). In the overlap model, the spread of the encoded letter positions is narrower and more precise for words than for nonwords; the rationale here is that top-down influences allow for the position uncertainty to be reduced faster when words are presented. Nonetheless, a fully implemented version of the overlap model is necessary to examine whether it can capture the whole pattern of data in the present experiments.

In summary, the present series of experiments has examined a key issue in visual-word recognition: how letter positions are attained in words. We have shown that the lexicality of the prime plays a key role in transposed-letter priming effects: it is easy to misperceive the nonword *JUGDE* with *JUDGE*, but not the word *CASUAL* with *CAUSAL*, at least under the experimental paradigm used here. Thus, a lexical transposed-letter prime provides substantially less facilitation (a null effect) than a nonword transposed-letter prime. As a final point, the presence of differential priming effects for substitution neighbors and transposed-letter neighbors constrains the choice of parameters in the computational models of visual-word recognition.

References

- Acha, J., & Perea, M. (2008). The effect of neighborhood frequency in reading: Evidence with transposed-letter neighbors. *Cognition, 108*, 290-300.
- Andrews, S. (1996). Lexical retrieval and selection processes: Effects of transposed-letter confusability. *Journal of Memory & Language, 35*, 775-800.
- Bijeljac-Babic, R., Biardeau, A., & Grainger, J. (1997). Masked orthographic priming in bilingual word recognition. *Memory and Cognition, 25*, 447-457.
- Carreiras, M., & Perea, M. (2002). Masked priming effects with syllabic neighbors in the lexical decision task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 28*, 1228-1242.
- Carreiras, M., Vergara, M., & Perea, M. (in press). ERP correlates of transposed-letter priming effects: The role of vowels vs. consonants. *Psychophysiology*.
- Castles, A., Davis, C., & Forster, K.I. (2003). Word recognition development in children: Insights from masked priming. In S. Kinoshita and S. Lupker (Eds.), *Masked priming: State of the Art* (pp 345-360). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Castles, A., Davis, C., Cavalot, P., & Forster, K.I. (2007). Tracking the acquisition of orthographic skills in developing readers: masked form priming and transposed-letter effects. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 97*, 165-182.
- Chambers, S.M. (1979). Letter and order information in lexical access. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 18*, 225-241.
- Christianson, K., Johnson, R.L., & Rayner, K. (2005). Letter transpositions within and across morphemes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition, 31*, 1327-1339.
- Coltheart, M., Rastle, K., Perry, C., Ziegler, J., & Langdon, R. (2001). DRC: A

dual-route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. *Psychological Review*, *108*, 204–256.

Davis, C.J. & Bowers, J.S. (2006). Contrasting five theories of letter position coding. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, *32*, 535-557.

Davis, C.J. & Lupker, S.J. (2006). Masked inhibitory priming in English: Evidence for lexical inhibition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, *32*, 668-687.

Davis, C.J. & Taft, M. (2005). More words in the neighborhood: Interference in lexical decision due to deletion neighbors. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *12*, 904-910.

Davis, C.J. (1999). *The Self-Organising Lexical Acquisition and Recognition (SOLAR) model of visual word recognition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New South Wales.

Davis, C.J., & Perea, M. (2005). BuscaPalabras: A program for deriving orthographic and phonological neighborhood statistics and other psycholinguistic indices in Spanish. *Behavior Research Methods*, *37*, 665-671.

Davis, C.J., Perea, M., & Acha, J. (in press). Re(de)fining the orthographic neighbourhood: The role of addition and deletion neighbours in lexical decision and reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*.

Duñabeitia, J.A., Molinaro, N., Laka, I., Estévez, A., & Carreiras, M. (in press). N250 effects for letter transpositions depend on lexicality: Casual or causal? *NeuroReport*.

Duñabeitia, J.A., Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (2007). Do transposed-letter

similarity effects occur at a morpheme level? Evidence for morpho-orthographic decomposition. *Cognition*, *105*, 691-703.

Ferrand, L., & Grainger, J. (1996). List context effects on masked phonological priming in the lexical decision task. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, *3*, 515-519.

Forster, K.I. (1987). Form priming with masked primes: The best-match hypothesis. In M. Coltheart (Ed.), *Attention & performance XII* (pp.127–146). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Forster, K.I., & Forster, J.C. (2003). DMDX: A Windows display program with millisecond accuracy. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *35*, 116-124.

Forster, K.I., & Veres, C. (1998). The prime lexicality effect: Form priming as a function of prime awareness, lexical status, and discrimination difficulty. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *24*, 498–514.

Forster, K.I., Davis, C., Schoknecht, C., & Carter, R. (1987). Masked priming with graphemically related forms: Repetition or partial activation? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *39*, 211-251.

Forster, K.I., Mohan, K., & Hector, J. (2003). The mechanics of masked priming. In S. Kinoshita and S. J. Lupker (Eds.), *Masked priming: The state of the art* (pp. 3–37). Hove, England: Psychology Press.

Gómez, P., Ratcliff, R., & Perea, M. (2008). A model of letter position coding: The overlap model. *Psychological Review*, *115*, 577-601.

Grainger, J. (2008). Cracking the orthographic code: An introduction. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *23*, 1-35.

Grainger, J., & Jacobs, A. M. (1996). Orthographic processing in visual word

recognition: A multiple read-out model. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 518-565.

Grainger, J., & Segui, J. (1990). Neighborhood frequency effects in visual word recognition: A comparison of lexical decision and masked identification latencies. *Perception and Psychophysics*, *47*, 191-198.

Grainger, J., & van Heuven, W. (2003). Modeling letter position coding in printed word perception. In P. Bonin (Ed.), *The Mental lexicon* (pp. 1-24). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Grainger, J., & Whitney, C. (2004). Does the human mind read words as a whole? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*, 58-59.

Grainger, J., Granier, J.P., Farioli, F., Van Assche, E., & van Heuven, W. (2006). Letter position information and printed word perception: The relative-position priming constraint. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *32*, 865-884.

Grainger, J., Kiyonaga, K., & Holcomb, P.J. (2006). The time course of orthographic and phonological code activation. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 1021-1026.

Guerrera, C., & Forster, K.I. (2008). Masked form priming with extreme transpositions. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *23*, 117-142.

Hunter, Z.R. & Brysbaert, M. (2008). Theoretical analysis of interhemispheric transfer costs in visual word recognition. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *23*, 65-82.

Johnson, R.L. (2008). *The quiet clam is quite calm: Transposed-letter neighborhood effects in reading*. Submitted.

Johnson, R.L., Perea, M., & Rayner, K. (2007). Transposed-letter effects in reading: Evidence from eye movements and parafoveal preview. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *33*, 209-229.

Lupker, S.J., Perea, M., & Davis, C.J. (2008). Transposed letter priming effects: Consonants, vowels and letter frequency. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 23, 93-116.

McClelland, J.L., & Rumelhart, D.E. (1981). An interactive activation model of context effects in letter perception: Part I. An account of basic findings. *Psychological Review*, 88, 375-407.

Nakayama, M., Sears, C.R., & Lupker, S.J. (in press). Masked priming with orthographic neighbors: A test of the lexical competition assumption. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*.

O'Connor, R.E., & Forster, K.I. (1981). Criterion bias and search sequence bias in word recognition. *Memory and Cognition*, 9, 78-92.

Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (2006a). Do transposed-letter similarity effects occur at a syllable level? *Experimental Psychology*, 53, 308-315.

Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (2006b). Do transposed-letter effects occur across lexeme boundaries? *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 13, 418-422.

Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (2006c). Do transposed-letter similarity effects occur at a prelexical phonological level? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59, 1600-1613.

Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (2008). Do orthotactics and phonology constrain the transposed-letter effect? *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 23, 69-92.

Perea, M., & Estévez, A. (2008). Transposed-letter similarity effects in naming pseudowords: Evidence from children and adults. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 33-46.

Perea, M., & Fraga, I. (2006). Transposed-letter and laterality effects in lexical

decision. *Brain and Language*, 97, 102-109.

Perea, M., & Lupker, S.J. (2003a). Does jugde activate COURT? Transposed-letter similarity effects in masked associative priming. *Memory & Cognition*, 31, 829-841.

Perea, M., & Lupker, S.J. (2003b). Transposed-letter confusability effects in masked form priming. In S. Kinoshita and S.J. Lupker (Eds.), *Masked priming: State of the art* (pp. 97-120). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Perea, M., & Lupker, S.J. (2004). Can CANISO activate CASINO? Transposed-letter similarity effects with nonadjacent letter positions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 51, 231-246.

Perea, M., & Pérez, E. (in press). Beyond alphabetic orthographies: The role of form and phonology in transposition effects in Katakana. *Language and Cognitive Processes*.

Perea, M., & Rosa, E. (2000). Repetition and form priming interact with neighborhood density at a short stimulus-onset asynchrony. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 7, 668-677.

Perea, M., Acha, J., & Fraga, I. (2008). Lexical competition is enhanced in the left hemisphere: Evidence from different types of orthographic neighbors. *Brain and Language*, 105, 199-210.

Perea, M., Duñabeitia, J.A., & Carreiras, M. (2008). Transposed-letter priming effects for close versus distant transpositions. *Experimental Psychology*, 55, 397-406.

Perea, M., Rosa, E., & Gómez, C. (2005). The frequency effect for pseudowords in the lexical decision task. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 67, 301-314.

Perry, C., Ziegler, J.C., & Zorzi, M. (2007). Nested incremental modeling in the

development of computational theories: The CDP+ model of reading aloud.

Psychological Review, 114, 273-315.

Pollatsek, A., & Well, A. (1995). On the use of counterbalanced designs in cognitive research: A suggestion for a better and more powerful analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 21, 785-794.

Pollatsek, A., Perea, M., & Binder, K. (1999). The effects of neighborhood size in reading and lexical decision. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 25, 1142-1158.

Rayner, K., White, S.J., Johnson, R.L., & Liversedge, S.P. (2006). Reading words with jumbled letters: There's a cost. *Psychological Science*, 17, 192-193.

Schoonbaert, S., & Grainger, J. (2004). Letter position coding in printed word perception: Effects of repeated and transposed letters. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 19, 333-367.

Sebastián-Gallés, N., Martí, M. A., Carreiras, M., & Cuetos, F. (2000). *LEXESP: Léxico informatizado del español*. Barcelona: Edicions Universitat de Barcelona.

Seguí, J., & Grainger, J. (1990). Priming word recognition with orthographic neighbors: Effects of relative prime-target frequency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 16, 65-76.

Velan, H., & Frost, R. (2007). Cambridge University vs. Hebrew University: The impact of letter transposition on reading English and Hebrew. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14, 913-918.

White, S.J., Johnson, R.L., Liversedge, S.P., & Rayner, K. (2008). Eye movements when reading transposed text: The importance of word beginning letters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 5, 1261-

1276.

Whitney, C. (2001). How the brain encodes the order of letters in a printed word: The SERIOL model and selective literature review. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 8, 221-243.

Whitney, C. (2008a). A comparison of the SERIOL and SOLAR theories of letter-position encoding. *Brain and Language*, 107, 170-178.

Whitney, C. (2008b). Supporting the serial in the SERIOL model. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 23, 824-865.

Whitney, C., & Cornelissen, P. (2008). SERIOL reading. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 23, 143-164.

Whitney, C., & Lavidor, M. (2005). Facilitative orthographic neighborhood effects: The SERIOL model account. *Cognitive Psychology*, 51, 179-213.

Table 1

Mean lexical decision times (in ms) and percentage of errors (in parentheses) for word and nonword targets in Experiments 1 and 2

	Type of Prime		
	Transposed-letter	Replaced-letter	Priming
<u>Experiment 1</u>			
<i>Experiment 1a</i>			
Word-Word trials	824 (9.4)	816 (9.0)	-8 (-0.4)
Nonword-Nonword trials	873 (5.9)	864 (6.8)	-9 (0.9)
<i>Experiment 1b</i>			
Nonword-Word trials	773 (8.5)	801 (6.6)	28 (-1.9)
Nonword-Nonword trials	866 (5.2)	863 (5.0)	-3 (-0.2)
<u>Experiment 2</u>			
Nonword-Word trials (from 1a)	747 (9.0)	765 (11.1)	18 (2.1)
Nonword-Word trials (from 1b)	733 (10.2)	760 (10.4)	27 (0.2)
Nonword-Nonword trials	790 (6.4)	785 (7.1)	-5 (0.7)

Table 2

Mean lexical decision times (in ms) and percentage of errors (in parentheses) for word and nonword targets in Experiment 3 and 4

	Type of Prime		
	Transposed-letter	Unrelated	Priming
<u>Experiment 3</u>			
Word-Word trials	774 (9.0)	774 (7.4)	0 (-1.6)
Nonword-Nonword trials	857 (2.1)	862 (3.7)	5 (1.6)
18 Word-Word trials (Exp. 4)	746 (5.5)	739 (4.2)	-7 (-1.3)
	Substitution-letter	Unrelated	Priming
<u>Experiment 4</u>			
Word-Word trials	706 (5.6)	687 (6.0)	-19 (0.4)
Nonword-Nonword trials	779 (6.3)	782 (5.2)	3 (-1.1)


Table 3

Mean lexical decision times (in ms) and percentage of errors (in parentheses) for word and nonword targets in Experiment 5

	Type of Prime		
	Transposed-letter	Unrelated	Priming
<u>Experiment 5a (66 ms SOA)</u>			
Word-Word trials	689 (4.9)	686 (4.0)	-3 (-0.9)
Nonword-Nonword trials	693 (1.8)	697 (1.5)	4 (-0.3)
<u>Experiment 5b (50 ms SOA)</u>			
Word-Word trials	684 (3.7)	678 (3.1)	-6 (-0.6)
Nonword-Nonword trials	739 (4.3)	752 (5.8)	13 (1.5)

Figure captions

Figure 1. The organization of the lexical neighborhood. SN refers to One-Letter Substitution Neighbors, AN and DN refer to Addition and Deletion Neighbors; TLN refers to Transposed-Letter Neighbors. All adjacent circles would activate each other whereas non-adjacent circles would not.



Footnotes

Footnote 1. Two of the words from the nonword-primed set were discarded from the analyses because their error rates were higher than 50%. These words were *CAMPA* (a variety of “field”) and *UNÍVOCO* (“univocal”).

Footnote 2. One target word from the present experiment (i.e., *arce*, “maple tree”) produced error rates higher than 60%. When this word was taken out from the analyses, the *p* value of the *F*₂ analysis was reduced to .04.

Footnote 3. We must bear in mind that, in a priming paradigm, an item is explicitly activated and the effect on target performance is measured. In contrast, in a single-presentation paradigm, the issue concerns whether partial activation of neighboring words that were never presented influences responses to the target item.

Footnote 4. We compared the scores for transposed-letter pairs (e.g., *cerdo-CEDRO*) and double-substitution pairs (e.g., *censo-CEDRO*) using the Match Calculator software, version 1.9, programmed by Colin J. Davis. This application is available at Colin Davis’ website:

<http://www.pc.rhul.ac.uk/staff/c.davis/Utilities/MatchCalc/index.htm>

Author's notes

The research reported in this article has been partially supported by Grants SEJ2004-07680-C02-02/PSIC, SEJ2006-09238/PSIC and PSI2008-04069/PSIC from the Spanish Government, and by Grant BFI05.310 from the Basque Government. The authors express their gratitude to Ken Forster and Carol Whitney for their comments on an earlier draft.