

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a preprint version which may differ from the publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/139800>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2019-04-24 and may be subject to change.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Aspects of competition in word production: Reply to Mahon and Navarrete

Ardi Roelofs and Vitória Piai

Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ardi Roelofs, Radboud University Nijmegen, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Centre for Cognition, Spinoza Building B.02.34, Montessorilaan 3, 6525 HR Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Email: A.Roelofs@donders.ru.nl

1. Introduction

A hotly debated issue concerning spoken word production is whether lexical selection is by competition or not. Recently, Mahon, Garcea, and Navarrete (2012) claimed that associative facilitation from color-related words in the Stroop task challenges lexical competition accounts of word production, such as implemented in the WEAVER++ model (e.g., Levelt, Roelofs, and Meyer, 1999; Roelofs, 1992). Associative facilitation concerns the finding that color naming (e.g., say “red”) is faster with associatively related words (e.g., the word *fire* in red ink color or combined with a red rectangle) than with unrelated words (e.g., *lawn*). However, in a comment (Roelofs and Piai, 2013), we demonstrated through WEAVER++ simulations that associative facilitation is fully compatible with a lexical competition account. In a response to our comment, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) argued that these simulations are problematic and that recent event-related brain potential (ERP) data provide evidence against lexical selection by competition.

In the present article, we first briefly discuss the associative facilitation in the Stroop task and our demonstration by computer simulations that the facilitation is fully compatible with a lexical competition account of word production (Section 2). Next, we argue that the rejection of this demonstration by Mahon and Navarrete (2014) is based on a mischaracterization of the competition account and its computational implementation in WEAVER++ and other models in the literature. We make clear what competition models really maintain and how competition is computationally implemented in these models, and we show that under the correct interpretation of what competition entails in these models, the rejection of lexical competition by Mahon and Navarrete is unwarranted (Section 3). Moreover, we argue that evidence on the time course of Stroop interference challenges the

1
2 response-exclusion account advanced by Mahon and Navarrete (Section 4). Finally, we
3
4 argue that the recent ERP findings are compatible with lexical competition models, again
5
6 contrary to what Mahon and Navarrete claim (Section 5).
7
8

9 **2. Associative facilitation and lexical competition**

10
11 In a seminal study of the effect of associative relatedness in the Stroop task, Dalrymple-
12
13 Alford (1972) obtained a facilitation effect of 85 msec in naming ink colors. Moreover,
14
15 Glaser and Glaser (1989, Experiment 5) obtained an associative facilitation effect of 27 msec
16
17 or more in naming color rectangles when the related and unrelated words were preexposed
18
19 (e.g., by 100, 200, or 300 msec) and a facilitation effect of 13 msec (significance unknown) at
20
21 zero stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA). In WEAVER++ simulations run by Roelofs (2003),
22
23 facilitation of 41 msec or more was obtained at word preexposure SOAs and no effect at zero
24
25 SOA. The facilitation effect at preexposure SOAs in the model clearly shows that associative
26
27 facilitation is compatible with lexical competition. This refutes the claim of Mahon et al.
28
29 (2012) that “the phenomenon can be explained only if one dispenses with the idea of
30
31 competitive lexical selection” (p. 375).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Still, although the absence of facilitation in the model at zero SOA is close to the 13
40
41 msec effect of Glaser and Glaser (1989), it does not agree with the facilitation that
42
43 Dalrymple-Alford (1972) observed at this SOA. Therefore, in our comment on Mahon et al.
44
45 (2012), we reported on our exploration of whether facilitation may be obtained at zero SOA
46
47 in WEAVER++ (Roelofs and Piai, 2013). Our simulations revealed that when the lexical
48
49 competition is somewhat increased by increasing the response-selection threshold (i.e., the
50
51 critical difference in activation between target and competitors) in the model (from 1.6 to
52
53 3.6), an associative facilitation effect of 27 msec is obtained at zero SOA. This corresponds
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 well to the 19 msec facilitation obtained by Mahon et al. (2012) in their own experiment.
2
3
4 The facilitation in the simulations concerned the difference in effect between associatively
5 related words (e.g., *fire* combined with a red rectangle) and unrelated words (e.g., *lawn*
6 combined with a red rectangle), contrary to the inaccurate suggestion by Mahon and
7
8
9
10 combined with a red rectangle), contrary to the inaccurate suggestion by Mahon and
11
12 Navarrete (2014) that we “tend to emphasize ‘facilitation’ and ‘interference’ relative to a
13 letter string baseline” (p. 123). Importantly, the tuning of the critical difference parameter
14 (i.e., the increase from 1.6 to 3.6) does not determine whether associative facilitation or
15
16
17 interference will be obtained, contrary to what Mahon and Navarrete incorrectly suggest in
18
19
20 their response. Rather, it determines whether facilitation will be obtained at word preexposure
21
22
23 SOAs only or, in addition, also at zero SOA. Moreover, the parameter tuning concerned a
24
25
26 small change rather than supplementing “WEAVER++ with additional processes” (p. 125) as
27
28
29 Mahon and Navarrete suggest.
30

31 **3. Critical difference and Luce ratio**

32
33
34 In their response, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) reject the counterarguments presented in
35
36
37 Roelofs and Piai (2013) by saying that “It is clear, from Roelofs and Piai’s discussion that
38
39
40 ‘tuning’ the free parameter CRITICAL DIFFERENCE effectively prevents lexical
41
42
43 competition from making a significant contribution to RT variance. But, if the way that
44
45
46 WEAVER++ explains semantic facilitation is by reducing (or even eliminating) the
47
48
49 connection between RT variance and lexical competition, then Roelofs and Piai have
50
51
52 provided an existence proof for our conclusion which was that semantic facilitation effects
53
54
55 are incompatible with the assumption of lexical competition.” (p. 124) However, the opposite
56
57
58 is true: Facilitation appeared in the model at zero SOA and not only at preexposure SOAs
59
60
61 exactly because we *increased* rather than reduced or eliminated lexical competition. Mahon
62
63
64
65

1
2 and Navarrete incorrectly equate competition in WEAVER++ with the Luce ratio, whereas
3
4 competition in the model has always been determined by two aspects, namely by the critical
5
6 difference and the Luce ratio.
7

8
9 As described extensively in earlier articles, competition in lexical selection in
10
11 WEAVER++ involves two phases (e.g., Levelt et al., 1999; Roelofs, 1992, 2003). In the first
12
13 phase, the activation of a target should exceed the activation of competitors by a critical
14
15 amount: the critical difference. In the second phase, the actual selection of the target is a
16
17 random event, whose probability is determined by a ratio of the activation of target and
18
19 competitors. We discuss these phases in more detail below.
20
21
22
23

24 First, the activation of a target lexical item should exceed that of competitors by a
25
26 critical difference. This aspect of the competition process in WEAVER++ is shared with
27
28 other implemented lexical competition models in the literature such as the model of La Heij
29
30 and colleagues (Bloem and La Heij, 2003; Starreveld and La Heij, 1996). As Starreveld and
31
32 La Heij (1996) stated, “Selection takes place when the activation of a phonological node
33
34 exceeds that of all other phonological nodes by some critical amount c (see Roelofs, 1992a,
35
36 for a selection mechanism that incorporates a similar parameter). If the selection process is
37
38 more difficult, the selection will take more iterations, and the simulated RT will be longer.”
39
40 (p. 904) In WEAVER++ and the model of Starreveld and La Heij, processing happens in
41
42 discrete time steps. On every time step, activation spreads from node to node in a lexical
43
44 network. Assume that the color of the word *green* in red ink has to be named (say “red”). In
45
46 the simulations, the corresponding concept node (for the red ink) and word node (for the
47
48 word *green*) receive external activation. Activation then spreads through the network with
49
50 each node sending a proportion of its activation to connected nodes. As a result, the word
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 nodes of *red* and *green* become activated. The word node for *red* will only be selected if its
3
4 level of activation exceeds that of competitors (e.g., *green*) by a critical amount. It will take
5
6 more time steps before this critical difference in activation between target and competitors is
7
8 reached in the incongruent Stroop condition (e.g., *green* in red ink) than in a control condition
9
10 (e.g., consisting of a series of Xs in red ink), because the activation of competitor word nodes
11
12 will be boosted by incongruent words (e.g., *green*) but not by Xs. Moreover, as the
13
14 WEAVER++ simulations of Roelofs (2003) and Roelofs and Piai (2013) showed, it takes
15
16 fewer time steps before the critical difference is reached with associatively related words
17
18 (e.g., *fire* in red ink) than unrelated words (e.g., *lawn* in red ink): the associative facilitation
19
20
21
22
23
24 effect.

25
26
27 Second, once the critical difference in activation has been reached in WEAVER++,
28
29 the actual selection of the target lexical item at a particular moment in time is a random event,
30
31 whose probability is determined by the Luce ratio (i.e., the activation of the target divided by
32
33 that of the sum of the activation of the competitors and the target itself). The higher the
34
35 activation of competitors, the longer it takes before the target is actually selected. This second
36
37 aspect of competition is not part of the model of La Heij and colleagues. So, the speed of
38
39 selection of the target lexical item in WEAVER++ depends in two ways on the activation
40
41 level of competitors, namely through the critical difference and the Luce ratio.
42
43
44

45
46 However, contrary to this, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) erroneously do not take the
47
48 exceeding of the critical difference to be part of the competition process. They stated, “less
49
50 attention has been paid to the computational step in the model that immediately precedes
51
52 lexical selection by competition. However, the faster (i.e., fewer time steps) a target word
53
54 takes to exceed the CRITICAL DIFFERENCE, the faster the system will advance to the stage
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 at which selection is a probabilistic event modeled using the Luce choice ratio (i.e., lexical
3 selection by competition).” But this incorrectly characterizes the competition process in
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

WEAVER++ as well as in the model of La Heij and colleagues, where the critical difference has always been at the heart of the competition process. In fact, if one would take the critical difference not to be part of the competition process, then the model of La Heij and colleagues would not be a competition model at all (since it does not use a Luce ratio), contrary to what La Heij and colleagues have argued in several articles (e.g., La Heij, Kuipers, and Starreveld, 2006; Starreveld and La Heij, 1996) and to what is maintained by Mahon and colleagues themselves. They stated, in these models “the time required to select the target word is affected by the levels of activation of nontarget words (La Heij, 1988; Levelt, Roelofs, & Meyer, 1999; Roelofs, 2003). This hypothesis is referred to as lexical selection by competition. The hypothesis of lexical selection by competition states that the time required to select the target word increases as the levels of activation of nontarget words increase” (p. 503).

The common way in which lexical competition happens in the competition models (i.e., shared by WEAVER++ and the model of La Heij and colleagues) is through the requirement that the target exceeds a critical difference in activation relative to competitors. The critical difference is at the heart of competition models rather than an aspect of these models of “peripheral interest” (Mahon and Navarrete, 2014, p. 124). Moreover, contrary to the suggestions by Mahon and Navarrete, it is important to distinguish the critical difference and the notion of a competition threshold that has recently been proposed by Piai, Roelofs, and Schriefers (2012), which is not part of WEAVER++. The critical difference concerns the

1
2 difference between target and competitors, whereas the competition threshold concerns
3
4 *which* items will be competitors.
5
6

7 Despite the demonstrations by Roelofs (2003) and Roelofs and Piai (2013) that
8
9 WEAVER++ accounts for the associative facilitation in the Stroop task, Mahon and
10
11 Navarrete (2014) still maintain incorrectly that the finding is incompatible with the
12
13 competition assumption of the model. However, Roelofs (2003) already showed that
14
15 associative facilitation occurs at word preexposure SOAs in the model, and Roelofs and Piai
16
17 (2013) showed that facilitation occurs at zero SOA when competition is somewhat increased.
18
19 The account of facilitation at word preexposure SOAs is important because models of Stroop
20
21 task performance should not only be able to explain effects at zero SOA but also at other
22
23 SOAs. However, Mahon and Navarrete concentrate only on zero SOA, thereby overlooking
24
25 that associative facilitation did occur in earlier simulations using WEAVER++ (Roelofs,
26
27 2003) and that the facilitation is thus compatible with lexical competition.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **4. Time course of Stroop interference**

35

36 Importantly, by concentrating only on zero SOA, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) missed the
37
38 fact that the SOA findings on Stroop interference of Glaser and Glaser (1989, Experiment 5)
39
40 challenge their response-exclusion account. This account holds that interference arises when
41
42 a motor program for the distractor word needs to be removed from an articulatory buffer. At
43
44 preexposure SOAs, incongruent color words (e.g., *green* combined with a red rectangle) yield
45
46 Stroop interference in color naming. The mean color naming RT in the control condition of
47
48 Glaser and Glaser was about 500 msec. Based on the estimations of Indefrey and Levelt
49
50 (2004; Indefrey, 2011), the articulatory buffer is estimated to be reached no earlier than about
51
52 145 msec before articulation onset (see Roelofs, 2014, for extensive discussion). For the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 study of Glaser and Glaser, this would mean that the articulatory buffer is reached no earlier
3
4 than about $500 - 145 = 355$ msec after color onset. This entails that under the response-
5
6 exclusion account of the interference effect at a word preexposure SOA of 300 msec, the
7
8 motor program for the word should still not have been removed from the buffer at $300 + 355$
9
10 msec = 655 msec after word onset. Similarly, in seminal SOA studies of Stroop task
11
12 performance, Glaser and Glaser (1982, Experiment 1) obtained Stroop interference at a
13
14 preexposure SOA of 300 msec. The same has been obtained more recently by Roelofs
15
16 (2010a). Moreover, Roelofs (2010b) obtained Stroop interference at a preexposure SOA of
17
18 400 msec, with a mean naming RT of about 600 msec. Under the response-exclusion account,
19
20 the latter finding entails that the motor program for the word is still not removed from the
21
22 articulatory buffer at about $400 + 455$ msec = 855 msec after word onset. The 655 and 855
23
24 msec estimates for response exclusion are much longer than the 200 msec proposed by
25
26 Dhooge and Hartsuiker (2010), who stated “responses to distractors can be removed as early
27
28 as 200 ms after presentation” (p. 887). This conclusion holds even when adding 100 msec for
29
30 the Stroop effect itself to the estimate of 200 msec. To conclude, extant RT findings on the
31
32 time course of the Stroop interference effect challenge the response-exclusion account.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **5. ERP evidence on distractor effects**

42
43 At the end of their response, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) discuss ERP data that they take to
44
45 be problematic for WEAVER++. First, Dell’Acqua et al. (2010) obtained semantic and
46
47 phonological effects of distractor words in picture naming in overlapping ERP time windows.
48
49 This is contrary to WEAVER++, where the onset of semantic effects should precede the
50
51 onset of phonological effects because semantic effects occur in lexical selection and
52
53 phonological effects during phonological encoding. However, Mahon and Navarrete do not
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 acknowledge that these findings of Dell'Acqua et al. are also problematic for their
3
4 response-exclusion account, where phonological effects should precede semantic effects,
5
6 because phonological effects occur during lexical access and semantic effects during
7
8 articulatory buffering according to this account (see Piai, Roelofs, and Schriefers, 2014, for
9
10 an extensive discussion). Moreover, the ERP findings of Dell'Acqua et al. challenge the
11
12 theory of Dell'Acqua, Peressoti, and Pascali (2007), which holds that semantic interference
13
14 arises during conceptualization processes (i.e., preceding lexical access), whereas
15
16 phonological effects occur during lexical access itself. Thus, the ERP findings of Dell'Acqua
17
18 et al. are problematic for all theories of word production. Given that the ERP findings of
19
20 Dell'Acqua et al. have not been replicated yet, we believe that it is premature to draw any
21
22 strong theoretical conclusions based on these findings, as Mahon and Navarrete do.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Second, Mahon and Navarrete (2014) argue that the ERP findings on the distractor
30
31 frequency effect of Dhooge, De Baene, and Hartsuiker (2013) challenge WEAVER++.
32
33 Dhooge et al. examined the time course of the distractor-frequency effect in picture naming:
34
35 Low-frequency distractor words yield longer naming RTs than high-frequency distractors.
36
37 They observed an ERP effect for low- versus high-frequency distractors between 420 and 500
38
39 msec and between 520 and 580 msec post picture-word onset. According to Dhooge et al.,
40
41 these ERP effects occur too late for WEAVER++ and thus support the response-exclusion
42
43 account. But is this conclusion really warranted?
44
45
46
47
48

49 It is important to note that competition in WEAVER++ not only occurs in lexical
50
51 selection but also in the selection of motor programs (i.e., during phonetic encoding, *before*
52
53 articulatory buffering), see Roelofs (1997, 2010a, 2014) and Levelt et al. (1999). Lexical
54
55 selection is the relevant level for the issue of the locus of semantic interference (semantically
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 related vs. unrelated words), but for the distractor-frequency effect, both lexical selection
3
4 and motor-program levels matter. In WEAVER++, low-frequency distractors are processed
5
6 longer (i.e., they are blocked out later) than high-frequency distractors and therefore induce
7
8 more competition at the lexical selection and phonetic encoding levels (cf. Roelofs, 1997;
9
10 Roelofs, Piai, and Schriefers, 2011). Indefrey and Levelt (2004; Indefrey, 2011) provided
11
12 estimates for the onsets of lexical selection and phonetic encoding, namely at about 200 msec
13
14 and about 455 msec post picture/color onset, respectively. However, the estimates of Indefrey
15
16 and Levelt were based on a mean naming RT of about 600 msec, whereas Dhooge et al.
17
18 (2013) observed a mean RT of 780 msec. For rescaling the estimates in case of longer mean
19
20 RTs, there are a number of options (Indefrey, 2011).
21
22
23
24
25

26 The most straightforward procedure would be a linear rescaling of all stage durations.
27
28 With linear rescaling, the onsets of lexical selection and phonetic encoding in Dhooge et al.
29
30 are estimated to occur at about 260 and 592 msec post picture-word onset, respectively. The
31
32 articulatory buffer is reached after 592 msec because phonetic encoding needs to be
33
34 completed before the motor program can enter the buffer. Another option would be to rescale
35
36 only some rather than all of the stage durations, based on assumptions about the details of the
37
38 experimental situation. For picture naming tasks with visual distractor words, it is plausible to
39
40 assume that early visual processing is more difficult with than without distractors. This would
41
42 entail that only the duration of early visual lead-in processes has to be rescaled rather than the
43
44 duration of all processing stages. With lead-in rescaling, the onsets of lexical selection and
45
46 phonetic encoding in Dhooge et al. are estimated to occur at about 380 and 635 msec post
47
48 picture-word onset, respectively. Again, the articulatory buffer is reached after 635 msec
49
50 because phonetic encoding still has to be completed. Thus, the distractor-frequency effect
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 (reflected in the ERPs between 420 and 500 msec and between 520 and 580 msec post
3
4 picture-word onset) occurred in the time window of word planning (i.e., 260-592 or 380-635
5
6 msec) rather than articulatory buffering (after 592 or 635 msec), regardless of the type of
7
8 rescaling, contrary to the claims of Dhooge et al. and Mahon and Navarrete (2014).
9
10

11
12 Nonetheless, Dhooge et al. (2013) took their ERP findings as evidence against the
13
14 lexical competition account and in favor of the response-exclusion account. However, even
15
16 without any rescaling, the ERP evidence of Dhooge et al. does not agree with the response-
17
18 exclusion account, which holds that the distractor-frequency effect should not occur earlier
19
20 than about 145 msec before articulation onset. That is, the ERP effect should not occur earlier
21
22 than about 635 msec post picture-word onset, whereas the effect was observed before 580
23
24 msec. In contrast, the findings of Dhooge et al. agree with WEAVER++'s assumption that the
25
26 distractor-frequency effect arises during word planning, which is also supported by other
27
28 EEG and MEG evidence on the time course of semantic and Stroop-like effects of distractor
29
30 words in picture naming (e.g., Piai, Roelofs, and Van der Meij, 2012; Piai, Roelofs, Jensen,
31
32 Schoffelen, and Bonnefond, 2014).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 It should be noted that cognitive processes usually have a random component that
40
41 influences their duration. The process duration on a particular trial typically will be shorter or
42
43 longer than the mean duration across trials. This holds for both RT and ERP data. Thus, the
44
45 time estimates figuring in the argumentation of Dhooge et al. (2013) and above should be
46
47 seen as approximations. Still, these approximations suggest that extant ERP findings are more
48
49 compatible with the lexical competition than with the response-exclusion account.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

6. Summary and conclusion

To recapitulate, we argued that Mahon and Navarrete (2014) incorrectly excluded the critical difference from the competition process in WEAVER++ and the model of La Heij and colleagues. Associative facilitation appeared in the WEAVER++ simulations of Roelofs and Piai (2013) at zero SOA and not only at preexposure SOAs because we *increased* rather than reduced or eliminated lexical competition, contrary to what Mahon and Navarrete maintain. Moreover, extant electrophysiological evidence on distractor effects in word production is either incompatible with all theories in the literature or specifically supports the competition account, again contrary to what Mahon and Navarrete maintain. Thus, whereas the response-exclusion hypothesis meets with theoretical and empirical difficulty (e.g., Aristei and Abdel Rahman, 2013; Abdel Rahman and Aristei, 2010; Abdel Rahman and Melinger, 2009; Hantsch and Mädebach, 2013; La Heij, Kuipers, and Starreveld, 2006; Mädebach, Oppermann, Hantsch, Curda, and Jescheniak, 2011; Mulatti and Coltheart, 2012, 2014; Piai et al., 2011, 2012, 2014; Roelofs and Piai, 2013; Roelofs et al., 2011, 2013; Sailor and Brooks, 2014; Starreveld, La Heij, and Verdonschot, 2013), the competition hypothesis remains a viable account of word selection in word production.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Abdel Rahman R, and Melinger A. Dismissing lexical competition does not make
6
7 speaking any easier: A rejoinder to Mahon and Caramazza (2009). *Language and*
8
9 *Cognitive Processes*, 24: 749-760, 2009.
10
11
12 Abdel Rahman R, and Aristei S. Now you see it ... and now again: Semantic interference
13
14 reflects lexical competition in speech production with and without articulation.
15
16 *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 17: 657-661, 2010.
17
18
19 Aristei S, and Abdel Rahman R. Semantic interference in language production is due to
20
21 graded similarity, not response relevance. *Acta Psychologica*, 144: 571-582, 2013.
22
23
24 Bloem I, and La Heij W. Semantic facilitation and semantic interference in word translation:
25
26 Implications for models of lexical access in language production. *Journal of Memory*
27
28 *and Language*, 48: 468-488, 2003.
29
30
31 Dalrymple-Alford EC. Associative facilitation and interference in the Stroop color-word task.
32
33 *Perception and Psychophysics*, 11: 274-276, 1972.
34
35
36 Dell'Acqua R, Job R, Peressotti F, and Pascali A. The picture-word interference effect is not
37
38 a Stroop effect. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14: 717-722, 2007.
39
40
41 Dell'Acqua R, Sessa P, Peressotti F, and Mulatti C, Navarrete E, and Grainger J. ERP
42
43 evidence for ultra-fast semantic processing in the picture-word interference paradigm.
44
45 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1: 177, 2010.
46
47
48 Dhooge E, and Hartsuiker RJ. The distractor frequency effect in picture-word interference:
49
50 Evidence for response exclusion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
51
52 *Memory, and Cognition*, 36: 878-891, 2010.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Dhooge E, De Baene W, and Hartsuiker RJ. A late locus of the distractor frequency effect
3
4 in picture-word interference: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Brain &*
5
6 *Language*, 124: 232-237, 2013.
7

8
9 Glaser MO, and Glaser WR. Time course analysis of the Stroop phenomenon. *Journal of*
10
11 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 8: 875-894, 1982.
12
13

14 Glaser WR and Glaser MO. Context effects in Stroop-like word and picture processing.
15
16 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 118: 13-42, 1989.
17

18
19 Hantsch A, and Mädebach A. What does the articulatory output buffer know about
20
21 alternative picture names? Evidence against the response-exclusion hypothesis.
22
23 *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28: 684-700, 2013.
24
25

26 Indefrey P. The spatial and temporal signatures of word production components: A critical
27
28 update. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2: 255, 2011.
29
30

31 Indefrey P and Levelt WJM. The spatial and temporal signatures of word production
32
33 components. *Cognition*, 92: 101-144, 2004.
34
35

36 La Heij W. Components of Stroop-like interference in picture naming. *Memory & Cognition*,
37
38 16: 400-410, 1988.
39
40

41 La Heij W, Kuipers J-R, and Starreveld PA. In defense of the lexical-competition account of
42
43 picture-word interference: A comment on Finkbeiner and Caramazza (2006). *Cortex*,
44
45 42: 1028–1031, 2006.
46
47

48 Levelt WJM, Roelofs A, and Meyer AS. A theory of lexical access in speech production.
49
50 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22: 1-38, 1999.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2 Mädebach A, Oppermann F, Hantsch A, Curda C, and Jescheniak JD. Is there semantic
3
4 interference in delayed naming? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
5
6 *Memory, and Cognition*, 37: 522-538, 2011.
7
8
9 Mahon BZ, Garcea FE, and Navarrete E. Picture-word interference and the response-
10
11 exclusion hypothesis: A response to Mulatti and Coltheart. *Cortex*, 48: 373-377, 2012.
12
13 Mahon BZ, and Navarrete E. The CRITICAL DIFFERENCE in models of speech
14
15 production: A response to Roelofs and Piai. *Cortex*, 52: 123-127, 2014.
16
17
18 Mulatti C, and Coltheart M. Picture-word interference and the response-exclusion
19
20 hypothesis. *Cortex*, 48: 363-372, 2012.
21
22
23 Mulatti C, and Coltheart M. Color naming of colored non-color words and the
24
25 response-exclusion hypothesis: a comment on Mahon et al. and on Roelofs and Piai.
26
27 *Cortex*, 52: 120-122, 2014.
28
29
30 Piai V, Roelofs A, Jensen O, Schoffelen J-M, and Bonnefond M. Distinct patterns of brain
31
32 activity characterise lexical activation and competition in spoken word production.
33
34 *PLOS ONE*, 9: e88674, 2014.
35
36
37 Piai V, Roelofs A, and Schriefers H. Semantic interference in immediate and delayed naming
38
39 and reading: Attention and task decisions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 64: 404-
40
41 423, 2011.
42
43
44 Piai V, Roelofs A, and Schriefers H. Distractor strength and selective attention in picture
45
46 naming performance. *Memory & Cognition*, 40: 614-627, 2012.
47
48
49 Piai V, Roelofs A, and Schriefers H. Locus of semantic interference in picture naming:
50
51 Evidence from dual-task performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
52
53 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40: 147-165, 2014.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2 Piai V, Roelofs A, and Van der Meij R. Event-related potentials and oscillatory brain
3
4 responses associated with semantic and Stroop-like interference effects in overt
5
6 naming. *Brain Research*, 1450: 87-101, 2012.
7
8
9
10 Roelofs A. A spreading-activation theory of lemma retrieval in speaking. *Cognition*, 42: 107-
11
12 142, 1992.
13
14 Roelofs A. The WEAVER model of word-form encoding in speech production. *Cognition*,
15
16 64: 249-284, 1997.
17
18 Roelofs A. Goal-referenced selection of verbal action: Modeling attentional control in the
19
20 Stroop task. *Psychological Review*, 110: 88-125, 2003.
21
22
23 Roelofs A. Attention and facilitation: Converging information versus inadvertent reading in
24
25 Stroop task performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
26
27 *and Cognition*, 36: 411-422, 2010a.
28
29
30 Roelofs A. Attention, temporal predictability, and the time course of context effects in
31
32 naming performance. *Acta Psychologica*, 133: 146-153, 2010b.
33
34
35 Roelofs A. Tracking eye movements to localize Stroop interference in naming: Word
36
37 planning versus articulatory buffering. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
38
39 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40: 1332-1347, 2014.
40
41
42 Roelofs A, and Piai V. Associative facilitation in the Stroop task: Comment on Mahon et al.
43
44 (2012). *Cortex*, 49: 1767-1769, 2013.
45
46
47 Roelofs A, Piai V, and Schriefers H. Selective attention and distractor frequency in naming
48
49 performance: Comment on Dhooge and Hartsuiker (2010). *Journal of Experimental*
50
51 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 37: 1032-1038, 2011.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Roelofs A, Piai V, and Schriefers H. Context effects and selective attention in picture
3
4 naming and word reading: Competition versus response exclusion. *Language and*
5
6 *Cognitive Processes*, 28: 655-671, 2013.
7
8

9
10 Sailor K, and Brooks PJ. Do part-whole relations produce facilitation in the picture-word
11
12 interference task? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 67: 1768-1785,
13
14 2014.
15
16

17 Starreveld, PA, and La Heij W. Time-course analysis of semantic and orthographic context
18
19 effects in picture naming. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
20
21 *and Cognition*, 22: 896-918, 1996.
22
23

24 Starreveld PA, La Heij W, and Verdonschot RG. Time course analysis of the effects of
25
26 distractor frequency and categorical relatedness in picture naming: An evaluation of
27
28 the response exclusion account. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28: 633-654,
29
30 2013.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65