



HAL
open science

Viewing-position effects in the Stroop task: Initial fixation position modulates Stroop effects in fully colored words

Patrick Perret, Stéphanie Ducrot

► **To cite this version:**

Patrick Perret, Stéphanie Ducrot. Viewing-position effects in the Stroop task: Initial fixation position modulates Stroop effects in fully colored words. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 2010, 17 (4), pp.550 - 555. 10.3758/PBR.17.4.550 . hal-01779309

HAL Id: hal-01779309

<https://hal.science/hal-01779309v1>

Submitted on 26 Apr 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Viewing-Position Effects in the Stroop Task: Initial Fixation Position
Modulates Stroop Effects in Fully Colored Words**

Patrick Perret and Stéphanie Ducrot

University of Provence, CNRS & Centre PsyClé

Short title: VIEWING-POSITION EFFECTS IN THE STROOP

Corresponding author:

Patrick PERRET

Centre PSYCLE

Université de Provence

29 av. Robert Schuman

13621 Aix-en-Provence, France

Patrick.Perret@univ-provence.fr

Viewing-Position Effects in the Stroop Task: Initial Fixation Position Modulates Stroop Effects in Fully Colored Words

ABSTRACT

In two experiments conducted with adult (Experiment 1) and child (Experiment 2) participants, we experimentally controlled the eyes' first fixation in the word using a variable viewing-position technique in a classical all-letter-coloring Stroop procedure. We explored the impact of initial-fixation position (optimal viewing position, hereafter called OVP versus end of the word) on the magnitude of Stroop effects (both interference and facilitation). The results showed that both interference and facilitation effects were reduced when the first fixation was located at the end of the word rather than at the OVP. These data make a new contribution to the study of the role of low-level processes in Stroop effects and add support to the growing body of research indicating that oculomotor processes can act as moderators of cognitive processes in the determination of Stroop effects.

Key words: Stroop task, Interference, Reading, Spatial attention, Optimal Viewing Position.

In the Stroop task, participants are instructed to name the color of the ink in which stimuli are presented (Stroop, 1935). A Stroop experiment classically compares three conditions. In the incongruent condition, the stimulus is a color word that is printed in a different color from the one it designates (e.g. the word "blue" printed in green). In the congruent condition, the word and the ink color correspond. Finally, the control condition consists of neutral words or non-words and provides a baseline for assessing the accuracy and speed with which participants carry out the basic task of naming the ink color. Comparisons of response times in these three conditions typically reveal an interference effect (longer RTs in the incongruent condition than in the control condition) and a facilitation effect (shorter RTs in the congruent condition than in the control condition). Interference in the incongruent condition stems from the differential automaticity of the two processes that conflict on those items: reading the word versus naming the ink color (MacLeod & MacDonald, 2000).

The mere existence of the Stroop effect is often cited as empirical evidence for the automaticity of reading, which is thought to occur without the possibility of being controlled. This view is supported by many studies indicating that Stroop effects persist in experimental conditions that should help participants ignore the meaning of the word (e.g. Lachter, Ruthruff, Lien, and McCann, 2008; see also Lien, Ruthruff, Kouchi, & Lachter, in press, for a discussion). Participants thus seem to process printed words in the same way whether or not they are informative for the task at hand. Two recent studies further documented this phenomenon in a new way that takes into account the oculomotor dimension of the task, which has been largely neglected up to now in the vast literature on the Stroop effect. In the first study, Hodgson, Parris, Gregory, and Jarvis (2009) investigated the effect of linguistic stimuli on eye-movement programming, using a modified version of the Stroop task which required a saccadic response rather than a verbal or press-button response. The subjects' task

was to respond by looking towards one of the four color patches that matched the “ink” color of a centrally presented word and to ignore the word’s meaning. Their results demonstrated that saccade-programming processes were affected by the word’s meaning even when the word form was irrelevant to task performance. In addition, they observed very short inter-saccade intervals between initial errors and subsequent corrective saccades, thus suggesting that saccadic responses were programmed in parallel to two goals defined by both the cue word’s meaning and color. The authors concluded that written-word cues could “capture” saccadic behavior in a manner similar to that found for peripheral visual onsets, in a task for which the semantic content of word stimuli must be ignored to effectively perform the task. In the second study, Smilek, Solman, Murawski, and Carriere (2009) used an eye-tracking device to record participants’ eye movements during the processing of Stroop material. The results indicated that the first eye fixations were systematically biased to fixate a particular position in the word: the OVP. A typical finding regarding the perception of written words by adults is that the ease with which printed words are recognized depends on the position where the eyes initially fixate. Word-recognition performance is maximal slightly left of the word’s center and decreases on both sides of this optimal viewing position (O’Regan, Lévy-Schoen, Pynte, & Brugailière, 1984). It has been shown that the typical leftward asymmetry of the viewing-position curve cannot be accounted for in terms of acuity alone, but results from the combined influence of several factors, namely, cerebral asymmetries (Brysbaert, Vitu, & Schroyens, 1996), attentional/perceptual biases¹ (e.g., Nazir et al., 2004; Nazir, Jacobs, & O’Regan, 1998), and distribution of information within the printed word, in languages such as English and French² (O’Regan et al., 1984; Stevens & Grainger, 2003). Smilek et al.’s (2009) data indicated that, despite the participants’ efforts to prevent themselves from processing the words in the Stroop task, eye-movement patterns (i) closely paralleled those observed during reading and (ii) paradoxically favored the

meaning-extraction process. This finding suggests that oculomotor behavior might influence Stroop effects: the difficulty for the participants to override their tendency to read could be rooted in their spontaneous bias to fixate a position in the word that facilitates word recognition. A crucial empirical argument in favor of this view is that the Stroop effect can be reduced if the first fixation deviates from the OVP. However, Smilek et al.'s (2009) study could not address this issue: because too few fixations fell away from the OVP, the authors could not compare the magnitude of the Stroop effect as a function of eye-fixation position.

In a study investigating the single-letter coloring effect (hereafter SLCE), Parris, Sharma, and Weekes (2007) provided the first data documenting the influence of the position at which the eyes initially fixate. The SLCE refers to the fact that when a single letter of a Stroop word is colored, the Stroop effect is reduced (e.g. Manwell, Roberts, & Besner, 2004). Parris et al. (2007) who suggested that this phenomenon could interact with the OVP effect, compared the SLCE obtained in four conditions, depending on the position of the colored letter in the word: initial letter, end letter, middle letter, or OVP. The results showed that a SLCE (i.e. the difference between Stroop effects obtained in the “all-letter condition” and the “single-letter condition”) was found for all letter positions except the OVP. This finding is in line with the hypothesis that eye-fixation position can modulate Stroop effects. However, in this experiment, the influence of the OVP was not studied independently of the single-letter coloring procedure. Manwell et al. (2004) argued that coloring a single element provides participants with a cue that helps them select a source of activation and aids selective attention. In contrast to situations in which all of the letters are colored and attention is therefore spread throughout the word, coloring only a single letter could enhance the viewing position's influence on the distribution of spatial attention (Besner & Stolz, 1999) and keep it focused on the single colored letter. Accordingly, the effect observed by Parris et al. (2007) might be specific to the SLCE experimental context and could hardly be

generalized to the broader range of classical Stroop studies. Thus, the authors could only conclude that “the OVP can moderate performance in the Stroop task *when only one letter is the color carrier*” (p. 278, our italics).

The Present Study

The aim of the present experiments was to explore the effects of initial-fixation location in a Stroop task with fully colored words. In order to achieve this, we needed to override the methodological difficulty that Smilek et al. (2009) encountered: spontaneous fixations in their eye-tracking study did not allow for comparing Stroop effects as a function of initial eye position. To avoid this difficulty, the present study relied on a different experimental paradigm: the variable viewing-position technique, known to elicit a highly stable pattern of performance in skilled readers³. This pattern gives rise to a systematic variation in reading performance as a function of the eye-fixation position in the word: word recognition performance is best when the eyes fixate slightly to the left of the word's center, and decreases when the eyes deviate from this optimal viewing position and move toward the beginning or the end of the letter string (O'Regan et al., 1984). In two experiments conducted with adult (Experiment 1) and child (Experiment 2) participants, we experimentally controlled the eyes first fixation in the word (at the OVP versus at the end of the word⁴) and explored its impact on Stroop effects (both interference and facilitation) in a classical all-letter-coloring procedure. In these experiments, participants had to identify the color of the ink in which stimuli were printed, in a computerized Stroop experiment. The stimuli were either incongruent (e.g., the word RED printed in green), congruent (e.g., the word RED printed in red), or neutral (rows of colored hash marks). Considering the theoretical arguments presented above, our main prediction was that an eye fixation at the OVP would increase the efficiency of word processing. Accordingly, we expected greater

interference and facilitation effects in the OVP condition than in the condition in which the initial eye fixation was located at the end of the word.

EXPERIMENT 1

Method

Participants. Twenty-nine students from the University of Provence volunteered to participate. Their mean age was 20.1 years. All were native speakers of French and reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision.

Design and Stimuli. Two sets of stimuli were used. The stimuli for the congruent and incongruent conditions were the four French color words, *bleu*, *vert*, *rouge*, and *jaune* (blue, green, red, and yellow). For the neutral condition, we used strings of hash marks matching the length of the color words used in the experiment, for example ##### for ROUGE (*red*). Half of the stimuli were four-letter words and the other half were five-letter words. The stimuli were equally likely to be colored in red (RGB 255,0,0), blue (RGB 0,0,255), green (RGB 0,220,75), or yellow (RGB 255,255,0) and appeared on a black background. Each stimulus was divided into five equally-wide zones (i.e., 0.8 letters wide for four-letter words and 1.0 letters wide for five-letter words). The stimuli were presented in such a way that subjects initially fixated either the center of the OVP zone (just to the left of the word's center), or the center of the rightmost zone (hereafter called positions P3 and P5). Across all participants, each stimulus was seen from both of these fixation positions. Experiment 1 thus manipulated trial congruency (neutral vs. congruent vs. incongruent) and initial fixation position (P3 vs. P5), in a 3 x 2 factorial design. All factors were manipulated within participants. There were 12 trials at each congruency level and each fixation position, making for a total of 72 experimental trials.

Apparatus and Procedure. Participants were tested individually. Stimulus presentation took place on a 17" color monitor (background luminance of 0.5 cd/m²) connected to a Pentium III laptop computer running on DMDX software version 2.9.01 (Forster & Forster, 2003). The stimuli were displayed in uppercase colored letters on a black background, in 24-point Courier New font (luminance of 25 cd/m²) with a 640 x 480 resolution. Participants were seated 60 cm from the screen. At this distance, one letter sustained 1° of visual angle. Each trial consisted of the following sequence of events (see Figure). At the beginning of a trial, participants had to fixate the cross displayed in the middle of the screen and not move their eyes. The importance of continuing to focus on this point was stressed repeatedly. Then, 500 ms later, the fixation point was replaced by a stimulus that remained on the screen until the participant responded. The stimulus was displayed off-center, i.e. shifted to the side with respect to the fixation point, depending on the position condition. In the P3 condition, stimuli were presented in such a way that subjects initially fixated the center of the OVP zone, located slightly left of center. In the P5 condition, stimuli were presented with their last letters on the central fixation point. The participant's task was to indicate the color in which each item was printed, as quickly and accurately as possible, by pressing one of four keys on a button box. Once the participant had responded, the screen was cleared and a new trial began after a 1000-ms delay. The order of the trials was completely randomized, with the constraint that none of the three conditions could occur more than three times in succession. Short subject-controlled breaks were allowed after 36 trials. A twelve-item training phase was held at the beginning of each session, followed by a single experimental block of 72 trials.

Insert Figure about here

Results and Discussion

Only RT data from correct responses were analyzed. The error data produced no effects of interest and showed no signs of a speed-accuracy tradeoff. Before any statistical analyses were conducted, response latency means and standard deviations on correct responses were calculated for each subject in each experimental condition. Any response that was more than 3 *SDs* above the subject mean was removed (see Long & Prat, 2002, and Berent & Marom, 2005, for an identical trimming procedure). Outliers accounted for less than 1% of the responses. We assessed the Stroop-interference effect by comparing the incongruent condition with the neutral condition, as Besner, Stolz, and Boutillier (1997) did. The RT data were input into a 3 (congruence: congruent vs. neutral vs. incongruent) x 2 (initial fixation position: OVP, P3 vs. word-end, P5) repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of Experiment 1 are summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

These analyses yielded a significant effect of trial congruency in the latency data, $F(2, 56) = 22.0301$, $p < .0001$, with RTs 40 ms longer in the incongruent-word condition (695 ms) than in the control condition (655 ms) and the congruent condition (645 ms). Pairwise comparisons indicated a Stroop-interference effect - responses were significantly slower in the incongruent condition than in the neutral condition, $F(1, 56) = 23.68$, $p < .001$. Conversely, responses were faster in the congruent condition than in the neutral condition, but the difference did not reach significance, $F(1, 56) = 1.8$, $p > .10$.

Responses on P5 trials (665 ms) did not differ significantly, $F < 1$, from responses on P3 trials (667 ms). The end-fixation position (P5) did not reliably facilitate color identification. However, there was a stronger Stroop effect in condition P3 than in condition P5, and this produced a significant interaction between fixation position and trial congruency, $F(2, 56) = 10.053$, $p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons revealed a significant difference between the congruent and control conditions in P3, $F(1, 56) = 4.05$, $p < .05$, but not in P5, $F < 1$. Conversely, the difference between the incongruent and control conditions was significant in the P3 condition, $F(1, 56) = 72.9$, $p < .0001$, but did not reach significance in the P5 condition, $F(1, 56) = 2.8$, $p = .10$, thus resulting in weaker interference and facilitation effects for condition P5 compared to condition P3.

The results of Experiment 1 are clear-cut. This is the first study showing that Stroop effects can be modulated by the eye-position variable when all the letters in the word act as the color carrier: whereas traditional interference and facilitation effects were observed in condition P3, both disappeared in condition P5. The use of the variable viewing-position technique allowed us to successfully address an unresolved issue in previous eye-tracking studies. Indeed, demonstrating that the eye position actually affects the magnitude of interference constitutes a critical argument in favor of Smilek et al.'s (2009) claim that low-level oculomotor processes mediate performance on the Stroop task.

Given the theoretical implications of these data, Experiment 2 was designed to replicate this result. Furthermore, in order to challenge the robustness of the viewing-position effect, we tested it on a sample of school-age children in whom oculomotor and visuo-attentional processes are still developing (Rayner, 1986).

EXPERIMENT 2

Experiment 2 applied the same procedure as Experiment 1 with a group of fifth graders. In this grade, children have already been reading for 4 years but still exhibit eye-movement behavior that is not fully developed (Ducrot, Lété, Sprenger-Charolles, Pynte & Billard, 2003; Rayner, 1986). At this age, French children are old enough for reading automaticity to have reached, at least an intermediate stage (see Samuels, LaBerge, & Bremer, 1978, for English). At the same time, although adult oculomotor strategies are not expected to be fully effective yet, an OVP effect is already observed in word-recognition studies (Aghababian & Nazir, 2000; Ducrot et al., 2003). The conjunction of these developmental trends thus makes this age range a particularly good one for challenging the robustness of the eye-position effect.

Method

Participants. Fifty-nine fifth graders who were native speakers of French, participated in the experiment. They were from two different classes of an elementary school located in Gap, a city in southern France. They were between 9 and 12 years of age (mean age = 10 years 11 months). All participants reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision.

Materials, Apparatus, and Procedure. The stimuli, apparatus, and procedure were the same as in Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

The results were analyzed as in Experiment 1⁵ and are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

As in Experiment 1, trial congruency generated a significant main effect, $F(2, 116) = 13.028, p < .0001$, reflecting the fact that RTs were longer in the incongruent condition (915 ms) than in the control condition (890 ms) and the congruent condition (867 ms). Pairwise comparisons indicated a Stroop-facilitation effect - responses were faster in the congruent condition than in the neutral condition, $F(1, 116) = 6.257, p = .013$ - and a Stroop-interference effect - responses were significantly slower in the incongruent condition than in the neutral condition, $F(1, 116) = 6.775, p = .010$.

We found no differences between the RTs observed on P3 (888 ms) and P5 (893 ms) trials, $F < 1$. But, there was a significant trial congruency by fixation position interaction, $F(2, 116) = 7.426, p = .0009$, with a stronger Stroop effect in P3 than in P5. Pairwise comparisons revealed a significant difference between the congruent and control conditions in P3, $F(1, 116) = 15.97, p = .0003$, but not in P5, $F < 1$. Conversely the difference between the incongruent and control conditions was significant in the P3 condition, $F(1, 116) = 8.22, p = .005$, but not in the P5 condition, $F(1, 116) = 1.931, p = .16$, thus resulting in weaker interference and facilitation effects for condition P5 compared to condition P3.

As can be seen in Table 2, we still observed the standard Stroop effect, and it was of about the same magnitude as in Experiment 1 (24 ms vs. 10 ms for the facilitation effect and 25 ms vs. 39 ms for the interference effect in Experiments 2 and 1, respectively). Stroop-dilution effects comparable to those observed with adults were evident by the end of the fourth year of reading instruction.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Our experiments provide a new contribution to the study of the role of low-level processes in Stroop effects. The results of Experiment 1 showed that the first eye fixation in

a word clearly modulates the Stroop phenomenon: whereas traditional interference and facilitation effects were observed in the OVP condition, both were found to be significantly reduced when participants were experimentally led to focus on the last letter of Stroop stimuli. The replication of the viewing-position effect with a sample of fifth graders in Experiment 2 further documented both the generalizability and the robustness of the effect: it can be observed at the earliest stages of automaticity and also when OVP effects in reading are stabilizing. These findings extend previous demonstrations of the importance of the OVP in single-word processing (O'Regan et al., 1984; O'Regan & Jacobs, 1992; see also Ducrot & Pynte, 2002). They also extend the results of Parris et al. (2007), which revealed an interaction between OVP and SLCE. Demonstrating that a viewing-position effect is observed independently of the single-letter-coloring procedure clearly widens the scope of Stroop studies, which should hereafter take the oculomotor dimension of the task into account.

The use of the variable viewing-position technique in our study allowed us to confirm that the interference effect is weaker if participants are led to move their eyes away from the OVP. Our interpretation of these data is that the eye-position variable may be responsible for a shift in the way in which interference is resisted. The replication of the Stroop interference effect in condition P3 is in line with the idea that skilled readers tend to process printed words when they are presented foveally, even if the written word provides no task-relevant information. In this case, resistance to interference must be achieved by suppressing the irrelevant color-word representation before it takes control of responding. Conversely, condition P5 may promote a preventive mode of resistance to interference on incongruent trials, by prevent the reading process itself. If letters presented on the right are perceived better than those presented on the left (which is presumably the case for French monolingual participants), then fixating to the right of the word's center (P5) is likely to reduce overall

letter visibility and prevent participants from reading the word. As a consequence, it could reduce the proportion of items for which a time-consuming process of conflict resolution is required, thus resulting in a smaller interference effect. A complementary account could be derived from a standard finding in the literature on visual word recognition: Words presented to the right visual field (RVF) are easier to recognize than words presented to the left visual field (LVF) (Lindell & Nicholls, 2003). A possible explanation for this asymmetry is that fixations on the left half of the word are less "damaging" than fixations on the right half, because attention can be allocated more rapidly to the right than to the left in people trained to read in that direction (see Ducrot & Grainger, 2007). Note that in condition P5 of our experiment, the first fixation was on the last letter of the word, which was thus displayed in the LVF.

Taken together, the results of the present study add support to Smilek et al.'s (2009) suggestion that experimental variations in the Stroop effect may partially rest on low-level oculomotor processes: Stroop effects are expected to decrease in conditions that favor eye fixations away from the OVP in such a way that word-recognition processes operate much less efficiently (e.g. the eyes are prevented from fixating - or are drawn away from - the OVP). Insofar as this factor is now known to affect both children and adults' resistance to interference, it should also be seriously considered in future interpretations of individual variability in Stroop performance. In this perspective, future investigations should assess the extent to which individual differences in Stroop performance could be associated with differences in eye-movement patterns. In the introduction of this paper, we suggested that reading involves managing eye movements in order to optimize information extraction. The present data indicate that this also holds true for reading prevention, which is the participant's goal in a Stroop task. Individual eye-movement differences might moderate the respective contributions of prevention and suppression mechanisms, which in turn would

affect their performance. To address this issue, two lines of research are presently planned:

(i) study the eye-movement patterns of adults with varying degrees of Stroop-task expertise, and (ii) explore the impact of dyslexia - which gives rise to specific visual-attentional processing (Brybaert & Meyers, 1993; Ducrot et al., 2003; Everatt, 1999; Lété & Ducrot, 2008) - on facilitation and interference effects in the Stroop task.

REFERENCES

- Aghababian, V. & Nazir, T. (2000). Developing normal reading skills: Aspects of visual processes underlying word recognition. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 76, 123-150.
- Berent, I. & Marom, M. (2005). The skeletal structure of printed words: Evidence from the Stroop task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, 31, 328-338.
- Besner, D., & Stolz, J. A. (1999). What kind of attention modulates the Stroop effect ? *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 6, 99-104.
- Besner, D., Stolz, J. A., & Boutilier, C. (1997). The Stroop effect and the myth of automaticity. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4, 221-225.
- Brysbart, M., & Meyers, C. (1993). The Optimal Viewing Position for children with normal and with poor reading abilities. In S. F. Wright, & R. Groner (Eds.), *Facets of Dyslexia and its Remediation* (pp. 107-123). Elsevier Science Publisher.
- Brysbart, M., Vitu, F., & Schroyens, W. (1996). The right visual field advantage and the optimal viewing position: On the relation between foveal and parafoveal word recognition. *Neuropsychology*, 18, 385-395.
- Ducrot, S., & Grainger, J. (2007). Deployment of spatial attention to words in central and peripheral vision, *Perception & Psychophysics* , 69 (4), 578-590.
- Ducrot, S., Lété, B., Sprenger-Charolles, L., Pynte, J., & Billard, C. (2003). The viewing position effect in beginning and dyslexic readers. *Current Psychology Letters : Behaviour, Brain and Cognition*, 10(1), Retrieved from the internet from <http://cpl.revues.org/document99.html>.

- Ducrot, S., & Pynte, J. (2002). What determines the eyes' landing position in words? *Perception & Psychophysics*, *64* (7), 1130-1144.
- Everatt, J. (1999). *Reading and Dyslexia: Visual and Attentional Processes*. London: Routledge.
- Forster, K. I., & Forster, J. C. (2003). DMDX: A Windows display program with millisecond accuracy. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *35*, 116-124.
- Hodgson, T. L., Parris, B., Gregory, N., & Jarvis, T. (2009). The saccadic Stroop effect: evidence for involuntary programming of eye movements by linguistic cues. *Vision Research*, *49* (5), 569-574.
- Jordan, T. R., Patching, G. R., & Milner, A. D. (1998). Central fixations are inadequately controlled by instructions alone: Implications for studying cerebral asymmetry. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *51A*, 371-391.
- Jordan, T. R., Patching, G. R., & Thomas, S. M. (2003). Assessing the role of hemispheric specialisation, serial-position processing, and retinal eccentricity in lateralised word recognition. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *20*, 49-71.
- Lachter, J., Ruthruff, E., Lien, M.-C., & McCann, R. S. (2008). Is attention needed for object identification? Evidence from the Stroop paradigm. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, *15*, 1110-1116.
- Lété, B. & Ducrot, S. (2008). Visuo-Attentional Deficits in Dyslexic Readers in the Reicher-Wheeler Task. *Current Psychology Letters : Behaviour, Brain and Cognition*, *24*(1), 25-39. <http://cpl.revues.org/document3523.html>

- Lien, M.-C., Ruthruff, E., Kouchi, S., & Lachter, J. (in press). Event frequent and expected words are not identified without spatial attention. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*.
- Lindell, A. K., & Nicholls, M. E. R. (2003). Attentional deployment in visual half-field tasks: The effects of cue position on word naming latency. *Brain and Cognition*, *53*, 273-277.
- Long D. L., & Prat C. S. (2002). Working memory and Stroop interference: An individual differences investigation. *Memory & Cognition*, *30*, 294-301.
- MacLeod, C. M., & MacDonald, P. A. (2000). Interdimensional interference in the Stroop effect: Uncovering the cognitive and neural anatomy of attention. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *4*, 383-391.
- Manwell, L. A., Roberts, M. A., & Besner, D. (2004). Single letter coloring and spatial cuing eliminates a semantic contribution to the Stroop effect. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *11*, 458-462.
- Nazir T. A. (2003). On hemispheric specialisation and visual field effects in the perception of print: A comment on Jordan, Patching and Thomas. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *20*, 73-80.
- Nazir, T., Ben-Boutayab, N., Decoppet, N., Deutsch, A., & Frost, R. (2004). Reading habits, perceptual learning, and the recognition of printed words. *Brain and Language*, *88*, 294-311.
- Nazir, T. A., Jacobs, A. M., & O'Regan, J. K. (1998). Letter legibility and visual word recognition. *Memory & Cognition*. *26*, 810-821.

- O'Regan, J. K., & Jacobs, A. M. (1992). Optimal viewing position effect in word recognition: A challenge to current theory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, *18*, 185-197.
- O'Regan, J. K., Lévy-Schoen, A., Pynte, J., & Brugailière, B. (1984). Convenient fixation location within isolated words of different length and structure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, *10*, 250-257.
- Parris, B. A., Sharma, D., & Weekes, B. (2007). An optimal viewing position effect in the Stroop task when only one letter is the color carrier. *Experimental Psychology*, *54*, 273-280.
- Rayner, K. (1979). Eye guidance in reading: Fixation location within words. *Perception*, *8*, 21-30.
- Rayner, K. (1986). Eye movements and the perceptual span in beginning and skilled readers. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *41*, 211-236.
- Samuels, S. J., LaBerge, D., & Bremer, D. (1978). Units of word recognition: Evidence for developmental changes. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior*, *17*, 715-720.
- Smilek, D., Solman, G. J. F., Murawski, P., & Carriere, J. S. A. (2009). The eyes fixate the optimal viewing position of task-irrelevant words. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *16*(1), 57-61.
- Stevens, M., & Grainger, J. (2003). Letter visibility and the viewing position effect in visual word recognition. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *65* (1), 133-151.
- Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *18*, 643-661.

AUTHORS' NOTES

Partial support for this research was provided by a grant from the "Conseil Régional PACA" and the "Conseil Général des Bouches du Rhône" to the second author. We are thankful to Benjamin Parris, Daniel Smilek, Evan Risko, and Joël Pynte for their helpful comments on the previous versions of this paper. Correspondence concerning this work can be addressed to P. Perret, Laboratoire PsyCLE, Université de Provence, 29 Av. Robert Schuman, 13621 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 1, France (e-mail : Patrick.Perret@univ-provence.fr) or to S. Ducrot, Laboratoire Parole et Langage, CNRS and Université de Provence, 29 Av. Robert Schuman, 13621 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 1, France (e-mail: Stephanie.Ducrot@univ-provence.fr).

FOOTNOTES

1. Note that perceptual biases may arise from perceptual learning (Nazir et al., 2004). According to this account, optimal word recognition will be obtained with eye fixations on the location in the word where the eyes prefer to land (i.e., between the beginning and the middle of the word; Rayner, 1979; Ducrot & Pynte, 2002).

2. In languages like English and French, for example, knowing the first letters of a word typically constraints on possible word identity more than knowing the final letters of a word.

3. Note that Jordan, Patching, and Thomas (2003) pointed out the fact that investigating visual-field asymmetries using lateralized stimuli without using an eye-tracker to monitor and control fixation location produces substantial amounts of misleading data (see also Jordan, Patching, and Milner, 1998 for similar conclusions). For our purpose, the most important point to emphasize is that the OVP effect remains identical, even under the stringent testing procedures adopted by Jordan and colleagues. Moreover, as Nazir (2003) pointed out, Jordan, Patching, and Milner (1998) showed in a study that was explicitly designed to investigate the effect of fixation errors on performance of laterally displayed words, that “noisy” fixations have virtually no effect on word-recognition performance.

4. An initial-letter condition was not included in this experiment because if performance declines when participants are forced to fixate on the outermost letters of the words, the processing cost is larger for fixations on the end letters than for fixations on the beginning letters (giving the OVP curve a J-shape rather than a U-shape). In this experiment, our aim was to oppose the two most extreme conditions: the OVP, where the greatest number of letters can be recognized, and the end of the word, where the word processing cost is maximal.

5. As in Experiment 1, only RT data from correct responses were analyzed (4.01% errors). The error data produced no effects of interest and showed no signs of a speed-accuracy tradeoff. Before any statistical analyses were conducted, response latency means and standard deviations on correct responses were calculated for each subject in each experimental condition. Any response that was more than 3 *SDs* above the subject mean was removed. Outliers accounted for 1.2% of the responses.

Table 1.

RTs as a function of Trial Congruency and Initial-Fixation Position. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses and error rates are reported in italics.

| | P3 | P5 |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Congruent Condition | 631.99 (90.25) | 658.78 (92.34) |
| Control Condition | 651.38 (69.75) | 659.51 (86.36) |
| Incongruent Condition | 713.18 (87.48) | 676.15 (83.20) |

Table 2.

RTs as a function of Trial Congruency and Initial-Fixation Position. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses and error rates are reported in italics.

| | P3 | P5 |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Congruent Condition | 846.47 (130.87) | 886.64 (138.20) |
| Control Condition | 891.99 (132.57) | 888.56 (129.71) |
| Incongruent Condition | 925.56 (154.60) | 904.61 (139.49) |

FIGURE




FIGURE CAPTION

Figure. Description of the procedure used