

Onset complexity and task conflict in the Stroop task

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-SIP-23-148.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Sep-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Parris, Benjamin; Bournemouth University, Psychology Hasshim, Nabil; University College Dublin, School of Psychology Ferrand, Ludovic; CNRS, LAPSCO Augustinova, Maria ; Université de Rouen UFR Lettres et Sciences Humaines,
Keywords:	Task set, Stroop task, Onset, Manual response

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Onset complexity and task conflict in the Stroop task
4
5
6

7 Benjamin A. Parris^{1*}, Nabil Hasshim², Ludovic Ferrand³ and Maria Augustinova⁴
8
9

10 1. Department of Psychology, Bournemouth University, UK
11

12 2. School of Health and Society, University of Salford, UK
13

14 3. Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LAPSCO, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France
15

16 4. Normandie Université, UNIROUEN, CRFDP, 76000 Rouen, France
17
18
19

20
21 Dr. Benjamin A. Parris
22

23 Department of Psychology
24

25 Faculty of Science and Technology
26

27 Bournemouth University
28

29 Talbot Campus
30

31 Fern Barrow
32

33 BH12 5BB
34

35 Email: bparris@bournemouth.ac.uk
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

Abstract

The present study examined the extent to which a key marker of task conflict, negative facilitation, is modified by *onset complexity*. Negative facilitation, slower RTs to congruent stimuli than to non-lexical neutral stimuli in the Stroop task, is thought to reflect competition between the task sets of colour naming and word reading in the Stroop task (also known as task conflict). That is, it reflects competition between whole task sets, over and above any competition between specific responses associated with a stimulus. An alternative account of negative facilitation argues that it reflects the specific phonological processing differences between pronounceable (e.g., congruent) and non-pronounceable (e.g., xxxx) stimuli that are magnified by the specific task contexts that produce negative facilitation (a mostly non-lexical trial context). Here we used *onset complexity* to manipulate pronounceability of the irrelevant words in the Stroop task to test this alternative account. However, before applying manipulations that produce negative facilitation, we initially tested whether there was an effect of onset complexity on Stroop task performance. The results from Experiment 1 (and 3) showed that complex onsets led to larger positive facilitation and congruency effects relative to simple onsets, but did not modify incongruent or neutral word RTs. Experiment 2 directly tested whether onset complexity modifies negative facilitation and provided strong evidence for no effect of onset complexity, contrary to the alternative account predictions. The implications of the results for task conflict theory, selective attention and phonological processing in the manual response Stroop task are discussed.

Keywords: Task set, Stroop task, Onset, Manual response

1
2
3 The Stroop task (Stroop, 1935) requires participants to focus on one dimension of a stimulus,
4 the colour dimension, whilst ignoring another dimension, the word dimension. The task
5 produces the Stroop *interference* effect – referring to the fact that identifying the colour that a
6 word is printed in takes longer when the word denotes a different colour (colour-incongruent
7 trials; e.g., the word *red* displayed in blue font) compared to a comparison baseline (e.g., the
8 colour-neutral word *top* displayed in blue font). In addition, words that are congruent with the
9 colour (colour-congruent trials; e.g., the word *red* in red font) commonly result in faster
10 colour-identification times when compared to a colour-neutral baseline condition, producing
11 the Stroop *facilitation* effect (Dalrymple-Alford, 1972; Dalrymple-Alford & Budayr, 1966;
12 see MacLeod, 1991, and Parris et al., 2022, for a review).

13
14
15 For most of their history, the magnitudes of Stroop interference and Stroop facilitation
16 were thought to result solely from the information conveyed by the irrelevant word
17 dimension. That is, the extent to which phonological, semantic, or response information in
18 the irrelevant dimension differed (together referred to as *informational* conflict) or was
19 consistent with that in the relevant dimension was thought to determine the magnitude of
20 Stroop interference and facilitation, respectively (Hasshim & Parris, 2014; 2021; MacLeod,
21 1991; Parris et al., 2022). However, more recent work has attributed some of Stroop task
22 performance to an additional competition between whole task sets, a form of conflict referred
23 to as *task* conflict (MacLeod & MacDonald, 2000; Monsell et al., 2001). That is, competition
24 between the endogenously activated task set for colour naming and the exogenously activated
25 task set for word reading; a form of task set conflict akin to that observed in task switching
26 studies (Monsell, 2003; Rogers & Monsell, 1995). In line with this idea, several lines of
27 research have attempted to measure task conflict independently of informational conflict (see
28 Littman et al., 2019 and Parris et al., 2022, for reviews).

29 For task conflict to occur, at least two task sets must compete for activation. This
30

1
2
3 means that the entire collection of control settings / task parameters that program the system
4
5 to perform one task (e.g., word reading – consisting of visual analysis, letter/grapheme
6
7 identification, lexical identification (semantic processing), phonological processing) would
8
9 compete for activation with the entire collection of control settings that program the system to
10
11 perform another task (e.g., classify a colour – consisting of visual analysis, colour
12
13 identification, semantic processing, phonetic encoding). The idea is that “whole task sets
14
15 compete, over and above any competition between specific responses associated with a
16
17 stimulus” (Monsell et al., 2001, pp. 139-140). That is, in addition to and over and above any
18
19 stimulus-response associations. In the context of the Stroop task, three findings have been
20
21 interpreted as evidence for “task conflict”: 1) Anterior cingulate activation on congruent trials
22
23 (MacLeod & McDonald, 2000); 2) slower colour-naming responses to neutral words (e.g., the
24
25 word ‘house’) than to non-lexical (i.e., non-pronounceable) stimuli (e.g., ‘xxxx’; see
26
27 Augustinova, Parris & Ferrand, 2019); 3) slower responses to congruent stimuli than to non-
28
29 lexical stimuli, also known as reverse or negative facilitation (e.g., Goldfarb & Henik, 2007).
30
31 In the present study, we focus on the latter.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Indeed, to measure task conflict in the Stroop task, studies have often compared
39
40 performance on trials on which the irrelevant dimension is a word (e.g., a colour word) to
41
42 trials on which the irrelevant dimension is non-lexical (e.g., a sequence of repeated letters
43
44 such as xxxx or www; e.g., Goldfarb & Henik, 2007). Since congruent stimuli contain
45
46 words (e.g., the word red in red) they should involve task conflict whereas non-lexical stimuli
47
48 should not, meaning that colour naming responses should be longer for stimuli that have
49
50 irrelevant real words than those that have irrelevant non-lexical stimuli. However, when
51
52 comparing congruent and repeated-letter string trials, congruent trials are commonly
53
54 responded to more quickly, producing positive, not negative facilitation (e.g., Brown, 2011;
55
56 Klein, 1964; Monsell et al., 2001), which might represent a challenge to the task conflict
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 account. Goldfarb and Henik (2007) reasoned that this is because in most Stroop tasks there
4 is a sufficiently large proportion of lexical stimuli to activate task conflict control. In other
5 words, constant exposure to real words in the Stroop task puts the *task conflict controller* on
6 high alert, ensuring that it is active, and that task conflict is kept low. The activation of task
7 conflict control means that positive facilitation can be expressed in the RT data. Goldfarb and
8 Henik (2007) further reasoned that increasing the proportion of non-lexical neutral trials (e.g.,
9 repeated letter strings) would create the expectation for a low task conflict context, thereby
10 reducing task conflict control. This would result in the exposure of task conflict via its unique
11 behavioural expression, *negative facilitation, where congruent stimuli are responded to more*
12 *slowly than repeated-letter stimuli*. The results from their Experiment 1 supported this
13 prediction (see also e.g., Entel & Tzelgov, 2018; 2020; Entel et al., 2015; Kalanthroff et al.,
14 2015).

15
16 In a subsequent experiment Goldfarb and Henik (2007, Experiment 2) replaced
17 repeated-letter trials with neutral word trials (i.e., the Hebrew word for *building*) and showed
18 that negative facilitation was now absent. Thus, they not only reported negative facilitation
19 for the first time, but they also showed its extinction. As a result, they introduced the notion
20 of a task conflict controller, a part of a system of cognitive control that is deployed to reduce
21 or prevent task conflict (see also Kalanthroff et al., 2018; and Littman et al., 2019, for a mini
22 review). Also, and importantly, this line of research has provided insights into the nature of
23 selective attention and has given rise to a new potential form of impairment that might
24 explain symptoms of clinical disorders such as obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD;
25 Kalanthroff et al., 2017).

26
27 Recently, however, the extent to which task sets and their control determine cognitive
28 performance has been questioned. In the context of task switching, some of the processing
29 costs that were previously attributed to controlled switching between active task sets, have
30

1
2
3 been accounted for with reference to feature-integration biases (see Schmidt et al., 2020).
4
5 Subsequently, Parris et al. (2023) described current challenges to the task conflict account of
6
7 negative facilitation in selective attention tasks. They pointed out that some of the findings
8
9 that were foundational in terms of the original conceptualisation of task conflict have not
10
11 been subsequently strongly supported and argued that the mechanisms that lead to negative
12
13 facilitation are not well-understood. In an attempt to highlight the notion that other accounts
14
15 of the data are at least feasible, Parris et al. (2023) also presented a tentative alternative
16
17 account of negative facilitation. In essence, the alternative account argued that contrary to
18
19 Monsell et al.'s (2001) position that “whole task sets compete, over and above any
20
21 competition between specific responses associated with a stimulus” (Monsell et al., 2001:
22
23 139-140), it is in fact competition between the specific phonological / phonetic responses
24
25 associated with pronounceable irrelevant stimuli and relevant colour names, that leads to
26
27 negative facilitation (see Parris et al., 2023, Figure 1); competition that is increased by
28
29 reduced control over word reading induced by the mostly non-lexical trial context.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **An alternative account of negative facilitation**

39
40 Parris et al. (2023) pointed out that the observance of negative facilitation is determined by
41
42 whether the baseline condition is non-lexical (e.g., repeated-letter strings) or lexical (colour-
43
44 neutral words). Task conflict proponents argue that the difference between these two types of
45
46 stimuli is the presence of task conflict on neutral word trials and its absence on repeated-letter
47
48 trials (hence their large proportion puts the task controller on low alert). Indeed, some
49
50 researchers (including ourselves) have even used the difference in RTs between these two
51
52 types of stimuli as a measure of task conflict (Augustinova et al., 2018; Augustinova et al.,
53
54 2019; Ferrand et al., 2020; Kinoshita et al., 2017; Kinoshita et al., 2018). However, Parris et
55
56 al. (2023) argued these stimuli also differ in *pronounceability*. Recent work indicates that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pronounceable letter strings result in the sub-lexically generated phonology which then
4
5 interferes with the segment-to-frame association processing in articulation planning, also
6
7 known as phonological encoding (Kinoshita et al., 2017). Given that repeated-letter Stroop
8
9 trials are free of this pronounceability cost, they might be responded to faster than congruent
10
11 Stroop trials, which are burdened by the pronounceability cost, thereby producing negative
12
13 facilitation (see Figure 1 for a visual representation of the two accounts of negative
14
15 facilitation). Under this account, negative facilitation is not due to the fact that a large portion
16
17 of repeated letter string trials puts the task conflict controller on low alert allowing the
18
19 expression of task conflict. Rather, a large portion of repeated letter string trials reduces
20
21 control over word reading and enhances the pronounceability cost of the infrequently
22
23 presented pronounceable items, including congruent stimuli, to the point that congruent items
24
25 are responded to slower than items that are free of pronounceability cost. Of course, if the
26
27 pronounceability cost is accentuated, why would the pronounceability benefit offered by
28
29 congruent trials not also be accentuated, producing more positive facilitation? Parris et al.
30
31 (2023) pointed out that having a large proportion of neutral trials in the Stroop task, whether
32
33 they be neutral words, repeated-letter strings, or shapes, has consistently resulted in the
34
35 absence of positive facilitation. In other words, there is something about a mostly neutral trial
36
37 context that prevents positive facilitation (see the General Discussion for a fuller discussion
38
39 of this issue). Thus, the conditions of the experiment remove the congruency benefit and
40
41 congruent words become equivalent to neutral words. Under this account there is no need for
42
43 a task controller and instead the burden of control falls to the controller that is already
44
45 responsible for reducing the impact of the phonetic code of the irrelevant stimulus during
46
47 Stroop task performance.

48
49 A prediction that follows from this alternative account is that any factor that modifies
50
51 the pronounceability cost will modify negative facilitation. Therefore, the present study
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 examined the extent to which negative facilitation is modified by pronounceability, using
4
5 *onset complexity* to manipulate pronounceability. Initially we investigated whether there was
6
7 an effect of onset complexity on Stroop task performance in a mostly neutral word trial
8
9 context. We then changed the mostly neutral word context to a mostly non-lexical, repeated-
10
11 letter trial context which was expected to induce negative facilitation.
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Onset complexity**

18
19 The onset of a word is the initial phonological unit which contains the initial consonant or
20
21 blend of consonants. Simple onsets are those that consist of a single consonant followed by a
22
23 vowel. The colour words *red* and *purple* are examples of colour words that have a simple
24
25 onset. Complex onsets are those that consist of two or more consonants. The colour words
26
27 *blue* and *green* have complex onsets.
28
29

30
31 Onset complexity has been shown to affect word reading latency. For example,
32
33 Frederiksen and Kroll (1976) reported that words with complex onsets are read aloud more
34
35 slowly than words with simple onsets. However, Kawamoto and Kello (1999) reported that
36
37 words with complex onsets are read aloud more quickly than are words with simple onsets –
38
39 exactly the opposite result. Kawamoto and Kello hypothesized that the inconsistency in their
40
41 results was due to how response latency was measured. Rastle and Davis (2002) replicated
42
43 Kawamoto and Kello's (1999) results when response latency was based on hand-marking
44
45 digitized responses, but reported an opposite effect when a simple voice-key was used,
46
47 replicating Frederiksen and Kroll (1976). Moreover, Rastle and Davis (2002) reported no
48
49 effect of onset complexity when an integrator voice-key was used. These results suggest that
50
51 the effect of onset complexity on word reading latency can be determined by how acoustic
52
53 latency is measured (Rastle & Davis, 2002; see also Kinoshita, 2000 vs. Schiller, 2008; for
54
55 contrasting effects of onset complexity in the masked onset priming effect). However, given
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the clear benefits of visually inspecting the acoustic waveform and hand-marking onsets, the
4
5 best evidence to date suggests a complexity benefit (words with complex onsets are read
6
7 more quickly than those with simple onsets; ~9ms in Rastle & Davis, 2002 and ~5ms in
8
9 Kawamoto & Kello, 1999). Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that in the Stroop task, the word is
10
11 not actually read aloud. Instead, a colour is named aloud, as in the vocal Stroop task, or it is
12
13 classified by button-press, as in the manual Stroop task. This permits consideration of onset
14
15 complexity without the attendant issues associated with measuring acoustic latency.
16
17

18
19 It is further worth noting that an effect of onset complexity on word naming latencies
20
21 in either direction have associated accounts: longer RTs for complex onsets have been
22
23 accounted for by the notion of a longer activation for the first phoneme of a complex onset
24
25 than for the single phoneme in a simple onset (McKay, 1987). Shorter latencies for complex
26
27 onsets have been accounted for by the notion of there being a larger number of competitor
28
29 words at the initial phoneme position (O'Seaghdha et al., 1992; Taraban & McClelland,
30
31 1987) for simple onset stimuli (e.g., *sand* would have neighbours *band, hand, land, wand*) –
32
33 here complexity is beneficial. Nevertheless, what is important for the purposes of the present
34
35 experiments is that both accounts are based on the notion that the effect of onset complexity
36
37 occurs at the stage at which the pronunciation is determined (Kawamoto & Kello, 1999).
38
39 Therefore, in line with our initial reasoning about pronounceability cost in the Stroop task
40
41 (see Parris et al., 2023) it remains plausible that onset complexity also determines the amount
42
43 of this cost. As far as we are aware, no study has yet investigated this type of effect (but see
44
45 Berent & Marom, 2005, who showed a skeletal congruency effect in the Stroop task which
46
47 reflected the overlap of phonological frames between word and colour name). Thus, the aim
48
49 of the present study was to fill this void and to investigate whether there is an onset
50
51 complexity effect in the Stroop task (Experiment 1) before going on to explore the effect of
52
53 onset complexity on negative facilitation (Experiment 2). To be clear, the alternative account
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 does not predict that either simple or complex onsets are the sole cause of negative
4
5 facilitation; if onset complexity modifies performance, negative facilitation will be bigger in
6
7 one condition than in the other, but it should be present in both because relative to a non-
8
9 pronounceable baseline, pronounceable stimuli will incur a processing cost.
10
11
12
13

14 **Experiment 1**

15
16
17 The aim of the present experiment was to investigate how onset complexity affects
18
19 Stroop task performance. To investigate this issue initially and independently of factors
20
21 thought to induce task conflict, the present experiment employed a mostly neutral word
22
23 context (see Goldfrab & Henik, 2007, Experiment 2). Since recent evidence indicates that
24
25 phonological processing does occur with manual responses (Parris et al., 2019; but see
26
27 Kinoshita et al., 2017; Kinoshita & Mills, 2020), the participants used manual key-presses to
28
29 identify the colour of different Stroop stimuli. The irrelevant dimension of these stimuli
30
31 consisted of irrelevant colour words with simple (i.e., red and purple) and complex (i.e., blue
32
33 and green) onsets. The onset complexity of colour-neutral words was further manipulated
34
35 such that words with complex (e.g., dry) and simple (e.g., dog) onsets were used. If onset
36
37 complexity affects pronunciation of any letter string, a difference will be observed between
38
39 the neutral trials with simple vs. complex onsets. If, on the other hand, the locus of the onset
40
41 complexity effect is at the level of activation of competitor responses (i.e., affects
42
43 informational conflict), onset complexity will interact with Stroop effects. In the present
44
45 experiment we also employed two different sets of Complex Neutral and Simple Neutral
46
47 words to avoid observed effects being due specifically to the choice of neutral words. Half
48
49 the participants were exposed to one set, half to the other.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Design

4 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Congruent vs. Neutral Complex vs. Neutral Simple) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures design with reaction times as the dependent variable.

Participants

Following Brysbaert and Stevens' (2018) recommendation for at least 1600 trials per condition, in both experiments presented in this paper we aimed to initially recruit at least 67 participants. Moreover, test sensitivity of the interactions and main effects were assessed through Bayes Factors and the optional stopping rule was applied for interactions (Rouder, 2014) after the initial 67 were recruited with the maximum number of participants limited to 90 participants given the funds available. In total 76 participants were recruited through the online testing platform, Testable (testable.org). Participants had to fulfil the following criteria to participate: 1) Be a Verified Mind; 2) Have an approval rate above 95%; 3) Be at least 18 years of age and below the age of 60; 4) Have English as their first language (British or American); 5) Could not have participated in previous Stroop studies run on the host account. It was also requested that the Testable Minds platform matched the number of male and female participants. All participants were paid \$4.50. Of the 75 participants, 4 were removed for reporting a language other than English as their first language, and 3 were removed for having >70% errors in any one of the experimental conditions. Of the remaining 69 participants, 36 were male. The ages ranged from 19-60 with an average age of 31.9 years (standard deviation = 10.3).

Stimuli and Procedure

The colours red (RGB: 255,0,0), purple (RGB: 128,0,128), green (RGB: 0,128,0) and blue (RGB: 0,0,255) were used as the response colours. These colours were chosen because the

1
2
3 names *red* and *purple* have simple onsets, whilst *green* and *blue* have complex onsets and the
4
5 two onset types were matched for word length (average 4.5 letters for both). The neutral
6
7 words were matched to the colour words on the following dimensions: 1) number of letters;
8
9
10 2) number of phonemes; 3) number of syllables. Complex graphemes such as ‘ph’ ‘sh’ (two
11
12 letters but one phoneme) and onsets with the first letters of the colour names R/B/G/P were
13
14 avoided for the neutral stimuli. There were two types of neutral stimuli; for complex onset
15
16 colour words there were both complex and simple onset neutral stimuli. Similarly, for the
17
18 simple onset colour words there were both complex and simple onset neutral stimuli. A
19
20 comparison of the two types of neutral words that are matched on psycholinguistic variables
21
22 permits measurement of potential onset complexity effects for neutral words. The complex
23
24 onset neutral words matched to the complex onset colours blue and green were *crew* and
25
26 *train* (Complex Neutrals for Complex or CNC) and the simple onset neutral words were *cake*
27
28 and *taste* (Simple Neutrals for Complex or SNC). Similarly, for the simple onset colour
29
30 words there were both complex and simple onset neutral stimuli. The complex onset neutral
31
32 words matched to the simple onset colours red and purple were *dry* and *frozen* (heretofore
33
34 Complex Neutrals for Simple or CNS) and the simple onset neutral words were *dog* and
35
36 *farmer* (Simple Neutrals for Simple or SNS; see Table 1 for the lexical characteristics of the
37
38 stimuli used in Experiment 1).
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 Furthermore, a second set of neutral stimuli were employed to avoid any observed
46
47 effects being due to the phonological characteristics of the onsets. In the second set, the CNS
48
49 words were *fly* and *clever* and the SNS words were *far* and *carbon*. The CNC words were
50
51 *tree* and *floor* and the SNC words were *tape* and *force*.
52
53

54
55 Once participants clicked the link to the experiment, they were directed to a reCaptcha
56
57 challenge. Once completed, participants calibrated their screen to ensure all stimuli were
58
59 presented the same size for all participants. Participants were then asked to enter their age,
60

1
2
3 gender, nationality and first language. They were then presented with instructions asking
4
5 them to respond as quickly and as accurately as they could to the colour of the font of the
6
7 letter string presented at the screen's centre. On each trial a fixation cross was presented for
8
9 2000ms before the onset of the Stroop stimulus. The Stroop stimuli stayed on the screen until
10
11 a response was made or until 2000ms had elapsed. Participants responded using the c (blue),
12
13 b (purple), n (green) and v (red) keys on their keyboards. Incorrect responses resulted in
14
15 feedback showing a large X (size +5 in Testable) which was presented for 500ms.
16
17
18 There were 384 trials in total. Forty-eight of the trials were incongruent, 48 were congruent.
19
20 Of the 48 incongruent trials, 24 had complex onset, 24 had simple onsets; likewise for the
21
22 congruent items. Of the 288 neutral word stimuli, 144 had simple onsets and 144 had
23
24 complex onsets. Of the 144 simple onset neutral trials, 72 were matched to the complex onset
25
26 colour words and 72 were matched to the simple onset colour words. Similarly, of the 144
27
28 complex onset neutral trials, 72 were matched to the complex onset colour words and 72 were
29
30 matched to the simple onset colour words (see Table 2 for a Stimulus Matrix for Experiments
31
32 1 - 3). Again, having the two types of neutral words matched to both the complex and simple
33
34 onset colour words meant that we could compare RTs to matched neutral words that differed
35
36 in onset complexity but were matched on other psycholinguistic variables.
37
38
39
40

41
42 --- Insert Table 1 about here ---
43

44
45 --- Insert Table 2 about here ---
46
47
48

49 **Results**

50
51 Only data from correct trials are reported below since there were no effects in the error data
52
53 other than main effects of Word Type (7.1% of data were removed as errors – see Table 3 for
54
55 error percentages as a function of condition). Any RTs greater than 2SDs either side of the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 overall mean were removed from analysis resulting in the removal of 2.8% of the correct
4
5 trials.
6

7
8 The data were entered into a 4 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Complex Neutral vs.
9
10 Simple Neutral vs. Congruent) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures
11
12 ANOVA and its Bayesian equivalent (see Figure 1; and see Table 3 for means, percentage
13
14 errors and Stroop effects). These analyses revealed a main effect of Word Type [$F(1.844,$
15
16 $125.389)$, Greenhouse-Geisser = 79.561, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .381$, $BF_{10} = 7.22 \cdot 10^{30}$] but no main
17
18 effect of Onset [$F(1, 68) = 1.138$, $p = .290$, $BF_{01} = 6.255$]. However, the interaction between
19
20 Word Type and Onsets was significant [$F(2.246, 152.704)$, Greenhouse-Geisser, = 6.667, $p =$
21
22 $.001$, $\eta^2 = .021$] with $BF_{incl} = 143$ for just the interaction (i.e., without the main effects also
23
24 included in the model).
25
26
27

28
29 The interaction was further decomposed into two one-way repeated-measures
30
31 ANOVAs and their Bayesian equivalents investigating Stroop effects in the Complex Onset
32
33 and Simple Onset conditions independently. A significant ANOVA for the Complex Onset
34
35 stimuli [$F(3, 204) = 62.883$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .480$, $BF_{10} = 3.27 \cdot 10^{25}$] was underpinned by a
36
37 significant overall Stroop or congruency effect (i.e., mean difference between Congruent and
38
39 Incongruent trials) of 119ms [$t(68) = 12.682$; $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = 0.930$, $BF_{10} = 3.56 \cdot 10^{11}$].
40
41 This latter effect resulted from a significant positive facilitation of 28ms [$t(68) = 2.985$,
42
43 $p(\text{Holm}) = .010$, $d = .711$, $BF_{10} = 23.056$] and a significant Stroop interference effect (91ms)
44
45 [$t(68) = 9.697$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .711$, $BF_{10} = 1.99 \cdot 10^{10}$] when CNC stimuli were used as
46
47 a color-neutral comparison baseline. When SNC stimuli were used to this end, the
48
49 aforementioned congruency effect resulted from significant positive facilitation of 22ms,
50
51 [$t(68) = 2.301$, $p(\text{Holm}) = .045$, $d = .219$] albeit where the Bayes Factor was anecdotal, BF_{10}
52
53 = 1.85; and a significant Stroop interference effect of 97ms, [$t(68) = 10.381$, $p(\text{Holm}) <$
54
55 $.001$, $d = .761$, $BF_{10} = 7.07 \cdot 10^{11}$]. Reaction times to Neutral stimuli with Complex vs. Simple
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 onsets did not differ significantly [6ms; $t(68) = 0.684$, $p(\text{Holm}) = .495$] where the Bayes
4
5 Factor supported the null, $\text{BF}_{01} = 3.632$.

6
7
8 A significant ANOVA for the Simple Onset stimuli [$F(3, 204) = 37.997$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 =$
9
10 .358, $\text{BF}_{10} = 2.91 \times 10^{16}$] was underpinned by a significant Stroop Congruency effect of 72ms
11
12 [$t(68) = 7.820$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = 0.571$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 268861$]. This latter effect resulted from a
13
14 non-significant negative facilitation [i.e., -7ms; $t(68) = 0.761$, $p(\text{Holm}) = .775$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.204$];
15
16 and a significant Stroop interference effect of 79ms [$t(68) = 8.581$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .626$,
17
18 $\text{BF}_{10} = 4.46 \times 10^7$] when CNS stimuli were used as a color-neutral comparison baseline. When
19
20 SNC stimuli were used to this end, the aforementioned congruency effect resulted from a
21
22 non-significant negative facilitation [i.e., -15ms; $t(68) = 1.627$, $p(\text{Holm}) = .316$] albeit where
23
24 the Bayes Factor was anecdotal, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.585$]; and a significant Stroop interference effect of
25
26 87ms [$t(68) = 9.446$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .690$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 1.55 \times 10^9$]. Again, reaction times to
27
28 Neutral stimuli with Complex vs. Simple onsets did not differ significantly [8ms; $t(68) =$
29
30 0.866, $p(\text{Holm}) = .775$] where the Bayes Factor favoured the null anecdotally, $\text{BF}_{01} = 2.179$].
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ***Effect of onset complexity on the Stroop Congruency Effect***

39
40 To assess the effect onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect further, the data
41
42 were entered into a 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) x 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs.
43
44 Incongruent) repeated-measures ANOVA and its Bayesian equivalent. These analyses
45
46 revealed a significant main effect of Word Type [$F(1, 68) = 105.631$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .407$,
47
48 $\text{BF}_{10} = 3.715 \times 10^{12}$] and as in previous analyses, no main effect of Onset [$F(1, 68) = 2.401$, p
49
50 $= .126$, $\text{BF}_{01} = 3.273$]. However, the interaction was also significant [$F(1, 68) = 9.662$, $p =$
51
52 $.003$, $\eta^2 = .025$, $\text{BF}_{\text{incl}} = 47$ for just the interaction] indicating strong support for an effect of
53
54 onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Post-hoc tests revealed that this interaction was due to a larger significant congruency
4 effect (119ms) for complex [$t(68) = 9.922$, $p(\text{Holm}) < 0.001$, $d = .864$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 3.559 \times 10^{11}$],
5
6 than for simple onsets (72ms) [$t(68) = 5.984$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 268861$]. Comparing
7
8 word types across onset complexity conditions revealed that onset complexity mainly takes
9
10 its effect on Congruent items [$t(68) = 3.371$, $p = .002$, $d = .244$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 18.309$] as the effect
11
12 on Incongruent items remained nonsignificant [$t(68) = 1.385$, $p = .171$, with the Bayes Factor
13
14 providing moderate evidence for the null, $\text{BF}_{01} = 3.042$]. Therefore, this latter effect of onset
15
16 complexity on the Stroop Congruency Effect is likely to result from changes on Stroop
17
18 facilitation instead of interference. Two supplementary ANOVAs and their Bayesian
19
20 equivalents were then run to directly to address this idea directly.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Effect of onset complexity on Stroop interference*

29
30 2 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Neutral) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-
31
32 measures analyses using the neutral trials that matched to the colour word for onset type
33
34 (CNC and SNS for complex and simple onset Stroop effects, respectively) further revealed
35
36 the main effect of Word Type [$F(1, 68) = 92.828$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .429$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 3.24 \times 10^{11}$].
37
38 However, both main effect of Onset [$F(1, 68) = 1.741$, $p = .191$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.318$] and the Word
39
40 Type x Onset interaction remained nonsignificant [$F(1, 68) = 1.248$, $p = .268$; with $\text{BF}_{\text{incl}} =$
41
42 0.302 for just the interaction] further suggesting that the aforementioned onset complexity
43
44 effect on the magnitude of Stroop Congruency is unlikely to result from changes on Stroop
45
46 interference and results from changes in facilitation instead.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Effect of onset complexity on Stroop facilitation*

55
56 This latter idea is directly suggested by the results of a 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs.
57
58 Neutral) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures ANOVAs revealing an
59
60

1
2
3 interaction between Word Type and Onsets [$F(1, 68) = 8.581, p = .005, \eta^2 = .045$, with BF_{incl}
4 = 57 indicating strong support for the interaction alone) in addition to main effect of both
5
6 Word Type [$F(1, 68) = 4.407, p < .040, \eta^2 = .016, BF_{10} = 106$] and of Onset [$F(1, 68) =$
7
8 8.819, $p = .004, \eta^2 = .038, BF_{10} = 3.588$, albeit with an anecdotal Bayes Factor favouring the
9
10 null, $BF_{10} = 0.608$]. Further post-hoc tests additionally revealed that the interaction was due
11
12 to significant *positive* facilitation of 28ms for complex onsets [$t(68) = 3.594, p(\text{Holm}) =$
13
14 0.002, $d = .224, BF_{10} = 23$], and non-significant *negative* facilitation of -7ms for simple
15
16 onsets [$t(68) = 0.896, p(\text{Holm}) > .9, BF_{10} = 0.204$].
17
18
19
20
21

22 --- Insert Table 3 about here ---
23
24
25
26
27

28 Discussion

29 The aim of the present study was to explore how onset complexity affects Stroop task
30 performance. The results from the present experiment convincingly show an onset
31 complexity effect on Stroop task performance such that complex onsets increase the
32 magnitude of positive facilitation and the Stroop congruency effect. Both effects were driven
33 by the fact that congruent words with complex onsets were responded to more quickly than
34 congruent words with simple onsets. This result, along with the null effects of onset
35 complexity on both incongruent and neutral words trials suggest the onset complexity effect
36 was driven by the activation of the phonological / phonetic representation of the correct
37 response, facilitating the classification of the colour (this is discussed further in the General
38 Discussion). This facilitating effect of complex onsets is consistent with the notion that
39 subvocal production of the colour name occurs even with a manual response (Parris et al.,
40 2019; but see Kinoshita et al. 2020), and is also consistent with a complexity advantage in
41 word reading (Kawamoto & Kello, 1999; Rastle & Davis, 2002).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The finding of robust positive facilitation in a mostly neutral word context is
4 somewhat unusual. Complex onsets appear to have created positive facilitation where
5 otherwise there would not have been. As Parris et al. (2023) have pointed out, when
6 presented in a mostly neutral word trial context, positive facilitation is not observed
7 (Goldfarb & Henik, 2007, Experiment 2; see also Shichel & Tzelgov, 2018); rather there is
8 no positive nor negative facilitation. This is in fact what we observe in the simple onset
9 condition in the present experiment. Thus, the finding of robust positive facilitation in the
10 complex onset condition is notable and indicates an extra level of information contributing to
11 performance.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Given the effect on congruent trials, it is somewhat surprising that the subvocal
25 production of the incongruent colour name – corresponding to the incorrect response – did
26 not also modify performance. Whilst a larger magnitude of interference was observed for the
27 complex onset incongruent stimuli (i.e., 97ms as compared to 79ms), the data are best
28 interpreted as showing no effect of onset complexity on incongruent trial RTs. It is also the
29 case that there was no onset complexity effect for neutral stimuli. An effect of onset
30 complexity on neutral and incongruent trials would be expected if the onset complexity effect
31 in the Stroop task were driven by just the phonological processing of the irrelevant word.
32 However, it is also notable that the size of the effect in the present study (~35ms) was much
33 larger than that reported in studies of intentional word reading (~7ms). Taken together, the
34 present results indicate that the onset complexity effect in the Stroop task is different from
35 that seen in studies of intentional word reading. The lack of an effect of onset complexity on
36 incongruent and neutral trials suggests that the onset complexity effect in the Stroop task
37 requires that the phonological codes of the word and colour name match; only then is the
38 complexity advantage observed. Indeed, the lack of an onset effect on neutral and
39 incongruent trials represents a limitation of the use of onset complexity as a manipulation; If
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the onset effect were apparent in the neutral and incongruent trials in the mostly xxxx trial
4
5 context, it would have least enabled us to argue that the disappearance of negative facilitation
6
7 is indicative of negative facilitation reflecting a different form of conflict to informational
8
9 conflict.
10
11

12 In intentional reading, the onset complexity effect results from the faster compilation
13
14 of the phonetic code of the written word but the results from the present study suggest that in
15
16 the Stroop task the complexity advantage is related to the benefit the phonetic code of the
17
18 written word has on the subvocal production of the acoustic code of the colour name. Thus,
19
20 despite the difference in the ease with which neutral words with complex vs. simple onsets
21
22 are read aloud (Rastle & Davis, 2002), there appear to be no implications for colour
23
24 responding. It is not therefore the pronounceability of the irrelevant word alone that matters;
25
26 it is the relationship between the pronounceability of the irrelevant word and the correct
27
28 colour name. Onsets that do not have congruent phonetic codes, whether they refer to
29
30 incongruent colours or neutral words, do not influence colour categorisation performance.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Experiment 2**

41
42 The aim of this experiment was to investigate whether onset complexity affects negative
43
44 facilitation. To do this, the mostly neutral word context employed in Experiment 1 was
45
46 replaced by a mostly non-pronounceable, repeated-letter stimuli context; a context shown to
47
48 repeatedly produce negative facilitation (Entel & Tzelgov, 2018; 2020; Goldfarb & Henik,
49
50 2007; Kalanthroff et al., 2013). Given the effect of onset complexity reported above, it was
51
52 predicted that colour-identification times for colour-congruent words with complex onsets
53
54 would reduce or eliminate negative facilitation relative to irrelevant words with simple
55
56 onsets. Such a finding would be consistent with the alternative account of negative
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 facilitation based on differences in pronounceability. In contrast to the alternative account,
4
5 the task conflict account of negative facilitation indicates that the longer RTs to congruent
6
7 trials result from competition between task sets. Since words with both complex and simple
8
9 onsets equally fulfil the criteria of being words, they should both equally activate the task set
10
11 for word reading and thus produce similar amounts of negative facilitation.
12
13

14
15 As with Experiment 1, in the present experiment we contrasted the effect of irrelevant
16
17 colour words with simple onsets (i.e., red and purple) and irrelevant colour words with
18
19 complex onsets (i.e., blue and green) on Stroop task performance. To ensure orthogonal
20
21 comparisons for facilitation and interference effects, half the repeated-letter stimuli were
22
23 employed as the neutral baseline for the complex onset colour word stimuli and half were
24
25 employed as the baseline for the simple onset colour word stimuli (and the repeated-letter
26
27 stimuli sets were matched for length with their word counterparts).
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Method**

34 *Design*

35
36
37 3 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Congruent vs. Repeated-letter neutral) x 2 (Onsets: Complex
38
39 vs. Simple) repeated-measures design with reaction times as the dependent variable.
40
41

42 *Participants*

43
44 90 new participants were recruited through the online testing platform, Testable
45
46 (testable.org). The inclusion criteria were the same as those in Experiment 1. All participants
47
48 were paid \$4.50. Of the 90 participants, 9 were removed for reporting a language other than
49
50 English as their first language, 3 were removed for having >70% errors in any one of the
51
52 experimental conditions, and 3 were removed because they had previously completed a
53
54 similar study. Of the remaining 74 participants, 45 were male. The ages ranged from 21-57
55
56 with an average age of 32.7 (SD = 9.4).
57
58
59
60

Stimuli and Procedure

The stimuli and procedure were identical to Experiment 1 with the exception of the repeated-letter baseline that replaced the neutral-word baseline. The repeated-letter stimuli used in this experiment were matched in length to the colour words (e.g., xxx for red, xxxxx for green).

The stimuli were presented in Testable's default font size and style.

Results

Only data from correct trials were used in this analysis (7.8% of data were removed as errors). None of the error analyses produced anything other than a main effect of Word Type and thus are not reported below (see Table 4 for error percentages). Any RTs greater than 2SDs either side of the overall mean were removed from analysis resulting in the removal of 5.3% of correct trials.

Effect of onset complexity on Negative Facilitation

To assess the effect of onset complexity on negative facilitation, the data were entered into a 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs. Repeated-letter) x 2 (Onset: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures ANOVA and its Bayesian equivalent. Analysis revealed no main effect of Onset [$F(1, 73) = 0.174, p = .678$ with $BF_{01} = 6.579$ supporting the null] and a non-significant Onset x Word Type interaction [$F(1, 73) = 0.003, p = .953$ with $BF_{01} = 40.667$] showing strong evidence against the interaction. However, there was also not strong evidence for the presence of negative facilitation. Indeed, the main effect of Word Type was significant with standard inferential ANOVA [$F(1, 73) = 5.445, p = .022, \eta^2 = .021$], but the Bayes Factor was anecdotal, $BF_{10} = 1.082$ (see Figure 2; see Table 4 for RTs, errors and Stroop effects).

Effect of onset complexity on the Stroop Congruency Effect

Whilst the main aim of the present experiment was to explore the effect of onset complexity on negative facilitation, here we analyse the effect of onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect to permit a more direct comparison with Experiment 1. The data were entered into a 2 (Onset: Complex vs. Simple) x 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs. Incongruent) repeated-measures ANOVA. This analysis revealed no main effect of Onset where $F(1, 73) = 0.726, p = .397, BF_{01} = 5.470$. The main effect of Word Type was significant where $F(1, 73) = 161.249, p < .001, \eta^2 = .487, BF_{10} = 1.416 \times 10^{17}$. The main effect was the result of an overall congruency effect of 118.1ms where $t(73) = 12.698, p(\text{Holm}) < 0.001, BF_{10} = 1.416 \times 10^{17}$. The Onset and Word Type interaction was not significant, $F(1, 73) = 1.076, p = .303$, and this was supported by the Bayes Factor for the contribution of the interaction alone ($BF_{\text{excl}} = 4.725$).

In sum, whilst we observed at least some evidence for negative facilitation, this was not modified by onset complexity. Furthermore, there evidence against an effect of onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect.

--- Insert Table 4 about here ---

Discussion

Despite employing an experimental context that has been shown to produce robust negative facilitation effects in previous studies (i.e., 75% repeated-letter stimuli; e.g., Entel & Tzelgov, 2018; Goldfarb & Henik, 2007; Kalanthroff et al., 2013), we were only able to provide weak evidence for negative facilitation in the present experiment. Parris et al. (2023) noted that for large and robust negative facilitation to be produced via the mostly non-lexical trial context, two other factors need to be present: 1) spare working memory capacity; 2) anticipation of informational conflict in the form of incongruent trials (see Entel & Tzelgov, 2018; 2020). In

1
2
3 the present experiment there was no working memory load imposed on the participants and
4
5 incongruent trials were included. It is therefore somewhat surprising that the overall main
6
7 effect of negative facilitation was so small.
8
9

10 In terms of the main aim of the current experiment, the Bayes Factor provided
11
12 evidence for no effect of onset complexity on negative facilitation and, furthermore, there
13
14 was no effect of onset complexity evident at all in the data – congruent trials were unaffected
15
16 by onset type. Given that the only difference between the present experiment and
17
18 Experiment 1 was the presence of the mostly repeated-letter (Experiment 2) context it is
19
20 likely that the mostly repeated-letter context was responsible for the lack of an onset
21
22 complexity effect in the present experiment. However, before interpreting the result from the
23
24 present experiment we felt it important to first replicate the onset complexity effect observed
25
26 in Experiment 1.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Experiment 3**

34
35 Given the lack of an onset complexity effect in Experiment 2 the aim of the present
36
37 experiment was to replicate the onset complexity effect observed in Experiment 1. Therefore,
38
39 the following experiment was identical to Experiment 1 except that only one set of neutral
40
41 words was used since there was no difference between the two sets in Experiment 1 ($p > .05$)¹.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹ We had also included a repeated-letter condition (i.e., 48 xxxx trials) in the present experiment to enable
59 calculation of facilitation effects relative to this baseline, but an error in programming meant that the data for
60 this condition was unusable.

Method

Design

4 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Congruent vs. Neutral Complex vs. Neutral Simple) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures design with reaction times as the dependent variable.

Participants

In total 124 participants were recruited through the online testing platform, Testable (testable.org). Participants had to fulfil the same criteria as the previous two experiments. None of them participated in Experiments 1 and 2. All participants were paid \$5. Of the 124 participants, 8 were removed for reporting a language other than English as their first language, and 6 were removed for having >70% errors in any one of the experimental conditions. Of the remaining 110 participants, 52 were male. The ages ranged from 19-64 with an average age of 32.9 years (standard deviation = 10.1).

Stimuli and Procedure

Identical to Experiment 1 with the exception that: 1) only one set (Set 1) of neutral words were used given no differences were observed between the two sets in Experiment 1 ($p > .8$); 2) An additional 48 repeated-letter trials were included to enable the calculation of facilitation effects relative to this new baseline. However, as noted in footnote 1, a programming error meant that the data from this condition were unusable and are therefore not reported below.

Results

Only data from correct trials are reported below since there were no effects in the error data other than main effects of Word Type (8.7% of data were removed as errors – see Table 5 for error percentages as a function of condition). Any RTs greater than 2SDs either side of the

1
2
3 overall mean were removed from analysis resulting in the removal of 5.1% of the correct
4
5 trials.
6

7
8 The data were entered into a 4 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Complex Neutral vs.
9
10 Simple Neutral vs. Congruent) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures
11
12 ANOVA and its Bayesian equivalent (see Figure 3; see Table 5 for means, percentage errors
13
14 and Stroop effects). These analyses revealed a main effect of Word Type [$F(1.924, 209.7)$,
15
16 Greenhouse-Geisser = 147.917, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .398$, $BF_{10} = 6.250 \cdot 10^{56}$], and a main effect of
17
18 Onset [$F(1, 109) = 4.776$, $p = .031$, although this was not supported by the Bayes Factor
19
20 which favoured the null, $BF_{10} = 0.314$]. The interaction between Word Type and Onsets was
21
22 also significant [$F(2.103, 229.246)$, Greenhouse-Geisser = 5.087, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .011$] with
23
24 $BF_{incl} = 24.137$ for just the interaction (i.e., without the main effects also included in the
25
26 model).
27
28
29

30
31 The interaction was further decomposed into two one-way repeated-measures
32
33 ANOVAs and their Bayesian equivalents investigating Stroop effects in the Complex Onset
34
35 and Simple Onset conditions independently. A significant ANOVA for the Complex Onset
36
37 stimuli [$F(3, 327) = 108.593$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .499$, $BF_{10} = 1.722 \cdot 10^{45}$] was underpinned by a
38
39 significant overall Stroop congruency effect (i.e., mean difference between Congruent and
40
41 Incongruent trials) of 116ms [$t(109) = 17.115$; $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = 0.968$, $BF_{10} =$
42
43 $8.796 \cdot 10^{21}$]. The congruency effect resulted from significant positive facilitation of 32ms
44
45 [$t(109) = 4.668$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .264$, $BF_{10} = 5088$] and a significant Stroop interference
46
47 effect (84ms) [$t(109) = 12.447$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .704$, $BF_{10} = 1.939 \cdot 10^{18}$] when CNC
48
49 stimuli were used as a color-neutral comparison baseline. When SNC stimuli were used, the
50
51 congruency effect resulted from significant positive facilitation of 30ms, [$t(109) = 4.353$,
52
53 $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .246$, $BF_{10} = 1219$]; and a significant Stroop interference effect of 87ms,
54
55 [$t(109) = 12.762$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = .721$, $BF_{10} = 5.728 \cdot 10^{17}$]. And consistent with
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Experiment 1, reaction times to Neutral stimuli with Complex vs. Simple onsets did not differ
4 significantly [2ms; $t(109) = 0.315$, $p(\text{Holm}) = .753$] where the Bayes Factor supported the
5
6 null, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.124$.
7
8

9
10 A significant ANOVA for the Simple Onset stimuli [$F(3, 327) = 62.590$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 =$
11
12 $.365$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 4.933 \times 10^{28}$] was underpinned by a significant Stroop Congruency effect of 84ms
13
14 [$t(109) = 11.294$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$, $d = 0.688$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 9.508 \times 10^9$]. This latter effect resulted
15
16 from non-significant negative facilitation [i.e., -2ms; $t(109) = 0.239$, $p(\text{Holm}) > .9$, $\text{BF}_{10} =$
17
18 0.109]; and a significant Stroop interference effect of 82ms [$t(109) = 11.054$, $p(\text{Holm}) < .001$,
19
20 $d = .674$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 1.813 \times 10^{15}$] when CNS stimuli were used as a color-neutral comparison
21
22 baseline. When SNC stimuli were used to this end, the aforementioned congruency effect
23
24 resulted from non-significant negative facilitation [i.e., -1ms; $t(109) = 0.82$, $p(\text{Holm}) > .9$,
25
26 $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.106$]; and a significant Stroop interference effect of 83ms [$t(109) = 11.212$, $p(\text{Holm})$
27
28 $< .001$, $d = .683$, $\text{BF}_{10} = 1.532 \times 10^{16}$]. Again, reaction times to Neutral stimuli with Complex
29
30 vs. Simple onsets did not differ significantly [1ms; $t(109) = 0.157$, $p(\text{Holm}) > .9$] where the
31
32 Bayes Factor favoured the null, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.112$.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Effect of onset complexity on the Stroop Congruency Effect*

41
42 To assess the effect onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect further, the data
43
44 were entered into a 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple) x 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs.
45
46 Incongruent) repeated-measures ANOVA and its Bayesian equivalent. These analyses
47
48 revealed a significant main effect of Word Type [$F(1, 109) = 201.653$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .426$,
49
50 $\text{BF}_{10} = 1.936 \times 10^{23}$] and a main effect of Onset [$F(1, 109) = 5.587$, $p = .020$, but where the
51
52 Bayes Factor was anecdotal $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.732$]. The interaction was also significant [$F(1, 109) =$
53
54 6.382 , $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .011$, $\text{BF}_{\text{incl}} = 7.077$ for just the interaction] indicating strong support for
55
56 an effect of onset complexity on the Stroop congruency effect.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Post-hoc tests revealed that this interaction was due to a larger significant congruency
4 effect (116ms) for complex [$t(109) = 12.220, p(\text{Holm}) < 0.001, d = .910, \text{BF}_{10} = 8.796 \times 10^{21}$],
5 than for simple onsets (84ms) [$t(109) = 8.829, p(\text{Holm}) < .001, \text{BF}_{10} = 9.508 \times 10^9$]. Comparing
6 word types across onset complexity conditions revealed that onset complexity takes its effect
7 on Congruent items [$t(109) = 3.370, p = .001, d = .321, \text{BF}_{10} = 20.646$] and not on
8 Incongruent items remained nonsignificant [$t(109) = 0.410, p = .683$, with the Bayes Factor
9 providing moderate evidence for the null, $\text{BF}_{10} = 0.115$]. Therefore, as shown in Experiment
10 1, the effect of onset complexity on the Stroop Congruency Effect results from changes to
11 congruent trials.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ***Effect of onset complexity on Stroop interference***

27
28 A 2 (Word Type: Incongruent vs. Neutral) x 2 (Onsets: Complex vs. Simple)
29 repeated-measures analyses using the neutral trials that matched to the colour word for onset
30 type (CNC and SNS for complex and simple onset Stroop effects, respectively) revealed no
31 Word Type x Onset interaction [$F(1, 109) = 0.018, p = .893$; with $\text{BF}_{\text{incl}} = 0.123$ for just the
32 interaction].
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 ***Effect of onset complexity on Stroop facilitation***

44 Consistent with Experiment 1 a 2 (Word Type: Congruent vs. Neutral) x 2 (Onsets:
45 Complex vs. Simple) repeated-measures ANOVAs revealed an interaction between Word
46 Type and Onsets [$F(1, 109) = 9.410, p = .003, \eta^2 = .033$, with $\text{BF}_{\text{incl}} = 259$ indicating strong
47 support for the interaction alone). Further post-hoc tests additionally revealed that the
48 interaction was due to significant *positive* facilitation of 32ms for complex onsets [$t(109) =$
49 $4.840, p(\text{Holm}) < 0.001, d = .257, \text{BF}_{10} = 5089$], and non-significant *positive* facilitation of
50 1ms for simple onsets [$t(109) = 0.093, p(\text{Holm}) > .9, \text{BF}_{10} = 0.106$].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 --- Insert Table 5 about here ---
4
5
6
7

8 **Discussion**

9
10 Given the lack of an onset effect in Experiment 2, the aim of the present experiment was to
11 replicate the onset effect observed in Experiment 1. The results from the present experiment
12 provide a clear replication of Experiment 1 showing faster colour responses to congruent
13 words with complex onsets than to congruent words with simple onsets. This resulted in an
14 onset complexity effect on the Stroop congruency and positive facilitation effects, but not on
15 interference effects. Moreover, the results from the present experiment confirm that colour
16 categorisation responses to neutral words with complex onsets do not differ from colour
17 categorisation responses to neutral words with simple onsets. The results from both
18 Experiment 1 and Experiment 3 therefore indicate that colour congruency is required to
19 observe an effect of onset complexity on Stroop task performance.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **General Discussion**

36
37 The aim of the present set of experiments was twofold: 1) To investigate whether onset
38 complexity modifies the magnitude of the common Stroop effects of Stroop interference,
39 Stroop (positive) facilitation and the Stroop congruency effect (Experiments 1 and 3); 2)
40 Investigate whether onset complexity modifies the magnitude of negative facilitation
41 (Experiment 2). Regarding the first aim, the results from both Experiments 1 and 3 provide
42 strong evidence for an effect of onset complexity on Stroop effects. Specifically, both
43 positive facilitation and the Stroop congruency effect (Experiments 1 and 3) were increased
44 when irrelevant colour words had complex onsets (e.g., *blue* and *green* vs. *red* and *purple*)
45 due to the effect of onset complexity on congruent trials. There was no evidence for an effect
46 of onset complexity on Stroop interference nor when the irrelevant word was a neutral, non-
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 colour related word indicating that the effect of onset complexity was at the level of encoding
4
5 the phonology of the correct response. Indeed, as noted above, the lack of an effect on
6
7 incongruent and neutral trials represents somewhat of a limitation for the use of onset
8
9 complexity for present purposes: if the onset effect was apparent in the neutral and
10
11 incongruent trials in the mostly xxxx trial context, it would have least enabled us to argue that
12
13 the disappearance of negative facilitation is indicative of the phenomenon reflecting a
14
15 different form of conflict to informational conflict.
16
17

18
19 The finding of an effect of onset complexity in the Stroop task is novel and is
20
21 consistent with the complexity advantage observed in word reading studies (Kawamoto &
22
23 Kello, 1999; Rastle & Davis, 2002). The results are consistent with the notion that complex
24
25 onsets are beneficial to word processing (O'Seaghdha et al., 1992; Taraban & McClelland,
26
27 1987). Furthermore, this result was obtained in a task in which the words are not read aloud,
28
29 and moreover, responses were manual, supporting the notion that phonological processing of
30
31 the irrelevant word happens with manual responses (Parris et al., 2019; cf. Kinoshita et al.,
32
33 2018; see below for a discussion of this issue). However, it is clear that the onset complexity
34
35 effect reported here is not the same as that reported in studies of intentional reading. The
36
37 magnitude of the effect was much larger and the effect was limited to when the complex
38
39 onset of the irrelevant word matched the complex onset of the colour name; colour name
40
41 congruency is the *sine qua non* of the onset complexity effect in Stroop task performance. In
42
43 the Stroop task it is the match between the phonological code of the irrelevant word and the
44
45 phonetic code of the colour name that results in the onset complexity effect.
46
47
48
49

50
51 In terms of the second aim of the present study, there was no effect of onset
52
53 complexity on negative facilitation. Indeed, there was no evidence of an onset effect in
54
55 Experiment 2 indicating that the mostly repeated-letter context prevented the onset effect
56
57 observed in Experiments 1 and 3. Onset complexity was manipulated because we thought that
58
59
60

1
2
3 any factor that makes phonetic encoding more difficult (simple onset stimuli in the present
4 study) would delay colour naming, enhancing negative facilitation. This is in contrast to the
5 task conflict account of negative facilitation which states that congruent trials RTs are longer
6 because they involve task conflict whilst non-lexical trials do not. And whilst simple onset
7 stimuli did delay colour naming of congruent items relative to complex onset stimuli in
8 Experiments 1 and 3, it did not modify negative facilitation in Experiment 2. It is notable
9 however that we did not observe large negative facilitation effects despite including
10 experimental conditions that produce it such as a mostly non-lexical trial context, spare
11 working memory capacity and exposure to incongruent trials (Parris et al., 2023).
12 Nevertheless, the small main effect of negative facilitation would not in itself preclude
13 variation in the two onset conditions. However, the evidence for a null interaction effect was
14 clear and therefore the best interpretation of the data is in line with the task conflict account
15 of negative facilitation: Given that both complex and simple onset words equally fulfil the
16 criteria of being words meaning the task conflict account predicts they would both produce
17 similar amounts of negative facilitation relative to a non-lexical baseline.

18
19 Since the onset complexity effect observed in Experiment 1 and 3 is one based on
20 positive facilitation, the absence of an onset effect in Experiment 2 could be explained by the
21 general effect of mostly neutral word or mostly non-lexical trial contexts on positive
22 facilitation (Parris et al., 2023; see below for a fuller discussion of this issue). Parris et al.
23 (2023) noted that positive facilitation seems to be prevented when the experimental context is
24 either mostly neutral words or mostly non-lexical stimuli. This would mean that an effect that
25 finds its expression only in positive facilitation would be unlikely to be observed in such
26 contexts. This means that the onset effect is not therefore an ideal test of the alternative
27 account. If the onset complexity effect were also observable in other measures of
28 informational conflict such as the Stroop interference effect, it could have potentially

1
2
3 produced an effect of onset complexity in Experiment 2 in all conditions except the congruent
4
5 condition thereby indicating that negative facilitation is qualitatively different from
6
7 informational conflict (the alternative account argues that negative facilitation is just another
8
9 form of informational (phonological) conflict). Without this more pervasive effect on indices
10
11 of Stroop task performance, it is unclear whether a strong test of the alternative account has
12
13 been provided.
14
15
16
17
18

19 **The effect of a mostly non-lexical trial context**

20
21
22 The finding of a lack of an onset complexity effect in Experiment 2 stands in stark contrast to
23
24 the findings of Experiments 1 and 3. The only difference between the experiments is the
25
26 mostly repeated-letter context in Experiment 2 (which replaced the mostly neutral word
27
28 context in Experiment 1). It therefore seems clear that the mostly repeated-letter context is
29
30 responsible for the lack of an onset effect. What is unclear is why the mostly repeated-letter
31
32 context would have this effect. Indeed, Parris et al., (2023) pointed out that the effect of the
33
34 mostly repeated-letter context needs further explanation given two opposing accounts from
35
36 task conflict theorists: according to Kalanthroff et al. (2018)'s model the mostly non-lexical
37
38 context induces a low task conflict control state because task conflict is not encountered often
39
40 enough, reducing proactive control (see also Spinelli and Lupker (2021, 2022) who argue that
41
42 the mostly non-lexical trial context reduces proactive control – although not in a way that is
43
44 related to task conflict per se). Given that proactive control is low, task conflict is high, which
45
46 leads to an inhibition mechanism modifying the response threshold to all lexical stimuli. This
47
48 raising of the response threshold would not happen for repeated letter string trials (e.g., xxxx)
49
50 because the task unit for word reading would not be activated for these trials. Since responses
51
52 to congruent trials would be slowed relative to non-lexical trials under these conditions,
53
54 negative facilitation would result. And since this raising of the response threshold would
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occur equally for all lexical stimuli it would not differentiate words with simple and complex
4
5 onsets, which would therefore not differ in terms of negative facilitation – as supported by the
6
7 results from the present study.
8
9

10
11 In contrast to this account, Entel and Tzelgov (2020) reasoned that a larger number of
12
13 non-lexical trials means that participants are less likely to inadvertently read the congruent
14
15 word, thereby increasing RTs to congruent words, and revealing negative facilitation and thus
16
17 task conflict relative to an xxx baseline. This account would also presumably predict
18
19 reduced phonological processing of congruent trials in this context. If phonological
20
21 processing of words is reduced, one would expect mitigation of phonological-based effects,
22
23 especially in a manual response Stroop task (Parris et al., 2019). A future experiment
24
25 investigating onset complexity with a vocal response Stroop task that promotes phonological
26
27 processing of irrelevant stimuli might provide an interestingly contrasting set of results.
28
29
30
31

32
33 In contrast to both of these accounts, the alternative account of negative facilitation,
34
35 tested in the present study, argued that the mostly repeated-letter, non-pronounceable trial
36
37 context reduces control over word processing and therefore predicts larger informational
38
39 conflict and facilitation effects. This position was motivated by the finding of Kinoshita et al.
40
41 (2018) who reported larger semantic conflict effects relative to a neutral word baseline in the
42
43 mostly repeated-letter trial context (see also Shichel & Tzeglov, 2018, for evidence of greater
44
45 semantic conflict in a mostly repeated-letter trial context). According to this position the
46
47 onset complexity effect should be larger in the mostly repeated-letter trial context of
48
49 Experiment 2 than in the mostly neutral word context of Experiment 1 because control over
50
51 phonological (as well as semantic) processing should be reduced and onset effects therefore,
52
53 larger, in the former. This position finds no support in the current set of results (although the
54
55 position might still hold true for semantic conflict effects). In sum, the present results are
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consistent with the notion that the mostly repeated-letter trial context discourages
4
5 phonological processing of presented letter strings and perhaps reduces inadvertent reading of
6
7 congruent items. However, since there is evidence that proactive control is reduced in this
8
9 mostly non-lexical trial context (Spinelli & Lupker, 2021, 2022) it is possible that positive
10
11 facilitation results from proactive control and thus intentional and not inadvertent reading. If
12
13 this is the case, then the effect of the mostly non-lexical context is not via lessening (Entel &
14
15 Tzelgov, 2019) or increasing (Parris et al., 2023) word processing, but on the amount of
16
17 proactive control that operates during task performance (Kalanthroff et al., 2018; Spinelli &
18
19 Lupker, 2021, 2022).
20
21
22
23
24

25 **The lack of an effect on onset complexity on neutral trials**

26
27 A further notable finding from the present study was the lack of an effect of onset complexity
28
29 on neutral word stimuli in Experiments 1 and 3. This finding has implications for another
30
31 account of performance in selective attention paradigms. Parris et al. (2023) acknowledged
32
33 the similarities between their alternative account of negative facilitation and the Response
34
35 Exclusion Hypothesis (Mahon et al., 2007) in the picture-word interference literature. Under
36
37 the Response Exclusion Hypothesis (REH) irrelevant words get obligatorily processed right
38
39 up to the point of a representation entering an articulatory buffer; no selection occurs before
40
41 this very late point in processing and selection does not involve selection by competition.
42
43 Under this account words have privileged access to the articulators. Thus, as with Roelofs
44
45 (2003) and Glaser and Glaser (1989) models which are based on architectural differences
46
47 between word reading/naming and colour naming, the REH is based on architectural
48
49 differences between word reading/naming and picture naming. Specifically, the REH
50
51 describes this privileged access as being based on the “quasi rule-like relationship between
52
53 orthography and phonology” (p. 524; Mahon et al., 2007) and as such leads to a “production-
54
55 ready” representation for the articulators to produce. The REH uniquely predicts that low
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 frequency words should interfere more than high frequency words, a finding - mirrored in the
4 colour-word Stroop literature (e.g., Burt, 2002) - that theories based on connectionist
5 architecture (e.g., Cohen et al., 1990), find difficult to explain. Under the REH, distractor
6 frequency effects arise because the earlier the response to the distractor enters the articulatory
7 buffer, the earlier it can be removed from the buffer. Since low frequency words would take
8 longer to reach the buffer, it takes longer to remove them from the buffer and thus colour
9 naming times would be slowed.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 The aim of the present work was to test and further develop the alternative account of
20 negative facilitation presented in Parris et al. (2023). The alternative account, like the REH,
21 assumes that the phonological representation of a pronounceable distractor delays the
22 response to the target colour. As with the REH, this means that phonological representations
23 whose phonetic codes are produced sooner can be excluded sooner. Hence high-frequency
24 words can be excluded faster than low frequency words and thus colour naming high
25 frequency distractors is faster (Burt, 1994; 1999; 2002). Given this, the REH and the
26 alternative account would predict that neutral words with complex onsets would have a
27 useable production-ready representation before neutral words with simple onsets. This means
28 that neutral words with complex onsets should be colour-named faster than neutral words
29 with simple onsets. We did not observe this effect in the present study which means that our
30 results contrast with this aspect of the REH and the alternative account (assuming that the
31 onset complexity effect observed here is the result of phonological encoding). Nevertheless,
32 future research should aim to further investigate this effect perhaps in a study that uses many
33 neutral words to avoid repetition of a small stimuli set.

Onset segment effects in Manual Stroop tasks

The present results have implications for recent debates on the type of processing that happens with manual response Stroop tasks. It has been argued that the mode of response used to classify the colour of the printed word (e.g., responding manually via a keypress vs. responding vocally by saying the colour name aloud) determines the magnitude and type of facilitation and interference that results (Augustinova et al., 2019; Fennell & Ratcliff, 2019; Glaser & Glaser, 1989; Kinoshita et al., 2017; McClain, 1983; Redding & Gerjets, 1977; Sharma & McKenna, 1998; Turken & Swick, 1999; Zahedi et al., 2019; see also MacLeod, 1991, and Parris et al., 2021). Accounts of differences between these two response modes propose differential access to the systems (i.e., phonological, lexico-semantic, or response level processing) that are assumed to produce interference and facilitation (Glaser & Glaser, 1989; Kinoshita et al., 2017; Sharma & McKenna, 1998; Sugg & McDonald, 1994; Turken & Swick, 1999; Virzi & Egeth, 1985; see also Fennell & Ratcliff, 2019; Zahedi et al., 2019). Consistent with this, it has recently been argued that vocal and manual responding involve different tasks (naming vs. classification, respectively) and as such the type of evidence that is accumulated during Stroop task performance is different, leading to qualitatively different Stroop effects and, importantly for present purposes, that phonological encoding does not occur with manual responses (Kinoshita et al., 2017; Kinoshita & Mills, 2020).

Onset segment effects on Stroop task performance were originally reported with a vocal response Stroop task. Coltheart and colleagues (1999) developed a novel Stroop paradigm by creating stimuli that either shared the initial phoneme or end phoneme of a colour name. For example, if the colour to be named was red, the to-be-ignored word would be *rat* (sharing initial phoneme) or *pod* (sharing the end phoneme) or a word that shares no phoneme at all (e.g., *fit*). Words that share a phoneme with a colour name have been shown to produce a naming latency advantage when naming the colour not the printed word (Regan,

1
2
3 1978). Coltheart and colleagues reasoned that if, as assumed by the Dual Route Cascaded
4 (DRC) model (see Coltheart et al., 2001), there is a serial order component in processing of
5 print-to-speech, there will be an advantage for colour names that share an *initial* phoneme
6 with the to-be-ignored written word compared to items that share an *end* phoneme because the
7 computation of phonology from print is left to. Consistent with their predictions, Coltheart
8 and colleagues reported that phonemic overlap was significant at both positions. However,
9 facilitation was greater for items with overlap in the initial phoneme position which they
10 argued is incompatible with models that do not assume a serial grapheme-to-phoneme
11 processing route in reading (see also Marmurek et al., 2006, and Mousikou et al., 2015)². In
12 contrast to the computation-of-phonology-from-orthography account of this *position-sensitive*
13 *Stroop effect*, Kinoshita and colleagues (2017, 2020) have argued that it reflects phonological
14 encoding (and hence that any left-to-right serial processing effects reflect phonological
15 encoding and not phonological computation).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Kinoshita et al.'s arguments that phonological encoding does not happen with manual
34 responses and that the left-to-right serial processing effects observed in Coltheart et al. (1999)
35 and subsequent studies reflect phonological encoding, predicts that left-to-right serial
36 processing effects should not be observed with manual responses. However, Parris et al.
37 (2019) replicated Coltheart et al. (1999) with both vocal and manual response versions of the
38 Stroop task, indicating that vocal and manual responses do not differ qualitatively, but only
39 quantitatively (the effect of onset overlap was larger in the vocal response). The results from
40 the present experiments are also therefore notable since they also indicate that phonological
41 encoding occurs with the manual response Stroop task. According to Kinoshita and
42 colleagues' position on the type of processing that can happen with a manual response, the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ² See Marmurek, Proctor and Javor (2006) for a replication of this effect and for findings showing the same
59 effect with non-words and an (albeit weaker) effect of onset overlap on Stroop interference, and Mousikou et al.
60 (2015) for a replication with both pronounceable and non-pronounceable non-words.

1
2
3 onset complexity effect observed in the present study would be due to phonological
4
5 computation and not phonological encoding.
6
7
8
9

10 In conclusion, the results from the present study show for the first time that onset
11 complexity modifies Stroop task performance whereby congruent words (but not neutral or
12 incongruent words) with complex onsets result in faster response times relative to congruent
13 words with simple onsets, thereby increasing Stroop facilitation and congruency effects. This
14 is consistent with the complexity advantage in intentional reading. Furthermore, in contrast to
15 the alternative account of negative facilitation that proposes that negative facilitation results
16 from difference in the pronounceability of irrelevant letter strings, onset complexity did not
17 modify the magnitude of negative facilitation. However, two findings mean that we cannot
18 conclusively reject the alternative account: 1) the negative facilitation effect was surprisingly
19 small in our study reducing the likelihood of its modification; 2) the onset complexity effect
20 took its effect by modifying positive facilitation only, the very index of performance that
21 appears to be generally prevented by mostly neutral (repeated-letter or neutral words) trial
22 contexts. Without a concomitant effect on incongruent and neutral trials, it is not possible to
23 determine whether negative facilitation is qualitatively different from informational conflict
24 (the alternative account argues that negative facilitation is just another form of informational
25 (phonological) conflict.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The results from this study have implications for understanding the levels of
48 processing of the irrelevant word with a manual response and indicate the need for a future
49 study comparing onset complexity effects in manual and vocal response Stroop tasks.
50
51 Moreover, the results from this study are favourable to the task conflict account of negative
52 facilitation, a theoretical approach that has provided insights into the nature of selective
53 attention including the suggestion of a new potential form of impairment that might explain
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 symptoms of clinical disorders such as obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD; Kalanthroff et
4
5 al., 2017).
6
7
8
9

10 **Funding information**

11
12 The writing was supported in part by ANR Grant ANR-19-CE28-0013 and RIN Tremplin
13
14 Grant 19E00851 awarded to BP, LF and MA and by the British Academy Grant
15
16 (SRG1819\190912) awarded to BP.
17
18
19

20 **Acknowledgements**

21 **References**

- 22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Augustinova, M., Parris, B. A., & Ferrand, L. (2019). The loci of Stroop interference and
34
35 facilitation effects with manual and vocal responses. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*,
36
37 1786. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01786>
38
39
40
41 Augustinova, M., Clarys, D., Spatola, N., & Ferrand, L. (2018). Some further clarifications
42
43 on age-related differences in Stroop interference. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*,
44
45 25, 767-774. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1427-0>
46
47
48
49 Berent, I., & Marom, M. (2005). Skeletal structure of printed words: evidence from the
50
51 Stroop task. *Journal of Experimental psychology. Human Perception and*
52
53 *Performance, 31*(2), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.31.2.328>
54
55
56
57 Brown, T. L. (2011). The relationship between Stroop interference and facilitation effects:
58
59 Statistical artifacts, baselines, and a reassessment. *Journal of Experimental*
60
61

1
2
3 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37(1), 85-99.

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019252>
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 Brysbaert, M., & New, B (2009). Moving beyond Kučera and Francis: A critical evaluation
13 of current word frequency norms and the introduction of a new and improved word
14 frequency measure for American English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 977–990.
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.977>
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 Brysbaert, M., & Stevens, M. (2018). Power Analysis and Effect Size in Mixed Effects
24 Models: A Tutorial. *Journal of Cognition*, 1(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.10>
25
26
27

28 Burt, J. S. (1994). Identity primes produce facilitation in a colour naming task. *Quarterly*
29 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Experimental Psychology*, 47(A), 957-
30 1000. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14640749408401103>
31
32
33
34
35

36 Burt, J. S. (1999). Associative priming in color naming: Interference and facilitation. *Memory*
37 *and Cognition*, 27(3), 454-464. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03211540>
38
39
40
41

42 Burt, J. S. (2002). Why do non-colour words interfere with colour naming? *Journal of*
43 *Experimental Psychology-Human Perception and Performance*, 28(5), 1019-1038.
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.28.5.1019>
46
47
48
49

50 Cohen, J. D., Dunbar, K., & McClelland, J. L. (1990). On the control of automatic processes:
51 a parallel distributed processing account of the Stroop effect. *Psychological*
52 *Review*, 97(3), 332. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.97.3.332>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Coltheart, M., Rastle, K., Perry, C., Langdon, R., & Ziegler, J. (2001). DRC: A dual route
4 cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud. *Psychological Review*,
5 *108*(1), 204-256. DOI: [10.1037//0033-295X.108.1.204](https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295X.108.1.204)
6
7
8
9
10
11 Coltheart, M., Woollams, A., Kinoshita, S., & Perry, C. (1999). A position-sensitive Stroop
12 effect: Further evidence for a left-to-right component in print-to-speech conversion.
13 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *6*(3), 456-463. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210835>
14
15
16
17
18
19 Dalrymple-Alford, E. C. (1972). Associative facilitation and interference in the Stroop color-
20 word task. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *11*(4), 274-276.
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210377>
23
24
25
26
27 Dalrymple-Alford, E. C., & Budayr, B. (1966). Examination of some aspects of the Stroop
28 color-word test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *23*(3), 1211-1214.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1966.23.3f.1211>
31
32
33
34
35 Entel, O., & Tzelgov, J. (2018). Focussing on task conflict in the Stroop effect. *Psychological*
36 *Research*, *82*(2), 284-295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-016-0832-8>
37
38
39
40
41 Entel, O., & Tzelgov, J. (2020). When working memory meets control in the Stroop effect.
42 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *46*(7),
43 1387–1406. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000790>
44
45
46
47
48
49 Entel, O., Tzelgov, J., Bereby-Meyer, Y., & Shahar, N. (2015). Exploring relations between
50 task conflict and informational conflict in the Stroop task. *Psychological Research*,
51 *79*, 913-927. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-014-0630-0>
52
53
54
55
56
57 Fennell, A. & Ratcliff, R. (2019). Does response modality influence conflict? Modelling
58 vocal and manual response Stroop interference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
59
60

1
2
3 *Learning, Memory and Cognition*. Advanced online publication.

4
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000689>
6
7
8

9 Ferrand, L., Ducrot, S., Chausse, P., Maïonchi-Pino, N., O'Connor, R. J., Parris, B. A.,
10 Perret, P., Riggs, K. J., & Augustinova, M. (2020). Stroop interference is a composite
11 phenomenon: Evidence from distinct developmental trajectories of its components.
12 *Developmental Science*, 23(2), e12899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12899>
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Frederiksen, J. R., & Kroll, J. F. (1976). Spelling and sound: Approaches to the internal
20 lexicon. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*,
21 2, 361–379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.2.3.361>
22
23
24
25

26
27 Glaser, W. R., & Glaser, M. O. (1989). Context effects in stroop-like word and picture
28 processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 118(1), 13-42.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.118.1.13>
31
32
33

34
35 Goldfarb, L., & Henik, A. (2007). Evidence for task conflict in the Stroop effect. *Journal of*
36 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 33(5), 1170-1176.
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.33.5.1170>
39
40
41

42
43 Hasshim, N., & Parris, B. (2014). Two-to-one color-response mapping and the presence of
44 semantic conflict in the Stroop task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1157.
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01157>
47
48
49

50
51 Hasshim, N., & Parris, B. A. (2021). The role of contingency and correlation in the Stroop
52 task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 74(10), 1657-1668.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1177/174702182110325>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kalanthroff, E., Avnit, A., Henik, A., Davelaar, E., & Usher, M. (2015). Stroop proactive
4 control and task conflict are modulated by concurrent working memory load.
5
6 *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 22(3), 869-875. [https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-014-0735-x)
7
8
9 014-0735-x
10
11
12
13 Kalanthroff, E., Davelaar, E., Henik, A., Goldfarb, L., & Usher, M. (2018). Task conflict and
14 proactive control: A computational theory of the Stroop task. *Psychological Review*,
15
16 125(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000083>
17
18
19
20
21
22 Kalanthroff, E., Goldfarb, L., Usher, M., & Henik, A. (2013). Stop interfering: Stroop task
23 conflict independence from informational conflict and interference. *The Quarterly*
24
25 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66(7), 1356-1367.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2012.74160>
28
29
30
31
32 Kalanthroff, E., Henik, A., Simpson, H. B., Todder, D., & Anholt, G. E. (2017). To do or not
33 to do: Task control deficit in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Behavior Therapy*,
34
35 48(5), 603-613. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2017.01.004>
36
37
38
39
40 Kawamoto, A. H., & Kello, C. T. (1999). Effect of onset cluster complexity in speeded
41 naming: A test of rule-based approaches. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
42
43 *Human Perception and Performance*, 25, 361–375. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.25.2.361)
44
45 1523.25.2.361
46
47
48
49
50 Kinoshita S. (2000). The left-to-right nature of the masked onset priming effect in
51 naming. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 7(1), 133–141.
52
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03210732>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kinoshita, S., De Wit, B., & Norris, D. (2017). The magic of words reconsidered:
4
5 Investigating the automaticity of reading color-neutral words in the Stroop
6
7 task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, *43*(3),
8
9 369-384. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000311>
10
11
12
13 Kinoshita, S., Mills, L., & Norris, D. (2018). The semantic stroop effect is controlled by
14
15 endogenous attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and*
16
17 *Cognition*, *44*(11), 1730-1742. [10.1037/xlm0000552](https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000552)
18
19
20
21 Kinoshita, S., & Mills, L. (2020). Phonological encoding in the oral but not manual Stroop
22
23 task: Evidence for the role of a speech production process. *Journal of Experimental*
24
25 *psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *46*(8), 1494–1504.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000828>
28
29
30
31 Klein, G. S. (1964). Semantic power measured through the interference of words with color-
32
33 naming. *The American Journal of Psychology*, *77*(4), 576-588.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1420768>
36
37
38
39 Littman, R., Keha, E., & Kalanthroff, E. (2019). Task conflict and task control: A mini-
40
41 review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1598. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01598>
42
43
44
45 MacLeod, C. M. (1991). Half a century of research on the Stroop effect: An integrative
46
47 review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *109*(2), 163-203. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.163)
48
49 [2909.109.2.163](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.163)
50
51
52
53 MacLeod, C. M., & MacDonald, P. A. (2000). Interdimensional interference in the Stroop
54
55 effect: Uncovering the cognitive and neural anatomy of attention. *Trends in Cognitive*
56
57 *Sciences*, *4*(10), 383-391. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01530-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01530-8)
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Mahon, B. Z., Costa, A., Peterson, R., Vargas, K. A., & Caramazza, A. (2007). Lexical
4
5 selection is not by competition: a reinterpretation of semantic interference and
6
7 facilitation effects in the picture-word interference paradigm. *Journal of Experimental*
8
9 *Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 33(3), 503–535.
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.33.3.503>
12
13
14
15
16 Marmurek, H. H. C., Proctor, C. & Javor, A. (2006). Stroop-like serial position effects in
17
18 colour naming of words and nonwords. *Experimental Psychology*, 53(2), 105-110.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169.53.2.105>
21
22
23
24 MacKay, D. G. (1987). *The organization of perception and action: A theory of action and*
25
26 *other cognitive skills*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
27
28
29
30 McClain, L. (1983). Effects of response type and set size on Stroop color-word performance.
31
32 *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 56, 735-743. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1983.56.3.735>
33
34
35
36 Monsell, S. (2003). Task switching. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(3), 134-140.
37
38 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(03\)00028-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00028-7)
39
40
41
42 Monsell, S., Taylor, T. J., & Murphy, K. (2001). Naming the colour of a word: Is it responses
43
44 or task sets that compete? *Memory & Cognition*, 29(1), 137-151.
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195748>
47
48
49
50 Mousikou, P., Rastle, K., Besner, D., & Coltheart, M. (2015). The locus of serial processing
51
52 in reading aloud: orthography-to-phonology computation or speech
53
54 planning?. *Journal of experimental psychology. Learning, memory, and*
55
56 *cognition*, 41(4), 1076–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000090>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 O'Seaghdha, P. G., Dell, G. S., Peterson, R. R., & Juliano, C. (1992). Modeling form-related
4 priming effects in comprehension and production. In R. Reilly & N. E. Sharkey
5 (Eds.), *Connectionist approaches to language processing* (Vol.1, pp. 373—408).
6 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Parris, B. A., Hasshim, N., Wadsley, M., Augustinova, M., & Ferrand, L. (2022). The loci of
14 Stroop effects: a critical review of methods and evidence for levels of processing
15 contributing to color-word Stroop effects and the implications for the loci of
16 attentional selection. *Psychological Research*, 86(4), 1029-1053.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-021-01554-x>
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Parris, B. A., Hasshim, N., Ferrand, L. & Augustinova, M. (in press). Do task sets compete
27 in the Stroop task and other selective attention paradigms? *Journal of Cognition*. DOI:
28 10.5334/joc.272
29
30
31
32
33
34 Parris, B. A., Sharma, D., Weekes, B. S. H., Momenian, M., Augustinova, M., & Ferrand, L.
35 (2019). Response Modality and the Stroop Task. *Experimental Psychology*, 66(5),
36 361–367. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000459>
37
38
39
40
41
42 Parris, B. A., Wadsley, M. G., Hasshim, N., Benattayallah, A., Augustinova, M., & Ferrand,
43 L. (2019). An fMRI study of Response and Semantic conflict in the Stroop task.
44 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2426. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02426>
45
46
47
48
49
50 Rastle, K., & Davis, M. H. (2002). On the complexities of measuring naming. *Journal of*
51 *Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*, 28(2), 307–314.
52 <https://doi.org/10.1037//0096-1523.28.2.307>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Redding, G. M., & Gerjets, D. A. (1977). Stroop effects: Interference and facilitation with
4 verbal and manual responses. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 45, 11-17.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1977.45.1.11>
7
8
9
10
11 Regan, J. (1978). Involuntary automatic processing in colour-naming tasks. *Perception &*
12
13 *Psychophysics*, 24(2), 130-136. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03199539>
14
15
16 Roelofs, A. (2003). Goal-referenced selection of verbal action: modelling attentional control
17
18 in the Stroop task. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 88. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033->
19
20 [295X.110.1.88](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.1.88)
21
22
23
24 Rogers, R. D., & Monsell, S. (1995). Costs of a predictable switch between simple cognitive
25
26 tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 124(2), 207-231.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.124.2.207>
29
30
31
32 Schiller N. O. (2008). The masked onset priming effect in picture naming. *Cognition*, 106(2),
33
34 952–962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.03.007>
35
36
37
38 Schmidt, J. R., Liefoghe, B., & De Houwer, J. (2020). An episodic model of task switching
39
40 effects: erasing the homunculus from memory. *Journal of Cognition*, 3(1), 22.
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.97>
43
44
45
46 Sharma, D., & McKenna, F. P. (1998). Differential components of the manual and vocal
47
48 Stroop tasks. *Memory & Cognition*, 26(5), 1033-1040.
49
50 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03201181>
51
52
53
54 Shichel, I., & Tzelgov, J. (2018). Modulation of conflicts in the Stroop effect. *Acta*
55
56 *Psychologica*, 189, 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2017.10.007>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Spinelli, G., & Lupker, S. J. (2021). Proactive control in the Stroop task: A conflict-
4
5 frequency manipulation free of item-specific, contingency-learning, and color-word
6
7 correlation confounds. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
8
9 *Cognition*, 47(10), 1550–1562.
- 10
11
12
13 Spinelli, G., & Lupker, S. J. (2022). Robust evidence for proactive conflict adaptation in the
14
15 proportion-congruent paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
16
17 *Memory, and Cognition*, 49(5), 675–700. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001144>.
- 18
19
20
21 Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of*
22
23 *Experimental Psychology*, 18(6), 643–662. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.121.1.15)
24
25 [3445.121.1.15](https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.121.1.15)
- 26
27
28
29 Taraban, R., & McClelland, J. L. (1987). Conspiracy effects in word pronunciation. *Journal*
30
31 *of Memory and Language*, 26, 608–631. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(87)90105-7)
32
33 [596X\(87\)90105-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(87)90105-7)
- 34
35
36
37 Turken, A. U., & Swick, D. (1999) Response selection in the human anterior cingulate
38
39 cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, 2, 920–924. <https://doi.org/10.1038/13224>
- 40
41
42
43 Zahedi, A., Rahman, R. A., Stürmer, B., & Sommer, W. (2019). Common and specific loci of
44
45 Stroop effects in vocal and manual tasks, revealed by event-related brain potentials
46
47 and post-hypnotic suggestions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 148(9),
48
49 1575–1594. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000574>
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Figure Captions*
4

5 *Figure 1. Task conflict theorists argue that “whole task sets compete, over and above any*
6 *competition between specific responses associated with a stimulus” (Monsell et al., 2001:*
7 *139-140). At some, as yet unclear, point in processing, the task set for word reading is*
8 *activated, creating competition between task sets. That is, independent of, and likely earlier*
9 *than some of the specific the S-R associations (in red), the task sets (which can be thought of*
10 *as collections of S-R associations) compete, creating task conflict (a unique marker of which*
11 *is negative facilitation). In contrast, the alternative account being tested here argues that the*
12 *S-R associations in red are enough to explain negative facilitation given the differences in the*
13 *pronounceability of non-lexical (i.e., xxxx) and lexical (e.g., blue) trials, especially in a*
14 *mostly repeated-letter (e.g., 75%) trial context.*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Figure 2. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word*
31 *Type and Onset Type in Experiment 1.*
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Figure 3. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word*
38 *Type and Onset Type in Experiment 2.*
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Figure 4. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word*
45 *Type and Onset Type in Experiment 3.*
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Task conflict theorists argue that “whole task sets compete, over and above any competition between specific responses associated with a stimulus” (Monsell et al., 2001: 139-140). At some, as yet unclear, point in processing, the task set for word reading is activated, creating competition between task sets. That is, independent of, and likely earlier than some of the specific the S-R associations (in red), the task sets (which can be thought of as collections of S-R associations) compete, creating task conflict (a unique marker of which is negative facilitation). In contrast, the alternative account being tested here argues that the S-R associations in red are enough to explain negative facilitation given the differences in the pronounceability of non-lexical (i.e., xxxx) and lexical (e.g., blue) trials, especially in a mostly repeated-letter (e.g., 75%) trial context.




Figure 2. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word Type and Onset Type in Experiment 1.

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




Figure 3. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word Type and Onset Type in Experiment 2.




Figure 4. Button press colour classification times in the Stroop task as a function of Word Type and Onset Type in Experiment 3.

Table 1*Stimulus characteristics in Experiment 1*

	Colour words		Neutral – Set 1		Neutral – Set 2	
	Complex	Simple	Complex	Simple	Complex	Simple
Number of letters	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Number of phonemes	3.5	3.5	3.75	3.75	3.75	4.0
Number of syllables	1.00	1.5	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
Word Frequency ^a	87.43	80.19	50.18	75.26	69.47	91.37

Note. Stimulus characteristics for Congruent stimuli are identical to those for Incongruent stimuli. a: Subtitle word frequency (Brysbaert & New, 2009).

Peer Review Version

Table 2

			<i>Colour names</i>			
			<i>Simple onset</i>		<i>Complex onset</i>	
			red	purple	green	blue
Experiments 1, 2 and 3	<i>Simple onset colour words</i>	red	12	4	4	4
		purple	4	12	4	4
	<i>Complex onset colour words</i>	green	4	4	12	4
		blue	4	4	4	12
Experiments 1 and 3	<i>Simple onset neutral words (Set 1)</i>	dog		12	12	12
		farmer	12		12	12
		taste	12	12		12
		cake	12	12	12	
	<i>Complex onset neutral words (Set 1)</i>	dry		12	12	12
		frozen	12		12	12
		train	12	12		12
	crew	12	12	12		
Experiment 1	<i>Simple onset neutral words (Set 2)</i>	far		12	12	12
		carbon	12		12	12
		force	12	12		12
		tape	12	12	12	
	<i>Complex onset neutral words (Set 2)</i>	fly		12	12	12
		clever	12		12	12
		floor	12	12		12
	tree	12	12	12		
Experiment 2	<i>Repeated-letter stimuli</i>	xxx		24	24	24
		xxxxxx	24		24	24
		xxxxx	24	24		24
		xxxx	24	24	24	

Table 3*RTs, errors and Stroop effects as a function of onset complexity in Experiment 1.*

<i>Onset</i>	<i>Word Type</i>						<i>Stroop effects</i>			<i>Complex vs. Simple Neutral</i>		
	<i>Incongruent</i>		<i>Congruent</i>		<i>Complex Neutral^{&}</i>		<i>Simple Neutral</i>		<i>Facilitation</i>		<i>Congruency Effect</i>	<i>Interference</i>
	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>				
<i>Complex</i>	914 (17)	9.8	795 (16)	6.2	823 (14)	7.1	816 (14)	6.6	28*	119*	91*	7 [^]
<i>Simple</i>	900 (17)	8.5	828 (16)	6.9	813 (13)	6.8	821 (14)	7.2	-7 [^]	72*	79*	-8
<i>Difference</i>	14 [^]		33*						35*	47*	12 [^]	

Note. * $p < .01$, [^]Evidence for null, [&]Note that half of the complex onset neutral trials were matched in length and frequency to the complex onset colour words and half were matched to the simple onset colour words. The same was true for the simple onset neutral stimuli. This meant that we could compare RTs for complex and simple onset neutral words that were matched on other psycholinguistic variables.

Table 4
RTs (ms), errors and Stroop effects as a function of onset complexity in Experiment 2.

<i>Onset</i>	<i>Word Type</i>						<i>Stroop effects</i>		
	<i>Incongruent</i>		<i>Congruent</i>		<i>Neutral (xxxxx)</i>		<i>Facilitation</i>	<i>Congruency Effect</i>	<i>Interference</i>
	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>			
<i>Complex</i>	955 (16)	10.8	828 (16)	7.3	815 (14)	7.6	-13	127**	140**
<i>Simple</i>	940 (16)	11.7	831 (16)	7.4	817 (13)	7.2	-14*	109**	123**
<i>Difference</i>	15		3^				1^	18	17

Note. * $p < .05$, $p < .001$, ^Evidence for null.

Peer Review Version

Table 5*RTs, errors and Stroop effects as a function of onset complexity in Experiment 3.*

<i>Onset</i>	<i>Word Type</i>								<i>Stroop effects</i>			<i>Complex vs. Simple Neutral</i>
	<i>Incongruent</i>		<i>Congruent</i>		<i>Complex Neutral</i>		<i>Simple Neutral</i>		<i>Facilitation</i>	<i>Congruency Effect</i>	<i>Interference</i>	
	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>	<i>Mean (SE)</i>	<i>% Er</i>				
<i>Complex</i>	945 (12)	12.1	829 (12)	7.9	861 (11)	8.1	859 (11)	8.5	32*	116*	84*	2^
<i>Simple</i>	942 (12)	11.3	858 (13)	8.4	860 (11)	8.5	859 (11)	8.1	1^	84*	83*	1^
<i>Difference</i>	3^		29*						31*	32*	1^	

Note. * $p < .01$, ^Evidence for null.