

# Is the word length effect linked to subvocal rehearsal?

Charlotte Jacquemot<sup>1</sup>

Emmanuel Dupoux<sup>1</sup>

Anne-Catherine Bachoud-Lévi<sup>2-4</sup>

1. Laboratoire de Sciences Cognitives et Psycholinguistique, CNRS / EHESS / DEC-ENS, Paris, France

2. INSERM U955 Team 1 « Neuropsychologie Interventionnelle », Institut Mondor de Recherche Biomédicale Créteil, France

3. AP/HP, Unité de Neuropsychologie, Service de Neurologie, Hôpital Henri Mondor, Créteil, France

4. Université Paris 12, Faculté de Médecine, Créteil, France

Short title: Subvocal rehearsal and word length effect

Address for Correspondence:

Charlotte Jacquemot

Laboratoire de Sciences Cognitives et Psycholinguistique

Ecole Normale Supérieure,

29, rue d'Ulm

75005, Paris

France

Phone: +33 (0)1 44 32 26 23

Fax: +33 (0)1 45 44 98 35

e-mail: charlotte.jacquemot@ens.fr

**Acknowledgments:**

The authors are grateful to John Crawford for providing the statistical tools for analysing single cases in neuropsychology. The authors are also grateful to Roberto Cubelli and two anonymous reviewers for their many helpful comments.

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

## Abstract

1  
2  
3  
4 Models of phonological short-term memory (pSTM) generally distinguish between two  
5  
6 components: a phonological buffer and a subvocal rehearsal. Evidence for these two  
7  
8 components comes, respectively, from the phonological similarity effect and the word length  
9  
10 effect which disappears under articulatory suppression. But alternative theories posit that  
11  
12 subvocal rehearsal is only an optional component of the pSTM. According to them, the  
13  
14 depletion of the length effect under articulatory suppression results from the interference of  
15  
16 the self-produced speech rather than the disruption of subvocal rehearsal.  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 In order to disentangle these two theories, we tested two patients with a short term memory  
22  
23 deficit. FA, who presents a pseudoword repetition deficit, and FL, who does not. FA's deficit  
24  
25 allowed for the observance of an ecological case of subvocal rehearsal disruption without any  
26  
27 articulatory suppression task. FA's performance in pSTM tasks reveals as controls a  
28  
29 phonological similarity effect, and contrary to controls no word length effect. In contrast, the  
30  
31 second patient, FL, exhibits the same effects as control subjects. This result is in accordance  
32  
33 with models of pSTM in which the word length effect emerges from subvocal rehearsal and  
34  
35 disappears when this latter is disrupted.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Keywords : phonological short-term memory, subvocal rehearsal, word-length effect,  
47  
48 articulatory suppression, conduction aphasia  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

# 1. Introduction

Phonological short-term memory (pSTM) allows the temporary storage and processing of verbal information. The first models of pSTM were developed in the 1970s (Baddeley and Hitch, 1974) but some components of this system are still discussed. Models of pSTM generally distinguish between two components: a phonological buffer and a subvocal rehearsal process (Baddeley, 1986). The phonological buffer is assumed to transiently store the phonological input and subvocal rehearsal to refresh the memory traces stored in the phonological buffer before they decay. Thus subvocal rehearsal increases the storage capacity of pSTM beyond the capacity of the phonological buffer itself (Cowan, 2001). Recent findings support a revision of the standard model, which describes a single phonological buffer, to a new model with two separate phonological buffers: an input buffer (in the perception system) and an output buffer (in the production system) that store phonological input and output respectively (Nickels et al., 1997; Martin et al., 1999; Laganaro and Alario, 2006). Subvocal rehearsal arises from the circulation of phonological information between these two buffers and involves two conversion mechanisms, one that converts phonological input into phonological output and one that does the reverse mapping (see Fig. 1) (Jacquemot and Scott, 2006). Previous studies suggest that these two buffers are not functionally equivalent and may be differentially affected by phonological variables like phonological similarity and phonological length.

The phonological input buffer has been found to be highly sensitive to phonological similarity: lists of phonologically similar stimuli are less well recalled than lists of dissimilar ones (Baddeley et al., 1984; Vallar and Baddeley, 1984a). For instance a list containing */bim/*, */pim/*, */kim/* yields more errors than a list containing */bam/*, */liv/*, */ron/*. This effect is called the phonological similarity effect and is present even when subvocal rehearsal is blocked by articulatory suppression (Baddeley, 1986). Typically, articulatory suppression is done by

1 asking participants to continuously repeat a token (e.g. “the, the, the”) during the memory  
2 task.  
3

4  
5 In contrast, the phonological output buffer is known to be highly sensitive to phonological  
6 length (Shallice et al., 2000; Nickels and Howard, 2004; Caramazza et al., 1986). In a very  
7 detailed analysis of aphasic speech production errors, Nickels and Howard (2004)  
8 demonstrated that production errors in aphasics were correlated with the number of phonemes  
9 of the word to be pronounced. This effect of phonological length has also been reported in  
10 healthy participants in speech production tasks (Levelt, 1992; Sternberg et al., 1980; Meyer et  
11 al., 2003; Roelofs, 2002; but see Romani et al., 2010; Bachoud-Lévi et al., 1998<sup>1</sup>). In pSTM  
12 tasks, sequences of short words are better recalled than sequences of long words. For instance  
13 a list containing *bed, sky, lamp*, is better recalled than a list containing *crocodile, telephone,*  
14 *magazine*. This word length effect depends on the phonological length (number of phonemes,  
15 syllables) of the words to be memorized (Caplan et al., 1992; Caplan and Waters, 1994;  
16 Service, 1998; Neath and Nairne, 1995) and has been attributed to the phonological output  
17 buffer (Jacquemot and Scott, 2006). The length effect is also observed when spoken output is  
18 not required, suggesting that it does not result only from delay during output (Baddeley et al.,  
19 2002; Cowan et al., 2003; Doshier and Ma, 1998). In addition, under articulatory suppression,  
20 which prevents participants from covertly rehearsing the phonological trace and therefore  
21 from using the phonological output buffer, the word length effect is abolished (Baddeley,  
22 1986).  
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 However the localization of the word length effect in the subvocal rehearsal component is  
50 controversial (Nairne, 1990; Neath and Nairne, 1995; Romani et al., 2005; Nairne et al., 1997;  
51  
52

---

53  
54  
55 <sup>1</sup>It is possible, under certain task demands and with the use of pressure on speed or accuracy, to induce the  
56 initiation of articulation before the full planning of the phonological utterance to-be-pronounced has been  
57 completed.  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 Neath, 2000). According to an alternative view, the standard length effect derives from the  
2 number of phonological features to be stored and because of capacity limits, trace decay or  
3 interference, longer words are at a disadvantage in recall tasks because more units have to be  
4 retained. But, in addition, there is an influence of lexico-semantic factors (Brown and Hulme,  
5 1995; Hulme et al., 1997; Romani et al., 2005). Longer words have an advantage since they  
6 offer more residual phonological information from which to attempt reconstruction (or  
7 redintegration) and fewer lexical competitors. If just one phonological segment of a word is  
8 lost, it would be easy to reconstruct “television” from “tele\_sion” but if one segment of a  
9 shorter item is lost such as in “\_at”, it will be difficult to retrieve “cat” between a great  
10 number of alternatives (bat, rat, hat, fat, etc). In these models, the word length effect results  
11 from the coupled effect of trace decay and of lexico-semantic influence and there is no need  
12 of subvocal rehearsal to account for it (Neath and Nairne, 1995; Brown and Hulme, 1995;  
13 Hulme et al., 1997). In some cases, the effect of lexico-semantic factors becomes more  
14 influential than the effect of the number of phonological features, leading to the abolition of the  
15 word length effect. For instance, under articulatory suppression, the self-produced speech  
16 adds noise to the phonological buffer. This addition of noise promotes the activation of  
17 lexico-semantic representation such as it occurs in irrelevant speech situations (Neath et al.,  
18 1998; Nairne, 1990; Gupta and MacWhinney, 1995; Romani et al., 2005) and encourages  
19 reliance on lexico-semantic information rather than phonological. As a result, longer words  
20 can more easily be reconstructed from degraded phonology than shorter words overriding the  
21 effect of the number of phonological features. Therefore, the abolition of length effect results  
22 not from the disruption of the rehearsal process but as a consequence of the interference of  
23 self-produced speech. Subvocal rehearsal in pSTM becomes an optional part of the system  
24 (Romani et al., 2005) or even a non-existing component (Brown and Hulme, 1995; Neath et  
25 al., 2003a; Neath and Nairne, 1995).

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

In this paper, we intend to clarify the issue of the link between the length effect and the potential subvocal rehearsal component. The aim is to decide whether the abolition of the word length effect under articulatory suppression is only a consequence of self-produced speech or whether it reflects the disruption of subvocal rehearsal. In order to disentangle these two alternatives, we tested two patients who each had a deficit in pSTM. FA presents a conduction aphasia restricted to pseudowords. In FA, the link between phonological input and output is damaged (see Fig. 1), implying a damaged subvocal rehearsal component. This creates a naturally occurring case of articulatory suppression: ie, the rehearsal process is blocked, but without the interference of self-produced speech. Models in which the word length effect emerges due to subvocal rehearsal predict that a word length effect should be absent in FA, since, as in normal subjects under articulatory suppression, there is no possible rehearsal (Jacquemot and Scott, 2006; Baddeley, 2003). Alternative models, however, predict that the word length effect should be observed in FA, since according to these models, the length effect is independent from articulatory suppression (Romani et al., 2005; Neath et al., 1998). The second patient, FL, acts as a patient control. Indeed, this patient has a reduced short term memory span, just as FA, but is not impaired in pseudoword repetition. Since FL has a normal rehearsal component, both types of models predict that FL should have a normal length effect.

*Insert Figure 1 about here*

## **2. Case report : FA**

FA is a 54-year-old, right-handed retired secretary (education: 9 years). One year before, she had a stroke leading to conduction aphasia. FA's deficit was extensively studied and described in a previous study (Jacquemot et al., 2007). In the present paper, we report new data relevant to the relationship between word length effect and subvocal rehearsal.

## **2.1. Word comprehension and production**

Word comprehension was tested with a picture matching task requiring to decide whether an auditory word matches a picture. The auditory word could either be the correct one such as the word hat for the picture of an hat (N=64), a phonological distractor such as rat (N=64), a semantic distractor such as bonnet (N=64) or a unrelated distractor such as cup (N=64). FA performed very well on this task (98.5% correct). FA's word production performance was assessed with a naming task of seventy pictures composed of 20 monosyllabic, 20 bisyllabic and 20 trisyllabic words. For each of these lengths, half of the words were low frequency and half were high frequency. There were also 10 quadrisyllabic words of low frequency. FA's word production was impaired relative the performance of matched controls (N=5, age range 52–60, years of education range 2–12) (respectively 84.3% and 99.7%  $\pm$  0.6 correct responses; Significance test (Crawford and Howell, 1998)  $t = 23.4$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed)  $< .001$ ). Her errors comprised non-responses (N=4), phonological paraphasia (N=1) and semantic paraphasia (N=6). She also suffered from a minor anarthric deficit characterized by the production of some distorted phonemes and a slow rate of speech. Her digit span was within normal range (4 forward and 5 backward).

## **2.2. Conversion mechanisms between phonological input and phonological output**

The conversion mechanism of phonological input into phonological output was assessed with a repetition task of words (N=32) and pseudowords (N=16). There were half monosyllable items and half bisyllable items for both words and pseudowords. For each length (monosyllables and bisyllables) words were half high frequency and half low frequency; likewise, for each length pseudowords were half of low neighbourhood density (no



1 phonological neighbour) or high neighbourhood density (more than 1). FA's performance is  
2 reported in Table 1. She was significantly more impaired in the pseudoword repetition  
3 condition than in the word condition (respectively 43.7% correct and 87.5% correct;  $\chi^2(1) =$   
4 10,  $p = .002$ ). In repeating words, errors were all phonological errors. In repeating  
5 pseudowords, errors include phonological errors (55%), lexicalization errors (22%), non-  
6 responses (17%), and unrelated responses (6%). There was neither a length effect with words,  
7 nor a neighbourhood effect with pseudowords. This discrepancy between performance for  
8 words and pseudowords was not observed in controls (respectively, 99.4% correct and 98.7%  
9 correct) and significantly differs from FA's pattern of results (Revised Standardized  
10 Difference Test (Crawford and Garthwaite, 2005)  $t(4) = 7.6$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .002) (Fig. 2, A).  
11  
12 FA's deficit was not explained by any perceptual deficit: she flawlessly completed a  
13 discrimination task that involves phonologically minimal pairs of words and pseudowords  
14 (see Table 1). These pairs were recorded by two speakers (male and female) and were used to  
15 construct 120 AX trials, half of them being composed by the repetition of the same item  
16 *coupure / coupure /kupyɾ/* and half of them being composed by two items that differ  
17 minimally such as *coupure / couture /kupyɾ/ /kutyɾ/*. FA's task was to decide whether the two  
18 stimuli were the same word (or pseudoword) or not. She performed at the same level than  
19 controls (96% correct and 96.5% correct respectively, significance test (Crawford and  
20 Howell, 1998),  $t = .1$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .92). FA's deficit for repeating pseudowords can not be  
21 explained by a deficit in producing pseudoword: FA's reading performance was assessed and  
22 even if she was not flawless in reading task (FA: 91.6 % correct, controls: 99.1% correct,  
23  $t = 9.8$ ,  $p = .001$ ), her performance in reading pseudowords was largely better than in repeating  
24 pseudowords (respectively, 90.6% correct and 43.7% correct;  $\chi^2(1) = 13.9$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Reading  
25 errors were all phonemic errors and there was neither a length nor a neighbourhood effect.  
26  
27 Therefore FA's dramatic difficulties in repeating pseudowords could not be attributed to a  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 deficit of the speech perception system or to a deficit of the speech production system. Given  
2 that this deficit specifically affected pseudowords –that do not have any lexico-semantic  
3 entry- we proposed that FA suffered from an impairment of the phonological mechanism that  
4 connects speech perception and the speech production system, that is the mechanism that  
5 converts the phonological input code into the phonological output code (see Fig.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 1)(Jacquemot et al., 2007).

13  
14  
15 We further assessed whether the mechanism that converts phonological output into  
16 phonological input was spared or not. We used a silent rhyme judgment task in which the  
17 patient had to decide if two written words would rhyme if pronounced. FA was asked to  
18 perform the task silently. This task, in which strings of letters have to be phonologically  
19 compared, requires several steps to be achieved. First, strings of letters have to be converted  
20 in a phonological form and stored into the phonological output buffer (Howard and Nickels,  
21 2005; Nickels et al., 1997). Then the phonological form has to be converted into a  
22 phonological input for evaluating the rhyme (Burani et al., 1991; Howard and Franklin,  
23 1990). Therefore, accurate performance on this task should reflect the integrity of the  
24 phonological output buffer and the conversion mechanism of the phonological output into the  
25 phonological input.

26  
27  
28 We constructed two sets of 20 pairs of written words, rhyming or non-rhyming. Within the 20  
29 rhyming pairs, there were 10 pairs that were also orthographically similar (e.g. *mémoire-*  
30 *armoire*, [memwaR]-[aRmwaR], *memory-wardrobe*) and 10 pairs that were not (e.g. *faon-*  
31 *éléphant*, [fã]-[elefã], *fawn-elephant*); similarly, within the 20 non-rhyming pairs, there were  
32 10 dissimilar pairs (e.g. *escalier-râteau*, [ɛskalje]-[Rato], *stairs-rake*,) and 10 orthographically  
33 similar pairs (e.g. *fille-tranquille*, [fij]-[tRãkil], *girl-peaceful*). Thus, the reliance on  
34 orthographic information during this task would lead to errors. FA's performance was lower  
35 than control subjects in this task (82.5 % correct and 96.5% correct respectively,  $t=4.4$ ,  $p =$

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

.012). As this task requires to covertly read the words, any reading deficit would impact the performance of the rhyme judgement task. We already showed that FA was slightly impaired in reading, thus we further assessed her reading performance on the same words as those used in the rhyming task. The results show that the level of performance on the overt reading task was similar to that on the covert rhyme judgement task (82.5% correct and 82.5% correct respectively) suggesting that the errors in the rhyme judgment task resulted from reading difficulties. FA flawlessly performed the rhyming task on the items that she has no difficulty in reading.

This pattern of performance suggests that the phonological output buffer and the conversion mechanism from phonological output into phonological input is spared in FA whereas the conversion mechanism from phonological input to phonological output is impaired (Jacquemot et al., 2007). In the present study, we tested FA with two additional tasks specifically tapping into the two components of pSTM: the phonological input buffer with a task involving to memorize lists of phonological similar and dissimilar items and subvocal rehearsal with a task involving to memorize lists of short and long words.

*Insert Table 1 about here*

### **2.3. Phonological Similarity Effect**

The phonological similarity effect is not be affected by the disruption of subvocal rehearsal component (Vallar and Baddeley, 1984b) meaning that FA should demonstrate the typical phonological similarity effect.

### 2.3.1. Methods

1  
2  
3 Immediate serial recall of phonologically similar and dissimilar items was assessed. FA was  
4  
5 instructed to listen to a list of items and to recall them in the correct order. FA was taught to  
6  
7 associate two auditory CV–CV pseudowords (C, consonant; V, vowel) to keys “1” and “2”,  
8  
9 respectively, on a computer keyboard. During a prior training session, FA was asked to  
10  
11 choose the correct key according to each of the pseudowords presented in isolation. After  
12  
13 training, FA was presented with progressively longer, random sequences of the two  
14  
15 pseudowords. FA was required to recall the sequence and transcribe it with the key “1” and  
16  
17 “2”. Six trials of two, three, four, five, and six items were presented in ascending order (for  
18  
19 procedure details see (Jacquemot et al., 2006)). For each pseudoword, six acoustically  
20  
21 different tokens were used in order to constrain the participants to use the phonological  
22  
23 information and not the acoustic one. The experiment was divided into two parts. In the first  
24  
25 part, the two pseudowords were phonologically dissimilar—/rapi/ versus /foga/—while in the  
26  
27 second part they were phonologically similar—/mipa/ versus /miba/—and constituted a  
28  
29 minimal pair differing in only one distinctive phonetic feature (i.e., voicing).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 2.3.2. Results

38  
39  
40 Results were analysed by estimating the critical sequence length that yielded 50% of correct  
41  
42 recall for each condition (dissimilar and similar items). We call this sequence length the  
43  
44 estimated memory span<sup>2</sup>. FA’s data was compared to data of 10 matched control participants  
45  
46 (age range 50–55, years of education range 5–22). FA’s span is 4.15 for the dissimilar items  
47  
48 and 3.2 for the similar items. The estimated span of the control participants is 5.7 for the  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>2</sup> This estimated span was computed by regressing the average recall rate across  
56  
57 sequence length with a linear function. This was done in R by fitting the data of each  
58  
59 individual participant.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

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

dissimilar items and 4.6 for the similar items (Fig. 2, B). Controls show the typical phonological similarity effect ( $t(9)=9.9$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The comparison of FA and controls' results was computed with RSDT (Crawford and Garthwaite, 2005). FA's span is lower than controls' span for both dissimilar condition ( $t(9)=2.5$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .046) and similar condition ( $t(9)=2.3$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed)= .03) but the performance difference between the similar and dissimilar items is not different to controls ( $t(9)=.37$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .72), meaning that FA as controls shows the typical phonological similarity effect.

*Insert Figure 2 about here*

## **2.4. Word length effect**

### **2.4.1. Methods**

Immediate serial recall of short and long words was assessed. FA was instructed to listen to a list of words and to recall them in the correct order. Words were presented at the rate of one per second. Two sets of stimuli, one composed of 10 monosyllabic words, and another of 10 quadrisyllabic words, were used. Monosyllabic words were phonologically less complex in terms of number of syllables and phonemes than quadrisyllabic words. The words in the two sets were concrete words of high imaginability and were matched for frequency.

For each set (monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic words), ten trials of a given sequence length (sequences from two to ten words) were generated at random. They were presented in ascending order. No word was presented twice within a sequence. If FA's recall of the first three trials of a given sequence length was correct, we assumed that this length was within her span and proceeded to the following string length (Vallar and Baddeley, 1984a). FA was required to immediately recall the words presented by the examiner by pointing to the appropriate stimuli in the presentation order. The ten words were presented in written format

1 only during the recall phase. This procedure was used because, due to FA's mild anarthria,  
2 her speech production was sometimes slowed and that may have affected her STM's  
3 performance (Papagno et al., 2008).  
4  
5  
6  
7

### 8 **2.4.2. Results**

9

10 Results were analyzed as above by estimating the span, that is the critical sequence length that  
11 yielded 50% of correct recall for each condition (monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic words).  
12  
13 FA's data was compared to the data of 5 matched control participants (age range 52–60, years  
14 of education range 2–12) tested with the same modality of response (pointing). FA's span is 4  
15 for the monosyllabic words and 3.9 for the quadrisyllabic words (Fig. 2, C). Controls' spans is  
16 6.9 for the monosyllabic words and 4.7 for the quadrisyllabic words. The controls show the  
17 typical word length effect ( $t(4)=5.1$ ,  $p=.007$ ). The comparison of FA and controls' results  
18 using RSDT shows that FA's span for monosyllabic words is marginally lower than controls'  
19 span ( $t(4)=2.4$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .06) and that FA's span for quadrisyllabic words is lower than  
20 controls ( $t(4)=4.8$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .008). The crucial point is that FA's difference between  
21 monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic words is significantly different from that observed in  
22 controls ( $t(4)=4.2$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed)= .014) showing that contrary to controls, FA does not  
23 display the typical word length effect  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **2.5. Discussion**

44

45 Two tasks were used for assessing the phonological input buffer and the subvocal rehearsal  
46 component. First, like controls, FA shows a phonological similarity effect, that is better  
47 performance in memorizing sequences of dissimilar items compared to sequences of similar  
48 items. FA's span is lower than controls, suggesting a deficit of the phonological input buffer.  
49  
50 Secondly, tested with sequences of short and long words, FA, contrary to controls, does not  
51 show any word length effect.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 We assessed the phonological similarity effect and the length effect with auditory stimuli and  
2 did not investigate these two effects in the visual modality. This restriction is explained by the  
3  
4 fact that FA's performance in reading was not perfect, suggesting a mild deficit of the  
5  
6 orthography-to-phonology conversion process. An abnormal phonological similarity word  
7  
8 length effect with visual stimuli would have been difficult to interpret, given that part of the  
9  
10 effect could be the result of the impairment in orthography-to-phonology conversion and not  
11  
12 related to the phonological buffer or phonological rehearsal per se. Hence, we only tested FA  
13  
14 with auditory stimuli, which do not require mediation with orthography, and directly measure  
15  
16 pSTM.  
17  
18

19  
20 In order to ensure that the absence of length effect results from the subvocal rehearsal  
21  
22 disruption and not from the phonological input buffer deficit, we tested another patient, FL,  
23  
24 who suffers from a deficit of the phonological input buffer, but does not have any impairment  
25  
26 of the conversion mechanism of phonological input into phonological output.  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **3. Case report: FL**

32  
33 Patient FL is a right-handed 59-year-old computer specialist. Five years before participating  
34  
35 in the study, he had a stroke leading to global aphasia. FL's deficit was previously described  
36  
37 in (Jacquemot et al., 2006). A computed tomography (CT) scan (at admission) and a magnetic  
38  
39 resonance imaging (MRI) scan (4 years later) confirmed a left perisylvian stroke. He was  
40  
41 fluent in speech production, to the extent that uninformed listeners did not detect  
42  
43 abnormalities in their speech. He performs well in the naming task (95% with only semantic  
44  
45 errors such for instance skirt for dress). His word comprehension was evaluated with the same  
46  
47 picture matching task as for FA and FL flawlessly performed this task (100% correct).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### **3.1. Conversion mechanism between phonological input and phonological output**

As FA, FL was tested with a phonological discrimination task that involves minimal pairs of words and pseudowords. FL flawlessly performed the discrimination task showing that he had no phonological decoding deficit. We also assessed the conversion mechanism from phonological input into phonological output with the same repetition task used with FA. FL's performance does not differ from controls (97% correct and 99% correct respectively,  $t=0.84$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .4). FL performs equally with words and pseudowords ( $\chi^2(1)=1.6, p = .2$ ) (Fig. 2, A). We assessed the conversion mechanism from phonological output to phonological input with the silent rhyme judgment task used with FA. FL performs as well as controls (97.5% correct and 96.5% correct respectively,  $t=.3$ ,  $p = .7$ ) (see Table 1).

This overall pattern of performance suggests that the both conversion mechanisms between phonological input and output and the phonological output buffer are intact in FL.

### **3.2. Phonological Similarity Effect**

In order to assess the phonological similarity effect in FL, we used the same experimental task as used with FA and results were analysed according to the same method. The estimated FL's span is 4.3 for dissimilar items and 3.2 for similar items (Fig. 2, B). FL's data was compared to the data of 10 matched control participants (age range 50–55, years of education range 5–22). The estimated span of the control participants is 5.7 for the dissimilar items and 4.65 for the similar items. Controls shows the typical phonological similarity effect ( $t(9)=9.94$ ,  $p < .001$ ). RSDT analysis shows that FL's span is lower than controls' span for both dissimilar condition ( $t(9)=2.3$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed)= .04) and similar condition ( $t(9)=2.2$ ,  $p$ (two-tailed)= .04) but that the span difference between similar and dissimilar items is the same as in controls ( $t(9)=.17$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .86). This data shows that FL, like controls, shows the typical



1 phonological similarity effect but that his phonological input buffer capacity is reduced  
2 relative to controls.  
3  
4

### 5 **3.3. Word length effect**

6  
7  
8 Immediate serial recall of short and long words was assessed. FL was instructed to listen to a  
9 list of words and to recall them in the correct order. The material and the testing procedure  
10 were similar to that used with FA except that in the recall phase, FL was asked to orally repeat  
11 the sequence instead of pointing to the written stimuli in the correct order.  
12  
13

14 We estimated FL's span (the critical sequence length that yielded 50% of correct recall) for  
15 the monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic conditions. FL's results were compared to the data of 10  
16 matched control participants (age range 50–55, years of education range 5-22) tested with the  
17 same modality of recall (oral response). FL's span is 3.86 for the monosyllabic words and  
18 2.97 for the quadrisyllabic words (Fig. 2, C). The estimated span of the control participants is  
19 5.7 for the monosyllabic words and 4.6 for the quadrisyllabic words. The controls show the  
20 typical word length effect ( $t(9)=6.82$ ,  $p < .001$ ). FL's span is lower than controls' span, for  
21 both monosyllabic words ( $t(9)=3.8$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed) = .004) and quadrisyllabic words ( $t(9)=2.9$ ,  
22  $p$  (two-tailed)= .016), but the difference between the span of the monosyllabic and  
23 quadrisyllabic words is similar to that obtained in controls ( $t(9)=0.8$ ,  $p$  (two-tailed)= .4)  
24 indicating that FL shows the typical word length effect.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 **3.4. Discussion**

47 FL's results show that word comprehension and word production systems are both  
48 unimpaired, and that the two conversion mechanisms between phonological input and  
49 phonological output are both intact. In the memory tasks, FL's span is globally lower than  
50 controls' span: his performance in the phonological similarity task is lower than the controls  
51 and his performance in the word length task is lower than controls showing that FL's  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 phonological input buffer has a lower storage capacity. Nevertheless, like controls, FL  
2 presents the typical span difference between similar and dissimilar items and the typical span  
3 difference between the monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic items. Overall FL suffers from an  
4 input buffer deficit with no associated deficit of the conversion mechanisms between  
5 phonological input and output.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Both FA and FL show a phonological input buffer deficit with a lower storage capacity  
11 relative to controls. The difference between FA and FL is that FA also suffers from a deficit  
12 of the mechanism that converts the phonological input into the phonological output. FL shows  
13 a word length effect whereas FA does not. FL was tested in order to assess whether the  
14 absence of word length effect could be explained by the phonological input buffer deficit.  
15  
16 Indeed, a reduction of the phonological input buffer capacities could trigger the use of the  
17 lexico-semantic information for memorizing the words. With low phonological memory  
18 abilities the system could rely on the lexico-semantic level rather than the phonological to  
19 store the information. According to such hypothesis, the length effect could disappear not  
20 because of the disruption of subvocal rehearsal but because of the activation of the lexico-  
21 semantic memory which is not sensitive to length effect. FL's result does not confirm this  
22 hypothesis and suggests that the absence of word length effect could not solely be explained  
23 by a phonological input buffer deficit.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 This is in accordance with previous data on two patients GF and CM with "locked in  
44 syndrome" (Vallar and Cappa, 1987; Cubelli and Nichelli, 1992). These patients were unable  
45 to produce any speech output and to covertly rehearse speech sounds (see Cubelli et al.,  
46 1993). GF and CM did not suffer from any comprehension deficit, their digit span was within  
47 normal limits and GF showed normal performance in probe recognition task using auditory  
48 material suggesting that his phonological input buffer was not impaired. Interestingly these  
49 patients that could not use their subvocal rehearsal showed a phonological similarity effect but  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 no word length effect. Their results showed that the absence of length effect in memory task  
2 was observed in natural situation of the abolition of subvocal rehearsal without interference of  
3 self-produced speech.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **4. General Discussion**

11 We tested two patients, FA and FL. FA suffered from a conduction aphasia with a reduction  
12 of short term memory and a relatively specific impairment in pseudoword repetition, with  
13 almost preserved comprehension, production, and word repetition. FL, in contrast was only  
14 impaired in short term memory. FA's deficit results from selective damage of the link between  
15 the input and output phonological codes, an element of the subvocal rehearsal component  
16 (Baddeley, 2003; Jacquemot and Scott, 2006). Tested on a sequence recall task, FA shows a  
17 normal phonological similarity effect: as controls and FL, she better recalls items that are  
18 phonologically dissimilar compared to phonologically similar ones. In contrast, FA does not  
19 show any word length effect: her span does not differ for monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic  
20 words. This result differs from controls and from FL: they show a typical word length effect  
21 meaning that the absence of word length effect in FA could not be due to experimental testing  
22 conditions. FL's data confirmed that the absence of the word length effect in FA could not be  
23 resulting solely from the phonological input buffer deficit.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Two main types of pSTM models are proposed to explain the phonological similarity and  
47 word length effects. There are clear differences between these two types of models with  
48 respect to the role of subvocal rehearsal in pSTM. In the first type, subvocal rehearsal is  
49 involved in refreshing the phonological trace that is stored in the phonological buffer through  
50 its access to the phonological output buffer (Baddeley, 2003; Howard and Franklin, 1990;  
51 Howard and Nickels, 2005; Nickels et al., 1997; Monsell, 1987; Murphy et al., 2006) and its  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 disruption induces the abolition of the word length effect. In the second type of pSTM model,  
2 subvocal rehearsal is only an optional component of the system. The length effect results from  
3  
4 the combined effect of phonological and lexico-semantic factors and the depletion of word  
5  
6 length effect under articulatory suppression is a consequence of the interference of self-  
7  
8 produced speech (Neath et al., 1998; Neath et al., 2003b; Gupta and MacWhinney, 1995;  
9  
10 Campoy and Baddeley, 2008; Romani et al., 2005).

11  
12  
13  
14 FA presents a natural case of articulatory suppression without any disturbance of additional  
15  
16 factors such as self-produced speech or dual task interference. According to model with  
17  
18 optional rehearsal, she should exhibit a word length effect. But this is not the case: FA's  
19  
20 results fit with pSTM model in which subvocal rehearsal is one of the main components of  
21  
22 pSTM (Howard and Franklin, 1990; Nickels et al., 1997; Baddeley, 2003; Jacquemot and  
23  
24 Scott, 2006). In this type of models, pSTM performance depends on the capacities of both  
25  
26 phonological input and phonological output buffers and on the ability to convert phonological  
27  
28 information between them (Fig. 1). Because of her deficit, FA can only use the phonological  
29  
30 input buffer to perform a short term memory task. As a result, she only shows a phonological  
31  
32 similarity effect, not a length effect. In other words, FA's results are close to those of normal  
33  
34 controls under an articulatory suppression task. This suggests that under articulatory  
35  
36 suppression, even if the self-produced speech may impact pSTM performance (Gupta and  
37  
38 MacWhinney, 1995), it cannot be entirely responsible for the depletion of the length effect  
39  
40 which mainly results from the disruption of subvocal rehearsal.

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Our data supports the hypothesis that the length effect emerges at least partly from the  
50  
51 phonological output buffer, a finding also supported by sign language literature which reports  
52  
53 a length effect in memory tasks when using short and long signs (Wilson and Emmorey,  
54  
55 1998). This is in favor of models of pSTM that include two phonological buffers, the input  
56  
57 and output buffers. Articulatory suppression has at least two separate effects on the  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 components of pSTM: (1) it disrupts the rehearsal component and (2) it interferes with the  
2 phonological input buffer (Gupta and MacWhinney, 1995). This could explain why the word  
3 length effect is even found to be inverted under articulatory suppression (Romani et al., 2005).  
4 Because of the interference of self-produced speech on the phonological input process,  
5 articulatory suppression promotes the activation of the lexico-semantic level that is not  
6 sensitive to length. At this level, longer words have an advantage since they offer more  
7 residual information from which reconstruction can be attempted (Hulme et al., 1997),  
8 explaining why an inversion of length effect could be observed.

9 Previous findings also reported that the length effect could survive under articulatory  
10 suppression when the memory task involves pseudowords and not words (Romani et al.,  
11 2005). We propose that this pseudoword length effect under articulatory suppression may  
12 result from the interference of the self-produced speech. This auditory signal impacts the  
13 process of phonological decoding and is likely to degrade the stored phonological input.  
14 Because of this phonological interference, some phonemes may be decoded misguidedly, and  
15 the more phonemes that compose the pseudowords, the more chance there is of making  
16 phonemic errors. Consequently, long words have a greater chance of giving rise to  
17 phonological errors and thus errors in memory tasks. This could explain why a pseudoword  
18 length effect could survive under articulatory suppression. FA's deficit allows for the testing  
19 of the impact of subvocal rehearsal disruption on length effect without the interference of self-  
20 produced speech. FA's data shows that when subvocal rehearsal is specifically disrupted the  
21 length effect disappears.

22 Before closing, we propose a speculative account of why the length effect should be related to  
23 the phonological output buffer rather than to the input buffer. According to Cowan (2001), the  
24 phonological input buffer stores a given number of units, called chunks, that can either be  
25 phonemes, syllables, words or groups of words (Cowan, 2001). The number of chunks that

1 can be memorized is limited to 3 or 5 (Chen and Cowan, 2009). In this framework, the only  
2 way to increase pSTM storage capacity is to extend the size of chunks by grouping syllables  
3 or words into larger chunks (Chen and Cowan, 2005). In our experiment, we presented the  
4 spoken stimuli as isolated words, each of them being uttered as a prosodic unit. We  
5 hypothesize that subvocal rehearsal enables participants to re-chunk the list of words by  
6 building larger multiword prosodic units, thus increasing the size of chunks. In essence, this is  
7 exactly the same as in speech production where the output buffer is devoted to stringing  
8 together phonemes to form a hierarchy of units, syllables, feet, words, phonological phrases  
9 (Levelt, 1992; Levelt et al., 1999; Jacquemot and Scott, 2006). Hypothetically, in a pSTM  
10 experiment, the same process would be involved for binding together syllables or words to  
11 form a new chunk, increasing memory capacity. But a chunk has a limited size (Cowan, 2010)  
12 and if the units are too large they cannot be combined into a chunk. According to this account,  
13 the shorter the words are, the more of them can be bound into a chunk, which explains why  
14 performance differs for sequences of short and long words (Glanzer and Razel, 1974). Thus  
15 the phonological output buffer may allow for increasing the length of the chunks and would  
16 be at least partly responsible for the length effect. This might explain why the phonological  
17 input buffer would be more sensitive to the number of chunks whereas the output buffer  
18 would be more sensitive to the size of chunks.

19 In conclusion, these data suggest that the phonological output buffer plays a role in pSTM and  
20 is at least partly responsible for the word length effect. This predicts that patients with a  
21 specific phonological output buffer deficit should present the same pattern as those suffering  
22 from a damage of the link between the input and output buffers, that is a normal phonological  
23 similarity effect but no length effect. Further studies comparing patients with phonological  
24 input buffer deficits to patients with phonological output deficits would provide interesting

data to disentangle the role of each buffer in the phonological similarity and phonological length effects and their relation with the number and the size of chunks.

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

**Table 1** :.Percent of correct responses for FA, FL and 5 matched controls (age range 51–56, years of education range 2-17).

	N of items	FA	FL	Controls, N=5 ( $\pm$ SD)
From perception to production: Repetition				
Word	64	87.5%	98.4%	99.4% $\pm$ .5
Pseudoword	32	43.7%	94%	98.7% $\pm$ .9
Speech perception : Minimal pair discrimination				
Words	60	96.7%	98.3%	98.5% $\pm$ 6.3
Pseudoword	60	95%	96.6%	94.5% $\pm$ 3.3
Speech production: Reading				
Word	64	91.7%		99.3% $\pm$ .7
Pseudoword	32	90.6%		97.5% $\pm$ 2.6
From production to perception: Rhyme judgement on written words				
Covert condition	40	82.5%	97.5%	96.5% $\pm$ 2.9
Overt condition	40	82.5%		



## Legends

### Figure 1

Functional model of phonological STM based on Jacquemot & Scott (2006). After the initial acoustic analysis, the phonological decoding is defined as the translation of acoustic information into discrete segmental categories that belong to the language, i.e. the phonological input and that can be stored in the phonological input buffer. The phonological encoding transforms the phonological output stored in the phonological output buffer into a motor programme for producing aloud the word. In this model, pSTM is composed of the two buffers dedicated to phonological processing in perception and production (phonological input and output buffers), and the mechanisms that convert phonological input information into output and vice versa (subvocal rehearsal).

The locus of FA's deficit is modelled on the conversion mechanism of phonological input into phonological output.

### Figure 2

Performance (mean and standard error) of FA, FL and control participants. NS for non significant, \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . A) Percent of correct responses in the repetition task. B) Estimated Span for dissimilar and similar items. C) Estimated span for monosyllabic and quadrisyllabic words. Because the task procedure was slightly different for testing the word length effect in FA and in FL, two groups of controls were tested according to each procedure.

## References

- 1  
2  
3 Bachoud-Lévi A-C, Cohen L, Dupoux E, and Mehler J. Where is the length effect? A cross-  
4  
5 linguistic study of speech production. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 39: 331-346,  
6  
7 1998.  
8  
9
- 10 Baddeley A. *Working memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.  
11
- 12  
13 Baddeley A. Working memory: Looking back and looking forward. *Nature Review*  
14  
15 *Neuroscience*, 4: 829-39, 2003.  
16  
17
- 18  
19 Baddeley A, Chincotta D, Stafford L, and Turk D. Is the word length effect in stm entirely  
20  
21 attributable to output delay? Evidence from serial recognition. *Quarterly Journal of*  
22  
23 *Experimental Psychology A*, 55: 353-69, 2002.  
24  
25
- 26  
27 Baddeley A and Hitch G. Working memory. In Bower G.A. (Ed.) *The psychology of learning*  
28  
29 *and motivation*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.  
30
- 31  
32 Baddeley A, Lewis V, and Vallar G. Exploring the articulatory loop. *Quarterly Journal of*  
33  
34 *Experimental Psychology A*, 36: 233-252, 1984.  
35  
36
- 37  
38 Brown GDA and Hulme C. Modeling item length effects in memory span: No rehearsal  
39  
40 needed? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 34: 594-621, 1995.  
41  
42
- 43  
44 Burani C, Vallar G, and Bottini G. Articulatory coding and phonological judgements on  
45  
46 written words and pictures: The role of the phonological output buffer. *The European*  
47  
48 *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 3: 379-398, 1991.  
49
- 50  
51 Campoy G and Baddeley A. Phonological and semantic strategies in immediate serial recall.  
52  
53 *Memory*, 16: 329-40, 2008.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Caplan D, Rochon E, and Waters GS. Articulatory and phonological determinants of word length effects in span tasks. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology A*, 45: 177-92, 1992.
- Caplan D and Waters GS. Articulatory length and phonological similarity in span tasks: A reply to baddeley and andrade. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology A*, 47: 1055-62, 1994.
- Caramazza A, Miceli G, and Villa G. The role of the (output) phonological buffer in reading, writing, and repetition. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 3: 37-76, 1986.
- Chen Z and Cowan N. Chunk limits and length limits in immediate recall: A reconciliation. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn*, 31: 1235-49, 2005.
- Chen Z and Cowan N. Core verbal working-memory capacity: The limit in words retained without covert articulation. *Q J Exp Psychol (Colchester)*, 62: 1420-9, 2009.
- Cowan N. The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24: 87-114; discussion 114-85, 2001.
- Cowan N. The magical mystery four: How is working memory capacity limited, and why? *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*, 19: 51-57, 2010.
- Cowan N, Baddeley AD, Elliott EM, and Norris J. List composition and the word length effect in immediate recall: A comparison of localist and globalist assumptions. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 10: 74-9, 2003.
- Crawford JR and Garthwaite PH. Testing for suspected impairments and dissociations in single-case studies in neuropsychology: Evaluation of alternatives using monte carlo simulations and revised tests for dissociations. *Neuropsychology*, 19: 318-31, 2005.

1 Crawford JR and Howell DC. Comparing an individual's test score against norms derived  
2 from small samples. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 12: 482-486, 1998.

3  
4  
5 Cubelli R and Nichelli P. Inner speech in anarthria: Neuropsychological evidence of  
6 differential effects of cerebral lesions on subvocal articulation. *J Clin Exp*  
7  
8  
9  
10 *Neuropsychol*, 14: 499-517, 1992.

11  
12  
13 Cubelli R, Nichelli P, and Pentore R. Anarthria impairs subvocal counting. *Percept Mot*  
14  
15 *Skills*, 77: 971-8, 1993.

16  
17  
18 Doshier BA and Ma JJ. Output loss or rehearsal loop? Output-time versus pronunciation-time  
19 limits in immediate recall for forgetting-matched materials. *Journal of Experimental*  
20  
21  
22  
23 *Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 24: 316-35, 1998.

24  
25  
26 Glanzer M and Razel M. The size of the unit un short-term storage. *Journal of Verbal*  
27  
28  
29 *Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13: 114-131, 1974.

30  
31 Gupta P and MacWhinney B. Is the articulatory loop articulatory or auditory? Re-examining  
32 the effects of concurrent articulation on immediate serial recall. *Journal of Memory and*  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 *Language*, 34: 63-88, 1995.

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 serial recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*,  
2 23: 1217-32, 1997.

3  
4  
5 Jacquemot C, Dupoux E, and Bachoud-Lévi AC. Breaking the mirror : Asymmetrical  
6  
7 disconnection between the phonological input and output codes. *Cognitive*  
8  
9  
10 *Neuropsychology*, 24: 3-22, 2007.

11  
12 Jacquemot C, Dupoux E, Decouche O, and Bachoud-Lévi AC. Misperception in sentences but  
13  
14 not in words: Speech perception and the phonological buffer. *Cognitive*  
15  
16  
17 *Neuropsychology*, 23: 949-971, 2006.

18  
19  
20 Jacquemot C and Scott SK. What is the relationship between phonological short-term  
21  
22 memory and speech processing ? *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 10: 480-486, 2006.

23  
24  
25 Laganaro M and Alario FX. On the locus of syllable frequency effect in speech production.  
26  
27  
28 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 55: 178-196, 2006. Levelt WJ. Accessing words in  
29  
30 speech production: Stages, processes and representations. *Cognition*, 42: 1-22, 1992.

31  
32  
33  
34 Levelt WJM, Roelofs APA, and Meyer AS. A theory of lexical access in speech production.  
35  
36  
37 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22: 1-37, 1999.

38  
39 Martin R, Lesch M, and Bartha M. Independence of input and output phonology in word  
40  
41 processing and short-term memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 41: 3-29, 1999.

42  
43  
44 Meyer AS, Roelofs A, and Levelt WJ. Word length effects in object naming: The role of a  
45  
46 response criterion *Journal of Memory and Language*, 48: 131-147, 2003.

47  
48  
49  
50 Monsell S. On the relation between lexical input and output pathways of speech. In Allport  
51  
52 A., Mackay D.G., Prinz W., and Scheerer E. (Eds.), *Language perception and*  
53  
54  
55 *production : Commun processes in listening, speaking, reading and writing*. London:  
56  
57 Academic Press, 1987, pp. 273-311.

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

Murphy K, Roodenrys S, and Fox A. Event-related potential correlates of the word length effect in working memory. *Brain Res*, 1112: 179-90, 2006.

Nairne JS. A feature model of immediate memory. *Memory and Cognition*, 18: 251-69, 1990.

Nairne JS, Neath I, and Serra M. Proactive interference plays a role in the word-length effect. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4: 541-545, 1997.

Neath I. Modeling the effects of irrelevant speech on memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 7: 403-23, 2000.

Neath I, Bireta TJ, and Surprenant AM. The time-based word length effect and stimulus set specificity. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 10: 430-4, 2003a.

Neath I, Farley LA, and Surprenant AM. Directly assessing the relationship between irrelevant speech and articulatory suppression. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 56A: 1269-1278, 2003b.

Neath I and Nairne JS. Word-length effects in immediate memory: Overwriting trace decay theory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2: 429-441, 1995.


Neath I, Surprenant AM, and LeCompte DC. Irrelevant speech eliminates the word length effect. *Memory and Cognition*, 26: 343-54, 1998.

Nickels L, Howard D, and Best W. Fractionating the articulatory loop: Dissociations and associations in phonological recoding in aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 56: 161-82, 1997.

Papagno C, Lucchelli F, and Vallar G. Phonological recoding, visual short-term store and the effect of unattended speech: Evidence from a case of slowly progressive anarthria. *Cortex*, 44: 312-24, 2008.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Roelofs A. Syllable structure effects turn out to be word length effects: Comment on santiago et al. (2000) *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 17: 1-13, 2002.
- Romani C, Galluzzi C, and Olson A. Phonological-lexical activation: A lexical component or an output buffer? Evidence from aphasic errors. *Cortex*, 2010.
- Romani C, McAlpine S, Olson A, Tsouknida E, and Martin R. Length, lexicality, and articulatory suppression in immediate recall: Evidence against the articulatory loop. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 52: 398-415, 2005.
- Service E. The effect of word length on immediate serial recall depends on phonological complexity, not articulatory duration. *Q J Exp Psychol A*, 51: 283-304, 1998.
- Sternberg S, Wright CE, Knoll RL, and Monsell S. Motot programs in rapid speech: Additinoal evidence. In Cole R.A. (Ed.) *Perception and production of fluent speech*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980, pp. 469-505.
- Vallar G and Baddeley A. Fractionation of working memory: Neuropsychological evidence for a phonological short-term store. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 23: 151-161, 1984a.
- Vallar G and Baddeley A. Phonological short-term store, phonological processing and sentence comprehension : A neuropsychological case study. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 1: 121-141, 1984b.
- Vallar G and Cappa S. Articulation and verbal short-term memory: Evidence from anarthria. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 4: 55-78, 1987.
- Wilson M and Emmorey K. A "Word length effect" For sign language: Further evidence for the role of language in structuring working memory. *Mem Cognit*, 26: 584-90, 1998.

Figure





Figure

