Dramatically Larger Flanker Effects

Sarah Munro, Cecil Chau, Karine Gazarian,







& Adele Diamond

Presented at the Cognitive Neuroscience Society Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April 9, 2006.

Flanker Effect by Stimulus Type



The Flanker Effect has been replicated many times, but is quite sensitive to stimulus parameters.

For instance, here you can see that there is a Flanker Effect for both standard (Inside) Flanker and for reverse (Outside) Flanker, but the effect essentially disappears when the stimuli are large.



Regardless of stimulus size, or whether a trial has an Inside or Outside target, the Mixed block always shows a far greater Flanker Effect 6-10 times larger).



Also, when standard and reverse Flanker trials are intermixed, the Flanker Effect is no longer sensitive to stimulus parameters such as stimulus size.



This dramatic increase in Flanker Effect size is **NOT** due to practice effects. Note that the Flanker Effect in the Mixed Block is larger than both the blocks before it AND after it.

Flanker Effect by Block for Study 2 (small stimuli), <u>OUTSIDE</u> Non-Switching



Practice effects are not present for Outside trials either.









Design

- Two Single-Task blocks (70 trials each)
 - Half received the Classic Flanker Task (Inner Target) First
 - Half received the Reverse Flanker Task (Outer Target) First
 - (Each block preceded by a 10 trial practice block)
- Block of Mixed Flanker Task (180 trials)
 - Half Inside trials, Half Outside Trials
 - (Preceded by a 16 trial practice block)
- In the second study, an additional Classic and Reverse Flanker Task were included after the Mixed Block, in reverse order.

<u>Participants</u>

Study 1 - 96 adults

- Study 2 32 adults
- 1/2 of participants were female
- 1/2 of participants were between 17-21 years
- 1/2 of participants were between 22-40 years





Looking at the Classic Flanker Effect

Analyses were <u>first</u> done looking at just trials in which the INSIDE stimulus is the target.

- For the Mixed Block, we first look at only INSIDE trials for which the previous trial was also INSIDE – to avoid effects of switching from the outside rule to the inside rule.
- Similar analyses were then done to examine the Flanker Effect for OUTSIDE trials.

Flanker Effect: Study 1 vs. Study 2 for Blocks 1 and 3 **INSIDE** Non-Switching Trials 300₇ 250 NS 200 150 msec 100 **50** 0 Large Small Large Small Block 1 (Classic Flanker) Block 3 (Mixed)

Study 2 (with the smaller stimuli) shows a significantly stronger Flanker Effect in the Classic Flanker Task block (consistent with past studies



Flanker Effect in the Mixed block in Study 1 & Study 2 did not significantly differ. The Mixed Block's Flanker Effect is less sensitive to stimulus parameters.

Flanker Effect: Block 1 vs. Block 3 INSIDE Non-Switching for Studies 1 and 2 3001 250 200 14 x **6**x 150[.] msec 163 msec 108 msec 100 50 0 Block 3 (mixed) Block 1 Block 1 Block 3 (mixed) Small Large

Both studies show a *very* significant increase in the Flanker Effect between the Classic Flanker single-task block and the Mixed task block.

Flanker Effect: Study 1 vs. Study 2 for Blocks 1 and 3 OUTSIDE Non-Switching



There is no significant difference between the Flanker Effect for Outside Stimuli in Study 1 or 2 for either block.



However, Outside trials show the same dramatic increase in the Flanker Effect between the Classic Single-task block and the Mixed-task block.



Half received Arrows Condition (directional stimuli)

Half received Colored Squares Condition (symbolic stimuli)



















Flanker Effect: Squares vs. Arrows for Blocks 1 and 3 <u>INSIDE</u>, Non-Switching for Studies 1 and 2 Combined



Arrows are a more directional and more automatic cue – so flanking arrows are more likely to cause disruption.

In the Mixed Block, we see the opposite trend (though insignificantly)



Squares – Outside trials have a much larger Flanker Effect than Arrows in Block 3. This seems to be always true for the harder condition – here the Outside Rule and Squares are both more difficult.



Study 2 Inside trials also show a larger Flanker Effect for Arrows in the singletask blocks (both for block 1 and 5) and an insignificant difference for the mixed-block.



Again, a significantly larger Flanker Effect for Squares in the Mixed Block for Outside trials.



 Separated – An external cue indicates whether the target is Inside or Outside (Background Color)

 Integrated – The cue for whether the target is Inside or Outside is part of the stimulus itself (Stimulus Shape)

















OUTSIDE









OUTSIDE







INSIDE











OUTSIDE



Rule type has an insignificant effect on the Flanker Effect for either the singletask block or the mixed block.



The Mixed Block is significantly larger than the Single Task Block for both rule types.

Flanker Effect: Separated vs. Integrated Rules for Block 1 and 3 <u>OUTSIDE</u>, Non Switching for Study 1 (Large Stimuli)



Rule type has an insignificant effect on the Flanker Effect for either the singletask block or the mixed block for Outside trials as well.

Flanker Effect: Separated vs. Integrated Rule for Blocks 1 and 3 <u>OUTSIDE</u> Non-Switching in Study 1



The Mixed Block is significantly larger than the Single Task Block for both rule types. for Outside trials as well.



-Regardless of Stimuli Type/Rule Type combination, the Mixed Block for *any* conditions has a greater Flanker Effect than ALL Single-Task blocks. -Squares Separated – A combo of two conceptually more difficult rules

RT: Study 1, Non-Switching Trials



Single-Task Blocks in Study 1 are NOT significantly different from one another. The Mixed Block has a significantly longer RT than either Block 1 or 2.

RT: Study 2, Non-Switching



Similarly, in Study 2, the first set of single-task blocks are insignificantly different from one another and the second set of single-task blocks show no difference in RT. The mixed block has a significantly great RT than all the others



Blocks 4 and 5 display a practice effect on RT for the task. But remember, the Flanker Effect for the second two single blocks was *insignificantly different* from the first two.

RT: Inside vs. Outside Trials, Study 1



RT: Inside vs. Outside Trials, Study 2



Trial Types

- 43% Incongruent Trials
- 29% Congruent Trials
- 14% Neutral Trials
- 14% No-Distractor Trials
- Order of trial-types and Switching (of Responses, Inside/Outside, and between trial-types) were counterbalanced within blocks.







Study 1 INSIDE Non-Switch Block 3



Study 2 nonSwitch inside Block 3









