

When recognition is dominated by regularity: Perceptual and lexical decisions under semantic impairment Timothy T. Rogers, Matthew A. Lambon Ralph^{*}, John R. Hodges, Karalyn Patterson

INTRODUCTION



Models of written-word Similarly, many models of visual the dual-route cascaded model posits an orthographic lexicon, which provides input semantics from orthography, but which allows written-word recognition independent of



recognition often invoke pre- object recognition posit that visual semantic lexical representations stimuli first activate stored prethat are capable of mediating semantic structural descriptions word-recognition without support that mediate recognition, which from semantics. For example, feed forward to activate semantic representations. Visual recognition can be spared under semantic impairment because semantic processing does not influence the activation of visual structural descriptions.

Alternatively.



Alternatively. connectionist models written-word and visual-semantic suggest processing distributed representations multiple levels interact mutually support one another \ semantics. Disruptions anywhere in the system can affect processing, but the particular effects observed depend upon representations at each Irregular items, such as words with unusual orthographies objects with atypical recognition for irregular items as appearances, rely to a greater semantic knowledge degrades, extent on the engagement of with relative sparing of semantic representations for recognition for regular items. successful recognition.



In the current work we tested of semantic mpairment on visual object and written-word recognition, in tasks that varied the regularity of the target and distractor items. Models that invoke pre-semantic representations to support recognition predict either spared impaired recognition for both regular and Distributed connectionist accounts predict increasingly impaired





Patient means by stimulus type and word frequency

Repeated-measures GLM: Accuracy = WordFrq + StimType + (WF * ST)

Semantic dementia WordFrq: F(1,12) = 25, p < 0.001 WordFrq: F(1,4) = 15, p < 0.02 StimType: F(1,12) = 21, p < 0.001 StimType: F(1,4) = 0.3, p = n.s. WF * ST: F(1,12) = 9, p < 0.01 WF * ST: F(1,4) = 0.03, p = n.s.

Broca's aphasia

Implications for theories of object- and word- recognition

1. Patients with semantic dementia increasingly tend to accept "regular" stimuli and reject "irregular" stimuli in both object-decision and lexical-decision tasks, regardless of whether the "regular" item is a real object or a real word.

2. Severely impaired patients can perform well on either task when targets respect the regularities of the domain, and distractors do not. The apparent sparing of word or object recognition under semantic impairment may result from the structure of the testing materials used in the task, and not from the selective preservation of pre-semantic "structural descriptions" or lexical representations. 3. Targets and distractors in the standard object-decision task (the BORB) are not matched for typicality. Performance on this task falls between performance in the two conditions of the OAT. 4. Comparison of lexical decision in semantic dementia and Broca's aphasia suggests that the poor performance of SD patients in the NW>W condition was not simply due to this condition being harder. 5. The results are consistent with the predictions of distributed and recurrent theories of written-word and visual-semantic processing.

References

Humphreys, G. W., Riddoch, M. J. and Quinlan, P. T. (1988). Cascade processes in picture identification.

R., Ziegler, J. (2001). DRC: A dual-route cascaded model for visual word recognition and reading aloud. Psychological Review, 108 (1), 204-256.

1996). Understanding normal and impaired word reading: Computational principles in guasi-regular domains. Psychological Review, 103 (1), 56-115. Rogers T.T. Lambon Ralph, M.A., Patterson, K. McClelland, J. L., and Hodges, J. R. (1999), A recurrent connectionist model of semantic dementia. Poster presented at the 1999 meeting of the Cognitive Neuroscience Society.

* NOTE: M. A. Lambon Ralph contributed to this work while at the University of Bristol, and is now at the University of Manchester, Manchester UK.