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INTRODUCTION

The congruency sequence effect (CSE) is the observation that the congruency effect is reduced following an incongruent trial (Gratton et al., 1992). Generally, the CSE is interpreted in terms of conflict adaptation, the idea that participants decrease attention to the distracter and/or increase attention to the target after experiencing conflict (e.g., Botvinick et al., 2001). An alternative learning and memory account proposes that the CSE is instead due to basic learning confounds (for a review, see Schmidt, 2013). For instance, systematic differences in the types of feature repetitions that are possible in each cell of the design might produce a CSE (Mayr et al., 2003; Hommel et al., 2004). Schmidt and De Houwer (2011) considered two additional learning and memory biases: sequential contingencies and congruency switch costs. However, Blais et al. (2014) presented data which they suggest argue against a role of these two biases. This article illustrates some issues with this work and suggests that contingency and congruency switch biases may play a role after all.

CONTINGENCY ANALYSIS UNDERPOWERED

Schmidt and De Houwer (2011) introduced the idea that sequential contingency biases might influence the CSE. Often, each distracter is presented more frequently in the congruent color than in each incongruent color. Unfortunately, this introduces a contingency, whereby words are predictive of the congruent response. Contingency biases are larger following an accurately predictive trial than following an incorrectly predictive trial (Schmidt et al., 2007). Thus, contingency biases can contribute to the CSE. Indeed, Mordkoff (2012) showed that, with feature repetitions removed, the CSE is present in a contingency-biased Simon task, but is not observed in a contingency-unbiased version of the same task.

Blais et al. (2014) report a reanalysis of verbal Stroop data in which each participant performed several blocks of trials with varying contingencies (as manipulated with proportions of congruent trials) from 5 to 95% in increments of 5% (though only 10 to 80% could be analyzed). Overall, CSEs were not reliable for most contingency levels. Critically, the CSE did not significantly increase as a function of contingency in response times. With these data, the authors argued that contingencies are unlikely to play a role in the CSE.

However, statistical power of the sample of 15 participants is a concern. Indeed, the slope was notably positive, but with considerable error, $B = 0.438 \pm 0.382$, $t_{(14)} = 1.15$, $p > 0.25$. The $B$ parameter is the amount of change in the CSE for a 1% contingency increment (i.e., 2.2 ms for each 5% increment, and 31 ms overall). Though not significant, this represents a medium effect size ($\beta = 0.315$). As Figure 1 illustrates, the study only had high (0.8) power to detect a large effect size ($\beta = 0.661$). As a further concern, contingencies were manipulated between blocks. Contingency biases are known to transfer across blocks (Schmidt et al., 2010), causing contamination. Thus, contingency biases were probably underestimated. Curiously, the slope for the errors was significant and in the predicted direction, $B = 0.038 \pm 0.017$, $t_{(14)} = 2.26$, $p = 0.040$. Though seemingly confirming a role of contingencies, the authors reasoned that this slope is difficult to interpret given that none of the CSE estimates for the various contingency levels were significant. This argument does not seem particularly convincing, only feeding concerns about statistical power.

CONGRUENCY SWITCH HYPOTHESIS, REVISED

Schmidt and De Houwer (2011) further considered the possibility that there might be encoding costs associated with “switching” from a congruent to an incongruent trial, or vice versa, relative to repeating the same type of trial. Thus, following an incongruent trial, incongruent trials will incur a benefit and congruent trials a loss. The reverse is true following a congruent
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

James R. Schmidt is a postdoctoral researcher of FWO – Vlaanderen (Research Foundation – Flanders).

REFERENCES

Allport, A., Styles, E. A., and Hsieh, S. (1994). “Shifting intentional set: exploring the dynamic control of tasks.” in Attention and Performance XV: Conscious and Non-conscious Information Processing, eds C. Umiltà and M. Moscovitch (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 421–452.

Blais, C., Stefanidis, A., and Brewer, G. (2014). The Gratton effect remains after controlling for contingencies and stimulus repetitions. Front. Psychol. 5:1207. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01207

Botvinick, M. M., Braver, T. S., Barch, D. M., Carter, C. S., and Cohen, J. D. (2001). Conflict monitoring and cognitive control. Psychol. Rev. 108, 624–652. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.108.3.624

Gratton, G., Coles, M. G. H., and Donchin, E. (1992). Optimizing the use of information: strategic control of activation of responses. J. Exp. Psychol. Gen. 121, 480–506. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.121.4.480

Hommel, B., Proctor, R. W., and Vu, K.-P. L. (2004). A feature-integration account of sequential effects in the Simon task. Psychol. Rev. 68, 1–17. doi: 10.1007/s00426-003-0132-y

Kim, S., and Cho, Y. S. (2014). Congruency sequence effect without feature integration and contingency learning. Acta Psychol. 149, 60–68. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2014.03.004

MacLeod, C. M. (1991). Half a century of research on the Stroop effect: an integrative review. Psychol. Bull. 109, 163–203. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.163

Mayr, U., Awh, E., and Laurey, P. (2003). Conflict adaptation effects in the absence of executive control. Nat. Neurosci. 6, 450–452. doi: 10.1038/nn1051

Mordkoff, J. T. (2012). Observation: three reasons to avoid having half of the trials be congruent in a four-alternative forced-choice experiment on sequential modulation. Psychon. Bull. Rev. 19, 750–757. doi: 10.3758/s13423-012-0257-3

Schmidt, J. R. (2013). Questioning conflict adaptation: proportion congruent and Gratton effects reconsidered. Psychon. Bull. Rev. 20, 615–630. doi: 10.3758/s13423-012-0373-0

Schmidt, J. R., Crump, M. J. C., Cheesman, J., and Besner, D. (2007). Contingency learning without awareness: evidence for implicit control. Conscious. Cogn. 16, 421–435. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2006.06.010
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