

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD267662
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; JUL 1961. Other requests shall be referred to Office of Naval Reserach, Arlington, VA 22203.
AUTHORITY
9 Nov 1977, ST-A per ONR ltr

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 267 662

*Reproduced
by the*

**ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA**



UNCLASSIFIED

**Best
Available
Copy**

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

FOR REFERENCE ONLY AT EACH OF THE
ASTIA OFFICES. THIS REPORT CANNOT
BE SATISFACTORILY REPRODUCED; ASTIA
DOES NOT FURNISH COPIES.

Department of Psychology

New York University

New York, N. Y.

Further Experiments on Immediate Recall of Word Lists with
the Requirement to Match List Length in Recall

by

Charles N. Cofer*

Technical Report No. 7 for Contract NONR 285(47)
(Learning, Retention, and Recovery of Meaningful Material)


between

New York University and the Office of Naval Research

July, 1961

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for the purposes of the United States
Government.

*Acknowledgment is made of the assistance of Miss Rona Copen, who tabulated
most of the data obtained in these experiments.



CATALOGED BY ASTIA
AS AD NO. 267662

Introduction

A prior report (Cofer, 1961) presented a replication of a part of an experiment by Deese (1959) on immediate free recall of lists of words which were composed either of high-frequency, low-frequency, or zero-frequency associates of the list name. Deese's finding that aspects of immediate free recall of such lists are closely related to the list's inter-item associative strength was confirmed. In addition to the replication of Deese's experiment, an extension of his experiment was run in which, after they had completed their free recalls, the subjects were asked to go on writing words until their total was equal to list length. This extension of the recall period was called "forced recall". During the forced recall period the subjects added, on the average, less than one correct item to those they had already recalled, but the correlation over the 13 lists between the number of correct items added during forced recall and inter-item associative strength was 0.73. The data of chief interest in the prior study, however, were the responses added during forced recall which were not correct. Deese's interpretation of his original findings was that subjects in "recalling" wrote down their associations to the few words they actually remembered. It would seem, on this hypothesis, that, asked to match list length during forced recall, the subjects would add responses by associating to the list name and to the list members they had already written. This expectation, however, was not realized, as the responses produced in free recall often did not include high-frequency associates either of the list name or of list members, although some of the responses produced were such associates and occurred in forced recall at frequencies the same as or even greater than their frequencies as free associates to the same words. It was suggested that a contextual factor might

have operated to make more or less available the associative responses in the recall situation.

In the present report, four additional experiments are described in which the purposes were to study factors in the instructions and other aspects of the method which might have influenced the results already described. In one, no separation was made between free and forced recall, but the instructions were to match list length. This variation was run to determine if the separation of the recall into two parts had a bearing on the results obtained. In another variation, there was no separation of free and forced recall but again the instructions were to match list length. In order to try to reduce the subject's possible set toward accuracy, however, he was assured that any words he thought of would do and he was asked to code the words he thought of as to his certainty or uncertainty of their list membership. In the other two experiments, free and forced recall periods were separated. In one, the subject was explicitly told that he could associate to the list name and in the other to the list members in his process of matching list length during forced recall.

In general, these variations on the original experiment did not seem to have any marked effects upon the kinds of responses the subjects produced in their efforts to match list length.

Method

Four small classes of psychology students were used, one for each experiment. Only six of the original lists constructed by Deese¹¹ were employed in these experiments, and the same six lists were used for each group. The lists were numbers 1, 4, 14, 17, 9, and 12 (Deese, 1959, Table 1, p.307), presented in that order. Lists 1 and 4 are composed of the high-frequency associates of Butterfly and of Slow,

Quali, respectively, and a list of 15 words, 10 associates of
Music and 5 of Music, respectively.

I gave the general instructions and presented each list and its
name as he had done in the pilot experiment (Slovic, 1961, pp. 2-3). I
wrote down the list, name, list to the list presentation, and then
wrote his recall. Where the recall was good, it was carried out as
described in the previous report, the variations introduced were
as follows:

Group IC: As before, instructions were given (Deese, 1959, pp. 306-307)
but both before and after. They were repeated and before and after
each list was read. I said that there would be 15 items on the list and
that I was to produce 15 and, whether or not he was sure that the
words he put down were on the list, he was told that he could use any
ones at all in help or to fill out the list to a total of 15. No
separation of the two kinds of recall was introduced here.

In Group IIC, I gave the revised recall which was used at the
beginning of Deese's recall task for the same reason as his total was
and to use the list as a stimulus for recall. I said to him, so he
was told the original list and a number of words to use for recall.

In Group III, the instructions were as in IIC, except that
I was told to use the original list and a number of words to use for
recall as stimulus for recall (as in IIC, but not as in IIC).

Group IV was the same as Group IIC, but with the addition of the
recall of the list, the original list was used as a stimulus for
further recall. I said to him, I was told to use the original list
as a stimulus for recall. I said to him, I was told to use the original
list as a stimulus for recall. I said to him, I was told to use the
original list as a stimulus for recall. I said to him, I was told to
use the original list as a stimulus for recall. I said to him, I was
told to use the original list as a stimulus for recall. I said to him,
I was told to use the original list as a stimulus for recall. I said
to him, I was told to use the original list as a stimulus for recall.

Table 1

Correct Responses and Intrusions during Free Recall
and Correct Responses during Forced Recall

Group	List	Free Recall		Forced Recall Correct
		Correct	Intrusions	
IC	RF(1)	12.00	2.50	--
IIC	RF(1)	10.25	0.5	0.850
IIIC	RF(1)	9.33	0.22	1.110
IVC	RF(1)	12.00	3.00	--
IC	RF(4)	10.09	4.90	--
IIC	RF(4)	9.85	0.50	1.125
IIIC	RF(4)	8.11	0.67	0.570
IVC	RF(4)	10.41	4.66	--
IC	LF(14)	8.00	5.90	--
IIC	LF(14)	8.75	1.25	0.625
IIIC	LF(14)	6.83	0.43	0.330
IVC	LF(14)	8.25	7.00	--
IC	LF(17)	9.36	5.63	--
IIC	LF(17)	10.25	1.00	0.375
IIIC	LF(17)	9.33	1.00	0.330
IVC	LF(17)	11.41	3.75	--
IC	ZF(9)	9.00	5.90	--
IIC	ZF(9)	9.65	0.375	0.250
IIIC	ZF(9)	7.33	0.56	0.110
IVC	ZF(9)	8.75	5.25	--
IC	ZF(12)	8.36	6.63	--
IIC	ZF(12)	8.75	0.50	0.000
IIIC	ZF(12)	7.00	0.56	0.110
IVC	ZF(12)	8.58	6.66	--

A total of 40 subjects were run, 11 in IC, 8 in IIC, 9 in IIIC, and 12 in IVC. The lists used for these 4 groups were the same as those used for Group I (N of 17) in the first experiment (Cofer, 1961).

Results

Table 1 shows mean results for each group and each list for number of correct responses in free and forced recall and intrusions during free recall. (The higher means for free recall for correct responses and intrusions in groups IC and IVC than for IIC and IIIC are due to the facts that the correct responses during forced recall are indicated separately for the latter two groups and that their intrusions in forced recall are not shown in Table 1.) These data resemble those reported by Deese (1959) and Cofer (1961) for comparable measures.

The free associative response distributions to the list members (Deese, personal communication) were examined in order to discover which responses appeared in forced recall and at what frequencies; similarly the associative responses to the list names were examined. There were no evident differences in the responses of the 4 groups in this experiment - the experimental manipulations were not effective in altering the pattern of results either among these groups or in comparison with the results reported earlier. Accordingly, the data for all four groups have been combined, and tabulations for one list at each level of association are shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Table 5 shows corresponding data for 57 subjects for the high frequency Butterfly list; this includes the 40 cases of the present experiments and the 17 cases of the relevant group from the earlier experiment.

Table 3 shows the list members for the low-frequency Chair list, their associates which occur with a frequency of 10% or greater in Deese's norms (or the Kent-Rosanoff norms), the frequencies of the occurrence of the associates in recall (free for groups IC and IVC and forced for groups IIC and IIIC), and the frequency with which the list

Table 7

Free Association Responses with Frequency of 10% or Greater to List Members of the High-Frequency Slow List and their Frequency in Free or Forced Recall for all Groups Combined. List Members presented in Alphabetical Order in Table*

List Member	Associative Frequency (N=50)	Forced Recall or Intrusion Frequency (N=40)	Frequency of Accurate Recall of List Member (N=40)
Down	up(37)	5	17
Drive	car(19), go(5)	6, 4	19
Fast	slow(34)	-	28
Lary	tired(11), sleep(y)(6)	3, 2	23
Poke	stick(9), hit(5)	0, 0	35
Quick	fast(24), slow(12)	-, -	26
Run	fast(15), walk(12)	-, -	30
Sign	post(6), road(5), stop(5)	0, 2, -	21
Skid	slide(11), car(10), row(6)	4, 6, 0	29
Snail	slow(27), crawl(5)	-, 2	29
Speed	fast(21), car(s)(11)	-, 6	27
Stop	go(28)	4	16
Traffic	light(10), car(s)(3), jam(6), cop(5)	3, 6, 1, 0	36
Walk	run(25)	-	34
Work	hard(20), play(12)	1, 1	17

*The number replaced by a dash indicates that the associate to a list member is also a list member.

Table 1

Free Association Responses with Frequency of .01 or Greater to List Members of the Low-Frequency (half) List and their Frequency in Free or Forced Recall for all Groups Combined. List Members presented in Alphabetical Order in Table^a

List Member	Associative Frequency (N=50)	Forced Recall or Intrusion Frequency (N=40)	Frequency of Accurate Recall of List Member (N=40)
Birth	dream(3), sleep(1)	0, 0	24
Branch	bed(10), safe(5), soft(15), steep(5)	0, 5, 13, 0	24
Cozy	warm(17)	0	22
Close	stick(7), soft(19)	2	21
Hard	soft(34)	13	23
High ^{ab}	low(19)	5	24
Lazy	tired(22), sleepy(6)	1, 3	20
Modern	old(17), new(17), old(15)	0, 0, 1	16
Point	red(1), black(1), brown(5), rose(5)	3, 0, 0, 0	13
Relax	easy(22), hard(1), tired(1)	4, 1	8
Rocky	smooth(1)		4
Small	large(1)	4, 0	24
Soft	hard(1), soft(39)	0, 0	25
Stony	hard(1), soft(19), smooth(1), warm(1), steep(1)	2, 14, 0, 0	11
Unstable	soft(13), hard(1), smooth(1), steep(1)	1, 0, 1	13
Warm ^{ab}	cold(1), hot(1), warm(3)	0, 1	

^a Words presented in bold type are those which were included in the list of words presented to the subjects.

^{ab} Words in this column are those which were included in the list of words presented to the subjects.

and dress 12.5% of the times in Dress's norms, but neither occurs in recall despite the fact that cloth is recalled by 24 of the 40 subjects. Warm, a frequent associate (3.5) of cozy, does not occur in recall, although 22 Ss recall cozy. A number of other similar cases occur, along with cases in which the associate, while occurring, does so at a low frequency as compared with the norm frequency (e.g., book to study, 16% in the norms, in recall only 5% of the times that study is recalled; large to small, 8% in the norms, in recall only 13% of the times that small is recalled). High frequency items to the list name (chair) in the norms are table (45%) and sit (20%); these occur, respectively, 12.5% and 7% of the times in recall. On the other hand, certain associates appear at even a higher frequency in the recalls than they do in the norms. Examples are sofa and soft, responses to couch and soft (also a response to hard).

An even more definite failure of the associates to list members to appear in recall is seen in Table 4, in the case of the zero-frequency list, music. No list-member associate occurs in recall at anything like its frequency of occurrence in free association. List name associates do occur, their frequencies in the norms are at 16% for song, 17% for notes, 12% for sound, and 5% for piano. Corresponding percentages of occurrence in recall are 9%, 17.5%, 7%, and 10%.

In Table 2 and Table 5 similar findings occur, although the data are limited because so many of the list-member associates are also list members. Striking examples of reduced frequency are, in Table 2, stick and hit (associated to poke), hard and play (associated to work). Increased frequencies also occur, as represented by car (associate to drive, skid, speed, and traffic).

The conclusions just made parallel those made in the earlier report (Singer, 1941, pp. 5-7) for data from different subjects, different lists,

The following are the names of the persons who have been
 identified as having been in contact with the subject
 during the period of the investigation. The names are listed
 in alphabetical order.

List Name	Address	City	State
Abstract	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
body	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
check	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
desert	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
depth	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
determine	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
face	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
face	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
tunnel	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY
road	12345678901234567890	New York	NY

The following are the names of the persons who have been identified as having been in contact with the subject during the period of the investigation. The names are listed in alphabetical order.

The following are the names of the persons who have been identified as having been in contact with the subject during the period of the investigation. The names are listed in alphabetical order.

Table 5

Free Association Responses with Frequency of 10% or Greater to List Members of the Interference Butterfly List and their Frequency in Free or Forced Recall for all Groups Combined. List Members are listed in Alphabetical Order in Table*

List Member	Associative Responses (N=57)	Number of Intra-List Frequency (N=57)	Frequency of Accurate Recall of List Member (N=57)
Bees	sting, honey(10), birds(9), buzz(4)	3, 4, 1, 0	32
Bird	fly(15), song(5)	1, 0	23
Blue	real(13), sky, color(4)	4, 3, 1, 1	34
Bug	insect(13), ant(4)	1, 1	25
Carroll	act(1), flying(1), bug(1)	1, 1, 1	39
Color	red(1), blue(1), black(1), white(1), blue(1)	4, 1, 1, 1, 1	20
Flower	insect, small(6)	1, 1	20
Fly	insect(1), insect(1)	1, 1	31
Insect	bug(1), fly(1)	1, 1	36
Moth	fly(10), caterpillar(6), clover(4), song(4)	1, 0, 1, 1, 1	40
Nut	insect(17)	0	17
Pretty	insect(1), song(15), insect(6)	0, 0, 1	27
Stomach	insect(1), insect(1)	0, 1	30
Wing	fly(15), fly(1)	1, 1	34
Yellow	red(1), color, green(1)	4, 1, 1	36

*The number replaced by a dash indicates that the associate to a list member is also a list member.

And did some associative connection in the list itself, then, to assist in a single associative connection of the recall as is inadequate as a conception for recall under the conditions of these experiments, some sort of selective process, perhaps inentifiable with the contextual character of the list, seems to be at work. The data for the zero-frequency list, in which the contextual factor (aside from the list name) is probably least pronounced, show a surprising lack of use of associates of list members in recall, however. It is possible, though, that the list name may be the contextual factor here.

Data were obtained in Group IVC on the accuracy with which subjects knew the list membership of the words they wrote down. Table 6 summarizes these data.

Table 6
Accuracy of Identification of Words as List Members
(Group IVC)

List	% Correct Identification when Word was Right	% Correct Identification when Word was Wrong
HF(1)	91	77
HF(4)	90	64
HF(14)	90	70
LF(17)	92	60
ZF(9)	90	76
ZF(12)	90	65
Mean	93.33	68.67

These data show that subjects are highly accurate in judging which of their recalled words were in fact on the list. Less accurate, but still high, is their judgment that a word "recalled" was not on the list. Both errors and uncertain judgments were much higher in the latter case than in the judgments about correct words.

Findings such as this suggest that subjects are at least sufficiently aware of list words they think of were on the list or not that an editing process could be invoked to account for their general failure

to associate freely to the list name or the list members as they "recall". An occasional subject was found who did state that he thought of an associate of a list member but did not record it because he knew it had not been on the list. On the other hand, since reports of this kind were infrequent it is uncertain that a generalization to this effect is appropriate.

The behavior of the subjects, typically, can be described as that of quickly writing down a number of words and then stopping. It is as if the memory bank were empty at the point of stopping, as if there is no more to be remembered no matter how much effort is given to the task. If additional words do arise at this point, they are probably edited as to probable list membership. Associative interrelations can apparently increase the number of words that will be produced, but it does not seem accurate to say that subjects go on associating unselectively until they have written enough words to satisfy themselves that they have complied with the experimenter's task.

Summary

A number of different experimental arrangements were introduced in order to study editing and associative processes in the immediate free-recall of list-item lists of words. None of these arrangements produced data differing substantially from those reported earlier (Cofor, 1951) and the conclusions of the earlier report seem to be warranted.

References

- Cofor, C. N. 1951. Inter-item associative strength and immediate free and forced recall. Tech. Rep. No. 1, Contract NONR285(17) between the Office of Naval Research and New York University.
- Deese, J. 1959. Influence of inter-item associative strength upon immediate free recall. Psychol. Monographs, 5, 305-312.
- Russell, W. A. and Jenkins, J. J. 1954. The complete Minnesota words for responses to list words from the Bent-Losanofig Word Association Test. Tech. Rep. No. 1, Contract N8012-6-216, between the Office of Naval Research and the University of Minnesota.