**Episodic vs semantic memory:** RA vs Tulving!

**Tulving: this is not episodic memory**!

-Memory lacks **contents of where, when** and the experiential flavour (**autonoetic**). Memory for this is noetic

-**Friederici & Fiebach**: Left basal temporal areas involved in **mental imagery** were more strongly activated during processing of **concrete words**, whereas a left inferior frontal region showed greater activity during abstract words

**Perspective**

-Dual-coding: concrete encoded twice: **verbal and imaginal**

-Context availability: concrete words **more associations**

-Levels of processing: deeper (**semantic) = better** memory

-Hippocampus + dlPFC

-Cowan, Baddeley, Atkinson-Shiffrin

-**Brown-Peterson task:** Trigram -> interference task -> recall

--**Proactive interference**: task change returns performance

**Conclusion:** Provides evidence for:

-Concreteness effect

-Primacy and recency effects for abstract and concrete lists

-Primacy effect for interference list.

**Individual data (Fig. 2)**

-Figure 2: FP19225 recalled 5 words from the **interference** list, but **3 were in the latter half**.

-Last 2 words (used in t-test to confirm function of interference) were not recalled but other “late words” were, **challenging the function of the interference** list if this is also true for other Ps

**Table 1:** Significant differences in recall probability between:

Primacy effect:

-Concrete list: First 2 > middle 4

-Abstract list: First 2 > middle 4

-Interference list: First 2 > middle 4

Recency effect:

-Concrete list: middle 4 < last 2

-Abstract list: middle 4 < last 2

-Interference list: middle 4 = last 2 (non-significant difference -> interference task works)

**Fig. 1: probability of recall**

-**Inverse bell:** primacy and recency

-Concrete lists higher: concreteness effect

**Repeated measures ANOVA:**

-No recency effect for interference list

-Main effect of list type and word position -> **primacy + recency effects, concreteness effect** might be present -> must **control for interference** list

-Interaction between list type and word position -> i**nterference list works**

-**Repeated measures ANOVA w/o interference list**: main effect of list type

-Confirms concreteness effect

-Testing for **concreteness effect w/o word position**: repeated measures **ANOVA** of list type effect using **only first 2 words**

-Main effect of list type -> concreteness effect is independent of word position -> may also be **relevant for LTM**

**Method:** 4 concrete + 4 abstract word lists (alternates)

-Read at 1 word per 2 seconds

-P recalls words

-Interference task on randomly assigned list

-Wait 1 minute -> minimize proactive interference

**Hypothesis**: Primacy, recency and concreteness effects

-Nullify recency through interference

**Free recall**: Ebbinghaus: nonsense words, primacy + recency

-Real words to investigate concreteness effect

-Rehearsal: Atkinson-Shiffrin multi-store + Baddeley WM