*To continue a discussion here that started in a separate channel: the questions about the Samuels paper posted above are (clarified based on previous feedback):*

1. *whether it finds a perceptual recalibration effect (PR) for the attended talker when the attended and unattended talker's speech overlap (SOA = 0)*
2. *whether it finds a perceptual recalibration effect (PR) for the unattended talker when the attended and unattended talker's speech overlap (SOA = 0)*
3. *whether it perhaps only addresses one of these questions, or even none of these questions. And if so, what is the closest thing it says about 1) and 2)?*

*"Attended talker" here means the one for which participants do the lexical decision task.*

*We are looking for a* ***one paragraph summary*** *that contains that information. This is not a trick question. Just a request to write up a succinct summary---in the terminology that we have established---of* ***what this paper has found that directly speaks to the predictions we should make for your proposed 0 SOA experiment (4)****. Ie. The exercise is to succinctly* ***relate that paper's most relevant findings to your experiment (5)****, and derive predictions from them.*

The paper does not collect any data on PR with a SOA of 0 between the two talkers. The closest SOA is 200ms.3 This paper found PR when the attended talker was the female talker (also the speaker with the critical words).1 They did not find PR when the attended talker was male (only produced filler words).2 As SOA was increased, more PR was found; various SOAs were only tested when the male voice was the attended talker. In my opinion, these results suggest that in our experiment we would see the participant adapting to the attended talker if our SOA < 400.4a However, because the experiments consistently presented the onset of the female voice (with critical words) before the male voice (only filler words), there could possibly be a temporal bias in terms of PR that would remain undetected in this experiment but could possibly cause unintended effects in our experiment where we examine PR to both talkers.4b Given that there is no presented data that suggests implementing an SOA of 0 would cause any issues (my understanding is all of the previous research cited used dual tasks that did not involve a second voice, and no SOA < 200 was examined here), it would be the best option to move forward with an SOA of 0, unless we had stronger reasons to believe the potential risks of an SOA of 0 (i.e., for it possibly being harder for participants to distinguish the two talkers) would truly be problematic.5

Length: 8 Sentences; 250 Words