Qwerty thoughts

They ran:

Right hand advantage predicting valence

* used items (which are repeated across three datasets as a repeated random factor)
* so dataset looked like this probably
  + CHEESE RHA ANEW VALENCE
  + CHEESE RHA DANEW VALENCE
  + CHEESE RHA SPANEW VALENCE
* So this makes sense to nest
* But we don’t have that type of data…
* b values hover around .04 - .05
* then controlled for letter frequency and word length

RHA predicting valence

* used subjects and items as repeated random factors
* we would need to reset our database to look like this
* SUB1 ITEMTYPE VALENCE OTHER STUFF

Reviewer stuff

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2. Is ANCOVA really the appropriate procedure?  Form a theoretical viewpoint, using typing speed as a covariate does not control for effects of expertise. Not speed of typing, but rather the style of typing (i.e. standard 10-finger system or hunt-and-peck-typing) are important for some of the effects observed in the literature. Typing speed coincides with typing style sometimes, but not always.  Further, as far as I know, if a covariate is measured only once, it does not adjust anything in a within-subject design as the covariate has the same value for all levels of all factors. | Switching to a mixed model analysis … regression may fix this issue |
| Please state your methods and your results in the abstract (i.e. mention that you used real and pseudowords and mention that effects were only found for real words) | Needs to be added in when we actually reanalyze |
| - p.3, line 37: “While other studies focused on errors…” I do not understand the logic of this sentence. | X |
| - p.3. line 44: Logan (2003) did not perform a kinematic analysis, investigating the movements during typing | Unless I’m mistaking the meaning of kinematic (they actually had people type when they analyzed it? Or maybe they mean that they didn’t look at specifically HOW people move their fingers?) they did look at how reaction times changed when they were actually pressing keys…. |
| - p3. line 56: In the study of Rieger (2004) using certain fingers to perform keypresses (rather than using the left or right hand, as the authors state) was of importance. The most important results for the author’s study probably was that letter-finger congruency still existed when participants responded with crossed hands, indicating effector-dependent representations | X |
| - p. 4, line 8: ‘imagery representations’: the authors should explain why they assume imagery representations. This is not immediately evident from the previously cited studies. Maybe the study by Beilock & Holt (2007), which is cited later in the text, would be helpful for this argument | I’m not sure if this is just a special phrase in the language world? I think it makes sense, what about you? |
| - p.4, line 56, “remembering the patterns presented”: In the Beilock & Holt study Participants actually executed the patterns. Importantly, preference judgments still showed the effects when the patterns did not involve the specific fingers used to type the presented dyads. | Not sure what to do with this one. We state that they “excecuted the patterns”  “participants also made preference selections while repeating a keypress combination. When expert motor planning was distracted by remembering the pattern presented, no preference for letter dyads was found, indicating that the simultaneous activation of the motor representation was necessary to influence their likability ratings.”  But why would we talk about it happening when the patterns did not involve the specific fingers used to type the presented dyads. Since that wouldn’t really help our argument? |
| - p.5, line 37: why does this NOT match? Is this a typo? | Because that idea holds that everyone thinks of positive as right and it’s not dependent upon handedness….  Check Davidson 1992 |
| - p.6, ‘the current study’: It might be good to also cite Beilock & Holt, 2007 for motivating the present study | X |
| Participants: the number of reported decimal places does not always conform to standard reporting style | Huh? Its 2 decimal points each time |
| - Participants: what typing styles do participants usually use? | X |
| - p.7, line 54: “Stimuli were examined across valence, arousal and dominance” – how was this pretest done? – Please describe. What participants took part? One could expect differences in valance given the results reported later? | uh…we looked at ANEW? I don’t know precisely what we “did” but anew looks into that, yeah? |
| - p.8, line 24: It is not clear to me how this controls for ‘word effects’ and what exactly the authors mean by ‘word effects’ | maybe if we put this phrase in the next sentence, cause word effects makes me think more of the order the words are presented in having some effect, as opposed to boredom/fatigue which goes along with how many they rated. |
| - Please specify factor names when describing the ANOVA/ANCOVA  - As mentioned above, ANCOVA does not seem the appropriate procedure. However, if there are any reasons to still perform an ANCOVA:  a) Were the statistical requirements for performing ANCOVA checked? For example, was there a linear relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable, homogeneity of regression?  b) Was there a significant effect of adjustment due to the covariate? Please report the statistics. | May not be useful since we are switching analyses |
| - p.9, line37: Are only real words included in the following analysis? | Uh….yeah…. |
| - At the beginning of the discussion, please give a short summary of the results | Can be dome after we re-run the results…. |
| - Also, the discussion would benefit from a short conclusion | Can be dome after we re-run the results…. |
| - In the main part of the discussion, please start with the more specific points first, and then become more broad (currently it is the other way round) | Can be dome after we re-run the results…. |
| J & C review |  |
| We have to take out the blog stuff completely probably. | Yup. |
|  |  |