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Abstract

Typing is a ubiquitous daily action for many individuals; yet, research on how these actions have changed our perception of language is minimal. The QWERTY effect is the supposed increase in pleasantness ratings for words typed more with the right hand on a traditional keyboard (Jasmin & Casasanto, 2012). Although this finding is intuitively appealing given both right handed dominance and the smaller number of letters typed with the right hand, the current interpretation does not appear to take account for the embodied nature of our procedural actions (Barsalou, 1999). The present paper reexamines the QWERTY effect within the embodied cognition framework and shows that participants rate words that are easier to type (i.e. alternating hand keypresses) as more pleasant than other typing combinations. This finding indicates that typing has influenced our perception of language due to action oriented, not spatially oriented, feedback.

QWERTY: We Like Easy Words to Type

From its creation in 1868, to its appearance in our homes today, the QWERTY keyboard has held the interest of psychologists. The process of typing on a keyboard requires many procedures to function in tandem, which creates a wealth of actions to research (Inhoff & Gordon, 1997). Rumelhart and Norman’s (1982) computer model of skilled typing is still highly influential. They hypothesize that typing results from the activation of three levels of cognition: the word level, the keypress level, and the response level. They believe that after word perception, the word level is activated, causing the keypress level to initiate a schema of the letters involved in typing the word. This schema includes the optimal position on the keyboard for that specific hand-finger combination to move to at the appropriate time for individual keystrokes. Concurrently, the response system sends feedback information to initiate a keypress motion when the finger is in the appropriate space. Their theory proposes that schemata and motion activations occur simultaneously, constantly pulling or pushing the hands and fingers in the right direction.

While other studies have focused on errors in typing to investigate response system feedback (F. A. Logan, 1999), Logan (2003) argued for parallel activation of keypresses. He examined the Simon effect to show more than one letter is activated at the same time, and consequently, the second keypress motion is begun before the first keypress is done. The Simon effect occurs when congruent stimuli create faster responses than incongruent stimuli, much like the Stroop task (Simon & Small, 1969; Simon, 1990). For example, if we are asked to type the letter *f* (a left handed letter), we type it faster if the *f* is presented on the left side of the screen. Similarly, Rieger (2004) reported a congruency effect when studying an altered Stroop task. The task consisted of centrally presented colored letters, in which participants were required to respond with left or right handed keys based on color. When the letter and color were congruent, the skilled typists’ responses were faster than when the letter and color were incongruent. These results suggest that automatic actions stimulate motor and imagery representations concurrently and may be linked together in the brain (Rieger, 2004; Logan & Zbrodoff, 1998; Hommel, Muesseler, Aschersleben, & Prinz, 2001). These results were also seen even when participants were told to respond with their hands crossed on the responding device. The dual activation of motor and imagined items is the basis for embodied cognition, a rapidly expanding field in psychology (Barsalou, 1999; Salthouse, 1986).

**Embodied Cognition**

While the mind was traditionally considered an abstract symbol processor (Newell & Simon, 1976), newer cognitive psychology theories focus on the interaction between the brain’s sensorimotor systems and mental representations of events and objects (Barsalou, 1999; Zwaan, 1999). The interplay between these systems has been found in both neurological (Hauk, Johnsrude, & Pulvermuller, 2004; Tettamanti et al., 2005; Lyons et al., 2010) and behavioral research (Zwaan & Taylor, 2006; Holt & Beilock, 2006; Cartmill, Goldin-Meadow, & Beilock, 2012). Even when not specifically asked to perform a task, the motor representation of that task is activated, and if the action is well-learned, the task is perceived as pleasant (Beilock & Holt, 2007; Ping, Dhillon, & Beilock 2009; Yang, Gallo, & Beilock, 2009). For example, Beilock and Holt (2007) asked novice and expert typists to pick which one of two letter dyads they preferred, which were either different hand combinations (*CJ*) or same finger combinations (*FV*). They found that novices have no preference in selection, while expert typists more reliably picked the combinations that were easier to type. To show that this effect was due to covert motor representation activation, and thus, expanding on findings from Van der Bergh, Vrana, and Eelen (1990), 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. Similar embodied findings have also been portrayed with emotionally charged sentences and facial movements (Havas, Glenberg, & Rinck, 2007), positive-negative actions, such as head nodding or arm movements (Glenberg, Webster, Mouilso, Havas, & Lindeman, 2009; Ping, Dhillon, & Beilock, 2009)*,* and perceptuomotor fluency (Yang, Gallo, & Beilock, 2009; Oppenheimer, 2008).

**Body Specificity Hypothesis**

Using an embodied framework, Casasanto (2009) has proposed that handedness dictates preference because our representations of actions are grounded in our physical interactions with the environment. In several studies, he portrayed that handedness influenced preference for spatial presentation (i.e. left handed individuals associate “good” with left, while right handed individuals associate “good” with right), which in turn influenced judgments of happiness and intelligence and our decision making in hiring job candidates and shopping. In all these studies, participants reliably selected the hand-dominant side more often, which does not match cultural or neurolinguistic representations of positive-is-right and negative-is-left (Davidson, 1992). These findings imply that our handedness is a motor expertise that causes ease of action on the dominant side to positively influence our perceptions of items presented on that side. Further, Casasanto (2011) compiled a review of body specific actions and their representation in the brain using fMRIs. Handedness interacted with imagining actions, reading action, and perceiving the meanings of action verbs, such that fMRI patterns were mirrored for left and right handed participants matching their dominant side.

**The QWERTY Effect**

These effects inspired Jasmin and Casasanto (2012) to propose the idea that typing, an action that often replaces speaking, has the ability to create semantic changes in how we perceive words. The asymmetrical arrangement of letters on the QWERTY keyboard increases fluency of typing letters on the right side because there are fewer keys, and thus, less competition for fingers. That arrangement should then cause us to perceive the letters on the right side as more positive and letters on the left side as more negative. Consequently, words that are composed of more letters from the right side (the right hand advantage) should be rated as more positive than those with more letters on the left. They found this preference for the right hand advantage over three languages (English, Spanish, and Dutch), and the effect was even stronger on words created after the invention of the QWERTY keyboard (i.e. *lol*), as well as evident in pseudowords such as *plook*. However, in contrast to the body specificity hypothesis, left and right handed participants showed the same trend in effects for positive-is-right words.

**The Current Study**

**Method**

**Participants.**

Participants (*N* = 157) were recruited from the university undergraduate human subject’s pool and received course credit for their time. Data were screened for multivariate outliers, and two participants were removed for having extreme Mahalanobis distance scores (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). Further, nine participants were eliminated for low typing accuracy (< 80%), which left *N* = 146 in the study. Approximately 10 percent (*N* = 14) of the sample was left handed. The average typing speed was *M* = 48.55 (*SD* = 13.86; range = 22 – 98 wpm), and the average percent accuracy rate for the typing test was *M* = 93.13 (*SD* = 5.55). Data was not collected on the tying styles of the participants as typing speed was thought to parse out any differences due to hunt-and-peck style typists as opposed to home-row typists.

**Materials.**

The English ANEW (Bradley & Lang, 1999) norms were used to create stimuli for this study, in an effort to replicate Jasmin and Casasanto’s (2012) experiments. Typing manuals were consulted, and letters were coded as left (q, w, e, r, t, a, s, d, f, g, z, x, c, v, b) or right handed letters (y, u, i, o, p, h, j, k, l, n, m). The three and four letter words were selected from this database and were coded as follows. First, concepts selected were either real or pseudowords. Second, words were classified by their typability into six categories: 1. All left handed, 2. All right handed, 3. More left handed, 4. More right handed, 5. Equal left-right handed, 6. Perfect alternation between left and right handed letters. Table 1 shows examples of stimuli for each word coding. Lastly, words were coded if they repeated keypresses on the same finger (across the whole word, *kin* would repeat, but *mop* would not) as a control variable. This coding scheme created 24 possible word conditions (2-real/pseudowords X 6-typability X 2-repetition), and ten words of each type were selected (240 words total). Since the ANEW database did not have enough stimuli of each type, 76 (31.7%) new words were created so that at least ten words of each type were available. Stimuli were examined across valence, arousal, dominance, and word frequency to ensure no pre-existing differences, all *Fs* < 1.25.

**Procedure.**

Upon consent to participate in the experiment, participants were given a typing test by using free typing test website (TypingMaster, Inc., 2013). Each participant typed Aesop’s Fables for one minute before the website would reveal their typing speed and accuracy rate, which was recorded by the experimenter. After this test, participants indicated their dominant writing hand. Participants were then given 120 of the 240 stimuli to rate for pleasantness. Five words of each of the 24 types described above were selected from the list of 240 words, which was used to control for word effects and fatigue/boredom on participants. These stimuli were counterbalanced across participants, and the order of the stimuli was randomized. Participants were told to rate each word for how pleasant it seemed using a 9 point Likert type scale (1 – very unpleasant, 4 – neutral, 9 – very pleasant). The same self-assessment manikin from Jasmin and Casasanto (2012) was shown to participants at the top of the computer screen to indicate the points on the Likert scale. The words appeared in the middle of the screen in 18 point Arial font. Participants then typed the number of their rating on the computer keyboard. Once they rated all stimuli, participants were debriefed and allowed to leave.

**Results**

Data were screened for assumptions of repeated measures ANOVA, as well as the outlier analysis described above. All assumptions were found to be satisfactory. A 2 (real/pseudoword) X 6 (all left, all right, more left, more right, equal, perfect) repeated measures ANCOVA was analyzed with a covariate of typing speed to neutralize effects of expertise on typing preferences (Beilock & Holt, 2007). Repeated finger keypresses were used as a control variable and were therefore not analyzed here. Real words were rated significantly higher than pseudowords, *F*(1, 145) = 103.42, *p* < .001, *η2* = .53, and a significant main effect was found for types of words, *F*(5, 460) = 6.25, *p* < .001, *η2* = .06. The interaction between real/pseudowords and word type was also significant, *F*(5, 265) = 12.26, *p* < .001, *η2* = .12, as shown in Figure 1. To understand the pattern of interaction, real and pseudowords were analyzed with two different repeated measures ANCOVAs across word type while still controlling for typing speed. These analyses showed that real words showed significant word type differences, *F*(5, 460) = 14.27, *p* < .001, *η2* = .13. However, pseudoword ratings were not significant, *F*(5, 460) = 2.06, *p* = .07, *η2* = .02, indicating that pseudowords were rated equally pleasant regardless of typability. Next, post hoc analyses were examined using Fisher’s Least Significant Difference and a Bonferroni correction on real words only for different word types. See Table 2 for the breakdown of the 15 pairwise comparisons. Adjusted alpha was set family wise at 0.003. As shown in the Table 2, perfectly alternating words were rated significantly higher than all other word types: left, right, or equally split between hands. Next, equally split words, more left, and more right words were rated correspondingly pleasant. Below this group, all left and all right words were rated at similar levels of pleasantness.

**Discussion**

These results imply that the QWERTY keyboard has influenced our perceptions of words, but not as a right handed advantage touted by Jasmin and Casasanto (2012). Rather, we find that the procedural action of typing changes our pleasantness ratings by endearing us to words that are easier to type in descending order (all alternating, some alternating, all one hand); thus supporting a strict embodied view that fluency of motor representation of an action impacts judgments. These results mirror a clever set of studies by Holt and Beilock (2006) wherein they showed participants sentences that matched or did not match a set of pictures (i.e. *the umbrella is in the air* paired with a picture of an open umbrella). Given dual-coding theory (Paivio, 1971), it was not surprising that participants were faster to indicate picture-sentence matches than non-matches (also see Stanfield & Zwaan, 2001; Zwaan, Stanfield, & Yaxley, 2002). Further, they showed these results extended to an expertise match; hockey and football players were much faster for sentence-picture combinations that matched within their sport than non-matches, while novices showed no difference in speed for matches or non-matches on sports questions. Even more compelling are results that these effects extend to fans of a sport and are consistent neurologically (i.e. motor cortex activation in experts; Beilock & Lyons, 2008).

Our results, however, did not support the interaction between typability and pseudowords, as all pseudowords were rated similarly with a very small effect size. Both Beilock and Holt (2007) and Van der Bergh et al. (1990) showed expert preferences for two and three letter combinations that were typed with different fingers. Here, our focus was on the influence of ease of typing on judgments rather than the skill of typing as a preliminary analysis, which may explain differing results. Our results could imply that our embodied actions influence preferences for procedures that are more likely in our environment. While our pseudowords were legal English phoneme combinations, they are extremely unlikely to have been previously practiced or encountered in our daily tasks. Therefore, typability preference will not extend to pseudowords (unpracticed actions) because they are not fluent (Oppenheimer, 2008). Coding typability does become extraordinarily complex with an increase in word length, but this initial reanalysis of the QWERTY effect illuminates the need to examine how skill can influence other cognitive processes. Further work should investigate these effects on other keyboard layouts, such as Dvorak, which was designed to predominately type by alternating hands to increase speed and efficiency (Noyes, 1988).

**References**

Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral And Brain Sciences*, *22*(4), 577-

660. doi:10.1017/S0140525X99002149

Beilock, S. L. & Holt, L. E. (2007). Embodied preference judgments: Can likeability be driven

by the motor system? Psychological Science, 18, 51-57. doi:10.1111/j.1467-

9280.2007.01848.x

Beilock, S. L. & Lyons, I. M. (2008). Expertise and the mental simulation of action. In K.

Markman, B. Klein, and J. Suhr (Eds.), The Handbook of Imagination and Mental Simulation (pp. 21-34). Psychology Press.

Bradley, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (1999). *Affective norms for English words (ANEW): Instruction*

*manual and affective ratings* (pp. 1-45). Technical Report C-1, The Center for Research in Psychophysiology, University of Florida.

Cartmill, E., Goldin-Meadow, S., & Beilock, S. L. (2012). A word in the hand: Human gesture

links representations to actions. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society *B:*

*Biological Sciences, 367,* 129-143.

Casasanto, D. (2009). Embodiment of abstract concepts: Good and bad in right- and left-

handers. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology: General*, *138*, 351-367. doi:10.1037/a0015854

Casasanto, D. (2011). Different bodies, different minds: The body specificity of language and

thought. *Current Directions In Psychological Science*, *20*, 378-383. doi:10.1177/0963721411422058

Davidson, R. J. (1992). Anterior cerebral asymmetry and the nature of emotion. *Brain and*

*Cognition, 20,* 125–151. doi:10.1016/0278-2626(92)90065-T

Dodds, P.S., & Danforth, C. (March 2012). Does QWERTY Affect Happiness? [Web blog].

Computational Story Lab ++. Retrieved from http://onehappybird.com/2012/03/19/does-qwerty-affect-happiness/

Glenberg, A. M., Webster, B. J., Mouilso, E., Havas, D., & Lindeman, L. M. (2009). Gender,

emotion, and the embodiment of language comprehension. *Emotion Review*, *1*, 151-

161. doi:10.1177/1754073908100440

Hauk, O., Johnsrude, I., & Pulvermuller, F. (2004). Somatotopic representation of action words

in the human motor and premotor cortex. *Neuron, 41,* 301–307. doi:10.1016/S0896-

6273(03)00838-9

Havas, D. A., Glenberg, A. M., & Rinck, M. (2007). Emotion simulation during language

comprehension. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *14*, 436-441.

doi:10.3758/BF03194085

Holt, L. E. & Beilock, S. L. (2006). Expertise and its embodiment: Examining the impact of

sensorimotor skill expertise on the representation of action-related text. Psychonomic

Bulletin & Review, 13,694-701. doi:10.3758/BF03193983

Hommel, B., Muesseler, J., Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (2001). The theory of event coding

(TEC): A framework for perception and action. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 24,* 869–

937. doi:10.1017/S0140525X01000103

Inhoff, A. W., & Gordon, A. M. (1997). Eye movements and eye-hand coordination during

typing. *Current Directions In Psychological Science*, *6*, 153-157. doi:10.1111/1467-

8721.ep10772929

Jasmin, K., & Casasanto, D. (2012). The QWERTY effect: How typing shapes the meanings of

words. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *19*, 499-504. doi:10.3758/s13423-012-0229-7

Liberman, M. (March 2012). The QWERTY effect [Web blog]. *Language Log*. Linguistic Data

Consortium. Retrieved from http://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=3829.

Logan, F. A. (1999). Errors in copy typewriting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*

*Perception and Performance, 25,* 1760–1773. doi:10.1037//0096-1523.25.6.1760

Logan, G. D. (2003). Simon-Type Effects: Chronometric Evidence for Keypress Schemata in

Typewriting. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception And*

*Performance*, *29*, 741-757. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.29.4.741

Logan, G. D., & Zbrodoff, N. J. (1998). Stroop-type interference: Congruity effects in color

naming with typewritten responses. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*

*Perception and Performance, 24,* 978– 992. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.24.3.978

Lyons, I., Cieslak, M., Mattarella-Micke, A., Nusbaum, H., Small, S., & Beilock, S. L. (2010).

Neural processing of action-related language. Brain & Language, 112, 214-222.

doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2009.05.006

[Newell, Allen](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allen_Newell); [Simon, H. A.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herbert_A._Simon) (1976), Computer Science as Empirical Inquiry: Symbols and

Search, *Communications of the ACM, 19,* 113-126. [doi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_object_identifier):[10.1145/360018.360022](http://dx.doi.org/10.1145%2F360018.360022)

Noyes, Jan (1988). The QWERTY keyboard: a review. *International Journal of Man-*

*Machine Studies*, *18,* 265-281. [doi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_object_identifier):10.1016/S0020-7373(83)80010-8.

Oppenheimer, D. M. (2008). The secret life of fluency. *Trends In Cognitive Sciences*, *12*, 237-

241. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2008.02.014

Ping, R., Dhillon, S., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Reach for what you like: The body’s role in

shaping preferences. Emotion Review, *1*, 140-150. doi:10.1177/1754073908100439

Paivio, A. (1971). *Imagery and verbal processes.* Oxford England: Holt, Rinedart & Winston.

Rieger, M. (2004). Automatic Keypress Activation in Skilled Typing. *Journal Of Experimental*

*Psychology: Human Perception And Performance*, *30*, 555-565. doi:10.1037/0096-

1523.30.3.555

Rumelhart, D. E., & Norman, D. A. (1982). Simulating a skilled typist: A study of skilled

cognitive-motor performance. *Cognitive Science, 6,* 1-36. doi:10.1016/S0364-

0213(82)80004-9

Salthouse, T. A. (1986). Perceptual, cognitive, and motoric aspects of transcription typing.

*Psychological Bulletin, 99,* 303–319. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.99.3.303

Simon, J. R. (1990). The effects of an irrelevant directional cue on human information

processing. In R. W. Proctor & T. G. Reeve (Eds.), *Stimulus–response compatibility: An*

*integrated perspective* (pp. 31–86). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Simon, J. R., & Small, A. M., Jr. (1969). Processing auditory information: Interference from an

irrelevant cue. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 53,* 433–435. doi:10.1037/h0028034

Stanfield, R. A., & Zwaan, R. A. (2001). The effect of implied orientation derived from verbal

context on picture recognition. *Psychological Science, 12*, 153-156. doi:10.1111/1467-

9280.00326

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.)*. Boston, MA:

Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

Tettamanti, M., Buccino, G., Saccuman, M.C., Gallese, V., Danna, M., Scifo, P., Fazio, F.,

Rizzolatti, G., Cappa, S.F., & Perani, D. (2005). Listening to action-related sentences

activates frontoparietal motor circuits. *Journal of Cognitive Neurosciences, 17*, 273–281.

TypingMaster, Inc., (March Aesop’s Fables. TypingMaster, Inc. Web. Retrieved from

http://www.typingtest.com/

Van den Bergh, O., Vrana, S., & Eelen, P. (1990). Letters from the heart: Affective

categorization of letter combinations in typists and nontypists. *Journal of Experimental*

*Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 16*, 1153–1161. doi:10.1037/0278-

7393.16.6.1153

Yang, S., Gallo, D., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Embodied memory judgments: A case of motor

fluency. Journal of Experiment Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition, 35,1359-

1365. doi:10.1037/a0016547

Zwaan, R.A. (1999). Embodied cognition, perceptual symbols, and situation models. *Discourse*

*Processes, 28*, 81–88. doi:10.1080/01638539909545070

Zwaan, R.A., & Taylor, L.J. (2006). Seeing, acting, understanding: Motor resonance in language

comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 135*, 1–11.

doi:10.1037/0096-3445.135.1.1

Zwaan, R. A., Stanfield, R. A., & Yaxley, R. H. (2002). Language comprehenders mentally

represent the shape of objects. *Psychological Science, 13*, 168-171. doi:10.1111/1467-

9280.00430

Table 1.

*Example Stimuli and Coding for Typability.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Word Type** | **Letter Coding** | **Real Words** | **Pseudowords** |
| All on Left | LLL, LLLL | Cat, Vest, Safe | Zet, Tafe, Faw |
| All on Right | RRR, RRRR | Milk, Nun, Mop | Hok, Poom, Joi |
| More Left | LLLR, LLR, RLLL, RLL | Heal, Dirt, Rude | Jeet, Tofe, Zape |
| More Right | RRRL, RRL, LRRR, LRR | Lamp, Wine, Shy | Pome, Noof, Zood |
| Equal Amount of Left and Right | LLRR, RRLL | Grin, Rain, Scum | Olra, Frol, Edop |
| Perfect Alternation | LRLR, RLRL | Burn, Cozy, Lamb | Rorp, Mepe, Spak |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2.  *Pairwise Comparisons for Real Words* | | | |
| Comparison | Difference Score | *p*-value | Effect size |
| Perfect - More left | 0.228 | < 0.001 | -0.36 |
| Perfect - Equal | 0.296 | < 0.001 | -0.32 |
| Perfect - More right | 0.322 | < 0.001 | -0.41 |
| Perfect - All right | 0.546 | < 0.001 | -0.65 |
| Perfect - All left | 0.567 | < 0.001 | -0.61 |
| Equal - More right | 0.026 | 0.643 | 0.04 |
| Equal - More left | -0.068 | 0.297 | -0.09 |
| Equal - All right | 0.250 | < 0.001 | -0.34 |
| Equal - All left | 0.271 | < 0.001 | -0.34 |
| More left - More right | 0.094 | 0.087 | 0.14 |
| More left - All right | 0.318 | < 0.001 | -0.46 |
| More left - All left | 0.339 | < 0.001 | -0.46 |
| More right - All right | 0.224 | < 0.001 | -0.30 |
| More right - All left | 0.245 | < 0.001 | -0.42 |
| All left - All right | -0.021 | 0.766 | -0.03 |

*Note.* Effect size is Cohen’s *d* calculated with standard deviation of the difference scores as the denominator. These comparisons have been ordered in descending pleasantness ratings.

*Figure 1.* Average word pleasantness ratings for each word type by real/pseudoword combination. Error bars represent standard deviation.

*Figure 2.* The relationship between the original QWERTY effect and average pleasantness scores by word. Negative values indicate left handed words, while positive values indicate right handed words.