QALMRI Scapinello Pictorial Stimuli

The role of familiarity and orientation immediate and delayed recognition of pictorial stimuli

1. Keywords
   1. Hunter klockounter
2. Question
   1. Broad question
      1. Recall intervals on recognition
         1. Little decline over short intervals , greater declines of longer intervals periods **>**1 day
   2. Specific question
      1. Differences in stimulus familiarity affect immediate or delayed recognition of pictorial stimuli
      2. Compare recognition for human faces , canine architectural
3. Alternative Hypotheses
4. Logic
5. Methods
   1. Subjects
      1. N = 80
      2. 40 males
      3. 40 females
      4. Random assignment between groups with a 20 minute delay between testing intervals
      5. Within groups procedure for orientation
   2. Experimental conditions
      1. Level I
         1. Orientation
            1. Upright
            2. rotated
      2. Level II
         1. Recall / test interval
            1. Immediate
            2. Delayed
      3. Familiarity
         1. Level I
            1. Low familiarity
         2. Level II
            1. High familiarity
   3. Procedure
      1. Three sets of photographs
         1. 20 facial
         2. 20 human
         3. 20 architectural
      2. Rating stimuli familiarity
         1. r = .80
         2. rated on a 5 point scale
         3. each S inspected 60 flash cards
            1. half presented once  **low familiarity**
            2. half presented seven successive inspection trials high familiarity
      3. Identification
         1. 40 S given test immediately
         2. Twenty viewed in upright orientation
6. Results
   1. ANOVA F obtained = 245 , 44, *p < .0001* significant familiarity
   2. ANOVA F obtained statistic = 48.41 , p < .0001 significant for orientation
   3. ANOVA F obtained statistic = 1.44 approaching 1 not significant p > .05 alpha condition for recall interval
   4. ANOVA F obtained statistic = 7.33 , p < .01 significant for familiar stimuli tested on delay
   5. ANOVA F obtained statistic < 1 no significant effect for unfamiliar stimuli
   6. Rotation versus human faces
      1. Unfamiliar
         1. ANOVA obtained statistic F =9.24 p < .0005
      2. Familiar
         1. ANOVA obtained statistic F = 18.34 p < .0001
   7. Rotation versus architecture
      1. No significant effects
      2. ANOVA familiar and unfamiliar F obtained statistic F < 1.00
   8. Rotation versus canine faces
      1. No significant effects
         1. Familiar
            1. F obtained statistic F = 3.23 , p > .05 alpha level
         2. Unfamiliar
            1. F obtained statistic F = 1.22 p > 0.5 alpha level
   9. Recognition performance declined as a function of stimulus rotation and a 20 min delay in testing
   10. This decline was significantly greater for human faces regardless of the recall interval
7. Inferences
   1. Disproportionate difficulty for rotated human faces was independent of familiarity