

R1 Delay category

Tyler J. Peckenpaugh

2019-06-03

Reading 1 delay category

First, participants were categorized based on their mean Reading 1 delay, with a fast mean Reading 1 delay being less than 0.9s, and a slow one being more than 1.2s. Everything else is categorized as “normal” and ignored. The distribution of participants across categories is shown in table 1.

Table 1: Participants by Reading 1 delay category

Delay category	n
FAST	8
NORMAL	15
SLOW	9

Note:

FAST < 0.9s; SLOW > 1.2s

Table 2 shows the number of occurrences and percentage per condition for both readings. Table 3 shows the same for just reading 1, and table 4 for just reading 2.




Figure 1: Plot of pattern proportions per condition

Table 2: Simple break pattern by condition and R1 delay category, both readings

		FAST				SLOW			
	m	D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP	D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP
BOTH	%	49.2	53.1	59.4	64.5	63.2	50.7	71.2	75.0
	n	31.0	34.0	38.0	40.0	43.0	34.0	47.0	51.0
OBJ	%	31.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	22.1	28.4	0.0	1.5
	n	20.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	19.0	0.0	1.0
PP1	%	19.0	21.9	40.6	35.5	14.7	20.9	28.8	23.5
	n	12.0	14.0	26.0	22.0	10.0	14.0	19.0	16.0

Table 3: Simple break pattern by condition and R1 delay category, Reading 1

		FAST				SLOW			
	m	D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP	D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP
BOTH	%	50.0	40.6	56.2	48.4	61.8	58.8	66.7	73.5
	n	16.0	13.0	18.0	15.0	21.0	20.0	22.0	25.0
OBJ	%	31.2	37.5	0.0	0.0	20.6	20.6	0.0	0.0
	n	10.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	0.0
PP1	%	18.8	21.9	43.8	51.6	17.6	20.6	33.3	26.5
	n	6.0	7.0	14.0	16.0	6.0	7.0	11.0	9.0

Table 4: Simple break pattern by condition and R1 delay category, Reading 2									
	m	FAST				SLOW			
		D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP	D -GP	D +GP	Q -GP	Q +GP
BOTH	%	48.4	65.6	62.5	80.6	64.7	42.4	75.8	76.5
	n	15.0	21.0	20.0	25.0	22.0	14.0	25.0	26.0
OBJ	%	32.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	23.5	36.4	0.0	2.9
	n	10.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	12.0	0.0	1.0
PP1	%	19.4	21.9	37.5	19.4	11.8	21.2	24.2	20.6
	n	6.0	7.0	12.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	8.0	7.0