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[INSERT TITLE HERE]

Task switching is commonly used to investigate cognitive control. In this paradigm, participants are presented with two simple but contrasting tasks and must alternate between completing them (i.e., performing an addition task on trial one but a subtraction task on trial two). Previous research has found that when individuals are forced to alternate between tasks, their reaction times are slower, and they typically commit more errors relative to completing each task separately [CITE].

While several task-switching paradigms have been made available (see XXXX for a review), for the present study we chose to focus on paradigms which allow for a direct comparison of local and global switch costs [CITE HERE]. These tasks present participants with blocks containing switch and non-switch trials interspersed within the same block (referred to as switch blocks) and pure blocks in which all trials use only one set of task instructions [CITE]. [EXPAND] The *global switch cost* refers to…[LOCAL SWITCH COSTS]

[EXPLAINATIONS OF SWITCH COSTS]

The Consonant-Vowel Odd-Even task (CVOE; Minear & Shah, 2008) is a simple task-switching paradigm that allows the measurement of both local and global task switching costs. In switch tasks such as the CVOE, individuals with mild cognitive impairment perform worse relative to younger and non-impaired adults on switch trials relative to a set of pure trials in which the task does not change. Additionally, work by Huff et al. (2015) has shown that global switch costs (switch trials compared to pure trials) increase as a function of age and AD, suggesting that…[EXPAND]. [ADD A SENTENCE OR TWO HERE ON WHY THE CVOE IS USEFUL]

Previous work on task switching using the CVOE paradigm has traditionally presented trials using an *alternating runs* pattern. In this presentation sequence, subjects complete the same type of trial twice before the instructions switch participants to the second task (i.e., the pattern of trials would be CV, CV, OE, OE, CV, CV). The result of this pattern is that every other trial (following the initial trial) is a switch trial, as it occurs following a change in the task set. [POTENTIAL PROBLEMS WITH THIS – PREDICTABILITY!]

**Distributional Analyses of RTs**

[WORDS HERE – DISCUSS EX-GAUSS AND VINCENTILES]

[TRANSITION – SET UP HYPOTHESES SEGUE INTO METHODS] The present study expands on previous CVOE task switching studies by incorporating both an alternating runs switch task and a randomized switch task (i.e., CV, OE, OE, OE, CV, OE) in which no discernable pattern of task switching can be detected.

**[EXPERIMENT HEADER]**

[WORDS HERE] Overall, it is expected that mean error rates and RTs will be higher on the switch tasks. Specifically, we predict that this local switch cost will be higher on the randomized task relative to the alternating runs task due to the lack of pattern. [WHY?]

**Method**

**Participants**

XX undergraduate students

**Materials**

**Procedure**

**Results**

[DATA SCREENING AND PBIC]