Response to Glenberg 1976

This series of experiments assessed the relationships between retention intervals, the lag effect, and various forms of retrieval (i.e. recognition, cued and free recall).

* I just want to be clear on how the authors are defining retention intervals, which I understood to be the period between encoding/exposure and retrieval/test.  Isn’t this very similar to how Lag is operationalized in Kuhn et al.?

**Experiment 1:**

* Cued recall experiment that spaced repetitions at lags of 1, 4, 8 20, and 40.  The pairs were then tested at either 2, 8, 32, or 64 items after the second presentation.
  + The probability of recall revealed non monotonic increases for retention intervals (2 and 8) and monotonic increases at larger intervals (32-64)
* **Results and Implications**

*Shorter Intervals*

* Results from intervals 2 and 8 both support and contradict prior research.  Although lag 0 items were recalled better than lag 1 items (in agreement with past findings), items with a lag of 4 were recalled better than lag 0 items and items with lags that were greater than 4 began to decrease thereafter.
* *Longer Intervals*
  + Lag effect was consistently monotonic, continually increasing after Lag 0
  + These findings supported neither the General Forgetting Theory or rehearsal theory

**Experiment 2:**

Experiment to was conducted to test the theory to account for experiment 1’s findings; i.e. increasing retention interval decreased similarity of stimulus as encoded between test and two presentations

* Okay, so here I believe Glenberg is making the “massed versus spaced presentations” case for the lag effect.  Whereby differing contexts benefit the retrieval of mass-repeated items and impair retrieval of spaced-repeated items.
* If this theory is correct → manipulating the actual context-similarity and maintaining the retention interval should predict monotonic versus non monotonic increases in lag effect.

**Results and Implications**

* The three main takeaways from experiment two are connecting paired associate learning paradigms with the Brown-Peterson paradigm (i.e. model of cognitive tasks, aimed at blocking rehearsal and testing limits of STM and working memory), implication that the retrieval process contributes to the production of the spacing effect → (cannot account for subjects not knowing whether recall was going to be cued or uncued, there could be no storage, consolidation, rehearsal, or habituation), an third