



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Hoffman, Y., Perlman, A., Orr-Urtreger, B., Tzelgov, J., Pothos, E. M. & Edwards, D. J. (2016). Unitization of route knowledge. *Psychological Research*, 81(6), pp. 1241-1254. doi: 10.1007/s00426-016-0811-0

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/15345/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-016-0811-0>

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

---

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

# Psychological Research

## Unitization of route knowledge

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	PRPF-D-16-00034R2
<b>Full Title:</b>	Unitization of route knowledge
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Article
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Yaakov S.G. Hoffman, Ph.D. Bar-Ilan University Ramat - Gan, ISRAEL
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	Bar-Ilan University
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Yaakov S.G. Hoffman, Ph.D.
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Yaakov S.G. Hoffman, Ph.D. Amotz Perlman, PhD Ben Orr-Urtreger, MA Joseph Tzelgov, PhD Emmanuel M. Pothos, PhD Darren J Edwards, PhD
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>There are many theories that explain how route knowledge is acquired. We examined here if the sequence of elements that are part of a route can become integrated into a single unit, to the extent that the processing of individual transitions may only be relevant in the context of this entire unit. In Experiments 1 and 2, participants learned a route for ten blocks. Subsequently, at test they were intermittently exposed to the same training route along with a novel route which contained partial overlap with the original training route. Results show that the very same stimulus, appearing in the very same location, requiring the very same response (e.g., left turn), was responded to significantly faster in the context of the original training route than in the novel route. In Experiment 3 we employed a modified paradigm containing landmarks, two matched routes which were both substantially longer and contained a greater degree of overlap than the routes in Experiments 1 and 2. Results were replicated, namely, the same overlapping route segment, common to both routes, was performed significantly slower when appearing in the context of a novel than the original route. Furthermore, the difference between the overlapping segments was similar to the difference observed for the non-overlapping segments, i.e., an old route segment in the context of a novel route was processed as if it were an entirely novel segment. We discuss the results in relation to binding, chunking and transfer effects, as well as potential practical implications.</p>
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	The graphs have been changed in accordance with the Editor's comment.

## Unitization of route knowledge

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

\*Yaakov Hoffman, Interdisciplinary Department of Social Sciences, Bar Ilan University

\*\*Amotz Perlman, Department of Management, Bar Ilan University

Ben Orr-Urtreger, Department of psychology, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Joseph Tzelgov, Department of psychology, the Department of Brain and Cognitive

Sciences, and Zlotowski Center for Neuroscience Ben-Gurion University of the

Negev and the Department of Psychology Achva Academic College

Emmanuel M. Pothos, Department of psychology, City University London

Darren J. Edwards, Department of Interprofessional Health Studies, Swansea

University

\*\*Please note that Amotz Perlman and Yaakov Hoffman contributed equally to this publication (order of authorship for these authors was determined by coin toss).

\*Address correspondence to: Yaakov Hoffman, Interdisciplinary Department of Social

Sciences, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900 Israel, telephone-97235317931, fax-

97237374039, Email: [hoffmay@biu.ac.il](mailto:hoffmay@biu.ac.il)

**Abstract**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

There are many theories that explain how route knowledge is acquired. We examined here if the sequence of elements that are part of a route can become integrated into a single unit, to the extent that the processing of individual transitions may only be relevant in the context of this entire unit. In Experiments 1 and 2, participants learned a route for ten blocks. Subsequently, at test they were intermittently exposed to the same training route along with a novel route which contained partial overlap with the original training route. Results show that the very same stimulus, appearing in the very same location, requiring the very same response (e.g., left turn), was responded to significantly faster in the context of the original training route than in the novel route. In Experiment 3 we employed a modified paradigm containing landmarks and two matched routes which were both substantially longer and contained a greater degree of overlap than the routes in Experiments 1 and 2. Results were replicated, namely, the same overlapping route segment, common to both routes, was performed significantly slower when appearing in the context of a novel than the original route. Furthermore, the difference between the overlapping segments was similar to the difference observed for the non-overlapping segments, i.e., an old route segment in the context of a novel route was processed as if it were an entirely novel segment. We discuss the results in relation to binding, chunking and transfer effects, as well as potential practical implications.

Key words: Route learning, Implicit learning, Chunking, Sequence learning,  
Unitization

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
Imagine the following scenario: a driver is driving down the same fixed route for the past week, month or year. Due to road works, the route is diverted, so that for the next several turns she must travel a *new* route which partially overlaps with the original route; e.g., from BLOCK <sup>1</sup> three to BLOCK six the novel route is exactly the same as the original route. While we expect that the driver will not show the same level of proficiency on the new parts of the *novel* route, what about the old parts of the novel route, those overlapping with segments of the old route? Will these overlapping route sections, which are the same for both the old familiar route and the *novel* route, be treated with the same proficiency? This possibility is intuitive, yet research into chunking reveals an alternative, striking possibility. Namely once a (route) sequence has been sufficiently learned and its representation is unitized, the individual elements comprising it cease to play a role in performance (e.g., see Perlman, Hoffman, Tzelgov, Pothos & Edwards, 2016). Accordingly, specific route information, e.g., "*turn right at this corner*", may only exist in the context of a given familiar route and cease to exist from a performance perspective when the very same information (e.g., making the same right turn at the same corner) is presented in the context of a different route.

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
This question, in addition to having theoretical value as elaborated below, applies to a multitude of route learners, who as opposed to e.g. taxi drivers, typically follow a fixed route when going from point A to point B, such as mailmen, milkmen, lorry drivers, or GPS guided driving. In such cases, the development of a cognitive map, where the entire geographic area is represented, is less feasible. For example, the first author recently visited London, where he asked a bus driver if he drives close to a certain street, and the bus driver replied that he had "no idea". Fixed route learning

---

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
<sup>1</sup> BLOCK (upper-case) refers to a segment connecting two intersections, whilst block (lower-case) refers to a group of experimental trials).

1 may involve different processes at the neural level as well. For example, London bus  
2 drivers (fixed route) had smaller hippocampal volume than did taxi drivers (non-fixed  
3 route), who were matched for mileage and stress (Maguire, Woollett, & Spiers, 2006).  
4  
5

6  
7 Typically, route learning is assumed to occur by non-unitized item specific  
8 information. Paths, edges, districts, landmarks etc. have been suggested as important  
9 cues in route learning (Epstein, & Vass, 2014, Gillner & Mallot, 1998; Kuipers, 1978,  
10 2000; Kuipers, Tecuci, & Stankiewicz, 2003; Meilinger, 2008, Meilinger,  
11 Frankenstein, & Bühlhoff, 2014; Werner, Krieg-Brückner, & Herrmann, 2000).  
12  
13 Additional information corresponds to direction-based strategies, which may rely on  
14 information about angular direction at different locations to the final destination, has  
15 also been shown to play a role in route learning (Bailenson, Shum, & Uttal, 2000; Fu,  
16 Bravo, & Roskos, 2015; Hochmair & Frank, 2002; Sakellaridi, Christova,  
17 Christopoulos, Vialard, Peponis, & Georgopoulos, 2015). Another plausible approach  
18 was suggested by Newell and Simon (1972), whereby arriving at the intended location  
19 involves incremental optimization, which is similar to cued recall, whereby one step  
20 informs the next (Newell & Simon, 1972). While these theories have substantial  
21 differences, they all focus on item specific information, such as a direction, an angle,  
22 or a previous step informing a later response. Recently, the notion that route learning  
23 is more complex than just simple stimulus response associations and may actually be  
24 represented in a unitized manner has been noted (Strickrodt, O'Malley & Wiener,  
25 2015; see also Klippel, Tappe, & Habel, 2003; Richter, & Klippel, 2005). Here we  
26 extend this notion to empirically address if route unitization, like other forms of  
27 unitization typical of the sequence learning domain, renders item-specific information  
28 less relevant.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 While in some of the reviewed studies participants were required to move  
2 through space our task involved following a moving dot across a map. Accordingly  
3 the spatial learning processes may not be exactly the same. Note, the current design is  
4 no less ecological as it is typical of many current navigation applications (e.g., google  
5 maps). Further note that this design is compatible with the current goal of addressing  
6 if the motor sequence corresponding to spatial responses could be chunked into a  
7 unitized representation.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Chunking, one of the most basic processes of the cognitive system (e.g.,  
Boucher & Dienes, 2003; Goldstone, 2000; Knowlton, & Squire, 1996; Miller, 1956;  
Rosenbaum, Hindorff, & Munro, 1987; Rosenbaum, Kenny, & Derr, 1983; Simon, &  
Barenfeld, 1969), relates to how elementary units can be bound together in aggregate  
chunks. In sequence learning (e.g., Cleeremans & McClelland, 1991), for example,  
the notion of chunking is central and refers to a situation where adjacent stimuli in a  
fixed sequence may eventually be chunked into a single unit. Chunking is a  
*hierarchical* process, where individual items (e.g., A, B, C, & D) form sub units (e.g.,  
AB, CD), which go on to form a single chunk (ABCD) representing an entire  
sequence (Perlman, Pothos, Edwards & Tzelgov, 2010). Chunking, as a process,  
necessitates a fixed order (Perlman, et al., 2010; 2015). The underlying assumption in  
chunking is that, as elementary units co-occur, larger units build up. Such an analysis  
is motivated from associative learning theory and has been embodied in important  
research traditions, such as that of connectionism (e.g., Elman, 1990; Rumelhart &  
McClelland, 1986).

When a fixed route is practiced repeatedly, we suggest that it may be viewed  
as a sequence (e.g., Meilinger, 2008), in the simple sense that individual route  
segments (e.g., turn right, go left, right and then right) form a sequence. In effect,



1 knowledge of this sequence constitutes route knowledge (Meilinger, et al. 2014).  
2 Accordingly, as in other sequence learning paradigms (e.g., Perlman, & Tzelgov  
3 2006; see also Perlman et al., 2015), after learning is acquired, the emphasis may no  
4 longer be on specific information, e.g., landmarks, individual turns or cues, but rather  
5 on a process of sequential compression (or chunking). The spatial information of  
6 represented route is compressed into a single unit of information. For example,  
7 consider a route that requires three turns to arrive at a location. Initially, there are  
8 three parts of information to process (i.e., turn right, turn left, turn right) whose  
9 processing may well be aided by landmarks. Once the entire sequence is learned, the  
10 information is compressed (or chunked) into a single unit of information (e.g., “route  
11 X”). Showing that fixed-route learning follows the pattern of typical sequence  
12 learning would indicate that it is an instance of a broader sequence learning domain.

13 Moreover, addressing route learning as a chunking process links such learning  
14 with other basic processes of the cognitive system, such as development of expert  
15 knowledge (e.g., Simon & Barenfeld, 1969), category learning (e.g., Goldstone, 2000;  
16 Knowlton & Squire, 1996), working memory (e.g., Miller, 1956), motor control (e.g.,  
17 Rosenbaum, Hindorff, & Munro, 1987; Rosenbaum, Kenny, & Derr, 1983) and  
18 control of complex and dynamic situations (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987). Such a link  
19 suggests that in route unitization, like other forms of chunking, participants cease to  
20 make use of smaller units (Perlman, et al. 2010) e.g., making a specific left turn  
21 following a previous right turn. That is, after unitization develops, such item-specific  
22 route information would no longer play a role when traversing the route. Others  
23 maintain that representation of smaller units actually may disappear or *decay* (see also  
24 e.g., Giroux, & Rey, 2009; Perruchet, Vinter, Pacteau, & Gallego, 2002; Perlman et  
25 al., 2015; Pothos & Wolff, 2006). In any case, these studies agree that item specific

1 information no longer plays a key role in performance after the learnt information  
2 becomes unitized into a single representation. Thus even if full decay of item-specific  
3 information does not ensue, for all intents and purposes such information is not  
4 utilized in performance. Accordingly, our research question is: if once the entire fixed  
5 route is learned, will the individual route parts become unitized, thereby rendering the  
6 item specific information irrelevant to performance? Note, we do not suggest that  
7 mapping, landmarks, angles, directions and cued recall are not part of a route mapping  
8 process; they most clearly are. Rather, we ask whether a bias can arise in route recall,  
9 from the extant theory on unitization, according to which the unitization of route  
10 knowledge can eventually supersede representation of individual elements.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24         The present paradigm follows the theme outlined in the aforementioned  
25 driving example. Namely, we measured performance on an overlapping route  
26 segment, common to both a previously learned route (which always appears in red),  
27 and to a novel route (which always appears in blue). In other words, both the original  
28 red training route and the novel blue route contained the same overlapping route  
29 section. Participants were randomly divided into two groups; the sequential group  
30 who learned the entire route in sequence and the random group who learned  
31 individual route segments not in sequence. We consider whether participants in the  
32 sequential group would show different test performance for the very same  
33 overlapping route segments when presented in different contexts, i.e., the context of  
34 the old training route (red) and the new test route (blue).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51         Accordingly, we expect the following: First, test performance on the red  
52 original route should be overall better in the sequential-group than in the random-  
53 group. We further predict an overall advantage for the same overlapping route  
54 segment when performed in the context of the red route versus the novel blue route.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 We also critically predict a two-way interaction between Group (sequential vs.  
2 random) and Route (original vs. novel), so that only participants in the sequential  
3 group will demonstrate better performance on overlapping route segments performed  
4 in the context of the red (original) route versus the blue (novel) route. This latter  
5 interaction is compatible with a unitization account whereby the individual elements  
6  
7 cease to play a role.  
8  
9

10 While the aforementioned result pattern relates to overlapping stimuli, results  
11 should be at least as robust in the non-overlapping BLOCKs. We focus on the  
12 *overlapping* BLOCKs in Experiments 1 and 2 for two reasons: First, only analysis of  
13 overlapping route segments can address unitization. Second, the non-overlapping  
14 BLOCKs could not be compared as they comprised different stimuli and responses  
15 (although see Experiment 3).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 -----  
32  
33  
34  
35 Insert Figure 1 about here  
36  
37 -----  
38  
39

## 40 Experiment 1

### 41 *Method*

#### 42 *Participants*

43  
44 Thirty students (7 males, mean age=22.9) from introductory psychology  
45 courses at Ben Gurion University participated in the experiment for course credit. All  
46 participants reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision.  
47  
48

#### 49 *Apparatus*

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The experiment was conducted using IBM compatible Pentium III computers  
2 with 17" monitors. The screen was placed approximately 60 cm from the participants.  
3  
4 Participants responded by keyboard press. The onset of a stimulus started the timer;  
5  
6 the stimulus changed location (intersection) as soon as the participant responded.  
7  
8 Responses were indicated by pressing the I/O keys (arrows pointing right/left were  
9  
10 taped onto these keys). Participants were asked to use the index fingers of both hands  
11  
12 for key presses.  
13  
14  
15

### 16 *Stimuli and Procedure*

17  
18 The stimuli were all based on two routes, that we call the red and the blue  
19  
20 routes. Each route comprises of BLOCKs, i.e., segments connecting two nearest  
21  
22 intersections. An 'intersection' is defined as a map location where one may make a  
23  
24 turn. As shown in Figure 1, there are 7 BLOCKs connected by 8 intersections in each  
25  
26 route. The routes were depicted on a city map (Figure 1) via a red line or blue line. At  
27  
28 all times, both red and blue lines, indicating the two routes, were present, regardless  
29  
30 of which route participants were responding to (this ensured saliency of the overlap  
31  
32 between the two routes). During training only the red route was performed, but during  
33  
34 test both the red and blue routes were performed. Indicating the route segments as  
35  
36 BLOCKs 1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6-7 and 7-8, we note that two BLOCKs (4-5, and 5-  
37  
38 6) were the same in both routes. BLOCK 4-5 began at intersection 4 and extended to  
39  
40 intersection 5, and BLOCK 5-6, began at intersection 5 and extended to intersection 6.  
41  
42 Traversing this same overlapping route segment required exactly the same response to  
43  
44 the same stimuli at the same location.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Training: Two groups of participants (sequential- vs. random-group)  
54  
55 underwent extensive training on the red route shown in Figure 1. Both groups were  
56  
57 instructed to follow the entire red route by monitoring the movement of a smil  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 ey and making the appropriate (left/right) response. Following each response,  
2 the smiley would move to the next intersection. In the sequential group, the smiley  
3 appeared at the beginning of the route and participants had to follow it by arrow-  
4 response across the entire route in sequence. A Trial began with the smiley located at  
5 the beginning of the training route (intersection 1, Figure 1), where the correct  
6 response would be pressing the left-arrow key. A depiction of the third trial is shown  
7 in Figure 1, lower panel, where after responding to the first two trials, the smiley  
8 moves to the third intersection. The correct response for this trial would be the left  
9 arrow which would move the smiley to intersection four, and so on. Once the smiley  
10 reached the end of the route it returns to the beginning, and participants begun again.  
11 The direction of movement was always from top to bottom.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 In the random-group, participants were exposed during training to individual  
28 BLOCKs along the red route, and never performed the entire route in sequence.  
29 Namely, the smiley appeared at random intersections across the route, participants  
30 made a single response (turn), upon which the smiley would randomly “jump” to  
31 another intersection. Some learning should occur even for the random condition, as at  
32 the very least, participants should gradually learn the correct responses to each  
33 intersection.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Training was comprised of 10 blocks<sup>2</sup>, each consisting of 105 trials (traversing  
44 7 BLOCKs 15 times). The response stimulus interval (RSI) separating each sequence  
45 (of 7 responses) from each other was 1000 ms. During the RSI, the map appeared  
46 with no smiley. Participants did not receive feedback; the smiley jumped to the next  
47 intersection even after errors. Note that no feedback was necessary, since the red line,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

---

60 <sup>2</sup> As explained above, block (lower-case) refers to a group of trials and not route segment (BLOCKS).  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 indicating the route, was continuously present on the screen and participants simply  
2 had to make the correct responses, at different intersections (indicated by the smiley).  
3

4  
5 Test: While participants did not perform the blue route during training, it was  
6 present, and thus participants during training saw that the overlapping route segment  
7 was common to both the red and blue routes. After training, participants in both  
8 groups proceeded to the same test, where they had to intermittently perform the old  
9 route (red training route) and a blue novel route in a random order. Performance was  
10 guided by the smiley which moved in a sequential manner from beginning to end. To  
11 reiterate, the only difference between groups was at training, where the random-group  
12 never performed the entire route in sequence. There were ten test blocks; each block  
13 comprised a red and blue route each appearing once yielding 140 trials. After each  
14 test route was performed, it was followed by an RSI of 1000 ms. During both training  
15 and test trials, participants had to respond, as fast as possible, by pressing the  
16 corresponding arrow key to the appearing smiley.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 *Results and discussion*

34  
35 The training results reveal improvement across training trials [ $F(9, 252)=$   
36 54.69,  $MSE= 13871$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.66$ ,  $p<.001$ ]; from a mean of 612 ms to mean of 351 ms  
37 in the experimental group and from a mean of 1008 ms to 699 ms in the control  
38 group. These group differences were significant across all blocks [ $F(1, 28)= 335.29$ ,  
39  $MSE= 217918$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.92$ ,  $p<.001$ ], even in the last block [ $F(1, 28)= 321.00$ ,  $MSE=$   
40 19814,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.91$ ,  $p<.001$ ].  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The key question of interest is whether a unitized representation developed, in  
52 a way that individual route segments may no longer be relevant. To answer this  
53 question we focused on the differences between overlapping route segments  
54 performed in the context of the red and blue routes. Both RT and error data for all test  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 trials were recorded. Comparable analyses were run on both of these measures,  
2 yielding similar results, except that some RT effects were not apparent in the error  
3 data. There was no evidence of a speed-accuracy trade-off, thus, only RT data from  
4 correct responses were included in the analysis and are presented in detail. Average  
5 error rates were 3.3% for the sequential group and 2.4% for the control group.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Test data: The median RT of each participant for each overlapping intersection  
13 was calculated across blocks and averaged across participants, see Figure 2. These  
14 medians were submitted to a two-way mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) with  
15 Route (original/novel) and Group (sequential/control) as between subject factors  
16 (Figure 2).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 -----  
25  
26 Insert Figure 2 about here  
27  
28  
29 -----  
30

31  
32 Performance on the original red route was faster than on the novel blue route  
33 [F(1, 28)= 8.402, MSE= 968,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.23$ ,  $p < .01$ ]. Overall performance of the  
34 sequential group was marginally better than of the random group [F(1, 28)= 3.781,  
35 MSE= 5241,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.11$ ,  $p < .07$ ]. The critical Route by Group interaction was  
36 significant [F(1, 28)= 12.734, MSE= 968,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.31$ ,  $p < .01$ ]. Planned comparisons  
37 revealed a significant difference within the sequential group, whereby latency was  
38 faster when participants responded to the overlapping BLOCKs appearing in the  
39 context of the original (red) route than when responding to these very same route  
40 segments appearing in the context of the novel (blue) route [F(1, 28)= 20.799, MSE=  
41 967.82,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. No such effect was found in the random-group [F<1].  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 Please see Figure 2.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 This main finding that RTs in the sequential group were shorter for the very  
2 same overlapping intersections (comprising BLOCKs 4-5 and 5-6) in the original  
3 route than in the novel route, provides evidence for the type of unitization we  
4 hypothesized (see also Perlman et al., 2015). This result suggests that item specific  
5 information, which is necessary at least for initial performance, may be superseded,  
6 when a unitized representation for the entire sequence emerges (see also Vallacher, &  
7 Wegner, 1987).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 It might be claimed that unitization was merely an efficient *strategy* in  
17 Experiment 1, which resulted in enhanced performance at test. Responding using  
18 individual item specific information for both the blue (novel) and red (original)  
19 routes, would only benefit 2/7 responses (number of overlapping stimuli), while  
20 responding on the basis of a unitized representation would benefit the remaining 5/7  
21 responses in the original red route (number of non-overlapping stimuli).  
22  
23 Consequently, unitization rather than being obligatory may merely be a preferred  
24 strategy employed only when there is no (cognitive) reason to utilize item-specific  
25 information. Indeed, Perlman et al. (2010) showed that an increase in sequence  
26 overlap renders unitization less likely. Yet Perlman et al.'s study concerned the  
27 *emergence* of unitization and not the application of the corresponding knowledge  
28 during test, after unitization was (presumably) generated. Nevertheless, motivated by  
29 these ideas, we can ask a similar question: assuming a unitized representation has  
30 already emerged, is it the case that it will be utilized when less efficient? Cognitively,  
31 as the overlap between a learned sequence and a novel one increases, perhaps it would  
32 make more sense to abandon a unitized representation and revert to item-specific  
33 information. The converse possibility is that, once a unitized representation has  
34 emerged, its use is *obligatory*, regardless of its efficiency in subsequent application of  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 the corresponding knowledge (Perlman, & Tzelgov, 2006). In Experiment 2 we  
2 examine if the same result pattern would be observed when overlap increases to 3/7  
3  
4 (from 28% to 42%).  
5

### 6 Experiment 2

7  
8 In Experiment 2 the degree of overlap between routes increased to include  
9 intersections 4, 5 and 6 (BLOCKs 4-5, 5-6, and 6-7, see Figure 3). Observing the  
10 same pattern of results as in Experiment 1 would suggest that a unitized  
11 representation, once generated, will be employed in an obligatory way, such that it is  
12 not possible to discard it, even if it becomes less efficient to utilize.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 *Method*

22  
23 Thirty university students (7 Males, Mean age=24.0) who did not take part in  
24 Experiment 1, participated in Experiment 2. The map used in this experiment is  
25 presented in Figure 3. Aside from increased overlap this experiment was identical to  
26  
27 Experiment 1.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 -----  
34  
35 Insert Figure 3 about here  
36  
37  
38  
39 -----  
40

### 41 *Results and discussion*

42  
43 Visual inspection of the mean latencies in the various conditions presented in  
44 Figure 4 show that the results of the experiment are broadly similar to those of  
45 Experiment 1. As before, to address how sequential vs. random (control) training  
46 affects performance, we focused on test performance. Regarding training, we briefly  
47 mention that there was evidence for improvement [ $F(9, 243) = 27.01$ ,  $MSE = 25146$ ,  
48  $\eta_p^2 = 0.50$ ,  $p < .001$ ], from a mean of 637 ms to a mean of 387 ms in the sequential  
49 group and from a mean of 1148 ms to 726 ms in the control random group. These  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 differences between groups was also significant [ $F(1, 27) = 82.03$ ,  $MSE = 1110335$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.75$ ,  $p < .001$ ] even in the last block [ $F(1, 27) = 152.04$ ,  $MSE = 39262$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.84$ ,  
2  
3  
4  
5  $p < .001$ ].

6  
7 Both RT and error data for all test trials were recorded. Comparable analyses  
8  
9 were run on both of these measures, yielding similar results, except that some RT  
10  
11 effects were not apparent in the error data. As in Experiment 1, there was no evidence  
12  
13 of a speed-accuracy trade-off, thus, only the RT data are presented in detail. Average  
14  
15 error rates were 4% for both groups. Only RTs from correct responses were included  
16  
17 in the analysis.  
18  
19

20  
21 As previously, for each participant, the median RT for each overlapping  
22  
23 intersection was calculated for all blocks and averaged across participants, see Figure  
24  
25 4. These medians were submitted to a two-way mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA)  
26  
27 with Route (original/novel) and Group as a between subjects factor (Figure 4). As  
28  
29 previously we focus on the interaction of Group by Route along with the  
30  
31 accompanying simple main effects. While the random group should show no  
32  
33 differences between performing the overlap route segments in the context of the two  
34  
35 routes (original-red/novel-blue), the sequential group should show better performance  
36  
37 for the overlapping BLOCKs in the context of the original route vs. the novel route.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 -----  
44

45  
46 Insert Figure 4 about here  
47

48 -----  
49

50  
51 The critical Route with Group interaction was significant [ $F(1, 28) = 5.717$ ,  
52  
53  $MSE = 437$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.16$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. Planned comparisons reveal (see Figure 4) a  
54  
55 significant difference in the sequential group, where latency was faster when  
56  
57 participants responded to overlapping BLOCKs appearing in the context of the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 original route than when responding to these very same BLOCKs when they appeared  
2 in the context of the novel (blue) route,  $[F(1, 28) = 7.193, MSE = 4370, \eta_p^2 = 0.20,$   
3  
4  
5  $p < .05]$ . No such effect was found in the random group  $[F < 1]$ .  
6

7 In both experiments, the sequential group responded faster to the very same  
8 overlapping route segments when they appeared in the context of the original route  
9 than when they appeared in the context of the novel route. Such results are consistent  
10 with unitization of route learning occurring only in the sequential group. Showing this  
11 same result pattern for increased overlap between routes where there is less utility for  
12 a unitization strategy is consistent with unitization being less of a strategy and more of  
13 an obligatory process that occurs regardless of overlap degree (Perlman, & Tzelgov,  
14 2006). Once unitization develops, item specific information, such as specific  
15 individual responses, may be less relevant to performance and execution of route  
16 knowledge (see also Perlman et al., 2015).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 In Experiments 1 and 2 a single route was employed at training and two routes  
32 at test. Participants learned a specific given red training route, and at test, performance  
33 of the same overlapping route segment was examined in both the context of this red  
34 route and in the context of a novel blue route. It is possible (although unlikely) that  
35 results may have been affected by this design. Also, having a single training route and  
36 a single novel route in test rendered impossible the comparison between overlapping  
37 and non-overlapping intersections. In Experiment 3 we ask whether the impairment in  
38 performing the overlapping route segment in a novel context is similar in magnitude  
39 to performing a new route segment (non-overlapping). In other words, is an old route  
40 segment appearing in a new context treated it as if it were a new route segment?  
41 Accordingly, Experiment 3 employed two counterbalanced routes, which were shown  
42 to be equally difficult, enabling comparisons between non-overlapping segments.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

In addition, we rectified some limitations of the first two experiments. First, perhaps unitization effects are limited to relatively short routes comprising even shorter overlapping segments. Unitization has been shown to be limited in sequence learning paradigms to motor chunks involving only 4 or 5 elements (Ganor-Stern, Plonsker, Perlman, & Tzelgov, 2013; Verwey, Shea, & Wright, 2015). Thus in Experiment 3, route length was increased to 15 intersections comprising an overlapping segment of six BLOCKs. Second, in Experiments 1 and 2 there were no landmarks that could cue participants. It can be claimed that unitization in route learning would be less necessary in the presence of landmarks, as learning can develop by associating turns to landmarks (Epstein, & Vass, 2014). Would evidence for unitization exist when landmarks are able to cue participants to familiar route segments? Demonstrating similar results even in the presence of salient landmarks would render the current claims more robust. Third, it might be claimed that showing the whole route on the screen continuously (as in Experiments 1 and 2) facilitated unitization. In Experiment 3, route presentation is limited by participants' progress. Finally, it could be claimed that showing both routes across training, which on the one hand is advantageous in rendering overlap more salient, may on the other hand have been disadvantageous. For example it may have allowed for some passive learning of the route intended as novel. In Experiment 3, only the route that was performed was shown at any given time.

### Experiment 3

The goal of Experiment 3 was to rectify the aforementioned points and to examine if an old route segment that appears in the context of a novel route is performed like a new (non-overlapping) route segment. Like previous experiments,

1 unitization would be demonstrated by comparing performance for the same  
2 overlapping segments from the original and novel routes. If item specific information  
3 is relevant to performance, participants would by definition recognize (at least show  
4 benefit for) the relatively long overlapping segment comprising the same stimuli,  
5 locations and response. Consequently, making the same response sequence to the  
6 overlapping segment should be similar, regardless of route, even if it is not  
7 consciously recognized as overlapping. Yet if item specific information is less  
8 relevant after unitization, the overlapping route segments should be responded to  
9 differently in the context of the training route than in the context of the novel route,  
10 this would demonstrate unitization of the training sequence. If this difference is  
11 similar to that observed between the non-overlapping segments of the original and  
12 novel routes, it would suggest that an old route segment presented in the context of a  
13 new route is akin to a novel stimulus.

### 31 *Method*

#### 32 *Participants*

33  
34  
35  
36 Thirty students (5 males, Mean age=25) from introductory psychology courses  
37 at Bar Ilan University participated in the experiment for course credit. All participants  
38 reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision.

#### 39 *Stimuli and Procedure*

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 The experiment was programmed in C++, and conducted with IBM  
47 compatible Pentium III computers and 17" monitors. The screen was placed  
48 approximately 60 cm from the participants. Participants responded by using the  
49 computer mouse. The aim of the participant was to follow a target along a route as  
50 shown in Figure 5. Response times were recorded.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
Unlike Experiments 1 and 2, in this experiment the route was not shown continuously during training, rather it was incrementally drawn, as participants progressed through task. Note, such a procedure is ecological, as in guided route navigation applications (e.g., Waze), the depicted route develops with one's progress. The stimuli are shown in Figure 5a, 5b. The experiment was organized in 25 training blocks and 5 test blocks. At training, participants received one of two routes. Both routes comprised 15 intersections. Each of the two different routes (see Figure 5) contained a common overlapping section comprising six BLOCKs. Half the participants were trained on route A, and half were trained on route B. Each training block consisted of 15 trials. Participants were instructed to follow a pink route-line by moving the Microsoft mouse cursor to a circle at the end of the depicted route segment (see Figure 6). Upon a response, the circle moved to the next intersection. Accordingly, participants were required to "touch" the mouse cursor on the next circle, for the target to move on to the following intersection. For example (see Figure 6), when moving from intersection 7 to 8, participants had to move the mouse along the pink-line, when the cursor touches intersection 8, the pink-line begins moving to intersection 9.

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
Two test routes, an original route and a novel route were presented intermittently in a random order. As in training, at test as well, performance was guided by tracking the route line with the mouse cursor (arrow, see Figure 5). Participants were required to respond as fast as possible. Each route appeared 5 times during test.

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
As opposed to both previous experiments where unitization was demonstrated by a Group by Route interaction, in Experiment 3 there was only one group. Accordingly, unitization should be demonstrated by a Route main effect (original vs.

new), which should be significant even for the overlapping segments. Namely, the overlapping route segment in the context of a novel route should be performed significantly slower than in the context of the original route.

-----  
Insert Figure 5 about here  
-----

### *Results and discussion*

We first checked that there were no overall differences in route difficulty: there was no significant difference across the learning trials between each of the two routes ( $F < 1$ ), indicating that both routes were comparable. Likewise, learning performance for both the overlapping segments of these routes ( $F < 1$ ) and the non-overlapping segments ( $F < 1$ ) was statistically the same.

The mean RTs of each test block of responses were submitted to a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Route (original-route/novel-route) and Overlap (overlapping/non-overlapping) as within subject factors. The Overlap effect was significant [ $F(1,29) = 21.077$ ,  $MSE = 1215$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.42$ ,  $p < .0001$ ], indicating that the overlapping route segment was performed significantly faster than the non-overlapping route segment. As expected, the critical Route effect was significant [ $F(1,29) = 26.591$ ,  $MSE = 829$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.47$ ,  $p < .0001$ ], indicating that participants performed significantly faster on the original route vs. the novel route. The Route by Overlap interaction was not significant [ $F(1,29) = 1.561$ ,  $MSE = 1596$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.22$ ], indicating that the observed performance advantage for the original vs. novel route evident in the non-overlapping condition was not statistically different than the same performance advantage evident in the very same overlapping route segments. Namely, performance of the non-overlapping route segment in the original route (443

1 ms) was faster than in the novel route (479 ms). Likewise, performing the overlapping  
2 segment in the original route was faster (423 ms) than performance of this very same  
3 segment in the novel route (441 ms). Furthermore, these differences were similar; the  
4 difference between overlapping segments performed in the context of the old vs, new  
5 route was similar to the difference observed between both routes in the non-  
6 overlapping route segments.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Unitization in the current experiment was demonstrated even when the length  
15 of the entire route and its overlapping segment was doubled. Demonstrating  
16 unitization for a segment of six overlapping elements appears to extend previous  
17 sequence learning findings where motor chunk size was limited to 4 or 5 elements  
18 (Ganor-Stern, et al., 2013; Verwey, Shea, & Wright, 2015). In addition, unitization  
19 occurred even when landmarks were available and could have been potentially used,  
20 and thus learning could have relied on item-specific representations by associating  
21 responses to landmarks (Epstein, & Vass, 2014). Note that landmark processing was  
22 not part of task requirement (Strickrodt, et al., 2015) e.g., turn left at the "big oak".  
23  
24 Other studies however show that the mere presence of constant landmarks is sufficient  
25 to allow their processing in a manner beneficial to route learning (Foo, Duchon,  
26 Warren, & Tarr, 2007). Thus while it is likely that landmark processing occurred,  
27 future research is required to discern if the obtained results apply to situations where  
28 intentional and associational landmark processing are part of task requirement. Finally  
29 results indicated that an old route segment in the context of a new route is performed  
30 as if it were a completely new route segment.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

-----

Insert Figure 6 about here



-----  
*General discussion*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 It is typically the case that route learning is assumed to depend on item  
6  
7 specific information such as angles, direction or turns (Gillner & Mallot, 1998;  
8  
9 Kuipers, 1978, 2000; Werner, et al, 2000; Kuipers, et al, 2003; Meilinger, 2008).  
10  
11 Extending previous approaches (Strickrodt , et al., 2015), we have demonstrated here  
12  
13 that, after sufficient learning, a unitized representation for a fixed route can emerge.  
14  
15 That is, the sequence of elements comprising a route can be unitized. This unitized  
16  
17 representation of a route sequence may suffice to guide an individual across the route,  
18  
19 in an assumedly more efficient manner, compared to a disjointed non-unitized  
20  
21 representation. Similarly, the motor behavior literature also indicates that people have  
22  
23 the capacity to control short sequences of actions using chunks, whose elements can  
24  
25 be treated collectively (Rhodes, Bullock, Verwey, Averbek & Page, 2004; Sakai,  
26  
27 Kitaguchi, & Hikosaka, 2003; Verwey, 1999, 2001; Verwey, Lammens & van Honk,  
28  
29 2002, Verwey, & Wright, 2014). Additionally, in contrast to typical sequence learning  
30  
31 paradigms where motor chunks represented subsequences with up to 4 or 5 elements  
32  
33 (Ganor-Stern, et al., 2013; Verwey, Shea, & Wright, 2015), Experiment 3  
34  
35 demonstrates unitization of a long sequence consisting of 15 segments. Accordingly,  
36  
37 unitization may be not as limited as previously supposed.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 As mentioned, the current paradigm involving following a dot across a map  
47  
48 may involve different learning mechanisms than route learning in some of the  
49  
50 aforementioned route learning studies (e.g., Meilinger, et al., 2014), where one  
51  
52 actually moves through space. Thus additional research may be required before  
53  
54 concluding that the current results straightforwardly apply to all forms of route  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 navigation. In any event, this paradigm is ecological because it resembles navigation  
2 applications (Google-maps, Waze) where one follows a moving dot across a map.  
3

4  
5 While a process of unitization is known to be relevant to other sequence  
6 learning tasks (Perlman, et al., 2010), these experiments extend earlier results to the  
7 domain of procedural route learning. These results suggest a new angle in route  
8 learning and navigation, whereby route knowledge, similar to information from other  
9 sequence learning paradigms, can be represented in a high density fashion, where all  
10 item-specific information, e.g., a specific turn, is compressed into a single unit which  
11 cannot be readily unpacked. Thus, as in other domains (Perlman et al., 2010; Perlman  
12 et al., 2015), following unitization, the item specific information that preceded  
13 learning may cease to be accessible or relevant. Consequently, individual elements no  
14 longer appear familiar as indicated by the increased RT for exactly the same turns in  
15 the overlapping segment when appearing in the novel route relative to the training  
16 route. This suggests that item specific information of a given response (turn) may  
17 exist only in the context of a given route, and thereby would only be helpful when  
18 performing the same exact route.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Unitization may be advantageous because it reduces the amount of  
40 information necessary for representation, i.e., instead of maintaining a representation  
41 of seven or fifteen individual turns, one may represent an entire route as a single  
42 representation, e.g., "route x", thereby reducing cognitive load. As the route becomes  
43 unitized, it constitutes a single object in working memory and thus presumably its  
44 representation is less demanding, as opposed to representing seven or fifteen  
45 individual units of information. Research by Bo and Seidler (2009) as well as Seidler,  
46 Bo, and Anguera (2012) support the link between unitization and working memory.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 performed automatically; there is no need to consciously retrieve the relevant  
2 information (see Ganor-Stern, et al., 2013 for such an account).  
3

4  
5 Viewing route learning as an automatic execution of a motor sequence does  
6  
7 not belittle the importance of item specific information. On the contrary, we believe,  
8  
9 in line with other prominent models such as the ACT-R (Adaptive Character of  
10 Thought-Rational, Anderson, & Matessa, 1997) theory, that typical learning initially  
11  
12 relies on item specific declarative information ("at the big oak tree turn left", "when  
13  
14 you reach Macy's turn right"). However, with practice, a route sequence may  
15  
16  
17 gradually become unitized and less reliant on item specific information, as is the case  
18  
19  
20 with other types of skill learning (see Anderson, & Matessa, 1997). It is interesting to  
21  
22 note that, even in the superficially simple examples in the present experiments, an  
23  
24 algorithm that qualitatively reproduces our results would not be straightforward. Such  
25  
26  
27 an algorithm would still need to be context-dependent, that is, allow for the fact that  
28  
29  
30 exactly the same stimuli may be responded to differently in different contexts (for  
31  
32  
33 illustration, in Appendix 1 we consider some simple examples of corresponding  
34  
35  
36 algorithms).  
37

38  
39 Sequence learning may lead to sequence knowledge consisting of associations  
40  
41 between the stimuli (Mayr, 1996), responses (Willingham, Wells, Farrell, &  
42  
43 Stemwedel, 2000), response–stimulus compounds (Ziessler, 1998) or stimulus–  
44  
45 response compounds (Schwarb & Schumacher, 2010). The present results  
46  
47 demonstrate that these narrow associations consisting of *two* elements are not driving  
48  
49 current performance. Associations between two locations were not relevant to  
50  
51 performance, thus something more is needed in order to explain learning.  
52  
53  
54 Accordingly, we would expect that drivers who drive along a fixed route may perform  
55  
56  
57 their daily driving in an automatic fashion, and so they would not be confused by  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 changing landmarks (e.g., removal of the oak tree, or relocation of Macy's). Clearly,  
2 there is a tradeoff between robustness of the route knowledge and inflexibility, in  
3 cases when route variations are expected. Moreover, automaticity of a unitized  
4 representation may also produce disadvantages in performance, as changes in a  
5 sequence would be more difficult, once a route is unitized. For instance, think of a  
6 situation where one frequently travels from X to Y via Route A in 80% of  
7 circumstances, then one day wishes to travel from X to Y via Route B, but wrongly  
8 takes the turn A instead. As the route sequence (X to Y via A) is a single unit (or  
9 decision), more cognitive resources may be needed to be allocated for properly  
10 traveling from X to Y via B (this extra processing is manifest through time latencies  
11 in classic unitization studies).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 In the current study, participants learned the route in a guided manner, a  
28 manner of route learning that is highly relevant for everyday life, due to the increasing  
29 popularity of navigation aids based on the global positioning system (GPS). Indeed  
30 while guided learning may produce fewer errors than non-guided route learning, less  
31 spatial awareness may ensue as a result of guided route learning (Li, Zhu, Zhang, Wu,  
32 & Zhang, 2013). The implications of the current study pertain to fixed routes. Other  
33 disadvantages have been documented for guided vs. non-guided walking (Ishikawa,  
34 Fujiwara, Imai, & Okabe, 2008).

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Along with the many advantages of a unitized route representation, the current  
47 aforementioned *possible* disadvantage has implications for transfer. The rigidity of  
48 unitized knowledge may generate a situation of non-transferable learning where  
49 knowledge about an overlapping route section in one context will not transfer to  
50 another route. Such skill learning may remain specific, as observed for example in  
51 sequence learning (Sanchez, Yarnik, & Reber, 2014), perceptual tasks (e.g., Karni &  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Sagi, 1991) or motor tasks (e.g., Pashler & Baylis, 1991). Conversely, a non-unitized  
2 representation should transfer from one context to another, as in the cases of pilots  
3 benefiting from a simulation of a flight experience (Gopher, Weil, & Bareket, 1994).  
4  
5 Transfer of learning has been a central theme in both cognitive psychology and  
6  
7 practical training courses. The current results can be viewed in this light, as an  
8  
9 absence of transfer, namely, knowledge of the overlapping same turns did not transfer  
10  
11 from the training route to the novel route. The current lack of transfer may differ from  
12  
13 that in related situations, namely, as everything about these overlapping stimuli in the  
14  
15 present experiments was identical (e.g., stimuli, location and responses), still the same  
16  
17 stimuli were responded to faster in the context of the familiar route versus the novel  
18  
19 route. Perhaps transfer would have occurred if the learning procedure varied, and thus  
20  
21 item specific information would not have been tied exclusively to a given context,  
22  
23 e.g., a given route (Perlman et al., 2015; see also Green, & Bavelier, 2008, for a  
24  
25 similar claim). Accordingly if from the beginning of training, turns along a given  
26  
27 route are equally traveled in the context of other routes, transfer may be more likely.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 More research is needed to investigate this interesting topic.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Compliance with Ethical Standards

**Funding:** This study was not funded.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Ethics:** All procedures performed in the reported studies were in accordance with the institutional ethical committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards

**Informed consent:** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

1  
2 Anderson, J. R., & Matessa, M. (1997). A production system theory of serial  
3 memory. *Psychological Review*, 104(4), 728.  
4

5  
6  
7 Bailenson, J. N., Shum, M. S., & Uttal, D. H. (2000). The initial segment  
8 strategy: A heuristic for route selection. *Memory & Cognition*, 28(2), 306–318.  
9

10  
11 Bo, J., & Seidler, R. D. (2009). Visuospatial working memory capacity  
12 predicts the organization of acquired explicit motor sequences. *Journal of*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Bo, J., & Seidler, R. D. (2009). Visuospatial working memory capacity  
predicts the organization of acquired explicit motor sequences. *Journal of*  
*Neurophysiology*, 101, 3125–3116

Cleeremans, A., & McClelland, J. L. (1991). Learning the structure of event  
sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 120, 235–253.

Dienes, Z., & Perner, J. (1999). A theory of implicit and explicit knowledge.  
*Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22, 735–808.

Elman, J.L. (1990). Finding Structure in Time. *Cognitive Science*, 14, 179–  
211.

Endsley, M.R. (1995). Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic  
systems. *Human Factors*, 37, 32–64.

Epstein, R. A., & Vass, L. K. (2014). Neural systems for landmark-based  
wayfinding in humans. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
*Sciences*, 369: 20120533.

Foo, P., Duchon, A., Warren Jr, W. H., & Tarr, M. J. (2007). Humans do not  
switch between path knowledge and landmarks when learning a new  
environment. *Psychological research*, 71(3), 240-251.

1 Fu, E., Bravo, M., & Roskos, B. (2015). Single-destination navigation in a  
2 multiple-destination environment: a new “later-destination attractor” bias in route  
3 choice. *Memory & cognition*, 1-13.  
4  
5

6  
7  
8 Ganor-Stern, D., Plonsker, R., Perlman, A., & Tzelgov, J. (2013). Are all  
9 changes equal? Comparing early and late changes in sequence learning. *Acta*  
10  
11 *Psychologica*, 144(1), 180-189.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 Gillner, S., & Mallot, H. A. (1998). Navigation and acquisition of spatial  
17 knowledge in a virtual maze. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 10, 445–463.  
18  
19

20  
21 Giroux, I., & Rey, A. (2009). Lexical and sub-lexical units in speech  
22 perception. *Cognitive Science*, 33, 260–272.  
23  
24

25  
26 Gopher, D., Well, M., & Bareket, T. (1994). Transfer of skill from a  
27 computer game trainer to flight. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human*  
28  
29 *Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 36(3), 387-405.  
30  
31

32  
33 Goldstone, R. L. (2000). Unitization during category learning. *Journal of*  
34  
35 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 26, 86-112.  
36  
37

38  
39 Golledge, R. G. (Ed.). (1999). Wayfinding behavior: Cognitive mapping and  
40 other spatial processes. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins University Press.  
41  
42

43  
44 Green, C. S., & Bavelier, D. (2008). Exercising your brain: a review of human  
45 brain plasticity and training-induced learning. *Psychology and aging*, 23(4), 692-701.  
46  
47

48  
49 Hochmair, H. H., & Frank, A. U. (2002). Influence of estimation errors on  
50 wayfinding-decisions in unknown street networks—analyzing the least angle strategy.  
51  
52 *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 2(4), 283–313.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Ishikawa, T., Fujiwara, H., Imai, O., & Okabe, A. (2008). Wayfinding with a GPS-based mobile navigation system: A comparison with maps and direct experience. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1), 74-82.

Karni, A., & Sagi, D. (1991). Where practice makes perfect in texture discrimination: evidence for primary visual cortex plasticity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 88(11), 4966-4970.

Klippel, A., Tappe, H., & Habel, C. (2003). Pictorial representations of routes: Chunking route segments during comprehension. In *Spatial cognition III* (pp. 11-33). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Knowlton, B. J., & Squire, L. R. (1996). Artificial Grammar Learning Depends on Implicit Acquisition of Both Abstract and Exemplar-Specific Information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 22, 169-181.

Kuipers, B. (1978). Modeling spatial knowledge. *Cognitive Science*, 2, 129–153.

Kuipers, B. (2000). The spatial semantic hierarchy. *Artificial Intelligence*, 19, 191–233.

Kuipers, B., Tecuci, D. G., & Stankiewicz, B. J. (2003). The skeleton in the cognitive map: A computational and empirical exploration. *Environment & Behavior*, 35(1), 81–106.

Li, B., Zhu, K., Zhang, W., Wu, A., & Zhang, X. (2013). A Comparative Study of Two Wayfinding Aids With Simulated Driving Tasks—GPS and a Dual-Scale Exploration Aid. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 29(3), 169-177.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Maguire, E. A., Woollett, K., & Spiers, H. J. (2006). London taxi drivers and bus drivers: a structural MRI and neuropsychological analysis. *Hippocampus*, *16*(12), 1091-1101.

Meilinger, T., Frankenstein, J., & Bühlhoff, H. H. (2014). When in doubt follow your nose—a wayfinding strategy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*, 1363.

Meilinger, T. (2008). The network of reference frames theory: A synthesis of graphs and cognitive maps. In C. Freksa, N. Newcombe, P. Gärdénfors, & S. Wöfl (Eds.), *Spatial cognition VI: Learning, reasoning, and talking about space* (pp. 44–360). Berlin: Springer.

Mayr, U. (1996). Spatial attention and implicit sequence learning: Evidence for independent learning of spatial and nonspatial sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *22*, 350–364.

Miller, G. A. (1956). The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information. *The Psychological Review*, *63*, 81-97.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human problem solving*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pashler, H., & Baylis, G. C. (1991). Procedural learning: II. Intertrial repetition effects in speeded-choice tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *17*(1), 33-48.

Perlman, A., Hoffman, Y., Tzelgov, J., Pothos, E. M., & Edwards, D. J. (2015). The notion of contextual locking: Previously learnt items are not accessible as such when appearing in a less common context. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1-22.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Perlman, A., Pothos, E. M., Edwards, D., Tzelgov, J., & (2010). Task-relevant chunking in sequence learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance*, 36, 649-661.

Perlman, A., & Tzelgov, J. (2006). Interactions between encoding and retrieval in the domain of sequence-learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 32(1), 118-130.

Perruchet, P., & Vinter, A. (2002). The self-organizing consciousness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 25, 297–388.

Pothos, E. M. (2007). Theories of artificial grammar learning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 227–244.

Rhodes B. J., Bullock D., Verwey W. B., Averbach B. B., & Page M. P. A. (2004) Learning and production of movement sequences: behavioral, neurophysiological, and modeling perspectives. *Human Movement Science* 23, 699–746.

Richter, K.-F., and Klippel, A. (2005). “A model for context-specific route directions,” in *Spatial Cognition IV. Reasoning, Action, Interaction*, eds. C. Freksa, M. Knauff, B. Krieg-Brückner, B. Nebel, and T. Barkowsky (Berlin: Springer), 58–78.

Rosenbaum, D. A., Kenny, S. B., & Derr, M. A. (1983). Hierarchical control of rapid movement sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 9, 86-102.

Rosenbaum, D. A., Hindorff, V., & Munro, E. M. (1987). Scheduling and programming of rapid finger sequences: Tests and elaborations of the hierarchical editor model. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 13, 193-203.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Rumelhart, D. E. & McClelland J. L. (1986). *Parallel Distributed Processing, Vol. 1, Foundations*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Sakai, K., Kitaguchi, K., & Hikosaka, O. (2003). Chunking during human visuomotor sequence learning. *Experimental Brain Research, 152*, 229–242.

Sakellaridi, S., Christova, P., Christopoulos, V. N., Vialard, A., Peponis, J., & Georgopoulos, A. P. (2015). Cognitive mechanisms underlying instructed choice exploration of small city maps. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 1-12.

Sanchez, D. J., Yarnik, E. N., & Reber, P. J. (2014). Quantifying transfer after perceptual-motor sequence learning: how inflexible is implicit learning? *Psychological research, 79*(2), 327-343.

Schwarb, H., & Schumacher, E. H. (2010). Implicit sequence learning is represented by stimulus–response rules. *Memory & Cognition, 38*, 677–688.

Seidler, R. D., Bo, J., & Anguera, J. A. (2012). Neurocognitive contributions to motor skill learning: The role of working memory. *Journal of Motor Behavior, 44*(6), 445–453.

Servan-Schreiber, E., Anderson, J. R. (1990). Learning Artificial Grammars With Competitive Chunking, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition, 16*, 592-608.

Simon, H. A. & Barenfeld M. (1969), Information-Processing Analysis of Perceptual Processes in Problem Solving. *Psychological Review, 76*, 473-483.

Strickrodt, M., O'Malley, M., & Wiener, J. M. (2015). This Place Looks Familiar—How Navigators Distinguish Places with Ambiguous Landmark Objects When Learning Novel Routes. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*.

1 Taatgen, N. A. (2002). A model of individual differences in skill acquisition in  
2 the Kanfer-Ackerman air traffic control task. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 3, 103–  
3  
4  
5 112.

6  
7 Vallacher, R. R., & Wegner, D. M. (1987). What do people think they're doing?  
8  
9 Action identification and human behavior. *Psychological review*, 94(1), 3-15.

10  
11 Verwey, W. B. (1999). Evidence for a multi-stage model of practice in a  
12  
13 sequential movement task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 and Performance, 25, 1693–1708.

19 Verwey, W. B. (2001). Concatenating familiar movement sequence: The  
20  
21 versatile cognitive processor. *Acta Psychologica*, 106, 69–95.

22  
23  
24  
25 Verwey, W. B., Lammens, R., & van Honk, J. (2002). On the role of the SMA  
26  
27 in the discrete sequence production task. A TMS study. *Neuropsychologia*, 40, 1268–  
28  
29  
30 1276.

31  
32  
33 Verwey, W. B., Shea, C. H., & Wright, D. L. (2015). A cognitive framework for  
34  
35 explaining serial processing and sequence execution strategies. *Psychonomic bulletin*  
36  
37  
38 & review, 22(1), 54-77.

39  
40  
41 Verwey, W. B., & Wright, D. L. (2014). Learning a keying sequence you never  
42  
43 executed: Evidence for independent associative and motor chunk learning. *Acta*  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

99 Werner, S., Krieg-Brückner, B., & Herrmann, T. (2000). Modelling  
99 navigational knowledge by route graphs. In C. Freksa, W. Brauer, C. Habel, & K. F.  
100 Wender (Eds.), *Spatial cognition II: Integrating abstract theories, empirical studies,*  
101  
102 formal methods, and practical applications (pp. 295–316). Berlin, Heidelberg:  
103  
104 Springer.

Willingham, D. B., Wells, L. A., Farrell, J. M., & Stemwedel, M. E. (2000).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
Implicit motor sequence learning is represented in response locations. *Memory & Cognition*, 28, 366–375.

Ziessler, M. (1998). Response– effect learning as a major component of implicit serial learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 24, 962–978.

## Figure Captions

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **Fig. 1** Upper panel: The stimuli employed in Experiment 1, which consisted of one  
8 learning route (red) and two test routes (the same red route along with a novel blue  
9 route). Navigation takes place from the upper part of the map downwards. Note that  
10 while only one route is being performed at any given time, both routes are shown  
11 throughout learning and test. Travel direction is indicated by the arrow. Lower panel:  
12 An example of the third learning trial in Experiment 1. After participants have  
13 responded twice via arrow press, the smiley moves to the third intersection. The  
14 correct response for this third trial would be the left arrow.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 **Fig. 2** Mean of median reaction times (RTs) for all test blocks of trials for the original  
27 and novel routes, in each condition of Experiment 1.  
28  
29  
30

31 **Fig. 3** The stimuli employed in Experiment 2.  
32  
33

34 **Fig. 4** Mean of median reaction times (RTs) for all test blocks of trials for the original  
35 and novel routes, in each condition of Experiment 2.  
36  
37  
38

39 **Fig. 5** The stimuli employed in Experiment 3 for Routes 1 (A) and 2 (B). Note that  
40 the overlapping segment in Route A (intersections 3-9) and Route B (intersections 6-  
41 12) is exactly the same.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Fig. 6** Example of a learning trial for route 1 (Experiment 3). After responding to the  
47 seventh learning intersection by moving the mouse, the subject must move the cursor  
48 to the eighth intersection for the route to continue to intersection 9.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Fig. 7** Mean of median reaction times (RTs) for all test blocks of trials for the original  
54 and novel routes, in each condition of Experiment 3.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Appendix 1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Simple algorithms for modeling sequence learning: We ask what kind of simple algorithms could, in principle, describe performance in our experiments and, specifically, the key finding that the overlapping stimuli were responded to differently in the practiced sequence than in isolation. These algorithms are clearly not cognitive models, but still they may be useful in that they illustrate the algorithmic complexity of the obtained results. For example, imagine one needs to program the order of operations for a robot from 1 to n. This can be done in several ways, A-D.

A:

If 1 than 2

If 2 then 3

If 3 than 4

In this (A) situation after 1, 2 has to appear. Even when a robot performs Action 2 after (say) 6 rather than after the Action 1, it knows to proceed to Action 3. In B, if 2 appears, then 3 may not necessarily appear, rather, only if 1 and 2 appear in sequence will 3 follow.

B:

If 1 than 2

If 1 & 2 than 3

If 1 & 2 & 3 than 4

C:



```
1      If 1 then 2
2          If 2 then 3
3              If 3 then 4
4                  End if
5              End if
6          End if
7      End if
```

D:

```
18      If x=1 then 2
19          Else if x<n then x+1
20              Else if x=n end
```

In C and D situations, Action 3 must appear after Action 2 that follows Action 1. In Situation C for example, when the robot performs Action 2 after (say) Action 6 rather than after the first action, it does not know that it has to continue to Action 3. If the robot in situation D performs Action 6 and then 3, it will correctly infer Action 4. Yet even in such a case the robot does not seem able to reproduce the obtained behavioral results, as the overlapping segment is performed differently in the original and novel routes. The very same route sequence is performed differently by the cognitive system according to the route context it appears in.

One of the possibilities that arise from this study is that during training, there is a transition from declarative memory of separate connections between the locations from 1 to n, that is as in A, to procedural and automatic execution where Action 1 leads to Action 2 which leads to Action 3 which leads to 4 as in B, C and D. If one

1 performs the route in an automatic manner as a unit, but at some point transfers to a  
2 different route that partly overlaps with the old route, performance must revert again  
3  
4 to declarative memory of separate connections between the locations.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 1






Figure 1

Figure2









Figure 3

Figure4





a



b

Figure 5




Figure 6



Figure 7

