



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Guitard, D., Saint-Aubin, J., Poirier, M., Miller, L. M. & Tolan, A. (2020). Forward and backward recall: Different visuospatial processes when you know what's coming. *Memory & Cognition*, 48(1), pp. 111-126. doi: 10.3758/s13421-019-00966-w

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/22603/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-019-00966-w>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, 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. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Forward and Backward Recall: Different Visuospatial Processes when you Know what's Coming

Journal:	<i>Memory & Cognition</i>
Manuscript ID	MC-ORIG-18-385.R1
Manuscript Type:	Resubmitted Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Guitard, Dominic; Universite de Moncton - Faculte des sciences de la sante et des services communautaires, Psychology Saint-Aubin, Jean; Universite de Moncton, Psychologie Poirier, Marie; City University, Memory Research Unit, Psychology Department Miller, Leonie; University of Wollongong, Psychology Tolan, Georgina; Australian Catholic University, Pscyhology
Keywords:	working memory, backward recall, visuospatial hypothesis



Campus de Moncton
FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES DE LA SANTÉ ET DES SERVICES COMMUNAUTAIRES
École de psychologie

Edmundston
Moncton
Shippagan

June 14, 2019

Prof. Philip Beaman
University of Reading

Re: Revision of manuscript MC-ORIG-18-385

Dear Prof. Beaman,

We are very pleased to submit our revised manuscript previously entitled “Forward and Backward Recall: Same Visuospatial Processes” (MC-ORIG-18-385), which is now entitled “Forward and Backward Recall: Different Visuospatial Processes when you Know what’s Coming” to *Memory and Cognition*.

We responded very carefully to all comments and we did not hesitate to run an additional experiment to provide a complete answer to your query and the similar one raised by Reviewer 1. As you will see, your suspicion was correct and we found that foreknowledge of recall direction is a major (overlooked) factor in accounting for backward recall performance. Given the results of this new experiment, we modified our conclusion, and changed the title accordingly. Furthermore, this additional experiment allowed us to reconcile previous incoherent findings in the field. We went further by suggesting a revised version of the visuospatial hypothesis to account for our results and those previously published. In the discussion, we now offer a new version of the visuospatial hypothesis as the main explanation and to stay within the 8000 word limit despite the addition of an experiment, we removed the sections on the Feature and the Primacy models that were no longer needed. We really thank you for this important suggestion, which strengthened the manuscript.

In the following pages, you will find our Guide to Changes in which we described how we have addressed each issue raised by yourself and the reviewers. We hope that you will share our enthusiasm and you will be satisfied with our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Jean Saint-Aubin
École de psychologie
Université de Moncton
New Brunswick

E1A 3E9, Canada

- 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

1
2
3 **GUIDE TO CHANGES**
4
5
6

7 Editor (Philip Beaman) had one major point :

8
9 **Major point 1: I have myself one query which elaborates upon a point made by**
10 **reviewer 1 and this is to do with participant strategy. I may be wrong but I was under**
11 **the impression that backward recall in neuropsychological tests (as discussed in the**
12 **introduction) is cued before encoding not afterwards, as in these experiments, so I**
13 **wonder to what extent neuropsychological test results might be based upon differences**
14 **at encoding rather than attempts at reversing direction (or some other strategy) at**
15 **recall. If this is the case then although strategies used when post-cued to recall**
16 **backwards are still to be explained somehow it does potentially undermine some of**
17 **the rationale for the experiments as currently stated. Similarly, it wasn't obvious to**
18 **me when reading through the manuscript which data-sets of those discussed were**
19 **obtained by post-cueing, and which by pre-cueing, direction of recall. There may be**
20 **nothing in this of course but equally a simple shift in procedure across studies might**
21 **account for some apparent inconsistencies. It would be helpful to explicitly point to**
22 **cases where direction of recall was either pre- or post-cued as at least an initial attempt**
23 **to address this issue.**
24
25
26
27

28 *Response:* In response to this comment, we made multiple changes. (a) In the introduction, we
29 now clearly mentioned which previous studies were pre-cued and which were post-cued. We
30 elaborated on this in the introduction of Experiment 5. (b) We added an experiment (now
31 Experiment 5), in which we used the same method as in Experiment 2, but recall direction was pre-
32 cued and blocked to mimic the design used in intelligence tests. Results were interesting and clear.
33 We found that when interference was at encoding, foreknowledge of recall direction had no impact:
34 Tapping was as detrimental in forward as in backward recall. However, when interference was at
35 recall, foreknowledge of recall direction had a large impact: Tapping was only detrimental in
36 backward recall. (c) With the new experiment, we provide the most comprehensive investigation
37 of backward recall ever published and based on it, in the General Discussion, we proposed a revised
38 version of the visuospatial hypothesis, since the original version (as well as all alternative models)
39 was unable to account for these data. (d) Given those changes, we modified the title of the
40 manuscript as well as the take home message.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Reviewer 1 (Geoff Ward) had three major and two minor points:

49
50 **Major point 1: I wonder whether a summary multi-panel graph plotting RD X I for the**
51 **different LI/Experiments would help illustrate the main message.**
52 **Point 1b: The results from Experiments 1–3 are convincing; but in Experiment 4, it**
53 **would be useful to discuss the significant interaction between RD x I x SP (p=.03)**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Response:* We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and we added a figure (now Figure 1). In this
4 new multi-panel figure, the proportion of correct recall as a function of recall direction, interference
5 and locus of the interference is presented for all experiments. Furthermore, as requested, we have
6 elaborated on the significant interaction between recall direction, interference and serial position.
7 The changes appear as follow on page 19:
8
9

10 *The interaction between recall direction, interference and serial position also*
11 *reached conventional level of significance. As previously observed in backward*
12 *recall studies, the latter interaction simply reflects the larger interference effect on*
13 *early serial positions in forward recall and on later serial positions in backward*
14 *recall (for a review, see, Ritchie et al., 2015).*
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Major point 2: I do not really understand why the words were re-presented at test**
22 **during E1, E2 and E4 as these experiments are nominally using tests of immediate**
23 **serial recall. Is there a danger that a spatial encoding strategy might be disrupted by**
24 **considering the new locations of the re-presented stimuli? If so, any spatial strategy**
25 **that might have been preferred in backward serial recall may be weakened in these**
26 **experiments, relative to more conventional serial recall (without re-presented items).**
27 **Some justification or discussion of this methodological point would be welcome.**
28
29

30 *Response:* Previous studies investigating the impact of visual similarity on recall of verbal
31 materials used both order reconstruction and immediate serial recall tasks and the same pattern of
32 performance was found with both tasks (see, Poirier, et al., 2007; Logie et al., 2000, 2006).
33 Furthermore, in previous studies investigating the detrimental effect of spatial manual tapping on
34 verbal materials, the same pattern of results has been observed with serial order reconstruction and
35 immediate serial recall (see, e.g., Guérard & Tremblay, 2008; Poirier et al., 2019). It is also worth
36 noting that in Experiment 3 with an immediate serial recall task and no foreknowledge of recall
37 direction the same pattern of results was observed in forward and backward recall, as observed
38 with the order reconstruction task. In the new Experiment 5, we also used immediate serial recall
39 and spatial tapping. Even with foreknowledge of recall direction, results revealed the same
40 detrimental effect of tapping in forward and backward recall when it occurred at encoding.
41 Therefore, we are confident that our results do not depend on this recall procedure.
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Major point 3: If the authors are primarily interested in whether participants use the**
48 **same/different encoding strategies for the two tasks, then a nice manipulation to**
49 **consider in the future (if it hasn't already been done) might be to compare trials with**
50 **and without foreknowledge of the test direction (e.g., Bhatarah, Ward and Tan, 2008**
51 **comparing free and serial recall).**
52

53 *Response:* We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. As mentioned in response to the Editor's first
54 comment, we added an experiment to address this issue and results provide important insights about
55 the processes called upon by backward recall.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Minor point 1: In Experiment 1 discussion: “Furthermore, the larger effect of tapping**
5 **during encoding than recall extends previous findings of larger tapping effects during**
6 **encoding than retention (Meiser & Klauer, 1999). ‘I’m not sure to which statistics in**
7 **E1 this is referring.**

8
9
10 *Response:* We clarified the problematic sentence. The new version appears as follows on page 13:
11 “Furthermore, at the descriptive level, the detrimental effect of tapping during encoding
12 was superior than recall which extends previous findings of larger tapping effects during
13 encoding than retention (see, e.g., Meiser & Klauer, 1999).”
14
15
16

17
18
19 **Minor point 2: In main text (page 3), Donolato’s name has been changed to Desolate**

20
21 *Response:* We corrected the typo.
22
23
24
25

26

Reviewer 2 had four major and three minor points:

27
28
29 **Major point 1: In Exp 1, 2 and 4, it is not clear whether participants could see the three**
30 **lines of words throughout the recall stage. If this were true, the visual information**
31 **during encoding and retrieval stage may prevent participants from using visuospatial**
32 **processing to support backward recall, leading to similar tapping effect on forward**
33 **and backward recall. This possibly should be discussed and the finding of Exp 1, 2, 4**
34 **(visual presentation) may not provide strong evidence against the visuospatial**
35 **processing hypothesis.**
36
37

38 *Response:* We clarified the method. On page 9, it is now written that: “After the presentation of the
39 last word, all words reappeared simultaneously in random order on three lines on the centre of the
40 screen and stay on the screen for the recall phase”. Furthermore, in the new experiment, we used
41 an immediate serial recall task in which items were not represented at recall. In the revised
42 manuscript comprising five experiments, we tested the visuospatial hypothesis by manipulating
43 recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of interference (encoding vs. recall), the
44 interference task itself (spatial manual tapping vs. DVN), the to-be-remembered items
45 (words vs. digits), foreknowledge of recall direction (post-cued vs. pre-cued), and the
46 recall task (immediate serial recall vs. immediate serial order reconstruction). Together,
47 our results provide the most comprehensive investigation of visuospatial processes in
48 backward recall.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Major point 2: In Experiment 3, it is good to see that auditory presentation was used,**
4 **but watching white screen in the no-interference condition may also prevent**
5 **participants to construct visuospatial representation of digits in space. This may be**
6 **the reason for absent interference effect of DVN as white screen may also disrupt**
7 **recoding digits using visuospatial strategies. If participants were allowed to close their**
8 **eyes during encoding, they may be more likely to adopt visuospatial strategies for**
9 **backward recall, and DVN may show an effect. It may be better to have an additional**
10 **experiment with auditory presentation as in Experiment 3 and use tapping task as**
11 **secondary task given its effect in Experiment 2, with eye-closure/eye open as an**
12 **independent variable. If tapping still showed a similar interference effect on forward**
13 **and backward recall in the eye-closure condition (which facilitate visuospatial**
14 **processing), this may provide a stronger argument against the visuospatial hypothesis.**
15
16
17

18 *Response:* We thank the reviewer for this interesting suggestion. Although we agree that watching
19 a white screen may cause interference when a visual strategy is used, previous results revealed that
20 the detrimental effect of dynamic visual noise is much larger than the control white screen condition
21 (see, e.g., Chubala et al., 2018; Quinn & McConnell, 2006; St Clair-Thompson and Allen, 2013).
22 We believe that the new experiment provides a strong additional test of the visuospatial hypothesis
23 that will alleviate the concerns that may have arisen from the DVN manipulation.
24
25
26

27 **Major point 3: In Figure 3, DVN seems to produce a larger effect on later-recalled**
28 **items to backward than forward recall conditions, is there any significant**
29 **interactions? It could be that last items (first-recalled items) in backward recall rely**
30 **on echoic memory, and only earlier items involve more of visual spatial processing. It**
31 **may be that multiple strategies were employed in backward recall, with visuospatial**
32 **processing provides more support for earlier items while latter ones relied on echoic**
33 **memory.**
34
35

36 *Response:* As shown in Table 1, the interaction between recall direction, interference and serial
37 position did not reach the conventional level of significant, $F < 1$, $p = .63$. Therefore, we prefer not
38 to speculate about this descriptive result.
39
40
41

42 **Major point 4: The authors described two working memory models and suggests a**
43 **single process for forward and backward recall. It is better to have more explanation**
44 **of the single process in terms of how it supports forward and backward recall.**
45
46

47 *Response:* In light of the results of the new experiment, we rewrote the discussion. We now present
48 a modified version of the visuospatial hypothesis and we removed the single process hypotheses.
49
50

51 **Minor point 1: It is helpful to see experimental design in Exp 1 (2 * 2* 2..), and it is**
52 **better to also show them in Experiment 2, 3 and 4.**
53
54

55 *Response:* We clarified the experimental design for each experiment of the manuscript and in
56 response to Major point 1 of Reviewer 1, we added a figure highlighting the design.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Minor point 2: In Experiment 1: where is the numeric keypad placed? It is better to**
5 **have them in the centre of space in order to produce a larger interference effect.**
6
7

8 *Response:* The position of the numeric keypad is now specified. On page 9, it is written that “the
9 numeric keypad was placed in the centre of the table space just in front of the participants.”
10
11

12 **Minor point 3: Page 28, The first sentence is a bit difficult to understand.**
13

14 *Response:* We have removed the problematic sentence and rewrote the section.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21

Reviewer 3 had three major and four minor points:

22
23

24 **Major point 1: An issue that I largely have is the overarching rationale of the four**
25 **experiments. I understand that all of the experiments are designed to examine**
26 **visuospatial contributions to backward serial recall. Experiments 1 and 2 follow a**
27 **natural progression--starting with verbal stimuli on the screen, moving to more visual**
28 **stimuli with digits. Following that, the authors move to Experiment 3 which shifts to**
29 **a completely different concurrent task and auditory presentation of digits instead of**
30 **visual. Then there is Experiment 4, which shifts back to visual presentation of digits**
31 **with the concurrent task from Expts. 1 and 2 along with articulatory suppression. The**
32 **procedures change dramatically, and it might be helpful to consider the overarching**
33 **narrative to explain why these large changes in procedures were necessary.**
34
35

36 *Response:* We understand that Experiment 3 may seem different. However, the sequence follows
37 the actual sequence of the experiments conducted in our laboratory, based on our best attempt at
38 understanding backward recall and visual processes. Therefore, we kept the same sequence but we
39 edited the text to improve the transition between the experiments.
40
41
42


43 **Major point 2: Experiment 3 feels, to me, like the wildcard in terms of procedure. All**
44 **of the other experiments have a tapping task, which introduces significant cognitive**
45 **load. Experiment 3 involves Dynamic Visual Noise, which seems a more passive**
46 **concurrent task--participants simply have to view the display, which seems like it may**
47 **not involve the same cognitive load as a tapping task. I am curious whether, if**
48 **cognitive load could be introduced with DVN (e.g., noting changes from one DVN**
49 **display to the next) that would require a more active processing component; it is**
50 **possible that the lack of results in Experiment 3 is because the concurrent task was**
51 **not sufficiently taxing. Given the other three experiments' results, I doubt this, but it**
52 **might need to be considered to rule out this possibility.**
53
54
55

56 *Response:* We agree that Experiment 3 can feel like a wildcard. However, Experiment 3 was a
57 necessary element in the systematic investigation of the visuospatial hypothesis and was the first
58
59
60

1
2
3 replication of the experiment conducted by St Clair-Thompson & Allen (2013) with a post-cued
4 recall direction. DVN is indeed a more passive task but its effects have been shown numerous times
5 when participants used extensive visual strategy (see, e.g., Chubala et al., 2018; Quinn &
6 McConnell, 2006; St Clair-Thompson and Allen, 2013). We thank the reviewer for the proposed
7 experiment that will be of interest for future research. In the context of the current study, we think
8 that the new experiment was more urgently needed and provides key findings to test the
9 visuospatial hypothesis.
10
11

12
13 **Major point 3: For the tapping task, given that the participants were expected to tap in**
14 **a particular order, did the authors find any performance changes from early trials**
15 **versus late trials? I would expect that tapping in a particular pattern would eventually**
16 **become more automatic, take up less cognitive load, and thus lead to better recall in**
17 **later lists compared to early lists.**
18
19

20 *Response:* We explored this possibility and found no convincing evidence for this hypothesis.
21 Results are reproduced in the figure below. In the figure, we combined data from all experiments
22 using spatial manual tapping (Experiment 1, 2, 4, and 5). Recall performance is presented as a
23 function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of interference effect (presentation vs.
24 recall), interference (control vs. tapping) and trial order. There were 14 trials per condition. In the
25 figure, we grouped trials by blocks of 2 to increase stability. As can be seen, the impact of tapping
26 is of similar magnitude across all trial blocks. Because, there was no interaction of tapping with
27 trial blocks and because we already have 6 multi-panel figures, we did not add this figure to the
28 manuscript. However, if the editor wants to see it in the manuscript, we will be happy to integrate
29 it.
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



Minor point 1: In Experiment 1, the words used were largely low-frequency. Was this done to rule out use of visualization (as higher-frequency words tend to be easier to visualize)?

Response: In fact, we used a range of word frequencies and on average, our words were frequent with a mean frequency count of 141.66 occurrences per million (see, page 8).


Minor point 2: In the Appendix, could the authors flag significant effects?

Response: We now flag the significant results by bolding them.

Minor point 3: In Experiments 2 and 3, was there any evidence of increased proactive interference with the use of digit lists?

Response: We investigated this possibility and found no convincing evidence for an increased proactive interference with the use of digits. Increased proactive interference would be shown by a decrement in recall performance across trials. We tested this possibility by collapsing together all 4 conditions (forward control, forward tapping, backward control, backward tapping) of Experiment 2 and 3. This was necessary because conditions varied randomly from trial to trial. For more stability, the 56 trials were then collapsed in 7 blocks of 8 trials each. As can be seen in the

figure below, the pattern of results does not suggest the presence of increased proactive interference effects across trials.



Minor point 4: As someone who wasn't familiar with DVN until reading this manuscript, it would be nice if the authors could discuss or define what DVN is earlier in the introduction of the paper to ground the reader. It is introduced on page 6 with the discussion of the St Clair-Thompson & Allen (2013) study along with the n-back task, but more time is devoted to discussing the procedure of n-back than the DVN, which is a critical part of Experiment 3. The DVN procedure isn't discussed until page 16 of the manuscript in its current form.

Response: We now define DVN at page 6. We also improved the clarity of our presentation.

Forward and Backward Recall: Different Visuospatial Processes when you Know what's Coming

Dominic Guitard and Jean Saint-Aubin

Université de Moncton

Marie Poirier

University of London, City

Leonie M. Miller

University of Wollongong

Anne Tolan

University of Southern Queensland

Authors' Note

This research was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada graduate scholarship to Dominic Guitard and by a Discovery grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada to Jean Saint-Aubin.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jean Saint-Aubin, École de psychologie, Université de Moncton, Moncton, New Brunswick, E1A 3E9, Canada.

Abstract

In an immediate memory task, when participants are asked to recall list items in reverse order, benchmark memory phenomena found with more typical forward recall are not consistently reproduced. These inconsistencies have been attributed to the greater involvement of visuospatial representations in backward than in forward recall at the point of retrieval. In the present study, we tested this hypothesis with a dual task paradigm in which manual-spatial tapping and dynamic visual noise were used as the interfering tasks. The interference task was performed during list presentation or at recall. In the first four experiments, recall direction was only communicated at the point of recall. In Experiment 1 and 2, fewer words were recalled with manual tapping than in the control condition. However, the detrimental effect of manual tapping did not vary as a function of recall direction or processing stage. In Experiment 3, dynamic visual noise did not influence recall performance. In Experiment 4, articulatory suppression was performed on all trials and manual tapping was added on half of them. As in the first two experiments, manual tapping disrupted forward and backward recall to the same extent. In Experiment 5, recall direction was known before list presentation. As predicted by the visuospatial hypothesis, when manual tapping was performed during recall, its detrimental effect was limited to backward recall. Overall, results can be explained by calling upon a modified version of the visuospatial hypothesis.

Keywords: Short-term memory, Backward recall, Visuospatial hypothesis.

Forward and Backward Recall:

Different Visuospatial Processes when you Know what's Coming

In a typical immediate serial recall task, participants recall lists of items immediately after their presentation, beginning with the first presented item and ending with the last one. In addition to this standard immediate serial recall task, there is a version in which participants recall items by beginning with the last presented item and ending with the first. This is known as backward recall. Although, backward recall has been studied for over a century (see, Blankenship, 1938, for an early literature review and Donolato, Giofré, & Mammarella, 2017, for a recent literature one), it is less well understood than forward recall (Lewandowsky & Farrell, 2008). Nevertheless, backward recall performance and error types have helped to test the predictions and limits of models in the area and hence contribute to theoretical developments (Beaudry, Saint-Aubin, Guérard, Pâquet, 2018; Donolato et al., 2017; Henson, 1998; Oberauer et al., 2018; Page & Norris, 1998; Hulme, Roodenrys, Schweickert, Brown, Martin, & Stuart, 1997; Saint-Aubin, Guérard, Chamberland, & Malenfant, 2014). Furthermore, backward recall is one of the most frequently used method in clinical and neuropsychological research and assessment. In effect, backward recall is incorporated in widely used tests. For instance, backward digits span is used in Wechsler Intelligence Scales (Wechsler, 2008a), the Mini Mental Status Examination (Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975), the British Abilities Scales II (Elliot, 1996) and the Working Memory Test Battery for Children (Pickering & Gathercole, 2001). In addition, compared to forward recall, backward recall better predicts mild cognitive impairment (Muangpaisan, Intalapaporn, & Assantachai, 2010), age-related cognitive decline (Bopp & Verhaeghen, 2005) and academic learning (see e.g., Bull, Espy, & Wiebe, 2008; Gathercole,

Pickering, Knight, & Stegmann, 2004). Because backward recall is a valuable tool for a variety of domains, better understanding processes it calls upon would have a broad impact.

The latter aim is challenging because benchmark memory phenomena—well-established in forward recall—are not systematically reproduced with backward recall (see, e.g., Baker, Tehan, & Tehan, 2012; Beaudry, et al., 2018; Bireta et al., 2010; Guérard, Saint-Aubin, Burns, & Chamberland, 2012; Hulme et al., 1997; Li & Lewandowsky, 1993; Ritchie, Tolan, Tehan, Goh, Guérard, & Saint-Aubin, 2015; Rosen & Engle, 1997; Surprenant, Brown, Jalbert, Neath, Bireta, & Tehan, 2011; Tehan & Mills, 2007; Walker & Hulme, 1999). In order to account for these inconsistencies, a visuospatial hypothesis has been suggested (Hermelin & O'Connor, 1973; Li & Lewandowsky, 1993, 1995; O'Connor & Hermelin, 1973; St Clair-Thompson & Allen, 2013). The current study was designed to provide a comprehensive investigation of said visuospatial interpretation.

The visuospatial hypothesis can be described as a dual-process view of immediate serial recall, where forward and backward recall are thought to call upon qualitatively distinct retrieval processes (Li & Lewandowsky, 1993, 1995; Reynolds, 1997; St Clair-Thompson & Allen, 2013). For instance, using factor analyses, Reynolds (1997) found that the forward and backward digit spans of Weschler's intelligence tests loaded on distinct factors (but see, Colom, Abad, Rebello & Shih, 2005). Reynolds concluded that contrary to forward recall, "backward recall may also invoke, for many individuals, visuospatial imaging processes even for ostensibly verbal materials such as letters" (p.39). In line with those individual differences results, Hoshi et al. (2000) reported neuroimaging evidence of the implication of visuospatial codes in backward digit span. Using an optical tomographic imaging system, they found stronger activation in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, associated to visuospatial imagery, in backward than in forward digit span. Hoshi et al. concluded that visuospatial imagery is an efficient strategy for backward digit span

1
2
3 but not for forward span (see also, Gerton et al., 2004). A similar conclusion was reached in
4
5 previous studies with brain damaged populations (e.g. Hanley, Young, & Pearson, 1991; Vallar
6
7 & Papagno, 1986). For instance, Rudel and Denckla (1974) found that forward digit span was
8
9 significantly lower for patients with damages to the left hemisphere compared to a control group,
10
11 while backward digit span was significantly lower for patients with brain injury to the right
12
13 hemisphere, associated to the visuospatial code, than for the control group.
14
15

16
17 Using an experimental approach in which recall direction was only indicated at recall, Li
18
19 and Lewandowsky (1995) reported that backward, but not forward recall, was impaired by
20
21 presenting the to-be-remembered items at various spatial locations on the screen. Although fitting
22
23 well with the visuospatial hypothesis, this finding is surprising in light of results about binding of
24
25 verbal and visuospatial information. For instance, Guérard, Tremblay, and Saint-Aubin (2009)
26
27 sequentially presented phonologically similar and dissimilar letters at different locations on a
28
29 computer monitor. Participants either recalled the letters in their order of presentation or the
30
31 spatial locations at which the letters had appeared. Results showed a detrimental effect of
32
33 phonological similarity on recall of locations suggesting binding of visuospatial and verbal
34
35 information in forward recall, even when it is detrimental to performance.
36
37
38
39

40 In another experiment, Li and Lewandowsky (1995) manipulated visual similarity by
41
42 contrasting lists of visually similar letters (e.g., O and Q) with lists of visually distinct letters
43
44 (e.g., X and B). Results revealed a *beneficial* effect of visual similarity, in backward, but not in
45
46 forward recall; the latter results with visual similarity are intriguing. In effect, robust and reliable
47
48 detrimental effects of visual similarity have subsequently been reported in forward recall of
49
50 words (e.g., *fly, cry, dry* vs. *guy, sigh, lie*; Logie, Della Sala, Wynn, & Baddeley, 2000; Logie,
51
52 Saito, Morita, Varma, & Norris, 2016; Saito, Logie, Morita, & Law, 2008) and of easily
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

VISUOSPATIAL HYPOTHESIS

6

1
2
3 nameable line drawings or abstract matrix patterns (Poirier, Saint-Aubin, Musselwhite,
4
5 Mohanadas, & Mahammed, 2007).

6
7
8 St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013) also tested the visuospatial hypothesis with a dual
9
10 task procedure allowing them to selectively impair encoding or retrieval processes. More
11
12 specifically, participants heard sequences of digits for an immediate forward or backward digit
13
14 recall task and had to respond verbally. In all their experiments, recall direction and interference
15
16 conditions were blocked and pre-cued. In addition, they introduced, either at encoding or
17
18 retrieval, the n-back task or Dynamic Visual Noise (DVN), an array of squares that randomly
19
20 switch between black and white and are known to interfere with visuospatial processing (Chubala
21
22 et al., 2018). In the n-back task, black circles randomly appeared one at a time on the screen.
23
24 Each circle could appear at one of nine possible locations. Participants were asked to indicate the
25
26 location currently occupied by the circle (0-back) or the position occupied by the circle two trials
27
28 before (2-back). During the digit memory task, the n-back task was performed at encoding or at
29
30 recall. At encoding, the n-back task had the same detrimental effect for both recall directions.
31
32 However, at retrieval, the n-back task had a greater impact on backward than forward recall. This
33
34 pattern of results was interpreted in favor of the visuospatial hypothesis. However, the n-back
35
36 task is a complex task calling upon multiple processes, including executive processes (see, e.g.,
37
38 Chatham, Herd, Brant, Hazy, Miyake, O'Reilly, & Friedman, 2011). In other words, even if the
39
40 n-back task required memory for spatial locations, it is impossible to know if its detrimental
41
42 effect was due to the spatial, the executive control, or any other components of the task.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 It could be argued that the experiments in which DVN was introduced overcame the
50
51 limitations observed with the n-back task. In support for this view, results with DVN were similar
52
53 to those with the n-back task: DVN hindered backward, but not forward performance when it was
54
55 introduced at recall. Although fitting well with the visuospatial hypothesis, these results must be
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interpreted with caution. In effect, in two experiments, the list length was not the same in the
4
5 forward and backward recall conditions. This situation is not optimum because previous studies
6
7 have shown that the magnitude of some memory effects, such as the phonological similarity
8
9 effect, was modulated by list length (e.g., Salamé & Baddeley, 1986). Furthermore, when list
10
11 length was equated, performance was at ceiling in the forward recall condition. Therefore, it is
12
13 impossible to know if the observed interaction reflects a real selective influence of DVN on
14
15 backward recall or simply a ceiling effect in forward recall.
16
17
18

19 In the present experiments, we tested the role of visuospatial representations in backward
20
21 recall by using a dual-task procedure. Manual spatial tapping was used to interfere with spatial
22
23 representations because its detrimental effect on spatial representations is well established. In
24
25 effect, manual spatial tapping has been found to interfere with visuo-spatial and verbal forward
26
27 recall, although the effect was larger with visuo-spatial materials (Guérard & Tremblay, 2008;
28
29 Guitard & Saint-Aubin, 2015; Jones, Farrand, Stuart, & Morris, 1995; Meiser & Klauer, 1999;
30
31 Poirier, Yearsley, Saint-Aubin, Fortin, Gallant, & Guitard, 2019). In Experiment 1, participants
32
33 memorized lists of seven words for an immediate serial recall task. Recall direction varied
34
35 randomly from trial to trial and was only indicated at retrieval. The direction of recall was
36
37 specified just before retrieval to reduce the possibility that encoding would be different in each
38
39 recall condition. Tapping was required at encoding or recall. In Experiment 2, words were
40
41 replaced by digits, known for their intrinsic visuospatial representation (see Spatial-Numerical
42
43 Association of Response Codes (SNARC) effect; Dehaene, Bossini, & Giraux, 1993). In
44
45 Experiment 3, DVN was used as the distractor and in Experiment 4 articulatory suppression was
46
47 added to tapping. In Experiment 5, recall direction was blocked and known in advance to mimic
48
49 the conditions used in psychometric tests. The inclusion of this condition allows testing whether
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

specific encoding processes would be called upon when expecting backward recall and whether they would modulate retrieval processes.

Experiment 1

In Experiment 1, we tested the visuospatial hypothesis by combining immediate serial recall of words and manual spatial tapping as a secondary task. Manual spatial tapping was required at encoding or at recall. According to previous findings and to the visuospatial hypothesis, a larger detrimental effect of tapping should be observed in backward than in forward recall, when it is performed during the recall stage (St Clair-Thompson & Allen, 2013).

Method

Participants. Forty undergraduate students (33 women and 7 men) from Université de Moncton volunteered to participate for course credits. All participants reported normal or corrected to normal vision and were French speakers.

Materials. The stimuli were monosyllabic French words with a mean frequency count of 141.66 occurrences per million (Min = 0, Max = 8795) according to Lexique (New, Pallier, Brysbaert, & Farrand, 2004). The 392 words were randomly assigned to 56 lists, each with seven words, with the constraints that a word could only be used in one list and no words within a list could rhyme. All words were presented in black, lowercase, 28 point Arial font, at the center of the computer screen. For the spatial-manual interference task, using their non-dominant hand, participants were required to press the 11 outside keys of the numeric keypad one at a time counter clockwise at a rate of two taps per second (see, Jones et al., 1995). The experiment was controlled with E-Prime 2.0 with a resolution of 800 X 600 pixels and the stimuli were presented on a 47.72 cm (18 inches) screen.

Design. A 2 x 2 x 2 x 7 mixed-design was implemented with the locus of the interference (presentation, recall) as the between-participants factor and recall direction (forward, backward),

1
2
3 interference (none, manual spatial tapping) and serial position (1-7), as the repeated-measures
4
5 factors. Conditions and lists were randomized for each participant. In addition, words within each
6
7 list were presented in a different random order for each participant.
8
9

10 Each participant underwent one block of 56 experimental trials preceded by 4 practice
11
12 trials. There were 14 experimental trials and one practice trial for each of the four possible
13
14 conditions (forward control, forward manual spatial tapping, backward control, backward manual
15
16 spatial tapping). As mentioned above, the order of the four practice trials and the 56 experimental
17
18 trials were randomized for each participant.
19
20

21 **Procedure.** All participants were tested individually in one experimental session lasting
22
23 approximately 30 minutes. The participant sat at approximately 60 cm from the screen; the
24
25 experimenter was present throughout the session to ensure compliance with the instructions. The
26
27 numeric keypad was placed in the centre of the table space just in front of the participants.
28
29 Participants in the interference at encoding condition, first saw the instructions for the
30
31 interference task during 1500 ms. The word “frappe” (tapping) in blue signalled the requirement
32
33 of pressing the keys of the numeric keyboard during the presentation and the word “fixe” (stay
34
35 still) in blue required participants to stay still during the presentation of the words. Immediately
36
37 after, the seven to-be-remembered words were presented at a rate of one word per second (1000
38
39 ms on, 0 ms off) on the center of the screen. After the presentation of the last word, all words
40
41 reappeared simultaneously in random order on three lines on the center of the screen and stay on
42
43 the screen for the recall phase. Recall direction was indicated in the upper part of the screen in
44
45 capital letters by the word “NORMAL” in blue (normal) for the forward recall condition or by
46
47 the word “INVERSE” in red (backward) for the backward recall condition just above the symbol
48
49 => or <= presented in black. For participants in the interference at recall condition, the procedure
50
51 was exactly as described above, except that instructions for the interference task were displayed
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 after the presentation of the last to-be-remembered word. Participants began tapping as soon as
4 the instructions were displayed and continued until recall was completed. In both interference
5 the instructions were displayed and continued until recall was completed. In both interference
6 the instructions were displayed and continued until recall was completed. In both interference
7 conditions, in the forward recall condition, participants were expected to recall the list of words
8 from the first to the last word that had been presented. In the backward recall condition,
9 participants were expected to recall the list from the last to the first presented word. Participants
10 were instructed to recall the items by saying them aloud and by saying “passe” (skip) whenever
11 they did not know the word at a given serial position. Participants were not allowed to backtrack
12 in order to modify a previous response. Responses were recorded with a digital recorder for later
13 codification. Participants initiated the next trial by pressing the left button of the mouse.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Results**

25 A strict serial recall criterion was used. With this criterion, words must be recalled in their
26 presentation position to be considered correct. For all analyses, the proportion of correct recall
27 was assessed as a function of serial position, recall direction (forward vs. backward), interference
28 (none vs. tapping) and the locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall). All analyses of
29 variance (ANOVAs) are reported in Appendix 1. In all experiments, the .05 level of significance
30 was adopted, and the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied when the sphericity criterion
31 was violated.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 As shown in Figure 1 and 2, participants were significantly better at recalling words in the
42 control than in the manual tapping condition. Most importantly, tapping produced a similar
43 modest memory decrement in both forward and backward recall conditions whether it occurred at
44 encoding or recall. The effect of tapping was slightly larger when performed at encoding than
45 recall. Reflecting those trends, the ANOVA reported in Appendix 1 revealed that recall accuracy
46 was significantly lower in the tapping ($M = .40$, $SD = .28$) than in the control condition ($M = .43$,
47 $SD = .29$). As usual, the main effect of serial position was significant as well as its interaction
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with recall direction. In addition, there was a significant interaction between serial position, recall
4 direction and the locus of interference. This interaction is not of particular theoretical interest and
5 will not be further discussed. None of the other interactions reached significance.
6
7

8
9
10 The non-significant interaction between recall direction and interference, and the non-
11 significant interaction between recall direction, interference and its locus are of particular
12 interest, $F = 1.27$, $p = .27$; $F < 1$, respectively. Given the theoretical importance of the three-way
13 interaction between recall direction, interference and its locus, we examined the size of the
14 tapping effect for both recall directions (forward vs. backward) and interference groups
15 (presentation vs. recall) by subtracting the proportion of correct recall in the interference
16 condition from the proportion of correct recall in the control condition. Contrary to the
17 predictions derived from the visuospatial hypothesis, when the interference occurred at encoding,
18 the effect of tapping was slightly larger in the forward ($M = .06$, $SD = .09$) than in the backward
19 recall ($M = .03$, $SD = .07$) condition. When interference occurred at recall, the effect of tapping
20 was similar in both recall directions (forward: $M = .02$, $SD = .08$; backward = $M = .02$, $SD = .07$).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Bayesian paired samples t-tests.** Because it is not possible to argue for a null effect with
36 null hypothesis testing (Jeffreys, 1961), and because the null effect of recall direction on the size
37 of the tapping effect is critical for evaluating the visuospatial hypothesis, we computed Bayesian
38 paired samples t -tests using JASP (Jasp Team, version 0.9.1.0). For all Bayesian paired samples
39 t -tests, the results were interpreted with the Bayes Factors (BF) approach (Jeffreys, 1961; Kass &
40 Raftery, 1995), which provides evidence in support of the null hypothesis (subscripted as 01) or
41 the alternative hypothesis (subscripted as 10). The Bayes Factors interpretation is based on the
42 benchmarks taken from Kass and Raftery (1995): $BF < 3$ indicates weak or anecdotal evidence; 3
43 $\leq BF < 20$ indicates positive evidence; $20 \leq BF < 150$ indicates strong evidence; and $BF > 150$
44 indicates very strong evidence. For all Bayesian paired samples t -tests, we set the Cauchy prior
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

width to JASP default value $r = 0.707$ (see Wagenmakers et al. 2018a; 2018b for examples, rationale and a comprehensive review of Bayesian analysis). Given that the visuospatial hypothesis is directional (backward detrimental effect > forward detrimental effect), we incorporated the order restriction (backward > forward) for all analyses unless otherwise mentioned. For simplicity, we interpreted the Bayes factor in function of the null model (backward detrimental effect is not greater than the forward detrimental effect).

Separate Bayesian t -tests we conducted for each group under the hypothesis that tapping effect should be larger in the backward than in the forward recall condition. Evidences in favor of the null hypothesis (backward tapping effect is not greater than the forward tapping effect) was positive when tapping was performed at presentation, $BF_{01} = 9.42$, or at recall $BF_{01} = 4.84$.

Discussion

Overall, recall accuracy was lower in the presence of manual tapping than in the control condition and this pattern was observed when tapping was performed at encoding or at recall. The effect of tapping replicates previous findings observed when tapping was required during presentation and a 10-second retention interval (Guitard & Saint-Aubin, 2015; Jones et al., 1995), or during presentation only (Guérard & Tremblay, 2008). Furthermore, at the descriptive level, the detrimental effect of tapping during encoding was superior than recall which extends previous findings of larger tapping effects during encoding than retention (see, e.g., Meiser & Klauer, 1999). The similar detrimental effect of tapping in forward and backward recall and particularly for the group performing tapping at recall is contrary to the pattern of results reported by St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013). In Experiment 2, we examined one possible cause for this discrepancy.

Experiment 2

1
2
3 St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013) used digits as the to-be-remembered items, while in
4
5 Experiment 1 we used words. Despite the fact that words and digits are both verbal items, it can
6
7 be argued that they do not involve visuospatial representations to the same extent as digits.
8
9 Compared to most words, digits benefit from intrinsic visuospatial representations as evidenced
10
11 by the SNARC effect (see, e.g., Dehaene, Bossini, & Giraux, 1993). In parity-judgment tasks,
12
13 response latency differences associated with the right and left hand are negatively correlated with
14
15 number magnitudes. Therefore, the greater involvement of visuospatial representations in
16
17 backward recall may only be observed with digits. We tested this hypothesis by using the same
18
19 design as in Experiment 1, but we replaced words by digits.
20
21
22

23 **Method**

24
25
26 **Participants.** Forty undergraduate students (34 women and 6 men) from Université de
27
28 Moncton volunteered to participate in exchange for course credits. All reported normal or
29
30 corrected to normal vision and were French speakers. None had participated in the previous
31
32 experiment.
33
34

35 **Materials and procedure.** The materials and procedure were the same as those used in
36
37 Experiment 1 except that lists were made by randomly selecting seven digits with the constraint
38
39 that a digit could only appear once within a list.
40
41

42 **Results**

43
44
45 As shown in Figure 1 and 3, results are virtually the same as those found in Experiment 1:
46
47 Recall was lower in the spatial manual tapping than in the control condition and the magnitude of
48
49 this effect was similar in forward and in backward recall. As shown in Appendix 1, the ANOVA
50
51 revealed that recall performance was significantly lower in the interference ($M = .51$ $SD = .32$)
52
53 than in the control condition ($M = .59$ $SD = .31$) and participants were better at recalling the digits
54
55 in the forward ($M = .61$ $SD = .31$) than the backward recall condition ($M = .49$ $SD = .32$).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, there was no significant interaction between recall direction and interference or
4
5 between recall direction, interference and the locus of the interference, both $F < 1$.
6

7 **Bayesian paired samples t-tests.** As in Experiment 1, under the assumption that the size
8
9 of the detrimental effect of spatial manual tapping should be larger in backward than in forward
10 recall, we computed Bayesian paired samples t -tests between recall direction for each
11
12 interference group (presentation or recall). As in Experiment 1, the size of the interference score
13
14 was obtained by subtracting the proportion of correct recall in the interference condition from the
15
16 proportion of correct recall in the control condition. Like in Experiment 1, evidences in favor of
17
18 the null hypothesis (backward tapping effect is not greater than the forward tapping effect), was
19
20 positive when tapping was performed at presentation, $BF_{01} = 3.08$, or at recall $BF_{01} = 3.71$.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Discussion**

27
28 Results of Experiment 2 revealed the typical detrimental effect of tapping on performance.
29
30 More importantly, as can be seen in the Appendix by comparing the size of the tapping effect in
31
32 Experiment 1 and 2, digits ($\eta_p^2 = .59$) were more disrupted by manual spatial tapping than words (
33
34 $\eta_p^2 = .28$). This difference fits nicely with the hypothesis that digits benefit from better
35
36 visuospatial representations than words, as previously shown with the SNARC effect (Dehaene et
37
38 al., 1993). However, even if digits were more sensitive to spatial manual tapping, the latter was
39
40 equally disruptive in backward than in forward recall. These results diverge from those of St
41
42 Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013) who have shown a larger detrimental effect of DVN on
43
44 backward than forward recall. The nature of the interference task may account for discrepancies
45
46 across studies.
47
48
49
50

51 **Experiment 3**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It has been suggested that spatial manual tapping interferes with motor actions such as
4 oculomotor movements used to support the retention of visuospatial information (see Tremblay,
5 Saint-Aubin, & Jalbert, 2006). However, in the context of backward recall, by interfering with
6 spatial representations, tapping may not be the best secondary task. Instead, the DVN procedure
7 developed by Quinn and McConnell (1996) and used by St Clair Thompson and Allen (2013)
8 may be more appropriate. Quinn and McConnell showed that DVN can interfere with the
9 encoding, maintenance, and retrieval of purely visual information in working memory. They
10 tested participants with the typical forward recall procedure. DVN interfered with performance
11 when participants recalled the word lists under elaborated visual mnemonic mediation
12 instructions. More precisely, participants first learned a list of 10 pegwords (“one is a bun, two is
13 a shoe”, etc.) and then generated an image for each item. They were then asked to create a visual
14 image for each word from the list as it was presented and to integrate it with the image of the
15 pegword. Recall was based on this integrated image. It should be noted that DVN had no effect
16 when participants were not using this exhaustive visual strategy and were simply rehearsing the
17 list. In line with those results, St Clair-Thompson and Allen used DVN in three experiments. As
18 predicted, a selective detrimental effect was observed in backward recall when DVN occurred at
19 recall. However, as mentioned above, in two experiments, list length varied as a function of recall
20 direction and in Experiment 5, when list length was equated, performance was at ceiling in
21 forward recall impeding the possibility of observing a DVN, or any other effect. In Experiment 3,
22 we introduced DVN as was used by St Clair-Thompson and Allen to further test the visuospatial
23 hypothesis. The design was the same as in Experiment 1 and 2, but we replaced spatial manual
24 tapping by DVN and used auditory presentation.

53 **Method**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Participants.** Forty undergraduate students (28 women and 12 men) from Université de
4
5 Moncton volunteered to participate in exchange for course credits. All reported normal or
6
7 corrected to normal vision and were French speakers. None had participated in the previous
8
9 experiments.

10
11
12 **Materials and procedure.** The materials and procedure were the same as those used in
13
14 Experiment 2, except for the following changes. The sequence of digits was presented aurally
15
16 through headphones instead of visually on the computer screen. The presentation of digit
17
18 sequences began 1000 ms after the instructions offset and digits were presented at a rate of one
19
20 digit per second. Audio files were generated using Google translate. We used the French
21
22 pronunciation of the digits. Audio recordings were created with SoundTap Streaming audio
23
24 Recorder 2.31 and sound files were edited with WavePad Sound Editor 5.96. Digits were not
25
26 represented at recall. Recall instructions were the same as those used in Experiment 2 except that
27
28 a 10 second time limit was added. The interference task was changed for DVN. DVN consisted
29
30 of a grid of 80 x 80 black and white cells (for a similar procedure, see Quinn & McConnell,
31
32 1996). At any given time, 50 % of the cells were white and 50 % were black. The DVN was
33
34 presented during 8,000 ms and the sequence of grid changes was the same for all participants.
35
36 Participants were instructed to look at the center of the computer screen throughout the
37
38 experiment and the grid changed every 1,000 ms.

39
40
41 Participants pressed the spacebar to initiate a trial. For the encoding interference group,
42
43 DVN or a white screen began immediately after the participant pressed the spacebar and ended
44
45 8,000 ms later as recall instructions appeared. Participants were given 10 sec to respond orally.
46
47 At the end of the recall period, a message was displayed on the screen indicating that the next
48
49 trial can be initiated by pressing the spacebar. For the recall interference group, the presentation
50
51 of DVN or a white screen with three question marks began 1000 ms after the presentation of the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 last to-remembered-item. Participants were instructed to begin recall only after seeing the
4
5 presentation of the question marks or the beginning of the DVN. Participants were also instructed
6
7 to look at the center of the computer screen throughout the experiment.
8
9

10 **Results**

11
12 As can be seen in Figure 1 and 4 and as confirmed by the ANOVA reported in Appendix
13
14 1, like Experiment 2, participants were better at recalling the digits in the forward ($M = .57$ $SD =$
15
16 $.31$) than the backward recall condition ($M = .46$ $SD = .28$), and the main effect of serial position
17
18 was significant. However, DVN did not hinder recall performance, did not interact with recall
19
20 direction or with the locus of interference.
21
22

23
24 **Bayesian paired samples t-tests.** As in the previous experiments, for each locus of the
25
26 interference task (encoding or recall), we computed Bayesian paired sample *t*-tests on the size of
27
28 the interference task effect with the assumption that the effect of the interference task (DVN in
29
30 this experiment) would be larger in backward than forward recall condition. Results revealed
31
32 anecdotal evidence in favor of the null hypothesis, $BF_{01} = 0.24$, when the interference occurred
33
34 during the presentation and positive evidence, $BF_{01} = 7.39$, when the interference occurred at recall.
35
36 It should be noted that the lack of evidence when DVN was introduced at encoding is due to a
37
38 reverse DVN effect with worse recall performance of control lists than of DVN lists (for a similar
39
40 trend see Experiment 3 of Chubala et al., 2018).
41
42
43

44 **Discussion**

45
46
47 Current results are in line with those of Quinn and McConnell (1996) who developed the
48
49 DVN procedure. They only found a detrimental effect of DVN when participants were forced to
50
51 use an elaborated visual strategy. Similar results were observed by St Clair-Thompson and Allen
52
53 (2013) who only found a DVN effect among the subset of participants using a visual strategy
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 while performing backward recall with DVN presented at recall. Before concluding that spatial
4 interference does not hinder backward more than forward recall, a further test is needed to rule
5 out a strategy-based hypothesis.
6
7
8

9 10 **Experiment 4**

11
12 In immediate memory tasks, participants may use alternative strategies to meet task
13 demands (see, e.g., Logie, 2018; Miles, Jones, & Madden, 1991; Watkins, LeCompte, & Kim,
14 2000). Perhaps variations in strategy could account for the findings reported herein. According to
15 this view, even if backward recall normally relies on visuospatial representations, participants
16 may have switched to verbal representations in the presence of manual tapping; such shifts in
17 strategy could have masked detrimental effects of tapping in backward recall. To address this
18 issue, we added an articulatory suppression requirement in all conditions. In other words, manual
19 spatial tapping was performed with concurrent articulatory suppression and was compared to a
20 control condition in which participants only performed articulatory suppression. Other than the
21 addition of articulatory suppression the design was the same as in Experiment 2.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Method**

36
37 **Participants.** Forty undergraduate students (27 women and 13 men) from Université de
38 Moncton volunteered to participate in exchange for course credits. All reported normal or
39 corrected to normal vision and were French speakers. None had participated in the previous
40 experiments.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 **Materials and procedure.** The method was the same as in Experiment 2 except that
48 articulatory suppression was required in addition to spatial manual tapping, and recall was
49 manual. More specifically, in all conditions, participants were required to repeat aloud the
50 alphabetic sequence (a, b, c, d, e, f, g) at a pace of two letters per second. For the group
51 experiencing spatial manual tapping at encoding, participants began repeating the letters as soon
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as the instruction “Parler” (to speak) appeared on the screen and continued until all to-be-
4 remembered digits reappeared on the screen for recall. Instructions were on the center of the
5 screen for 1500 ms, and the presentation of the first digit began immediately after. For tapping
6 trials, the instruction was “Parler + Frappe” (to speak + tapping). Manual spatial tapping was
7 performed with the non-dominant hand at the same time as articulatory suppression. The method
8 was the same when interference occurred at recall, except that participants executed the
9 interfering task during the recall period. Accordingly, at recall, the instructions reappeared
10 simultaneously with the digits to indicate the beginning of the interference task. Participants were
11 warned to continue tapping until the last to-be remembered item has been recalled. Recall in both
12 conditions was achieved by clicking on the items with the dominant hand.

26 **Results**

27
28 As can be seen in Figure 1 and 5 and as confirmed by the ANOVA in Appendix 1, recall
29 performance was better in the forward ($M = .58$ $SD = .32$) than in the backward recall ($M = .43$
30 $SD = .36$) conditions. Overall, recall performance was significantly lower in the interference
31 (articulatory suppression + spatial manual tapping) ($M = .45$ $SD = .33$) than in the control
32 (articulatory suppression) condition ($M = .56$ $SD = .36$). Furthermore, the addition of spatial
33 manual tapping had a larger detrimental effect at encoding ($M = .14$ $SD = .13$) than at recall ($M =$
34 $.07$ $SD = .13$). The interaction between the locus of the interference and recall direction was
35 significant. This interaction is simply to do with the better recall in the forward than in the
36 backward condition for the recall interference group; recall was similar in both recall directions
37 for the encoding interference group. There was also a significant interaction between the locus of
38 the interference and tapping. This interaction is due to a larger effect of tapping when it occurred
39 at encoding than when it occurred at recall. The interaction between recall direction, interference
40 and serial position also reached conventional level of significance. As previously observed in
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

backward recall studies, the latter interaction simply reflects the larger interference effect on early serial positions in forward recall and on later serial positions in backward recall (for a review, see, Ritchie et al., 2015). As in Experiment 1, there was a significant interaction between serial position, recall direction and the locus of the interference. Most importantly, there was no significant interaction between recall direction and interference or between recall direction, interference and the locus of the interference.

Bayesian paired samples t-tests. The null effect of tapping between recall directions for each interference loci was explored with Bayesian paired samples *t*-tests. Results revealed anecdotal evidence in favor of the null hypothesis (backward interference effect is not greater than forward interference effect), $BF_{01} = 1.35$, when interference occurred during presentation and positive evidence, $BF_{01} = 8.90$, when interference occurred during recall. Importantly, an inspection of the evidences in favor of the alternative hypothesis (backward interference effect is greater than forward interference effect) was inferior to the evidence in favor of the null hypothesis and anecdotal, $BF_{10} = 0.74$ ($1/BF_{01}$).

Discussion

As in Experiment 1 and 2, recall accuracy in forward and backward recall was lower in the spatial interference than control condition. Consistent with Experiment 1 and 2, the effect of spatial manual tapping was equally disruptive in backward and in forward recall. Because participants were required to perform articulatory suppression throughout the task, the similar effect of manual tapping in forward and backward recall cannot be attributed to a shift in strategies from a typical visual-spatial processing to a verbal processing in backward recall.

Experiment 5

1
2
3 Results of the current experiments are clear and straightforward: The same pattern of
4
5 results was always observed in forward and backward recall. These results contradict those of St
6
7 Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013), and of Li and Lewandowsky (1995), as well as the received
8
9 view in the field of intelligence testing (Reynolds, 1997). According to this view, forward and
10
11 backward recall call upon qualitatively distinct retrieval processes. More precisely, backward
12
13 recall would rely more heavily on visuospatial processes compared to forward recall. In order to
14
15 account for these discrepancies, it could be argued that foreknowledge of recall direction may
16
17 allow participants to encode items differently as suggested by studies showing that participants
18
19 use alternative strategies to meet task demands (see, e.g., Miles, Jones, & Madden, 1991;
20
21 Watkins, LeCompte, & Kim, 2000). Under this view, reminiscent of the transfer appropriate
22
23 processing hypothesis (see Morris, Bransford, & Franks, 1977), backward recall would only rely
24
25 on visuospatial processes when enough visual features have been encoded. This would be the
26
27 case in psychometric tests, as well as in the study by St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013), in
28
29 which recall direction was blocked and known in advance. In Experiment 5, we tested this idea
30
31 by telling participants at the beginning of each block what the direction of recall was going to be
32
33 for said block. A modified version of visual-spatial hypothesis, taking foreknowledge of recall
34
35 direction into account, would suggest that manual tapping is more disruptive in backward than in
36
37 forward recall when recall direction is known. This would occur because, foreknowledge leads to
38
39 more visuospatial encoding in backward recall relative to forward recall; it follows that tapping
40
41 should interfere more with backward than forward recall (see, e.g., Guitard & Saint-Aubin, 2015;
42
43 Meiser & Klauer, 1999; Poirier et al., 2019). To test this modified version of the visuospatial
44
45 hypothesis we used the same design as in Experiment 2, but recall direction was blocked and was
46
47 specified at the beginning of each block.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Method**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Participants.** Forty undergraduate students (31 women and 9 men) from Université de
4 Moncton volunteered to participate in exchange for course credits. All reported normal or
5 corrected to normal vision and were French speakers. None took part to the previous
6 experiments.

7
8 **Materials and procedure.** The method was the same as in Experiment 2, except that
9 recall direction varied across blocks. More specifically, recall direction was presented at the
10 beginning of each of the two blocks (forward, backward) and never varied within a block. This
11 procedure is analogous to intelligence tests in which participants separately complete forward and
12 backward digit spans. The order of the blocks was counterbalanced across participants. In
13 addition, items were not represented at recall.

24 **Results**

25
26 As can be seen in Figure 1 and 6 and as confirmed by the ANOVA in Appendix 1, recall
27 performance was better in the forward ($M = .66$ $SD = .32$) than in the backward recall ($M =$
28 $.56$ $SD = .29$) conditions. Overall, recall performance was lower in the spatial manual tapping
29 ($M = .66$ $SD = .30$) than in the control condition ($M = .56$ $SD = .31$). Furthermore, the addition of
30 spatial manual tapping had a larger detrimental effect at encoding ($M = .14$ $SD = .09$) than at
31 recall ($M = .05$ $SD = .06$). As in Experiment 4, the interaction between the locus of
32 the interference and tapping was significant. This interaction is due to a larger effect of tapping
33 when it occurred at encoding than when it occurred at recall. Most importantly, there was a
34 significant interaction between recall direction, interference and the locus of the interference.
35 This interaction is due to the similar detrimental effect of tapping in forward and backward recall
36 directions when it was performed at encoding, but to a restricted detrimental effect in the
37 backward recall direction when it was performed at recall.

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Bayesian paired samples t-tests.** The effect of tapping between recall directions for each
4
5 interference loci was explored with Bayesian paired samples *t*-tests. Results revealed positive
6
7 evidence in favour of the null hypothesis (backward interference effect is not greater than
8
9 forward interference effect), $BF_{01} = 6.81$, when interference occurred during presentation and
10
11 positive evidence, $BF_{10} = 7.18$, (backward interference effect is greater than forward interference
12
13 effect) when interference occurred during recall.
14
15

16 17 **Discussion**

18
19 Forward and backward recall were equally disrupted by manual tapping when it occurred
20
21 at encoding. This finding nicely replicated results of the previous experiments reported here.
22
23 Once more, current results contradict those of St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013) who did not
24
25 observe a disruptive effect on backward recall when interference occurred at encoding. However,
26
27 when tapping occurred at recall, its selective detrimental effect on backward recall nicely
28
29 reconciled results of the first four experiments without foreknowledge with those of St Clair-
30
31 Thompson and Allen and with the visuospatial hypothesis.
32
33

34 35 **General discussion**

36
37 The current study was aimed at investigating the visuospatial hypothesis as applied to
38
39 backward serial recall. According to this hypothesis, forward and backward recall call upon
40
41 qualitatively distinct retrieval processes (Li & Lewandowsky, 1993, 1995; Reynolds, 1997; St
42
43 Clair-Thompson & Allen, 2013). More specifically, backward recall is thought to rely more
44
45 heavily on visuospatial processes compared to forward recall. Consequently, a secondary task
46
47 known to interfere with visuospatial representations should hinder backward recall more than
48
49 forward recall. In five experiments, we tested this hypothesis by manipulating recall direction
50
51 (forward vs. backward), locus of interference (encoding vs. recall), the interference task itself
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (spatial manual tapping vs. DVN), the to-be-remembered items (words vs. digits) and the
4
5 foreknowledge of recall direction (post-cued vs. pre-cued).
6

7
8 Our results are clear and straightforward: Contrary to a strict interpretation of the
9
10 visuospatial hypothesis, when recall direction is post-cued, DVN had no effect on performance
11
12 and spatial manual tapping had the same detrimental effect on forward and backward recall. The
13
14 latter pattern of results was observed with words (Experiment 1) and digits (Experiment 2 and 4);
15
16 with oral (Experiment 1, 2) and manual responses (Experiment 4); when interference was
17
18 introduced at presentation (Experiment 1, 2, 4, and 5) or at recall (Experiment 1, 2, and 4), and
19
20 even when usage of an alternative phonological strategy was prevented (Experiment 4).
21
22 However, consistent with the predictions derived from the visuospatial hypothesis, in
23
24 Experiment 5, when recall direction was known prior to encoding the items, spatial manual
25
26 tapping performed at recall had a larger detrimental effect on backward recall than forward recall.
27
28 Taken together, current results provided partial support to the visuospatial hypothesis, while
29
30 highlighting the need for an additional assumption.
31
32
33
34

35 The large and reliable effect of spatial manual tapping on forward recall performance for
36
37 verbal items replicated previous results (Allen, Havelka, Falcon, Evans, & Darling, 2015;
38
39 Guérard & Tremblay, 2008; Guérard, Jalbert, Neath, Surprenant, & Bireta, 2009; Guitard &
40
41 Saint-Aubin, 2015; Jones et al., 1995, Kee, Bathurst, & Hellige, 1983; Keefe, 1985; Larsen &
42
43 Baddeley, 2003; Meiser & Klauer, 1999; Poirier et al., 2019; Thornton & Peters, 1982). In
44
45 addition, when recall direction was post-cued, the similar detrimental effect of manual tapping in
46
47 forward and backward recall extends previous results observed with a spatial memory task. Using
48
49 the Corsi blocks as the primary memory task, Higo, Minamoto, Ikeda, and Osaka (2014) reported
50
51 an equivalent detrimental effect of spatial manual tapping in both forward and backward recall
52
53
54
55
56 (see also, Vandierendonck, Kemps, Fastame, & Szmalec, 2004). Spatial manual tapping adds to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the list of factors which have been found to have a similar effect in forward and backward recall
4
5 for post-cued demonstrations, such as phonological similarity, word length, irrelevant speech,
6
7 lexicality, associative links, and imageability (Beaudry et al., 2018; Guérard & Saint-Aubin,
8
9 2012; Guérard et al., 2012; Saint-Aubin et al., 2014). Finally, the detrimental effect of spatial
10
11 manual tapping was of similar magnitude when it was performed at encoding or at recall in two
12
13 experiments (Experiment 1 and 2), and it was larger when performed at encoding than at recall in
14
15 two experiments (Experiment 4 and 5). This pattern of results is in line with previous forward
16
17 recall studies. For instance, Meiser and Klauer (1999) observed a detrimental effect at encoding,
18
19 but not during a retention interval. However, Allen et al. (2015) found a detrimental effect at both
20
21 recall and encoding.
22
23
24
25

26 In Experiment 3, the failure to find a DVN effect on memory performance for verbal
27
28 materials adds to the list of studies which failed to find the effect (see e.g., Avons & Sestieri,
29
30 2005; Andrade, Kemps, Werniers, May, & Szmalec, 2002; Chubala et al., 2018; Quinn &
31
32 McConnell, 2006; St Clair-Thompson and Allen, 2013). Our results fit well with those of Quinn
33
34 and McConnell (1996) who showed that DVN interferes with the encoding, maintenance, and
35
36 retrieval of verbal materials if, and only if, participants engaged in elaborated visual mnemonic
37
38 processing such as paring each to-remembered-item with an image. In line with those results, in
39
40 their fourth experiment, St Clair-Thompson and Allen only observed a DVN effect among a
41
42 subgroup of 11 participants who reported having used visual strategies. It is worth noting that in
43
44 itself, this result is contrary to the visuo-processing hypothesis as two thirds of the participants
45
46 were classified as not having used those strategies in backward recall. Although interesting,
47
48 results with the subgroup of 11 participants can be interpreted by calling upon a reverse causality.
49
50
51 Overall, DVN would have no effect. As any randomly distributed variable, some participants
52
53 would perform worse in the DVN than the control condition, while it would be the reverse for
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 others. When questioned about their strategies, participants who struggled more with the DVN in
4
5 backward recall, may have mentioned using a visual strategy as it was allowing them to make
6
7 sense of their performance.
8
9

10 In their fifth experiment, St Clair-Thompson and Allen (2013) found a significant
11
12 detrimental effect of DVN in backward recall with the whole sample and no effect in forward
13
14 recall. However, since performance was at ceiling in the forward recall condition, it is unclear if
15
16 the observed DVN effect was due to the involvement of visual processes in backward recall or if
17
18 it simply created some general distraction, which could not be observed in forward recall due to
19
20 the ceiling effect. When considering all evidences from the current and past studies, it can be
21
22 concluded that, unless participants are forced to use a visual strategy with verbal materials, the
23
24 effect of DVN on immediate serial recall is at best small and elusive.
25
26
27

28 Current results fit well with some of those reported by Li and Lewandowsky (1995). In
29
30 their first two experiments, after the presentation of each list item, participants performed one
31
32 trial of a mental rotation task adapted from Shepard and Metzler (1971). Results showed a large
33
34 detrimental effect in both forward and backward recall and the magnitude of the effect was the
35
36 same for both recall directions. This result is interesting because the mental rotation task is well
37
38 known to call upon visual-spatial processing (see, e.g., Gignac, Kovacs, & Reynolds, 2018).
39
40 Although Li and Lewandowsky offered an alternative interpretation, this finding can be seen as
41
42 contradicting the visuospatial hypothesis. Furthermore, these results are consistent with the
43
44 similar detrimental effect of spatial manual tapping when introduced at encoding for both pre-
45
46 and post-cued manipulations.
47
48
49
50

51 The main support for the visuospatial hypothesis was provided by the last three
52
53 experiments of Li and Lewandowsky (1995). In two experiments, they found that presenting the
54
55 to-be-remembered items at various locations on the screen instead of presenting them in the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 center of the screen interfered with backward but not forward recall. The lack of effect in forward
4
5 recall is surprising in light of results showing binding between verbal and spatial representations
6
7 in forward recall. For instance, Guérard et al. (2009) have shown a detrimental effect of
8
9 phonological similarity among the to-be-remembered letters presented at various locations on the
10
11 screen when participants were asked to recall the locations instead of the letters. Furthermore,
12
13 although fitting well with the visuospatial hypothesis, results of Li and Lewandowsky are hard to
14
15 reconcile with subsequent findings. For instance, Fischer-Baum and Benjamin (2014) used an
16
17 immediate serial recall task in which participants performed forward or backward recall. The to-
18
19 be-remembered letters were sequentially presented in a unique spatial position, with the order of
20
21 these spatial positions progressing from either left to right or right to left. In forward and
22
23 backward recall conditions, recall was superior when the sequence of letters was presented from
24
25 left to right (congruent with English reading) compared to the presentation from the right to the
26
27 left (incongruent with English reading). Most importantly, in line with current results, and
28
29 contrary to the Li and Lewandowsky results, the magnitude of the effect was similar for both
30
31 recall directions. In their last experiment, Li and Lewandowsky reported a beneficial effect of
32
33 visual similarity in backward, but not in forward recall. This finding diverges from later studies
34
35 that all showed a detrimental effect of visual similarity on forward recall of verbal materials (see,
36
37 e.g., Logie et al., 2000; 2006; Logie et al., 2016; Poirier et al., 2007; Saito et al., 2008). The
38
39 reason for these discrepancies is not fully understood, but they weakened the support for the
40
41 visual-spatial processing hypothesis.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Theoretical Implications**

50
51 Our study was designed to test the visuospatial hypothesis. According to this hypothesis,
52
53 backward recall relies in part on visual-spatial processes. For instance, participants would create a
54
55 mental image of the list, and at recall, would either scan it to produce the items or execute a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 variant of a mental rotation to produce the items in their requested order (Hermelin & O'Connor,
4
5 1973; Li & Lewandowsky, 1993, 1995; O'Connor & Hermelin, 1973; St Clair-Thompson &
6
7 Allen, 2013). According to the visuospatial hypothesis, manual tapping should have interfered
8
9 more with backward than forward recall independently of the foreknowledge of the recall
10
11 direction. Furthermore, according to St Clair-Thompson & Allen, the larger detrimental effect in
12
13 backward recall should only emerge when the interference task is introduced at recall. Consistent
14
15 with this hypothesis, whether recall direction was pre- or post-cued, when manual tapping was
16
17 performed at encoding, we observed a similar detrimental effect in forward and backward recall
18
19 conditions. Critically, in Experiment 5, when recall direction was post-cued and manual tapping
20
21 was performed at recall, a larger detrimental effect was observed in backward than in forward
22
23 recall. However, contrary to the predictions of the visuospatial hypothesis, when recall direction
24
25 was post-cued, the detrimental effect of spatial manual tapping was of similar magnitude in
26
27 forward and backward recall (see also, Fischer-Baum & Benjamin, 2014).
28
29
30
31
32

33 These results highlight the need to qualify the visuospatial hypothesis. Based on the
34
35 transfer-appropriate processing view, it could be argued that backward recall relies more on
36
37 visuospatial processes, if and only if, enough relevant features were encoded (see Morris et al.,
38
39 1977, for a similar view). As previously suggested, even for verbal materials, there may be both
40
41 phonological and visuospatial encoding (see, e.g., Doherty et al., 2018). When anticipating
42
43 forward recall, participants would rely more on phonological encoding and they would rely more
44
45 on visuospatial encoding when anticipating backward recall (for a related idea see, Miles et al.;
46
47 Watkins et al., 2000). When unsure about recall direction, participants would rely on an
48
49 intermediate level of phonological and visuospatial encoding. This would translate into a similar
50
51 detrimental effect of manual tapping—or any other visuospatial interfering task—if participants
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have no foreknowledge of recall direction and a much larger effect when they anticipate a
4
5 backward than a forward recall (see Logie, 2018).
6
7

8 **Conclusion**

9
10 The current study uncovers a complex, but coherent interaction between foreknowledge,
11
12 recall direction, visuospatial interference and its locus. These findings do not support a strict
13
14 version of the visuospatial hypothesis. However, a modified version in which retrieval processes
15
16 are dependent upon encoding provides an adequate account. Although more evidence is needed
17
18 to evaluate this modified version of the visuospatial hypothesis, the latter adequately accounts for
19
20 all available findings.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Open Practices Statement**

27
28 All the data and materials for the experiments reported here are available upon request by contacting
29
30 the corresponding author. None of the experiments was preregistered.
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

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Allen, R. J., Havelka, J., Falcon, T., Evans, S., & Darling, S. (2015). Modality specificity and
6 integration in working memory: Insights from visuospatial bootstrapping. *Journal of*
7
8 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *41*, 820–830.
9
10
11
12 Andrade, J., Kemps, E., Werniers, Y., May, J., & Szmalec, A. (2002). Insensitivity of visual
13 short term memory to irrelevant visual information. *The Quarterly Journal of*
14
15 *Experimental Psychology A: Human Experimental Psychology*, *55A*, 753-774.
16
17
18
19 Avons, S. E., & Sestieri, C. (2005). Dynamic visual noise: No interference with visual short-term
20 memory or the construction of visual images. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*,
21
22 *17*, 405-424.
23
24
25
26 Baker, R., Tehan, G., & Tehan, H. (2012). Word length and age influences on forward and
27 backward immediate serial recall. *Memory & Cognition*, *40*, 40-51.
28
29
30
31 Beaudry, O., Saint-Aubin, J., Guérard, K., & Pâquet, M. (2018). Are lexical factors immune to
32 response modality in backward recall? The effects of imageability and word frequency.
33
34 *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*.
35
36
37
38 Bireta, T. J., Fry, S. E., Jalbert, A., Neath, I., Surprenant, A. M., Tehan, G., & Tolan, G. A.
39
40 (2010). Backward recall and benchmark effects of working memory. *Memory &*
41
42 *Cognition*, *38*, 279-291.
43
44
45 Blankenship, A.B. (1938). Memory span: A review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*,
46
47 *35*, 1-25.
48
49
50 Bopp, K. L., & Verhaeghen, P. (2005). Aging and verbal memory span: A meta-analysis. *The*
51
52 *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *60*(5),
53
54 P223–P233.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bull, R., Espy, K. A., & Wiebe, S. A. (2008). Short-term memory, working memory, and
4
5 executive functioning in preschoolers: Longitudinal predictors of mathematical
6
7 achievement at age 7 years. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *33*, 205–228.
8
9
10 Chatham, C. H., Herd, S. A., Brant, A. M., Hazy, T. E., Miyake, A., O'Reilly, R., & Friedman,
11
12 N. P. (2011). From an executive network to executive control: A computational model of
13
14 the n-back task. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *23*, 3598–3619.
15
16
17 Colom, R., Abad, F. J., Rebello, I., & Shih, P. C. (2005). Memory span and general intelligence:
18
19 A latent variable approach. *Intelligence*, *33*, 623-624.
20
21
22 Dehaene, S., Bossini, S., & Giraux, P. (1993). The mental representation of parity and number
23
24 magnitude. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *122*, 371-396.
25
26
27 Doherty, J. M., Belletier, C., Rhodes, S., Jaroslawska, A., Barrouillet, P., Camos, V., ... Logie, R.
28
29 H. (2018). Dual-task costs in working memory: An adversarial collaboration. *Journal of*
30
31 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.
32
33
34 Donolato E., Giofrè D., & Mammarella I. C. (2017) Differences in Verbal and Visuospatial
35
36 Forward and Backward Order Recall: A Review of the Literature. *Front. Psychol.* 8:663.
37
38
39 Elliot, C. D. (1996). *British Ability Scales II*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson
40
41
42 Fischer-Baum, S., & Benjamin, A. S. (2014). Time, space, and memory for order. *Psychonomic*
43
44 *Bulletin & Review*, *21*, 1263–1271.
45
46
47 Folstein, M., Folstein, S.E., McHugh, P.R. (1975). “Mini-Mental State” a practical method for
48
49 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*,
50
51 *12*, 189-198.
52
53
54 Gathercole, S. E., Pickering, S. J., Knight, C., & Stegmann, Z. (2004). Working memory skills
55
56 and educational attainment: Evidence from national curriculum assessments at 7 and 14
57
58 years of age. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *18*(1), 1–16.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gerton, B. K., Brown, T. T., Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Kohn, P., Holt, J. L., Olsen, R. K., &
4
5 Berman, K. F. (2004). Shared and distinct neurophysiological components of the digits
6
7 forward and backward tasks as revealed by functional neuroimaging. *Neuropsychologia*,
8
9 *42*, 1781-1787.
- 11
12 Gignac, G. E., Kovacs, K., & Reynolds, M. R. (2018). Backward and forward serial recall across
13
14 modalities: An individual differences perspective. *Personality and Individual Differences*,
15
16 *121*, 147-151.
- 18
19 Guérard, K., Jalbert, A., Neath, I., Surprenant, A. M., & Bireta, T. J. (2009). Irrelevant tapping
20
21 and the acoustic confusion effect: The effect of spatial complexity. *Experimental*
22
23 *Psychology*, *56*, 367-374.
- 25
26 Guérard, K., & Tremblay, S. (2008). Revisiting evidence for modularity and functional
27
28 equivalence across verbal and spatial domains in memory. *Journal of Experimental*
29
30 *Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, *34*, 556-569.
- 32
33 Guérard, K., Tremblay, S., & Saint-Aubin, J. (2009). Similarity and binding in memory: Bound
34
35 to be detrimental. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *62*, 26-32.
- 37
38 Guérard, K. & Saint-Aubin, J. (2012). Assessing the effect of lexical variables in backward
39
40 recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, *38*,
41
42 142-152.
- 44
45 Guérard, K., Saint-Aubin, J., Burns, S. C., & Chamberland, C. (2012). Revisiting backward
46
47 recall and benchmark memory effects: A reply to Bireta et al. (2010). *Memory &*
48
49 *Cognition*, *40*, 388-407.
- 51
52 Guitard, D., & Saint-Aubin, J. (2015). A Replication of "Functional equivalence of verbal and
53
54 spatial information in serial short-term memory (1995; Experiments 2 and 3)". *The*
55
56 *Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *11*, 4-7.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hanley, J. R., Young, A. W., & Pearson, N. A. (1991). Impairment of the visuo-spatial sketch
4 pad. *The Quarterly Journal Of Experimental Psychology A: Human Experimental*
5 *Psychology*, *43A*, 101-125.
6
7
8
9
10 Henson, R. N. A. (1998). Short-term memory for serial order: The Start–End Model. *Cognitive*
11 *Psychology*, *36*, 73–137.
12
13
14 Hermelin, B., & O'Connor, N. (1973). Ordering in recognition memory after ambiguous initial or
15 recognition displays. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, *27*, 191.
16
17
18
19 Higo K, Minamoto T, Ikeda T and Osaka M (2014) Robust order representation is required for
20 backward recall in the Corsi blocks task. *Front. Psychol.* 5:1285. doi:
21 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01285
22
23
24
25
26 Hoshi, Y, Oda, I, Wada, Y, Ito, Y, Yamashita, Y, Oda, M, Ohta, K, Yamada, Y, & Tamura, M.
27 (2000). Visuospatial imagery is a fruitful strategy for the digit span backward task: a
28 study with near infrared optical tomography. *Cognitive Brain Research*, *9*, 339–342.
29
30
31
32
33 Hulme, C., Roodenrys, S., Schweickert, R., Brown, G. D. A., Martin, S., & Stuart, G. (1997).
34 Word-frequency effects on short-term memory tasks: Evidence for a redintegration
35 process in immediate serial recall. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
36 *Memory, and Cognition*, *23*, 1217–1232.
37
38
39
40
41
42 Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of probability (3rd edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
43
44
45 Jones, D., Farrand, P., Stuart, G., & Morris, N. (1995). *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
46 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition.* *21*, 1008-1018.
47
48
49 Kass, R., & Raftery, A. (1995). Bayes Factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*,
50 *90*, 773-795. doi:10.2307/2291091
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kee, D. W., Bathurst, K., & Hellige, J. B. (1983). Lateralized interference of repetitive finger
4 tapping: Influence of familial handedness, cognitive load and verbal production.

5
6
7 *Neuropsychologia*, 21, 617-624.

8
9
10 Keefe, K. (1985). Motor and cognitive interference effects on unimanual tapping rates. *Brain*
11 *and Cognition*, 4, 165-170.

12
13
14 Larsen, J. D., & Baddeley, A. (2003). Disruption of verbal stm by irrelevant speech,
15 articulatory suppression, and manual tapping: Do they have a common source? *The*
16 *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 56, 1249–1268.

17
18
19 Lewandowsky, S., & Farrell, S. (2008). Short-Term Memory : New Data and a Model.
20
21
22 *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 49, 1-48.

23
24
25 Li, S.-C., & Lewandowsky, S. (1993). Intralist distractors and recall direction: Constraints on
26
27
28 models of memory for serial order. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
29
30
31 *Memory, and Cognition*, 19, 895–908. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.19.4.895>

32
33 Li, S.-C., & Lewandowsky, S. (1995). Forward and Backward Recall: Different Retrieval
34
35
36 Processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology : Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 21,
37
38
39 837-847.

40 Logie, R. H. (2018). Human cognition: Common principles and individual variation. *Journal of*
41
42
43 *Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 7, 471-486.

44
45 Logie, R. H., Del Sala, S., Wynn, V., & Baddeley, A. D. (2000). Visual Similarity Effects in
46
47
48 Immediate Verbal Serial Recall. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*
49
50
51 *Section A*, 53, 626–646.

52 Logie, R. H., Saito, S., Morita, A., Varma, S., & Norris, D. (2016). Recalling visual serial order
53
54
55 for verbal sequences. *Memory & Cognition*, 44, 590–607.

56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Muangpaisan, W., Intalapaporn S., & Assantachai P. (2010). Digit span and verbal fluency tests
4
5 in patients with mild cognitive impairment and normal subjects in Thai-community.
6
7 *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*, 93, 224-230.
8
9
- 10 Meiser, T., & Klauer, K. C. (1999). Working memory and changing-state hypothesis. *Journal of*
11
12 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25, 1272-1299.
13
14
- 15 Miles, C., Jones, D. M., & Madden, C. A. (1991). Locus of the irrelevant speech effect in short
16
17 term memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
18
19 *Cognition*, 17, 578-584.
20
- 21 Morey, R. D. (2008). Confidence intervals from normalized data: A correction to Cousineau
22
23 (2005). *Tutorial in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 4, 61-64.
24
25
- 26 Morris, C. D., Bransford, J. D., & Franks, J. J. (1977). Levels of processing versus transfer
27
28 appropriate processing. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16, 519 –533.
29
- 30 New, B., Pallier, C., Brysbaert, M., & Ferrand, L. (2004). Lexique 2: A new French lexical
31
32 database. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers*, 36, 516-524.
33
34
- 35 Oberauer, K., Lewandowsky, S., Awh, E., Brown, G. D. A., Conway, A., Cowan, N.,... Ward, G.
36
37 (2018). Benchmarks for models of short term and working memory. *Psychological*
38
39 *Bulletin*, 144, 885–958.
40
41
- 42 O'Connor, N., & Hermelin, B. M. (1973). The spatial or temporal organization of short-term
43
44 memory. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 25, 335-343.
45
46
- 47 Page, M. A., & Norris, D. (1998). The primacy model: A new model of immediate serial recall.
48
49 *Psychological Review*, 105, 761-781.
50
- 51 Pickering, S. J., & Gathercole, S. E. (2001). *Working Memory Test Battery for Children*. London:
52
53 Psychological Corporation
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Poirier, M., Yearsley, J. M., Saint-Aubin, J., Fortin, C., Gallant, G., & Guitard, D. (2019).
4
5 Dissociating visuo-spatial and verbal working memory: It's all in the features. *Memory &*
6
7 *Cognition*, *47*, 603-618.
8
9
10 Poirier, M., Saint-Aubin, J., Musselwhite, K., Mohanadas, T., & Mahammed, G. (2007). Visual
11
12 similarity effects on short-term memory for order: The case of verbally labeled pictorial
13
14 stimuli. *Memory & Cognition*, *35*, 711–723.
15
16
17 Quinn, J. G., & McConnell, J. (1996). Irrelevant pictures in visual working memory. *The*
18
19 *Quarterly Journal Of Experimental Psychology A: Human Experimental Psychology*,
20
21 *49A*, 200-215.
22
23
24 Quinn, J. G., & McConnell, J. (2006). The interval for interference in conscious visual
25
26 imagery. *Memory*, *14*, 241–252.
27
28
29 Reynolds, C. R. (1997). Forward and backward memory span should not be combined for clinical
30
31 analysis. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, *12*, 29–40.
32
33
34 Ritchie, G., Tolan, G. A., Tehan, G., Goh, H. E., Guérard, K., & Saint-Aubin, J. (2015).
35
36 Phonological effects in forward and backward serial recall: Qualitative and quantitative
37
38 differences. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *69*, 95-103.
39
40
41 Rosen, V. M., & Engle, R. W. (1997). The role of working memory capacity in retrieval. *Journal*
42
43 *of Experimental Psychology: General*, *126*, 211-227.
44
45
46 Rudel, R. G., & Denckla, M. B. (1974). Relation of forward and backward digit repetition to
47
48 neurological impairment in children with learning disabilities. *Neuropsychologia*, *12*,
49
50 109-118.
51
52
53 Saint-Aubin, J., Guérard, K., Chamberland, C., & Malenfant, A. (2014). Delineating the
54
55 contribution of long-term associations to immediate recall. *Memory*, *22*, 360–373.
56
57 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2013.794242>
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 St Clair-Thompson, H. L., & Allen, R. J. (2013). Are forward and backward recall the same? A
4
5 dual-task study of digit recall. *Memory & Cognition*, *41*, 519-532.
6
7 Saito, S., Logie, R. H., Morita, A., & Law, A. (2008). Visual and phonological similarity effects
8
9 in verbal immediate serial recall: A test with kanji materials. *Journal of Memory and*
10
11 *Language*, *59*, 1–17.
12
13
14 Salamé, P., & Baddeley, A. (1989). Effects of background music on phonological short-term
15
16 memory. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, *41*, 107–122.
17
18
19 Shepard, R. N., & Metzler, J. (1971). Mental rotation of three-dimensional objects. *Science*, *171*,
20
21 701–703.
22
23
24 Tehan, G., & Tolan, G. A. (2007). Word length effects in long-term memory. *Journal of Memory*
25
26 *& Language*, *56*, 35–48.
27
28 Thornton, C. D., & Peters, M. (1982). Interference between concurrent speaking and sequential
29
30 finger tapping: Both hands show a performance decrement under both visual and non
31
32 visual guidance. *Neuropsychologia*, *20*, 163-169.
33
34
35 Vandierendonck, A., Kemps, E., Fastame, M. C., & Szmalec, A. (2004). Working memory
36
37 components of the Corsi blocks task. *British Journal of Psychology*, *95*, 57–79.
38
39
40 Wagenmakers, E.-J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., Love, J., ... Morey, R. D.
41
42 (2018a). Bayesian inference for psychology Part I: Theoretical advantages and practical
43
44 ramifications. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *25*, 35–57
45
46
47 Wagenmakers, E.-J., Love, J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., ... Morey, R. D.
48
49 (2018b). Bayesian inference for psychology Part II: Example applications with
50
51 JASP. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *25*, 58–76.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Walker, I., & Hulme, C. (1999). Concrete words are easier to recall than abstract words: Evidence
4
5 for a semantic contribution to short-term serial recall. *Journal of Experimental*
6
7 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25, 1256-1271.

8
9
10 Watkins, M. J., LeCompte, D. C., & Kim, K. (2000). Role of study strategy in recall of mixed
11
12 lists of common and rare words. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
13
14 *and Cognition*, 26, 239-245.

15
16
17 Wechsler, D. (2008a). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale—Fourth Edition*. San Antonio, TX:
18
19 Pearson.

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

Appendix

Results of Experiments 1 to 5

Table 1

Analyses of variance for the proportion of correct recall (strict recall criterion)

Source	Tapping (Exp.1 Post-cued)				Tapping (Exp.2 Post-cued)				DVN (Exp.3 Post-cued)			
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η_p^2	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
LI	1,38	0.36	.55	.01	1,38	2.45	.13	.06	1,38	2.22	.15	.06
RD	1,38	0.05	.83	.00	1,38	34.90	<.001	.48	1,38	34.90	<.001	.48
I	1,38	15.04	<.001	.28	1,38	54.17	<.001	.59	1,38	1.82	.19	.05
SP	*2.53,96.24	30.86	<.001	.45	*2.80,106.48	19.92	<.001	.34	*2.51,95.30	51.35	<.001	.56
LI x RD	1,38	0.71	.40	.02	1,38	0.26	.62	.01	1,38	1.20	.28	.03
LI x I	1,38	2.10	.16	.05	1,38	0.45	.51	.01	1,38	0.02	.90	.00
LI x SP	*2.53,96.24	0.26	.82	.01	*2.80,106.48	1.94	.13	.05	*2.51,95.30	0.77	.49	.02
RD x I	1,38	1.27	.27	.03	1,38	0.17	.68	.01	1,38	0.07	.79	.00
RD x SP	*4.22,160.21	98.28	<.001	.72	*3.02,114.59	90.62	<.001	.71	*1.87, 70.90	162.81	<.001	.81
I x SP	6,228	1.59	.17	.04	6,228	0.16	.98	.01	*4.40,167.30	0.90	.47	.02
LI x RD x I	1,38	0.79	.38	.02	1,38	0.02	.90	.00	1,38	3.41	.07	.08
LI x RD x SP	*4.22,160.21	2.91	.02	.07	*3.02,114.59	0.63	.60	.02	*1.87, 70.90	1.35	.26	.03
LI x I x SP	6,228	1.04	.40	.03	6,228	0.85	.52	.02	*4.40,167.30	0.75	.57	.02
RD x I x SP	6,228	0.41	.85	.01	6,228	1.13	.35	.03	6,228	0.67	.63	.02
LI x RD x I x SP	6,228	0.61	.71	.02	6,228	1.49	.20	.04	6,228	2.90	.02	.07
Source	AS + Tapping (Exp.4 Post-cued)				Tapping (Exp.5 Pre-cued)							
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η_p^2	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2				
LI	1,38	0.32	.58	.01	1,38	0.25	.62	.01				
RD	1,38	23.39	<.001	.38	1,38	15.54	<.001	.29				
I	1,38	47.56	<.001	.56	1,38	57.39	<.001	.60				
SP	*2.55,96.88	13.94	<.001	.27	*3.45,131.09	29.06	<.001	.43				
LI x RD	1,38	10.45	.003	.22	1,38	0.26	.61	.01				
LI x I	1,38	4.86	.03	.11	1,38	14.39	<.001	.28				
LI x SP	*2.55,96.88	1.52	.22	.04	*3.45,131.09	0.62	.62	.02				
RD x I	1,38	0.09	.77	.00	1,38	2.04	.16	.06				
RD x SP	*3.41,129.58	48.34	<.001	.56	*1.93,73.26	149.87	<.001	.80				
I x SP	5,190	0.58	.69	.02	*4.12,156.51	1.45	.22	.04				
LI x RD x I	1,38	3.09	.09	.08	1,38	5.90	.02	.13				
LI x RD x SP	*3.41,129.58	3.64	.01	.09	*1.93, 73.26	.87	.42	.02				
LI x I x SP	5,190	3.69	.01	.09	*4.12,156.51	.51	.73	.01				
RD x I x SP	*3.71,141.15	2.85	.03	.07	*3.59,136.39	1.19	.32	.03				
LI x RD x I x SP	*3.71,141.15	0.42	.78	.01	*3.59,136.39	1.84	.13	.05				

Note. Exp. = experiment; DVN = dynamic visual noise; AS = articulatory suppression; LI = locus of the interference task; RD = recall direction; I = interference task; SP = serial position; Post-Cued = recall direction was known after the presentation of the test items; Pre-Cued = recall direction was known before the presentation of the test items. Results in bold indicated that $p < .05$. * Mauchly's test of sphericity indicates that the assumption of sphericity is violated $p < .05$ and the Grenhouse-Geisser correction is applied.




Figure 1. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), and interference task (none vs. spatial manual tapping or Dynamic Visual Noise). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.




Figure 2. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 1 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), interference task (none vs. spatial manual tapping), and serial position (1-7). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.




Figure 3. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 2 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), interference task (none vs. spatial manual tapping), and serial position (1-7). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.




Figure 4. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 3 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), interference task (none vs. dynamic visual noise), and serial position (1-7). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.




Figure 5. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 4 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), interference task (articulatory suppression vs. articulatory suppression and tapping), and serial position (1-6). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.




Figure 6. Proportion of correct recall for Experiment 5 as a function of recall direction (forward vs. backward), locus of the interference (presentation vs. recall), interference task (none vs. spatial manual tapping), and serial position (1-7). Error bars represent 95% within-participant confidence intervals computed according to Morey's (2008) procedure.