



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Sonier, R-P., Poirier, M., Guitard, D. & Saint-Aubin, J. (2020). A round Bouba is easier to remember than a curved Kiki: Sound-symbolism can support associative memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 27(4), pp. 776-782. doi: 10.3758/s13423-020-01733-8

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/23959/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-020-01733-8>

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](#).

A round Bouba is easier to remember than a curved Kiki:

Sound-symbolism can support associative memory

René-Pierre Sonier

Université de Moncton

Marie Poirier

City, University of London

Dominic Guitard, and Jean Saint-Aubin

Université de Moncton

Author's Notes

This research was supported by a Discovery grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) to Jean Saint-Aubin. While working on this article, R.-P. Sonier was supported by a graduate scholarship from the New Brunswick Innovation Foundation and D. Guitard was supported by a graduate scholarship from NSERC.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jean Saint-Aubin, École de psychologie, Université de Moncton, Moncton, New Brunswick, E1A 3E9, Canada. Email: jean.saint-aubin@umoncton.ca.

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

2

Abstract

Past research has shown that prior knowledge can support our episodic memory for recently encountered associations. According to the model proposed by Cox and Criss (2018) and Cox and Shiffrin (2017), any features shared by associated items should facilitate encoding and retrieval. We implemented a strict test of this prediction by taking advantage of sound-symbolism associations; here, the latter refer to relationships between phonemes and object characteristics—relationships that participants readily find natural—even if they have never encountered the items before. For instance, the non-word ‘maluma’ is much more readily seen to refer to a random shape with rounded contours than to a shape that has sharp angles. In our study, 70 participants completed paired-associate memory tests after studying lists of three pairs, each composed of a random shape and a non-word. As predicted, there was better associative memory performance for sound-shape pairs that could rely on sound-symbolism links.

Keywords: Sound-symbolism, episodic memory, associative memory

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

3

A round Bouba is easier to remember than a curved Kiki:

Sound-symbolism can support associative memory

One of the defining features of episodic memory is that its content involves associating multiple elements, often including the who, what and where of an event. As such, the content of episodic memory involves both items (people, places, objects, feelings) and the associations between those items (e.g., Cox & Criss, 2017, 2018; Kahana, Howard, & Polyn, 2008; Murdock, 1982; Tulving, 1972). Associations matter; our capacity to explicitly relate objects and their meaning and to relate context and items (events / people) is at the heart of learning and memory (e.g., Anderson & Bower, 1973; Zacks & Tversky, 2001). Moreover, one of the signatures of normal cognitive aging is a loss in the capacity to create new associations between items—a phenomenon known as the age-related associative deficit (Naveh-Benjamin, 2000). Although most agree on the importance of associative memory, our understanding of the nature of associations and how they relate to item information is still very limited (Cox & Criss, 2017, 2018; Cox & Shiffrin, 2017). It follows that a better understanding of associative memory will support the development of memory theory and contribute to our understanding of important issues such as normal and abnormal cognitive aging.

In the laboratory, episodic memory for associations or associative memory, is often assessed by presenting pairs of stimuli. At test, pairs are presented for recognition or one pair member is presented, and participants attempt to produce or select the second pair member (cued recall). It has been established for some time that semantically related and frequently co-occurring items are more easily recalled than unrelated pairs (e.g., Doshier, 1984). However, Jones, Estes, and Marsh (2008) and Badham, Estes, and Maylor (2012) showed that novel word pairs can be recalled at the same level as semantically related pairs if they share an integrative relation. In an integrative relation, the first word of the pair specifies or classifies the second

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

4

word of the pair (e.g., monkey-foot or horse-doctor). Badham et al. (2012) also showed that integrative relations very significantly reduced the age-related deficit in associative memory. Moreover, there is evidence that integrative relations facilitate processing in an obligatory fashion, without strategic control, contrary to what has often been assumed for semantic relations (see Badham et al., 2012; Estes & Jones 2009). The findings of Jones et al. (2008) and Badham et al. (2012) suggest that prior knowledge can support associative memory in a variety of indirect, not-so-explicit ways.

This view is echoed within recent models of item and associative memory. Cox and Shiffrin (2017; Cox & Criss, 2017, 2018) proposed models of associative memory in which any features shared by pair members facilitate encoding and recall of the pair. They suggest that, when presented with a new pair of stimuli, associative features can only be formed once participants accumulate enough information on the individual items presented. In other words, associative features between the items of a pair would be derived from the individual features of the items and would serve as a form of compound cue. As is stated by Cox and Criss (2018) “Our dynamic account of associative encoding says that shared item features of any kind make it possible to encode more associative information in memory, leading to better recognition of intact pairs and better rejection of rearranged pairs” (p. 253). While this quote applies to recognition, the authors argued that similar mechanisms are involved in other types of tests, including cued recall (Cox, Hemmer, Aue, & Criss, 2018).

Here, we examined the impact of an unusual type of prior knowledge on associative memory, namely sound-symbolism. Studies of sound-symbolism have shown that some phonemes are inherently associated with specific features (Köhler, 1929; Ramachandran & Hubbard, 2001). For example, some phonemes such as /u/ as in *who* and /o/ as in *hope* are associated to roundness while other phonemes such as /k/ and /t/ are associated to sharpness

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

5

(Maurer, Pathman, & Mondloch, 2006; Nielsen & Rendall, 2011). Empirically, these sound-symbolism relationships are highly reliable; if participants are presented with an angular shape as well as a more rounded shape and asked which is a 'kiki' or a 'bouba', over 95% associate the shape with sharper edges with the non-word 'kiki' and the rounder shape with the non-word 'bouba' (Ramachandran & Hubbard, 2001).

In the work reported here, our goal was twofold. First, we wanted to verify if sound-symbolism could support associative memory. Second, we wanted to implement what can be thought of as a strict test of the view proposed by Cox and collaborators that any form of shared features should support item and associative memory (Cox & Criss, 2017, 2018; Cox & Shiffrin, 2017). In our experiment, a non-verbal item (random shape) and a verbal item (non-word) were combined to form an unfamiliar to-be-remembered pair; note that both the items and their associations are new. Moreover, neither the items nor their relationship can be supported by semantic knowledge of the type involved in semantic relatedness or integrative relations. We compared memory for associations relying on known sound-symbolism pairings with memory for associations that did not conform to these sound-symbolism links.

To the best of our knowledge, there has been a single attempt to investigate the impact of sound-symbolism relationships on associative memory. In their study, Preziosi and Coane (2017) asked participants to study the definition of non-words that were either sound symbolically congruent or incongruent with the non-word. Results revealed a beneficial effect of sound-symbolism. However, the definitions were generated by another group of participants. This raises the possibility that in addition to congruency between sound qualities of the non-words and their definition, some additional associations were present. In addition, since the normative group spontaneously generated these definitions, participants in the memory experiment may have produced the correct answer by guessing the definition. Preziosi and Coane addressed this issue

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

6

in a control experiment in which non-words and their definition were not participant-generated and the effect did not reach significance. Therefore, it remains to be seen if associative memory can benefit from sound-symbolism.

Method

Participants

Seventy participants ($M_{age} = 26.53$, $SD = 3.80$, 42 female, 28 male) were recruited from the online platform ProlificAC using the following inclusion criteria : (a) Native English speaker; (b) currently living in Canada, the United States or the United Kingdom; (c) Vision normal or corrected to normal; (d) no language disorder; (e) no cognitive impairment of any kind; (f) approval rating of at least 90% on prior submissions; and (g) age between 18 and 32. All participants were offered £1.50 for their participation. The complete procedure including consent, instructions and debriefing lasted approximately 10 minutes.

Materials

Non-word selection. Non-words were selected from Westbury, Holis, Sidhu, and Pexman's (2017) database. Westbury et al. began with 21,220 non-morphologically inflected English words, which were input into the LINGUA software in order to create 629,797 non-words using a Markov chaining process to connect sets of three characters. All trigrams created this way also appeared in real words and were proportionately represented according to their probability of occurring in real words. This process led to the production of non-words beginning like real words, marked for one level of stress and being syllabified. Westbury et al. then hand selected 12,556 non-words of 3 to 8 letters judged to have an unambiguous pronunciation and a plausible ending. Using text-to-speech software, they created audio files for all selected non-words and removed problematic files until 8000 remained. They then asked participants to make yes/no judgments on category membership for 20 categories. Of interest here, the stimuli were

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

7

1
2
3 judged on how well they fit in either the ‘sharp’ (i.e., spiky) or ‘round’ categories; it was hence
4
5 possible to compute the probability of assigning each non-word to the sharp and round categories.
6
7

8 For the current study, we used the following criteria for selecting non-words from
9
10 Westbury’s et al. (2017) database. First, the probability of being characterized as round was
11
12 subtracted from the probability of being selected as sharp. With this metric, words with the
13
14 highest positive scores were the sharpest, words with the highest negative scores were the
15
16 roundest, and words with the scores closest to zero were neutral. Second, in order to avoid over
17
18 representing some initial letters, a maximum of five non-words starting with the same letter were
19
20 allowed in a category (sharp, round, and neutral). Each category was first populated with the 5
21
22 most representative non-words starting with all 26 letters of the alphabet, except for the letter X
23
24 since only 3 non-words in the database start with the letter X; this generated a total of 128 non-
25
26 words per category. If more than five non-words started with the same letter and had the same
27
28 difference score, five of them were randomly selected from the tied items. In addition, when two
29
30 non-words in a category were too similar to each other, one of the non-words was randomly
31
32 deleted and replaced with the next most representative non-word. Two non-words were judged
33
34 too similar if they (1) were orthographic neighbors (shared all letters at the same positions but
35
36 one, i.e., moom and mool) or (2) if they were identical except one had an extra letter (i.e., mool
37
38 and mooll or camulo and campulo). Thirdly, all non-words with a difference score smaller than
39
40 .50 were removed from the sharp list, all non-words with a difference score larger than -.50 were
41
42 removed from the round list and all non-words with an absolute difference larger than .05 were
43
44 removed from the neutral list. At this stage, there were 72, 121 and 88 non-words in the sharp,
45
46 neutral and round categories respectively. Fourth, to further reduce the number of non-words in a
47
48 list, the least representative non-words in each category were removed; however, in order to keep
49
50 the number of non-words starting with different letters similar, the number of non-words starting
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

8

with each letter was calculated and only non-words starting with the most common letter were removed. Consequently, if five non-words started with the letters A and C and only three started with the letter O, non-words starting with the letters A and C were removed before removing a non-word starting with the letter O. This procedure was applied until only 66 non-words remained in each category (total=198; see Figure 1 for examples).

Shape stimuli. Shape stimuli were taken from Sidhu and Pexman (2017); there were 28 sharp, 28 round and 28 ambiguous shapes (total= 84; see Figure 1 for examples). Ambiguous shapes served as the neutral stimuli as they share both round and sharp characteristics. These shapes were created by drawing outlines, in black on a white background, with round edges for the round shapes, sharp edges for the sharp shapes and a combination of round and sharp edges for the ambiguous shapes. Anti-aliasing was used on all images to avoid jagged stair-like contour lines, without losing jagged edges for the sharp and neutral images. Shapes in all three categories were matched in terms of area, height and width. We standardized the image size to 300x300 pixels.

Procedure

The experiment was developed using the PsyToolkit (Stoet, 2010, 2017) and run online. Participants completed a paired-associate learning task comprising 12 trials. Each participant completed 6 congruent and 6 incongruent trials. Presentation order of the 12 trials was randomized independently for each participant. As shown in Figure 1, on each trial, three pairs of stimuli comprising a non-word and a shape were sequentially presented. With each trial comprising 3 pairs, each trial generated 3 observations for a total of 18 observations per participant per condition (6 trials/condition x 3 pairs). In the congruent condition, said three pairs included a sharp, round, and neutral pair, with each shape paired with an appropriate non-word. That is, the round shape was always paired with a round non-word, the sharp shape with a sharp

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

9

1
2
3 non-word and the neutral shape with a neutral non-word. In the incongruent condition, a given
4
5 shape can be associated with two types of non-word to produce an incongruent pair. For instance,
6
7 a round shape can be associated with a sharp or neutral nonword. To balance the design, over the
8
9 six incongruent trials, shapes were paired three times with one incongruent non-word type and
10
11 three times with the other type. Hence, for three trials, the round shape was paired with a sharp
12
13 non-word and on three trials, it was paired with a neutral non-word, etc.
14
15

16
17 For each trial and each participant, an appropriate group of three shapes and three non-
18
19 words were randomly selected without replacement, with the condition constraining how pairs
20
21 were constructed (congruently or not). This implies that each participant only saw a subset of the
22
23 possible shapes and non-words; each participant was presented with 36 shapes in total from the
24
25 possible pool of 84 and 36 non-words from the overall pool of 198. This ensured that any
26
27 observed effects were not due to stimuli-set effects.
28
29

30
31 Participants were instructed that, on each of the 12 trials, they would see three pairs
32
33 composed of one shape and one non-word. They were further informed that their task was to
34
35 memorize the non-word that was presented with each shape for a memory task in which the
36
37 shapes would appear one at a time in a random order along with the three presented non-words.
38
39 They were warned that their task would be to click on the appropriate non-word. As shown in
40
41 Figure 1, each trial began with the presentation of a fixation cross at the center of the screen for
42
43 500 ms, followed by the sequential presentation of the three pairs of shape/non-word stimuli.
44
45 Pairs were presented at a rate of 3 seconds per pair with an inter-stimulus interval of 500 ms. The
46
47 shape was always presented on the left side of the screen while the non-word was always on the
48
49 right side of the screen, both centered within their respective side. Recall began 500 ms after the
50
51 last pair of stimuli was presented. At recall, all three non-words were simultaneously presented in
52
53 a vertical list format and in a random order on the right side of the screen. Non-words presented
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

10

1
2
3 at recall were the same three non-words that appeared during the encoding phase. Each shape was
4
5 sequentially presented on the left side of the screen. The presentation order at recall was pseudo-
6
7 random with the constraint that the recall order could not be identical to the presentation order
8
9 and that the last presented shape could not be the first one to be recalled. Participants had to
10
11 select the appropriate non-word by clicking on it. Once an answer was selected, the next shape
12
13 was presented following a 100 ms delay. No feedback was provided about the accuracy of the
14
15 response.
16
17

Results

18
19 Mean proportion of correct responses were computed separately for each condition.
20
21 Results revealed significantly better performance in the congruent ($M = .78$, $SD = .16$) than in the
22
23 incongruent condition ($M = .68$, $SD = .22$), $t(69) = 3.86$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.461$.
24
25
26
27

28 We further investigated the contribution of sound-symbolism to associative memory by
29
30 testing an alternative interpretation. According to this alternative interpretation, the benefit
31
32 observed for the congruent pairs is not due to memory, but to a form of guessing whereby if
33
34 participants cannot remember a response, they tend to select the item that satisfies the sound-
35
36 symbolism relationship. In order to examine this possibility, we analyzed the errors in the
37
38 incongruent condition as this is the only condition where selecting a congruent shape can produce
39
40 an error. In this condition, a shape was always studied with one of the two incongruent non-word
41
42 types. For instance, a round shape could either be paired with a neutral or a sharp non-word, but
43
44 never with a round non-word. Consequently, two kinds of errors can be produced at the point of
45
46 test; recall that each shape is presented along with the sharp, round, and neutral non-word studied
47
48 in the trial. Two erroneous choices are hence possible; participants could select the congruent
49
50 non-word (the round one in our example) or the incorrect incongruent non-word. If the beneficial
51
52 effect of sound-symbolism observed in the congruent condition is not due to memory processes,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

11

1
2
3 but to a form of guessing, errors in the incongruent condition should show a similar bias. In other
4
5 words, when an error is made—presumably this is more likely when memory fails—the
6
7 congruent non-word should be selected more frequently than the incongruent non-word. Given
8
9 the presence of two alternatives, a probability of .50 of selecting the congruent response would
10
11 indicate no bias, a probability of 1 would indicate a perfect bias toward selecting the congruent
12
13 response and a probability of 0 would indicate a perfect bias toward selecting the other
14
15 incongruent response.
16
17

18
19 In total, in the incongruent condition, there were 406 errors representing 32.22% of
20
21 responses. The mean probability of selecting the congruent alternative was .502 (SD = .173).
22
23 After collapsing data across participants, the one-sample *t*-test revealed that this probability was
24
25 not significantly greater than the expected chance level of .50, $t(59) = 0.09$, $p = .93$, Cohen's $d =$
26
27 0.012. Given the theoretical importance of this null effect and the impossibility of arguing for the
28
29 null effect with null hypothesis testing, we further analyzed the data using a Bayesian one-sample
30
31 *t*-test analogue by means of the BayesFactor package (Morey & Rouder, 2018) in the R statistical
32
33 software (Version 3.6.1; R Core Team, 2019). We used the default priors provided in the
34
35 BayesFactor package. Results revealed a Bayes factor of 7.05 indicating positive evidence in
36
37 favor of the null hypothesis according to Raftery's (1995) labeling system.
38
39
40
41

42 Discussion

43
44 In this paper, we offer the first demonstration of the impact of sound-symbolism on episodic
45
46 memory for associations. Based on the work of Cox and Criss (2017, 2018) and Cox and Shiffrin
47
48 (2017), we expected that novel item pairs that conformed to known sound-symbolism pairings
49
50 would lead to better memory for associations when compared to pairs that did not.
51
52

53
54 Results confirmed this expectation; pairs of non-words and abstract shapes that were
55
56 congruent with known sound-symbolism associations were better recalled than incongruent pairs
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

12

of the same stimuli. This finding is important because the relations between the items were novel; moreover, contrary to other types of relations, the benefit provided by sound-symbolism is not likely to depend on explicit processing of meaning or shared features (Sidhu & Pexman, 2018). Consider the case of the integrative word pair advantage (Badham et al., 2012; Jones et al., 2008). Integrative word pairs can only facilitate associative memory if the meaning of each item is accessed and the semantics of the words allow meaningful integration. Even if the pair and the relations were never encountered before, the integration still relies on meaning and prior knowledge of integration rules (e.g., metal-flower is a 'compositional' relation; it implies that the flower is made of metal). The work presented herein extends these findings by showing memory facilitation for pairs that have no prior relations and are also entirely novel items (i.e., random shapes and non-words). Hence, our findings suggest that learning novel associations between unfamiliar items can benefit from forms of prior knowledge that do not rely on semantic integration or other forms of relatively elaborate semantic processing.

What is the nature of the knowledge embodied in sound-symbolic links? Although there is a wealth of research on the impact of sound-symbolism, much less is known about the mechanisms that give rise to these associations between the acoustic and articulatory properties of phonemes and other stimuli or properties. Sidhu and Pexman (2018) provided a review of the current thinking regarding potential causal mechanisms which include: (1) a co-occurrence view whereby phoneme features and related stimuli features co-occur in the world, (2) the proposal that phonemes and associated stimuli share some properties at the perceptual, conceptual, affective or linguistic level, (3) a hypothesis attributing the associations to structural properties of the brain, evolution, or language patterns. It seems possible that sound-symbolism and its impact on memory might be attributable to a special form of co-occurrence / associative learning. The latter would lead to obligatory, pre-awareness, but albeit weak links (see Heyman, Maerten,

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

13

1
2
3 Vankrunkelsven, Voorspoels, & Moors, 2019) between phonemes and certain properties of
4
5 objects which—like other forms of co-occurrence-based associations—can support encoding and
6
7 retrieval of new associations. However, this remains a speculative account; further research is
8
9 needed to elucidate the nature of the sound-symbolism links.
10

11
12 Overall our findings fit well with the proposals of Cox and Criss (2017, 2018) and Cox
13
14 and Shiffrin (2017), as they stipulated that any information shared by both items of a pair should
15
16 facilitate the encoding and retrieval of associative links. In this case, the links embedded within
17
18 sound-symbolism associations led to better recall performance in a cued-recall task where both
19
20 the items and their associations were novel. Although results fit well with the model of
21
22 associative memory put forward by Cox and colleagues, it can be argued that, because there were
23
24 no interfering tasks between encoding and retrieval, the paired-associate memory test used here
25
26 also called upon short-term memory. This possibility would fit nicely with Cowan's model
27
28 (2019) suggesting that short-term memory is formed from a subset of the elements in long-term
29
30 memory that are in a temporarily heightened state of activation. Under this view, properties of
31
32 associative memory should impact performance in a short-term memory task. Alternatively, it
33
34 can be argued that short-term memory is distinct from associative memory with a separate copy
35
36 of the information and different operating principles (e.g., Norris, 2017). In this case, if it is
37
38 assumed that short-term memory is unable to capitalize on sound-symbolism associations, we
39
40 would have underestimated the size of the sound-symbolism effect. This issue could be addressed
41
42 in further studies by using a delayed task.
43
44
45
46
47

48 49 **Conclusion**

50
51 We found that pairs of novel stimuli congruent with sound-symbolism principles were
52
53 better recalled than pairs of novel stimuli incongruent with the same principles. The major
54
55 finding of this study was to show the facilitative role of subtle associations between very different
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

14

1
2
3 types of stimuli—i.e., the acoustic and articulatory properties of phonemes and the visual
4
5 properties of random shapes. These associations are not considered to be the result of semantic
6
7 processing, nor are they reliant on meaning as is the case for integrative relations or semantic
8
9 relatedness – although they might be the results of a form of implicit learning based on co-
10
11 occurrence in the environment. Overall, our results extend the influence of sound-symbolism to
12
13 the domain of episodic memory and are congruent with the expectations derived from the work of
14
15 Cox and Criss (2018) and Cox and Shiffrin (2017) on associative memory.
16
17
18
19
20

21 *The data and materials are available at*

22 (https://osf.io/84sfu/?view_only=f8bb27530644455fbb088e337167c956) and the experiment was
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

not preregistered.

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

15

References

- 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
- Anderson, J. R., & Bower, G. H. (1973). *Human associative memory*. Washington DC: Winston.
- Badham, S. P., Estes, Z., & Maylor, E. A. (2012). Integrative and semantic relations equally alleviate age-related associative memory deficits. *Psychology and Aging, 27*, 141-152. doi: 10.1037/a0023924
- Cowan, N. (2019). Short-term memory based on activated long-term memory: A review in response to Norris (2017). *Psychological Bulletin, 145*(8), 822–847. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000199>
- Cox, G. E., & Criss, A. H. (2017). Parallel interactive retrieval of item and associative information from event memory. *Cognitive Psychology, 97*, 31–61. doi: 10.1016/j.cogpsych.2017.05.004
- Cox, G. E. & Criss, A. H. (2018). What's in an association? The relationship between similarity and episodic memory for associations. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, (pp. 250-255). Madison, MI: Cognitive Science Society.
- Cox, G. E., Hemmer, P., Aue, W. R., & Criss, A. H. (2018). Information and processes underlying semantic and episodic memory across tasks, items, and individuals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147*, 545–590. doi: 10.1037/xge0000407
- Cox, G. E., & Shiffrin, R. M. (2017). A dynamic approach to recognition memory. *Psychological Review, 124*, 795–860. doi: 10.1037/rev0000076
- Dosher, B. A. (1984). Discriminating preexperimental (semantic) from learned (episodic) associations: A speed-accuracy study. *Cognitive Psychology, 16*, 519–555. doi: 10.1016/0010-0285(84)90019-7

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

16

- 1
2
3 Estes, Z., & Jones, L. L. (2009). Integrative priming occurs rapidly and uncontrollably during
4
5 lexical processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *138*, 112–130.
6
7 doi:10.1037/a0014677
8
9
- 10 Heyman, T., Maerten, A. S., Vankrunkelsven, H., Voorspoels, W., & Moors, P. (2019). Sound-
11
12 Symbolism Effects in the Absence of Awareness: A Replication Study. *Psychological*
13
14 *Science*. Advance online publication. doi : 10.1177/0956797619875482
15
16
- 17 Jones, L. L., Estes, Z., & Marsh, R. L. (2008). An asymmetric effect of relational integration on
18
19 recognition memory. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *61*, 1169–1176.
20
21 doi:10.1080/17470210801994997
22
23
- 24 Kahana, M. J., Howard, M. W., and Polyn, S. M. (2008). Associative retrieval processes in
25
26 episodic memory. In H. L. Roediger (Ed.), *Cognitive psychology of memory. Vol. 2 of*
27
28 *Learning and memory: A comprehensive reference*, 4 vols. (J. Byrne, Editor). Oxford:
29
30 Elsevier.
31
32
- 33 Köhler, W. (1929). *Gestalt psychology*. New York, USA: Liveright
34
- 35 Maurer, D., Pathman, T., & Mondloch, C. J. (2006). The shape of boubas: Sound-shape
36
37 correspondences in toddlers and adults. *Developmental Science*, *9*, 316-322. doi:
38
39 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2006.00495.x
40
41
42
- 43 Morey, R. D. & Rouder, J. N. (2018). BayesFactor: Computation of Bayes Factors for Common
44
45 Designs. R package version 0.9.12-4.2. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BayesFactor)
46
47 [project.org/package=BayesFactor](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BayesFactor)
48
49
- 50 Murdock, B. B. (1982). A theory for the storage and retrieval of item and associative information.
51
52 *Psychological Review*, *89*, 609–626. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.89.6.609
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

17

- 1
2
3 Naveh-Benjamin, M. (2000). Adult age differences in memory performance: Tests of an
4
5 associative deficit hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
6
7 *and Cognition*, 26, 1170–1187. doi: 10.1037//0278-7393.26.5.1170
8
9
10 Nielsen, A., & Rendall, D. (2011). The sound of round: Evaluating the sound-symbolic role of
11
12 consonants in the classic Takete-Maluma phenomenon. *Canadian Journal of*
13
14 *Experimental Psychology*, 65, 115-124. doi: 10.1037/a0022268
15
16
17 Norris, D. (2017). Short-term memory and long-term memory are still different. *Psychological*
18
19 *Bulletin*, 143(9), 992–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000108>
20
21
22 Preziosi, M. A., & Coane, J. H. (2017). Remembering that big things sound big: Sound-
23
24 symbolism and associative memory. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 2.
25
26 doi:10.1186/s41235-016-0047-y
27
28
29 R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
30
31 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
32
33
34
35 Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research (With Discussion). In P. V.
36
37 Marsden (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology 1995* (pp. 111-196). Cambridge, MA:
38
39 Blackwell.
40
41
42 Ramachandran, V. S., & Hubbard, E. M. (2001). Synaesthesia – A window into perception,
43
44 thought and language. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 8, 3-34.
45
46
47 Sidhu, D. M., & Pexman, P. M. (2017). A prime example of the Maluma/Takete effect? Testing
48
49 for sound symbolic priming. *Cognitive Science*, 41, 1958-1987. doi: 10.1111/cogs.12438
50
51
52 Sidhu, D. M., & Pexman, P. M. (2018). Five mechanisms of sound symbolic association.
53
54 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25, 1619–1643. doi: 10.1177/0956797619875482
55
56
57
58
59
60

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY

18

- 1
2
3 Stoet, G. (2010). PsyToolkit - A software package for programming psychological experiments
4
5 using Linux. *Behavior Research Methods*, *42*, 1096-1104. doi: 10.3758/BRM.42.4.1096
6
7
8 Stoet, G. (2017). PsyToolkit: A novel web-based method for running online questionnaires and
9
10 reaction-time experiments. *Teaching of Psychology*, *44*, 24-31. doi:
11
12 10.1177/0098628316677643
13
14
15 Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and semantic memory. In E. Tulving & W. Donaldson (Eds.),
16
17 *Organization of memory* (pp. 381-403). New York: Academic Press.
18
19 Westbury, C., Hollis, G., Sidhu, D. M., & Pexman, P. M. (2018). Weighing up the evidence for
20
21 sound-symbolism: Distributional properties predict cue strength. *Journal of Memory and*
22
23 *Language*, *99*, 122-150. doi: 10.1016/j.jml.2017.09.006
24
25
26 Zacks, J., & Tversky, B. (2001). Event structure in perception and conception. *Psychological*
27
28 *Bulletin*, *127*, 3-21. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.3
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

SOUND-SYMBOLISM AND ASSOCIATIVE MEMORY




Figure 1. Illustration of two typical trials starting with a fixation cross, followed by item presentation and recall. A congruent trial is presented on the left side and an incongruent trial is presented on the right side.