This article was downloaded by: *[Universidad de Valencia]*
On: *20 May 2009*
Access details: *Access Details: [subscription number 779262408]*
Publisher *Psychology Press*
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t716100704

Does the brain regularize digits and letters to the same extent?

Manuel Perea [a]; Jon Andoni Duñabeitia [b]; Alexander Pollatsek [c]; Manuel Carreiras [d]
[a] Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain [b] Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain [c] University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA [d] Basque Research Center on Cognition, Brain and Language, Donostia, Spain

First Published on: 19 May 2009

To cite this Article Perea, Manuel, Andoni Duñabeitia, Jon, Pollatsek, Alexander and Carreiras, Manuel(2009)'Does the brain regularize digits and letters to the same extent?',The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology,
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/17470210902923374
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17470210902923374

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY
i*First*, 1–8

Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

Short article

Does the brain regularize digits and letters to the same extent?

Manuel Perea
Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain

Jon Andoni Duñabeitia
Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

Alexander Pollatsek
University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA

Manuel Carreiras
Basque Research Center on Cognition, Brain and Language, Donostia, Spain

The cognitive system does not just act as a mirror from the sensory input; instead, it tends to normalize this information. Given that letter processing seems to be much more specialized than digit processing in the cortex, we examined whether the regularization process occurs differently from digits to letters than from letters to digits: We employed a masked priming same/different experiment (e.g., *probe*, VESZED; *prime*, V35Z3D; and *target*, VESZED). When embedded in letter strings, digits that resemble letters (e.g., 3 and 5 in V35Z3D-VESZED) tend to be encoded in a letter-like manner, whereas when embedded in digit strings, letters that resemble digits (e.g., E and S in 9ES7E2 – 935732) tend not to be encoded in a digit-like manner.

Keywords: Word recognition; Priming; Letter processing.

Letters, words, and numbers are cultural inventions of our society, which have become an integral part of our daily cognitive operations. Even though our brain efficiently processes letters and digits in similar contexts (e.g., in the expression *April 24, 1905*), it does not seem to be the case that they are being processed in the same way. Recently, Dehaene, Cohen, Sigman, and

Correspondence should be addressed to Manuel Perea, Departamento de Metodología, Facultad de Psicología, Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 21, 46010-Valencia, Spain. E-mail: mperea@valencia.edu

The research reported in this article has been partially supported by Grants CONSOLIDER-INGENIO2010_CSD2008–00048, SEJ2006–09238/PSIC, and PSI2008–04069/PSIC from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and Grants 1R01HD057153–01 and HD26765 from the National Institute of Health. Jon Andoni Duñabeitia was the recipient of a postgraduate grant from the Basque Government. We thank Simon Liversedge, Richard Shillcock, and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

© 2009 The Experimental Psychology Society

http://www.psypress.com/qjep
DOI:10.1080/17470210902923374

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

Vinckier (2005) proposed a neuronal model according to which the brain decodes letters/words (but not digits) through a hierarchy of local *combination detectors* in the occipito-inferotemporal pathway. They tentatively proposed detectors for letter shapes in V4, abstract letters in V8 (i.e., irrespective of CaSe, size, and font), and for letter strings in the left fusiform gyrus. Indeed, a number of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies have shown that words and letter strings produce a larger activation in the left fusiform gyrus than do digit strings (Baker et al., 2007; James, James, Jobard, Wong, & Gauthier, 2005; Polk et al., 2002). In contrast, there is no unambiguous empirical evidence supporting greater activation in any particular area in the cortex for visually processing digits than for visually processing letters or words (Polk et al., 2002).[1] Furthermore, the letter/digit distinction is consistent with neuropsychological evidence (see Cohen & Dehaene, 1998, for evidence of pure alexia).

How does the brain normalize the information from the sensory input? Readers are constantly exposed to various font types and to handwriting, and hence they do have experience with the mapping of shapes (with varying ranges of physical similarity) onto a particular letter/digit representation. Indeed, readers compute a representation of visually presented stimuli that generalizes over physical differences (Bowers, 2000, for review). For instance, access to stored entries can be achieved somewhat independently of physical form, presumably on the basis of some top-down feedback that normalizes the visual input (see Jordan, Thomas, & Scott-Brown, 1999, for an effect of illusory letters in word identification). But the question we examine in the present experiment is how robust the letter and the digit processing systems are to distortion. We do so by employing a visual encryption code which has become relatively popular, in particular on the internet and in gaming: the so-called *leet* code. The term *leet* describes a form of symbolic writing used widely on the internet (retrieved October 10, 2008 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leet). The basic strategy is to use symbols that closely resemble the letters for which they stand (e.g., the digit 3 may look somewhat like the letter E, as in L0TT3RY, and this would foil most search engines for the purposes of filter evasions).

The leet code employs characters that can be easily read by any human reader (e.g., L0TT3RY). But is there a cost associated with reading the leet stimulus M4T3R14L as MATERIAL? This issue was recently examined in a series of experiments by Perea, Duñabeitia, and Carreiras (2008; see also Carreiras, Duñabeitia, & Perea, 2007) with readers with no prior knowledge of leet. They used a masked priming paradigm in a lexical decision task (i.e., "Is the target stimulus a word or not?"; see Forster, 1998, for a review) to investigate whether words with numbers activate their base words. The results were clear-cut: Response times to words preceded by a briefly presented (50 ms) masked leet prime (M4T3R14L-MATERIAL) were close to the response times to words preceded by an identity prime (MATERIAL-MATERIAL). Furthermore, the responses to target words preceded by a masked leet prime (M4T3R14L-MATERIAL) were substantially faster than the responses to target words preceded by appropriate control primes (e.g., the letter control prime was MOTURUOL-MATERIAL, and the digit control prime was M6T8R86L-MATERIAL). In a subsequent study, Duñabeitia, Perea, and Carreiras (in press) tested whether there is a reading cost associated with the replacement of letters with symbols or numbers that have form resemblance in an online sentence-reading experiment that included words with leet characters (e.g., YESTERDAY I SAW THE SECRE74RY WORKING VERY HARD). Participants' eye movements showed that when reading for comprehension, and when the manipulations are consciously perceived by the

[1] Although the inferior parietal cortex plays a key role in the sense of quantity (see Piazza, Izard, Pinel, LeBihan, & Dehaene, 2004), this may have little to do with the early stages of digit form processing.

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

participants, the leet-to-letter normalization process involves some cost, especially when the nonletter is a number.

The presence of a leet priming effect for words strongly suggests that access to word forms can be achieved somewhat independently of physical form, probably on the basis of some top-down feedback that regularizes the visual input. As indicated by Dehaene and Cohen (2007) in the context of their neuronal model, "the letter detectors, which are thought of as the front end of invariant word recognition, tolerate some shape distortion, thus enabling the letter detector for 'A' to react to 'Δ' or '4'" (p. 456). Following this letter stage, "processing would continue at bigram, morpheme, and word levels with only a minor reduction in the amount of bottom-up information" (p. 456). Note that, in the Dehaene et al. model, this regularization process purportedly takes place at the level of domain-specific neurons involved in letter–word identification at the level of the left fusiform gyrus. Indeed, the findings from Perea et al. (2008) are consistent with a top-down feedback mechanism (see also Jordan et al., 1999). But would a similar leet priming effect occur for digit strings? Bear in mind that the letter-processing area in the cortex seems to activate a more restricted area than digit processing (see Polk et al., 2002.). If leet digits and letters share a sufficient set of features (see Grainger, Rey, & Dufau, 2008), the leet priming could be due to mere perceptual overlap and would thereby occur to the same degree in leet digit-to-letter regularization processes (e.g., V35Z3D–VESZED) and in leet letter-to-digit regularization processes (e.g., 9ES7E2 – 935732). This is precisely what Dehaene and Cohen (2007) suggested regarding leet priming: "Visual similarity alone can explain the results" (p. 456). In contrast, if letter perception is based on a higher degree of tolerance to shape variation than is number recognition, there would be greater leet priming for digit-to-letter regularizations than for letter-to-digit regularizations.

Thus, the question under scrutiny in the present paper is whether the same leet priming effect occurs going from digits to letters as from letters to digits. More specifically, does the leet string 9ES7E2 activate the digit string 935732 to the same extent that the leet string V35Z3D activates the letter string VESZED? We tested this by using a same–different task—a task that taps low level, prelexical processing and that (unlike lexical decision) can be used for digit strings. (Note that the manipulated leet characters are equally similar to their target characters when going from letters to digits and from digits to letters, thereby controlling for visual similarity; e.g., as in the strings V35Z3D–VESZED and 9ES7E2 – 935732.) Furthermore, the same–different task has a long history (Norris & Kinoshita, 2008, for a review). In the context of a masked priming paradigm, participants in the same–different task are required to press the "same" button if the probe and target are the "same" and to press the "different" button if the probe and target are "different" (see Norris & Kinoshita, 2008). Norris and Kinoshita adapted the task for masked priming by putting a masked prime before the target; they showed that when the probe and target were the same (e.g., probe, faith; target, FAITH), a related masked prime (e.g., fiath) produced an advantage in response time relative to a control prime (fouth). Furthermore, Norris and Kinoshita demonstrated that this effect was due to the activation of abstract (letter) representations. It is important to note that all priming effects in this task occur with "same" responses: The reason is that for "different" responses both the related and unrelated primes provide information that is different from the probe (Norris & Kinoshita, 2008).

The procedure in the present experiment was straightforward: On each trial, a *probe* (e.g., the letter string VESZED or the digit string 734238) was presented above a *forward mask* consisting of six hash marks (######) for 1,000 ms. The probe then disappeared, and the forward mask was replaced by a *prime* in lower case presented for 50 ms, which in turn was replaced by the *target* stimulus. A target string of letters (e.g., VESZED) was preceded by: (a) an identity prime (VESZED); (b) a leet prime (V35Z3D; with 3 leet characters); (c) a control letter prime (VYNZYD); or (d) a control digit

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

prime (V87Z8D). Given that part of the leet effect for letter strings might be due to feedback from the word level, none of the letter strings looked like real words (e.g., the letter string VESZED). Similarly, a target string of digits (e.g., 935732) was preceded by: (a) an identity prime (935732); (b) a leet prime (9ES7E2; with 3 leet characters); (c) a control letter prime (9UN7U2); or (d) a control digit prime (987782). The participants' task was to decide whether the probe and the target were the same or different. To minimize physical continuity between primes and targets, primes were presented in 11-pt font, and targets were presented in 12-pt font.

If the letter-detector system readily normalizes the signal from the leet prime, as deduced from the lexical decision experiments reported by Perea et al. (2008), then one would predict an advantage of the leet condition V35Z3D–VESZED over the control conditions VYNZYD–VESZED and V87Z8D–VESZED; in addition, the advantage of the identity condition (VESZED–VESZED) over the leet condition (V35Z3D–VESZED), if any, should be relatively small. But the key question here is whether the leet priming effect also occurs with digit strings. If the left fusiform gyrus tends to process letter-like stimuli, the characters in the leet primes (e.g., E in the sequence 9ES7E2) may not initially be processed as digits but as letters, and hence the resulting percept may not benefit as much from the visual similarity of the leet characters. If so, the advantage of the identity condition (935732–935732) over the leet condition (9ES7E2–935732) should be smaller than the analogous comparison with letter strings. Furthermore, the advantage of the leet condition (9ES7E2–935732) over the control digit condition (987782–935732) should be relatively small. That is, tolerance to letter variation may be higher than tolerance to number variation, and therefore greater digit-to-letter effects would be expected. Nonetheless, in a recent study, Tydgat and Grainger (2009) claimed—on the basis of a series of behavioural two-alternative forced-choice experiments—that "numbers are processed using the same mechanism as letter strings (in which case the term 'alphanumeric array' would be more appropriate)" (p. 494). If the Tydgat and Grainger hypothesis is correct, one would expect a similar leet priming effect for letters and for digits; indeed, from this perspective, one might expect even a greater effect going from letters to digits as there are only 10 digits to be discriminated among.

Method

Participants

A total of 28 students from the University of La Laguna took part in the experiment. All of them either had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were native speakers of Spanish. None of the participants had expertise in leet.

Materials

There were two sets of targets: (a) 200 orthographically legal six-letter pseudowords (e.g., VESZED, KEIREF, JESCER, CASKAG, DASPAB, CIADIZ, etc.), and (b) 200 six-digit numbers (e.g., 734238, 214717, 931837, 635632). (The number strings did not include the digit 0.) The pseudoword targets were presented in upper case and were preceded by primes that were: (a) the same as the target (*identity condition*, e.g., VESZED–VESZED; 935732–935732); (b) the same as the target except for a replacement of leet characters for the corresponding letters in the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th positions (*leet condition*, e.g., V35Z3D–VESZED, 9ES7E2–935732; as in the Perea et al. (2008) experiments, the leet characters were A = 4, E = 3, I = 1, and S = 5); (c) the same as the leet condition except that the leet characters were replaced with other letters, as in VYNZYD–VESZED or 9UN7U2–935732 (*letter control condition*); and (d) the same as the leet condition except that the leet characters were replaced with other digits (*digit control condition*; e.g., V87Z8D–VESZED or 987782–935732). On half of the trials, the probe and the target were the same, and on the other half of trials the probe and the targets were different (e.g., for the probe BESFEN, the primes could be the prime CIADIZ, C14D1Z, CYUDUZ or C87D8Z, and the target would be CIADIZ; for

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

the probe 236439, the primes could be 814616, 8IA6I6, 869666, 8UO6U6, and the target would be 814616). The probe and target were always either both pseudowords or both numbers. Four lists of materials were constructed so that each target appeared once in each list (25 items/condition), but each time in a different priming condition. Different groups of participants were used for each list.

Procedure

Participants were tested individually. The stimuli were presented using PCs running the DMDX software for Windows (Forster & Forster, 2003) on a CRT monitor with a 16.6-ms refresh rate. Reaction times were measured from target onset until the participant's response. On each trial, a 12-pt probe was presented above a forward mask consisting of six hash marks (######) for 1,000 ms. Next, the probe disappeared, and the forward mask was replaced by an 11-pt prime presented for 50 ms, which was replaced by a 12-pt target. The target stimulus remained on the screen until the response. Participants were told that they would see strings of letters or a string of digits and that they were to press the button marked "SÍ" [YES] (with their right index finger) if they thought the probe and target were the same stimulus, and they were to press the button marked "NO" (with their left index finger) if they thought the probe and target was a different stimulus. Participants were instructed to make this decision as quickly and as accurately as possible. Participants were not informed of the presence of prime stimuli. Each participant received a different, randomized order of trials. There were 20 practice trials. The experiment lasted less than 20 minutes.

Results

Incorrect responses (5.8% of the data) and reaction times less than 250 ms or greater than 1,500 ms (less than 0.5% of the data) were excluded from the latency analysis. The mean latencies for correct responses and error rates are presented in Table 1. Participant and item analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for the "same" response latencies and percentages of error were conducted based on a 2 (type of string: letter string, number string) × 4 (type of prime: identity, leet, control letter, control digit) × 4 (list: List 1, List 2, List 3, List 4). In all statistical analyses, the factor list was included as a dummy variable to extract the error variance due to counterbalancing (Pollatsek & Well, 1995).

On average, response times for "same" responses were 35 ms faster for letter strings than for number strings, $F_1(1, 24) = 31.81$, $MSE = 1{,}857$, $p < .001$; $F_2(1, 192) = 64.16$, $MSE = 3{,}344$, $p < .001$. The effect of prime type was also significant, $F_1(3, 72) = 88.32$, $MSE = 479$, $p < .001$; $F_2(3, 576) = 54.87$, $MSE = 2{,}760$, $p < .001$. More important, there was a significant interaction between the two factors, $F_1(3, 72) = 3.72$, $MSE = 860$, $p < .02$; $F_2(3, 576) = 4.80$, $MSE = 2{,}760$, $p < .003$, which reflected a different pattern of priming effects for letter strings and for number strings. On the one hand, for letter strings, responses in the identity condition were 23 ms faster than those in the leet

Table 1. *Mean response times and percentage of errors for targets in the experiment*

		Type of prime			
Responses	*String*	*Identity*	*Leet*	*Control digit*	*Control letter*
"Same"	Letter	506 (5.0)	529 (6.1)	560 (9.3)	569 (9.9)
	Digit	529 (4.7)	576 (6.6)	571 (6.9)	629 (7.0)
"Different"	Letter	552 (4.3)	564 (3.9)	543 (3.1)	543 (4.6)
	Digit	576 (6.6)	574 (5.4)	572 (5.1)	575 (5.3)

Note: Mean response times in ms; percentage of errors in parentheses.

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

condition, $F_1(1, 24) = 15.85$, $MSE = 458$, $p < .001$; $F_2(1, 96) = 9.51$, $MSE = 3{,}040$, $p < .003$. In addition, responses in the leet condition (V35Z3D–VESZED) were 31 ms faster than those in the digit control condition (V87Z8D–VESZED), $F_1(1, 24) = 15.05$, $MSE = 907$, $p < .003$; $F_2(1, 96) = 14.34$, $MSE = 3{,}270$, $p < .003$, and 40 ms faster than the responses in the letter control condition (VYNZYD–VESZED), $F_1(1, 24) = 72.93$, $MSE = 312$, $p < .003$; $F_2(1, 96) = 28.22$, $MSE = 2{,}716$, $p < .003$, while there was no significant difference between the two control conditions (both ps $> .20$). On the other hand, for digit strings, although responses in the identity condition were 47 ms faster than the responses in the leet condition, $F_1(1, 24) = 27.74$, $MSE = 686$, $p < .003$; $F_2(1, 96) = 29.98$, $MSE = 2{,}797$, $p < .003$, responses in the leet condition (9ES7E2–935732) were virtually the same as the responses in the control digit condition (987782–935732; 576 vs. 571 ms, respectively, both ps $> .25$). In addition, responses in the letter control condition were 58 ms slower than those in the digit control condition, $F_1(1, 24) = 27.42$, $MSE = 508$, $p < .003$; $F_2(1, 96) = 14.21$, $MSE = 2{,}755$, $p < .003$.

The error data only showed an effect of prime type, $F_1(3, 576) = 3.57$, $MSE = 86.4$, $p < .02$; $F_2(3, 72) = 4.63$, $MSE = 32.9$, $p < .01$, which reflected a higher accuracy for the identity condition than for the other three conditions (see Table 1).

Finally, as expected, there were no signs of a priming effect for "different" responses. The only significant effect on the latency data was that responses to letter strings were 24 ms faster than the responses to digit strings, $F_1(1, 24) = 12.38$, $MSE = 2{,}089$, $p < .02$; $F_2(1, 192) = 21.94$, $MSE = 5{,}004$, $p < .001$. The only significant effect in the error data was that participants made more errors to digit strings than to letter strings, $F_1(1, 24) = 10.0$, $MSE = 15.1$, $p < .005$; $F_2(1, 192) = 3.82$, $MSE = 141.2$, $p = .052$—note that there were no speed/accuracy trade-offs.

Discussion

The results of the present masked priming experiment are clear-cut. The way the cognitive system processes letters embedded in digit strings appears to be different from the way the cognitive system processes digits embedded in letter strings. When embedded in letter strings, leet characters (e.g., 3 and 5 in V35Z3D–VESZED) in the appropriate context tend to be encoded in a letter-like manner, whereas when embedded in digit strings, leet characters (e.g., E and S in 9ES7E2–935732) tend not to be encoded in a digit-like manner. First, the advantage of the identity condition over the leet condition was twice as big for the digit strings (47 ms) as for the letter strings (23 ms). (Note that the magnitude of masked priming effects, including that of the leet priming effect, seems to be greater in the same/different task than in the lexical decision task; see Norris & Kinoshita, 2008.) Perhaps what is even more diagnostic is that we found a robust leet priming effect (around 35 ms) for letter strings relative to both control conditions with other letters or digits, whereas there was virtually no leet priming effect (5 ms) for digit strings relative to its corresponding control digit condition (9ES7E2–935732 vs. 987782–935732). Finally, for letter strings, we found no difference between the two control conditions, whereas for digit strings, responses were much faster for the control digit condition (987782–935732) than for the control letter condition (9UN7U2–935732).

The take-home message is straightforward: The cognitive system readily normalizes leet digits (e.g., 3) to letters (E, as in SOCI3TY), but not leet letters (E) to digits (3, as in 9ES7E2). The cognitive system—presumably the left fusiform gyrus in terms of the neuronal model of Dehaene and colleagues—regularizes the shape of the leet characters embedded in words or pseudowords with little cost. This suggests the presence of a "visual analysis system" that acts as a complex filter between the visual and language domains (see Pammer et al., 2004) rather than an "alphanumeric array" (Tydgat & Grainger, 2009). This might imply some perceptual preference of the human visual system, whereby it tends to treat a string of letter-like symbols as a string of readable letters, rather than as a meaningless string of letters and digits. Such preference

might partially reflect a top-down, strategic regulation of bottom-up computations. Another possibility is that that letters appear in such varied forms (especially in handwriting) that the cognitive system allows much more variability than for digits, where there is little variation in their form (e.g., compare the shapes of a, **a**, *a* vs. 4, **4**, *4* in Times New Roman, Comic Sans, and Brush Script fonts, respectively). Finally, we must take into account that letter strings are different from the digit strings in that there is a more unitary code for them (i.e., the pronunciation of the pseudoword) and also some resonance with real words. In contrast, the digit strings are just random sequences of digits. What we should also note here is that the fact that letter strings in this experiment formed pronounceable Spanish pseudowords cannot be taken as direct evidence for a top-down advantage (e.g., because of a potential similarity of the pseudowords to real words) that might have contributed to the observed asymmetry. In order to quantify the similarity of the pseudowords to Spanish real words, two measures were computed. First, the number of orthographic neighbours (*N*) of these strings was obtained. The mean *N* value for the items was 0.03 ($\pm$0.17), and only three of the pseudowords had real words as neighbours ($N = 1$ in the three cases). Thus, this explanation does not seem suitable for accounting for the obtained asymmetry. Second, in a new attempt to explore this issue, we computed the orthographic Levenshtein distance 20 (OLD20; see Yarkoni, Balota, & Yap, 2008), which is a composite measure that also takes into account embedded words and other types of orthographic neighbouring representations. The mean OLD20 value for the pseudowords was 2.97 ($\pm$0.31; range: 2.0–3.8). We conducted correlation analyses between the OLD20 values and the reaction times in each condition, as well as between the OLD20 and the priming effects. None of the correlation coefficients between the OLD20 values and the reaction times were close to significant (identity: $r = .02$, $p = .85$; leet: $r = .14$, $p = .17$; control letter: $r = .05$, $p = .65$; control digit: $r = -.06$, $p = .53$). The correlations between OLD20 values and net priming effects were also nonsignificant (identity effect: $r = .02$, $p = .83$; leet effect: $r = -.13$, $p = .20$). Hence, the potential similarity of the letter strings to real words does not seem responsible for the observed priming asymmetry.

To summarize, the leet priming phenomenon suggests that access to stored entries in the brain can be achieved somewhat independently of physical form, presumably on the basis of some top-down feedback that regularizes the visual input. This is consistent with the model of visual-word recognition proposed by Dehaene et al. (Dehaene & Cohen, 2007; Dehaene et al., 2005), when they claim that feedback and lateral connections are numerous in the visual system and probably contribute to shaping the neurons. Importantly, this normalization process is particularly strong for letter strings, thus suggesting that the letter processing area in the brain is highly specialized.

Original manuscript received 26 October 2008
Accepted revision received 13 March 2009
First published online day month year

REFERENCES

Baker, C., Liu, J., Wald, L., Kwong, K., Benner, T., & Kanwisher, N. (2007). Visual word processing and experimental origins of functional selectivity in human extrastriate cortex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*, 9087–9092.

Bowers, J. S. (2000). In defense of abstractionist theories of word identification and repetition priming. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *7*, 83–99.

Carreiras, M., Duñabeitia, J. A., & Perea, M. (2007). READING WORDS, NUMB3R5 and $YMβOL$. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 454–455.

Cohen, L., & Dehaene, S. (1998). Number processing in pure alexia: The effect of hemispheric asymmetries and task demands. *Neurocase*, *1*, 121–137.

Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2007). Response to Carreiras et al: The role of visual similarity, feedforward, feedback and lateral pathways in reading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 456–457.

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009

Dehaene, S., Cohen, L., Sigman, M., & Vinckier, F. (2005). The neural code for written words: A proposal. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *9*, 335–341.

Duñabeitia, J. A., Perea, M., & Carreiras, M. (in press). Eye movements when reading words with $YMβOL$ and NUM83R5: There is a cost. *Visual Cognition*.

Forster, K. I. (1998). The pros and cons of masked priming. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *27*, 203–233.

Forster, K. I., & Forster, J. C. (2003). DMDX: A Windows display program with millisecond accuracy. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *35*, 116–124.

Grainger, J., Rey, A., & Dufau, S. (2008). Letter perception: From pixels to pandemonium. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *12*, 381–387.

James, K. H., James, T. W., Jobard, G., Wong, A. C.-N., & Gauthier, I. (2005). Letter processing in the visual system: Different patterns for single letters and strings. *Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Neuroscience*, *5*, 452–466.

Jordan, T. R., Thomas, S. M., & Scott-Brown, K. C. (1999). The illusory letters phenomenon: An illustration of graphemic restoration in visual word recognition. *Perception*, *28*, 1413–1416.

Norris, D., & Kinoshita, S. (2008). Perception as evidence accumulation and Bayesian inference: Insights from masked priming. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *137*, 434–455.

Pammer, K., Hansen, P. C., Kringelbach, M. L., Holliday, I. E., Barnes, G., Hillebrand, A., et al. (2004). Visual word recognition: The first half second. *NeuroImage*, *22*, 1819–1825.

Perea, M., Duñabeitia, J. A., & Carreiras, M. (2008). R34D1NG W0RD5 W1TH NUMB3R5. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *34*, 237–241.

Piazza, M., Izard, V., Pinel, P., LeBihan, D., & Dehaene, S. (2004). Tuning curves for approximate numerosity in the human parietal cortex. *Neuron*, *44*, 547–555.

Polk, T. A., Stallcup, M., Aguirre, G. K., Alsop, D. C., D'Esposito, M., Detre, J. A., et al. (2002). Neural specialization for letter recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *14*, 145–159.

Pollatsek, A., & Well, A. D. (1995). On the use of counterbalanced designs in cognitive research: A suggestion for a better and more powerful analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *21*, 785–794.

Tydgat, I., & Grainger, J. (2009). Serial position effects in the identification of letters, digits and symbols. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *35*, 480–498.

Yarkoni, T., Balota, D., & Yap, M. (2008). Moving beyond Coltheart's N: A new measure of orthographic similarity. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *15*, 971–979.

Downloaded By: [Universidad de Valencia] At: 16:20 20 May 2009