



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Speed-accuracy trade-off behavior: Response caution adjustment or mixing task strategies?

van Maanen, L.

Published in:
Proceedings of ICCM 2015

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Maanen, L. (2015). Speed-accuracy trade-off behavior: Response caution adjustment or mixing task strategies? In N. A. Taatgen, M. K. van Vugt, J. P. Borst, & K. Mehlhorn (Eds.), *Proceedings of ICCM 2015: 13th International Conference on Cognitive Modeling* : April 9-11, Groningen, The Netherlands (pp. 214-219). Groningen: University of Groningen.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Proceedings of
 ICCCM
 2015

13th International Conference on Cognitive Modeling

April 9-11, Groningen, The Netherlands

Edited by

Niels A. Taatgen
 Marieke K. van Vugt
 Jelmer P. Borst
 Katja Mehlhorn

Table of Contents

Introduction & Sponsors	vii
Committees	viii
Keynotes	ix
Talks: Connectionist Models - Thu April 9; 10.00-10.40h	
A Connectionist Semantic Network Modeling the Influence of Category Member Distance on Induction Strength	1
Michael Vinos, Efthymios Tsilionis, Athanassios Protopapas	
Explorations in Distributed Recurrent Biological Parsing	7
Terrence Stewart, Peter Blouw, Chris Eliasmith	
Talks: Model Formalization - Thu April 9; 11.10-12.30h	
Abstraction of analytical models from cognitive models of human control of robotic swarms	13
Katia Sycara, Christian Lebiere, Yulong Pei, Don Morrison, Yuqing Tang, Michael Lewis	
A Method for Building Models of Expert Cognition in Naturalistic Environments	19
Korey MacDougall, Matthew Martin, Nathan Nagy, Robert West	
Mathematical Formalization and Optimization of an ACT-R Instance-Based Learning Model	25
Nadia Said, Michael Engelhart, Christian Kirches, Stefan Körkel, Daniel V. Holt	
A specification-aware modeling of mental model theory for syllogistic reasoning	31
Yutaro Sugimoto, Yuri Sato	
Poster Session I - Thu April 9; 12.30-14.00h	
Modeling the Workload Capacity of Visual Multitasking	37
Leslie Blaha, James Cline, Tim Halverson	
SIMCog-JS: Simplified Interfacing for Modeling Cognition - JavaScript	39
Tim Halverson, Brad Reynolds, Leslie Blaha	
Modeling Password Entry on a Mobile Device	45
Melissa Gallagher, Mike Byrne	
Fast-Time User Simulation for Dynamic HTML-based Interfaces	51
Marc Halbrügge	
Cognitive Modelling for the Prediction of energy-relevant Human Interaction with Buildings	53
Jörn von Grabe	
Visual Search of Displays of Many Objects: Modeling Detailed Eye Movement Effects with Improved EPIC	55
David E. Kieras, Anthony Hornof, Yunfeng Zhang	
An Adaptable Implementation of ACT-R with Refraction in Constraint Handling Rules	61
Daniel Gall, Thom Frühwirth	

Supraarchitectural Capability Integration: From Soar to Sigma	67
Paul S. Rosenbloom	
Populating ACT-R's Declarative Memory with Internet Statistics	69
Daniela Link, Julian Marewski	
Tracking memory processes during ambiguous symptom processing in sequential diagnostic reasoning .	71
Agnes Scholz, Josef Krems, Georg Jahn	
Mathematical modeling of cognitive learning and memory	73
Vipin Srivastava, Suchitra Sampath	
Modeling Choices at the Individual Level in Decisions from Experience	75
Neha Sharma, Varun Dutt	
Expectations in the Ultimatum Game	81
Peter Vavra, Luke Chang, Alan Sanfey	
Quantifying Simplicity: How to Measure Sub-Processes and Bottlenecks of Decision Strategies Using a Cognitive Architecture	82
Hanna Fechner, Lael Schooler, Thorsten Pachur	
Reducing the Attentional Blink by Training: Testing Model Predictions Using EEG.	84
Trudy Buwalda, Jelmer Borst, Marieke van Vugt, Niels Taatgen	
Explaining Eye Movements in Program Comprehension using jACT-R	86
Sebastian Lohmeier, Nele Russwinkel	
Affordances based k-TR Common Coding Pathways for Mirror and Anti-Mirror Neuron System Models	88
Karthik Mahesh Varadarajan	
Functional Cognitive Models of Malware Identification	90
Christian Lebiere, Stefano Bennati, Robert Thomson, Paulo Shakarian, Eric Nunes	
The value of time: Dovetailing dynamic modeling and dynamic empirical measures to conceptualize the processes underlying delay discounting decisions.	96
Stefan Scherbaum, Simon Frisch, Maja Dshemuchadse	
Combining Dynamic Modeling and Continuous Behavior to Explore Diverging Accounts of Selective Attention	97
Simon Frisch, Maja Dshemuchadse, Thomas Goschke, Stefan Scherbaum	
Symposium: Neural Correlates of Cognitive Models - Thu April 9; 14.00-15.30h	
Neural Correlates of Cognitive Models	98
Marcel van Gerven, Sennay Ghebreab, Guy Hawkins, Jelmer Borst	
Talks: Social Cognition - Thu April 9; 16.00-17.00h	
The Role of Simple and Complex Working Memory Strategies in the Development of First-order False Belief Reasoning: A Computational Model of Transfer of Skills	100
Burcu Arslan, Stefan Wierda, Niels Taatgen, Rineke Verbrugge	
A Two-level Computational Architecture for Modeling Human Joint Action	106
Jens Pfau, Liz Sonenberg, Yoshi Kashima	

Metacognition in the Prisoner's Dilemma	112
Christopher Stevens, Niels Taatgen, Fokie Cnossen	
Talks: Exploration & Surprise - Fri April 10; 10.00-10.40h	
Exploration-Exploitation in a Contextual Multi-Armed Bandit Task	118
Eric Schulz, Emmanouil Konstantinidis, Maarten Speekenbrink	
Predicting Surprise Judgments from Explanation Graphs	124
Meadhbh Foster, Mark Keane	
Talks: Memory - Fri April 10; 11.10-12.30h	
Reconciling two computational models of working memory in aging	130
Violette Hoareau, Benoit Lemaire, Sophie Portrat, Gaen Plancher	
Stability of Individual Parameters in a Model of Optimal Fact Learning	136
Florian Sense, Friederike Behrens, Rob R. Meijer, Hedderik van Rijn	
Spontaneous Retrieval for Prospective Memory: Effects of Encoding Specificity and Retention Interval .	142
Justin Li, John Laird	
Holographic Declarative Memory and the Fan Effect: A Test Case for A New Memory Module for ACT-R ..	148
Matthew Kelly, Kam Kwok, Robert West	
Talks: Perception & Working Memory - Fri April 10; 15.00-16.00h	
Modeling Two-Channel Speech Processing with the EPIC Cognitive Architecture	154
David E. Kieras, Gregory H. Wakefield, Eric R Thompson, Nandini Iyer, Brian D. Simpson	
How does prevalence shape errors in complex tasks?	160
Enkhbold Nyamsuren, Han van der Maas, Niels Taatgen	
When and Why Does Visual Working Memory Capacity Depend on the Number of Visual Features Stored: An Explanation in Terms of an Oscillatory Model	166
Krzysztof Andrelczyk, Adam Chuderski, Tomasz Smolen	
Poster Session II - Fri April 10; 16.00-17.30h	
How should we evaluate models of segmentation in artificial language learning?	172
Raquel G. Alhama, Remko Scha, Willem Zuidema	
A constraint-based approach to pronoun interpretation in Italian	174
Margreet Vogelzang, Hedderik van Rijn, Petra Hendriks	
Investigating the semantic representation of Chinese emotion words with co-occurrence data and self-organizing maps neural networks	176
Yueh-lin Tsai, Hsueh Chih Chen, Jon-fan Hu	
Understanding the Misunderstood	178
David Tobinski, Oliver Kraft	
Towards a unified reasoning theory: An evaluation of the Human Reasoning Module in Spatial Reasoning	180
Matthias Frorath, Rebecca Albrecht, Marco Ragni	

The Ship of Theseus: Using mathematical and computational models for predicting identity judgments	186
Tuna Cakar, Annette Hohenberger	
Modelling insight: The case of the nine-dot problem	188
Thomas Ormerod, Patrice Rusconi, Adrian Banks, James MacGregor	
Cognitive Models Predicting Surprise in Robot Operators	190
David Reitter, Yang Xu, Patrick Craven, Anikó Sándor, R. Chris Garrett, E. Vince Cross, Jerry L. Franke	
Cue confusion and distractor prominence explain inconsistent effects of retrieval interference in human sentence processing	192
Felix Engelmann, Lena Jaeger, Shravan Vasishth	
A spreading activation model of a discrete free association task	194
Vencislav Popov	
Fail fast or succeed slowly: Good-enough processing can mask interference effects	196
Bruno Nicenboim, Felix Engelmann, Katja Suckow, Shravan Vasishth	
Evaluating Instance-based Learning in Multi-cue Diagnosis	198
Christopher Myers, Kevin Gluck, Jack Harris, Vladislav Veksler, Thomas Mielke, Rachel Boyd	
The Influence of Cognitive Strategies on Performance in Working Memory Tasks	200
Menno Nijboer, Jelmer Borst, Hedderik van Rijn, Niels Taatgen	
Numerical Induction beyond Calculation: An fMRI Study in Combination with a Cognitive Model	202
Xiuqin Jia, Peipeng Liang, Xiaolan Fu, Kuncheng Li	
Is it lie aversion, risk-aversion, or IRS aversion? Modeling deception under risk and no risk	204
Tei Laine, Tomi Silander, Kayo Sakamoto, Ilya Farber	
Should Androids Dream of Electric Sheep? Mechanisms for Sleep-dependent Memory Consolidation	210
George Kachergis, Roy de Kleijn, Bernhard Hommel	
Social Categorization Through the Lens of Connectionist Modeling	212
Andre Klapper, Iris van Rooij, Ron Dotsch, Daniel Wigboldus	
Talks: Decision Making - Sat April 11; 10.00-10.40h	
Speed-accuracy trade-off behavior: Response caution adjustment or mixing task strategies?	214
Leendert van Maanen	
An Instrumental Cognitive Model for Speeded and/or Simple Response Tasks	220
Royce Anders, F.-xavier Alario, Leendert van Maanen	
Talks: Human-Computer Interaction - Sat April 11; 11.10-12.30h	
Password Entry Errors: Memory or Motor?	226
Kristen Greene, Franklin Tamborello	
Toward Expert Typing in ACT-R	232
Robert St. Amant, Prairie Rose Goodwin, Ignacio Dominguez, David Roberts	
A Predictive Model of Human Error based on User Interface Development Models and a Cognitive Architecture	238
Marc Halbrügge, Michael Quade, Klaus-peter Engelbrecht	

An Activation-Based Model of Routine Sequence Errors	244
Laura Hiatt, Greg Trafton	
Symposium: Unified Theories of Cognition: Newell's Vision after 25 Years - Sat April 11; 14.00-15.30h	
Unified Theories of Cognition: Newell's Vision after 25 Years	250
Glenn Gunzelmann	
Talks: Distraction & Fatigue - Sat April 11; 16.00-17.00h	
Modeling mind-wandering: a tool to better understand distraction	252
Marieke van Vugt, Niels Taatgen, Jerome Sackur, Mikael Bastian	
Two Ways to Model the Effects of Sleep Fatigue on Cognition	258
Christopher Dancy, Frank Ritter, Glenn Gunzelmann	
A Model of Distraction using new Architectural Mechanisms to Manage Multiple Goals	264
Niels Taatgen, Ioanna Katidioti, Jelmer Borst, Marieke van Vugt	
Author Index	270

Speed-accuracy trade-off behavior: Response caution adjustment or mixing task strategies?

Leendert van Maanen (lvmaanen@gmail.com)

Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam
Weesperplein 4, 1018 XA, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

The speed-accuracy trade-off (SAT) effect refers to the behavioral trade-off between fast yet error-prone responses and accurate but slow responses. Multiple theories on the cognitive mechanisms behind SAT exist. One theory assumes that SAT is a consequence of strategically adjusting the amount of evidence required for overt behaviors, such as perceptual choices. Another theory hypothesizes that SAT is the consequence of mixing different task strategies. In this paper these theories are disambiguated by assessing whether the fixed-point property of mixture distributions holds, in both simulations and data. I conclude that, at least for perceptual decision making, there is no evidence for mixing different task strategies to trade off accuracy of responding for speed.

Keywords: speed-accuracy trade-off; SAT; fixed-point property; fp; mixture distributions; evidence accumulator models; diffusion model.

Introduction

In sports, acting fast is often as important as acting precise. For example, a basketball player trying to make the winning shot in the dying seconds of the game may be satisfied with less precision in his attempt given the severe time pressure of the clock. On the other hand, if he has just been awarded a free throw without any time pressure, accuracy in his attempt is vital. In experimental psychology, the ability to trade speed of responding for accuracy of responding is referred to as the speed-accuracy trade-off (SAT, Schouten & Bekker, 1967; Wickelgren, 1977). SAT-related effects have been shown in many different experimental paradigms (e.g., Dutilh et al., 2011; Meyer et al., 1988; Wagenmakers et al., 2008).

Response Caution Adjustment

The most prominent theory about the neural and cognitive mechanisms of SAT is *Response Caution Adjustment* (RCA, Bogacz et al., 2010). This view entails that SAT is a consequence of strategically adjusting the amount of evidence required for overt behaviors, such as perceptual choices. According to this view, perceptual choice behavior can be best described as the accumulation of evidence for each choice alternative. That is, given a particular stimulus, the decision maker accumulates over time which alternative is most likely to be the correct response. A response is then provided once a certain minimal level of evidence is exceeded (Figure 1A). Computational models that quantify this process have accounted for many different aspects of decision-making behavior (for reviews see Mulder et al., 2014; Ratcliff & McKoon, 2008), including SAT.

SAT occurs in the accumulator framework through response caution adjustment (Figure 1B). If a decision maker

is pressed for time (or has any other reason why speed-of-responding is important), the minimal level of evidence required for a response may be set to a lower value. If a decision maker is more cautious, then the minimal level of evidence may be set to a higher value. A high value automatically results in longer decision times – and hence longer response times (RT) – since the amount of evidence required to make a decision is larger, and thus takes longer to accrue. However, because of the stochastic nature of the evidence accumulation process, the increased decision time is accompanied by a larger probability of being correct. This is because the probability of accumulating enough evidence for the *incorrect* response alternative is lower as the threshold is set higher.

Mixing Task Strategies

The RCA theory of SAT has been tested in many different studies (e.g., Rae et al., 2014; Mulder et al., 2010, 2013), and in addition is also consistent with many neuroscientific findings (Boehm et al., 2014; Forstmann et al., 2008, 2010; Ho et al., 2012; Van Maanen et al., 2011; Winkel et al., 2012).¹ Nevertheless, alternative theories have been proposed about the nature of SAT. However, no model comparison between different theoretical proposals for SAT has so far been attempted.

One alternative theory of SAT that warrants a formal comparison with RCA is what I refer to here as the *Mixing Task Strategies* (MTS) theory. This theory entails that participants switch between two modes of responding during a task, depending on the speed and accuracy requirements (Ollman, 1966; Meyer et al., 1988). Under accuracy stress, participants respond through a stimulus-controlled process, which is thought to yield optimal – yet relatively slow – performance. Under speed stress, participants are thought to recruit an additional guess process on a large proportion of trials. Because this is hypothesized to be a fast process, the average response times decreases. However, because the guess process leads to chance performance on a certain proportion of trials, accuracy drops as well. This mixture idea lies at the heart of more modern models of SAT, such as the phase-transition model by Dutilh et al. (2011) and a recent ACT-R model of SAT (Schneider & Anderson, 2012).

The essential property of the Mixing Task Strategies theory is that participants use two modes of responding, but in different proportions. In fact, a strong prediction is that any exper-

¹For completeness, it should be mentioned that many of these formal modeling approaches also required the “non-decision time” parameter to vary between speed-stressed and accuracy-stressed conditions.




Figure 1: A. An illustration of two evidence accumulation processes, one depicted by a solid line, one by a dashed line. The process that reaches the response threshold the earliest is selected. B. A decreased threshold (panel B vs A) may yield a faster, possibly incorrect, choice.

imental condition that has intermediate speed and accurate stress, should have an in intermediate mixing proportion of the two modes as well. In this paper will test this strong prediction for a simple perceptual choice task (Forstmann et al., 2008) using the fixed-point property of mixture distributions (Falmagne, 1968).

Fixed-Point Property

The fixed-point property (Falmagne, 1968) is a general property of mixture distributions with two base distributions, that can be easily applied to response time data (Van Maanen et al., 2014). Because the probability density of a binary mixture distribution is always the weighted sum of the densities of the two base distributions, it follows that there is (at least) one value that has the same density, independent of the mixture proportions (for a proof, see Falmagne 1968; reiterated in Van Maanen et al. 2014). In terms of mixture distributions of response times, this implies that there will be one RT for which the probability of providing a response at that particular time is equal for all mixtures.

The fixed-point property is illustrated in Figure 2. The figure shows the probability densities of four binary mixture distributions. Each is a mixture of two shifted Wald distribution functions with common scale ($\lambda = 5000$) and shift ($\theta = 100$), but different means ($\mu_1 = 300$ and $\mu_2 = 500$).² The legend in Figure 2 refers to the mixture proportion, here represented as the proportion of the data that comes from the second base distribution (with $\mu_2 = 500$). As is clear from the figure, all densities cross each other at a common RT value, referred to as the *crossing point*. In the Results section below, we will test for the presence of the fixed-point property in empirical

data by assessing whether across participants, the crossing points of pairs of distributions with different mixture proportions are indeed the same.




Figure 2: Binary mixture distributions with different mixture proportions always cross at a common RT.

The fixed-point property is predicted by the MTS theory of SAT. That is, if observed RT distributions in SAT are a mixture of the guess process and the stimulus-controlled process, and the mixture proportions differ as a result of the amount of speed stress, then the fixed-point property should be present in the data. On the other hand, the fixed-point property is not predicted by the RCA theory. These predictions will be fleshed out in the next section.

Simulations

To understand which of the theories of SAT predicts the fixed-point property in RT distributions, I generated data under the two theories, for three levels of speed stress. In the RCA

²I chose the shifted Wald distribution function as an example because of its wide applicability in RT data (e.g., Anders et al., 2015; Heathcote, 2004), but the fixed-point property does not depend on the choice of distribution function.

simulation, all trials are drawn from a simple random-walk process with positive drift (cf. Bogacz et al., 2006), and the speed-stress levels are simulated by three different settings of an absorbing boundary. In the MTS simulation, only a proportion of the trials is drawn from that random-walk process, with the remaining trials drawn from a guess process. The three levels of speed-stress are simulated by different mixture proportions.

Response Caution Adjustment Simulation

For the RCA simulation I used a pure drift diffusion model (Bogacz et al., 2006):

$$dx = \mu dt + N(0, \sigma^2 dt) \text{ with } x(0) = a/2. \quad (1)$$

The speed of evidence accumulation is represented by the constant drift μdt , with standard deviation σ . On each trial, a decision is made once the evidence x exceeds one of two boundaries at $x = 0$ and $x = a$. The response time is then determined by the time when one of the boundaries is crossed, plus a fixed non-decision time intercept t_0 . Similar models have been applied to many decision making paradigms to study the cognitive (e.g., Donkin & Van Maanen, 2014; Mulder et al., 2013; Palmer et al., 2005; Ratcliff, 1978; Van Maanen et al., 2012b,a) and neural (e.g., Forstmann et al., 2008, 2010; Ratcliff et al., 2009) mechanisms underlying choice behavior. In particular, this model has been used extensively to study SAT. Overall, SAT has been linked to changes in the boundary parameter a (e.g., Forstmann et al., 2008, 2010; Mulder et al., 2013; Van Maanen et al., 2011; Winkel et al., 2012).

To generate RT distributions for this model, I simulated 10,000 trials in each condition, with the following parameters: $\mu = 0.2$; $\sigma = 0.3$; $t_0 = 200$; $a_1 = 0.3$; $a_2 = 0.6$; $a_3 = 0.72$. Table 1 presents mean RTs for correct responses and accuracy of these simulations, to illustrate that indeed a SAT is simulated.

Table 1: Summary of simulated data.

Model	Mean RT (ms)	Accuracy
RCA		
- $a_1 = 0.3$	458	.67
- $a_2 = 0.6$	1103	.80
- $a_3 = 0.72$	1416	.84
MTS		
- $p_1 = 0.6$	885	.68
- $p_2 = 0.75$	987	.72
- $p_3 = 1.0$	1104	.80

Figure 3A displays kernel density estimates of the RT distributions for correct responses under the RCA theory. The standard deviation of the smoothing kernel is set at 1,000 ms, above the minimal value of 1 standard deviation in the data, as suggested by Van Maanen et al. (2014). It is clear that these

density functions do not all cross at the same RT. Figure 3B shows this even clearer. Here, the differences between each pair of speed-stress levels (i.e., boundary settings) are shown. The RTs where these differences are zero are the crossing points. The absence of the fixed-point property in this simulation is apparent from the multiple crossing points.

Mixing Task Strategies Simulation

The MTS simulation generates data from a stimulus-controlled and a guess process. The stimulus-controlled process is identical to the RCA simulation, except that the boundary setting of the pure drift diffusion is always set at $a = 0.6$. The guess process is simulated by a random draw from a Bernoulli process representing the choice, and an independent draw from a normal distribution with mean $\mu_{guess} = 400$ and $\sigma_{guess} = 100$ representing the response time. Of note is that the mean RT of the guess process is below the mean RT of the stimulus-controlled process, as it represents the faster speed-stressed trials (see the mean RT for the RCA simulation with $a_2 = 0.6$ in Table 1).

Table 1 again presents mean RT for correct responses as well as accuracy for the simulations under the MTS theory. This shows that MTS is indeed consistent with a general SAT effect. Figure 3C shows the kernel density estimates of the RT distributions (with the same smoothing kernel as for the RCA simulations); Figure 3D the density differences. These figures confirm that the MTS theory predicts a fixed-point in the data, as all crossing points in Figure 3D align.

Analysis of Behavioral Data

Simulation of an RCA and an MTS model suggest that a fixed-point in the data is consistent with the MTS theory, but not with the RCA theory. To disentangle these alternative accounts in the domain of perceptual decision making, I re-analyzed data from Forstmann et al. (2008). In this study, participants were asked to perform a random-dot motion task while being stressed for either speed, accuracy, or both on a trial-by-trial basis. This task has been used extensively in the context of SAT (e.g., Palmer et al., 2005; Forstmann et al., 2008; Van Maanen et al., 2011; Mulder et al., 2013) and SAT effects have been explained by the RCA theory. However, a formal comparison with the MTS theory has never been performed. In this particular experiment, the presence of three levels of speed-stress enables a test of the MTS hypothesis that the fixed-point property holds in the data. If the MTS theory is correct, then the proportion of guess responses should be lower for accuracy-stressed trials than for speed-stressed trials. Stressing both speed and accuracy (or rather not stressing anything) should yield a proportion of guess responses that is in between these two extremes.

The Task

In the random-dot motion task, participants had to indicate from a cloud of semi-randomly moving dots what the overall direction of motion is. Prior to each stimulus, participants were presented with one of three cues for 1,000 ms. The cues




Figure 3: A. Kernel density estimates of three simulated conditions under the Response Caution Adjustment theory; lines represent different threshold settings (a). B. Density differences of each pair of conditions from A. C. Densities of three simulated conditions under the Mixing Task Strategies theory; lines represent the different proportions p of trials that are form the stimulus-controlled process. D. Density differences of each pair of conditions from C.

could be either “SN” (referring to the German “Schnell”), “NE” (“Neutral”, stressing neither speed nor accuracy), or “AK” (“Akurat”). After a variable interval of 500 ms, the stimulus appeared for another 1,000 ms, followed by 350 ms feedback. Feedback reflected the previously presented cue. Thus, when the cue was either “SN” or “NE”, feedback was given on response speed; when the cue was either “AK” or “NE”, feedback was given on response accuracy. The experiment consisted of 840 trials, equally distributed across the conditions. A total of 20 participants took part in the experiment (see Forstmann et al. 2008 for more details on the experimental procedure).

Results

To assess the presence of the fixed-point property, I only analyzed correct responses (additional simulations showed that the influence of incorrect responses on the crossing points was marginal). The kernel density estimates were computed using a kernel with a standard deviation of 300 ms. Figure 4A and B illustrate that there is no fixed-point in the data. For these figures I aggregated all data points to compute one density function per condition. However, to formally assess the presence of the fixed-point property would be to test within-subjects whether the crossing points are the same (Van Maanen et al., 2014). Because standard frequentist analyses can only test for the presence of a *difference* between conditions, we prefer to apply Bayesian statistics (Rouder et al., 2012). A Bayesian ANOVA (Rouder et al., 2012) quantifies the probability that the observed crossing points are sampled from one underlying population (i.e., when the fixed-point prop-

erty holds) or are sampled from multiple populations (when the fixed-point property does not hold).

Crossing points of the density differences per condition and participant were computed and are presented in Figure 4C. A Bayesian within-subjects ANOVA yields a Bayes factor of 53 in favor of multiple populations of crossing points. This means that the data are 53 times more likely to be generated by such a model than by a model assuming one true population. This result is clearly not in agreement with the fixed-point property, and by extension not in agreement with the MTS theory.

Discussion & Conclusion

The data from Forstmann et al. (2008) is not consistent with an important signature of binary mixture distributions. The absence of the fixed-point property therefore speaks against a MTS theory of SAT. A Bayesian analysis shows that it is in fact 53 times more likely that the data are not from binary mixture distributions. This result is consistent with an RCA theory of SAT. To some extent, this is not surprising, given the excellent fits of cognitive models that implement the RCA theory, both on this data set as well as on related data (e.g., Forstmann et al., 2010; Van Maanen et al., 2011; Mulder et al., 2010, 2013). However, no formal model comparison had so far been attempted. Theoretically, the MTS theory could have generated data that would be excellently fit by RCA models (cf. model mimicry, Ratcliff, 1988; Ratcliff & Smith, 2004). The phase-transition model of Dutilh et al. (2011, an instance of MTS), has been compared to other mod-




Figure 4: A: Densities of the correct RT distributions in the data. B. Density differences of each conditions pair from A. C. Boxplots indicating the distribution of crossing points per condition pair.

els, but the authors did not include an RCA model in their model comparison. Therefore, although they argue against RCA, it cannot be excluded based on their study.

It is entirely possible that the effects that are collectively referred to as SAT effect depend on different cognitive mechanisms. For example, if presenting a speed-stress cue results to increased preparation (e.g., motor preparation, Rhodes et al. 2004) independently of which mode is actually used on that specific trial, then a fixed-point would also not be observed. This is because the observed response time distributions are not pure mixtures of two base distributions, but rather constitute multiple processes.

Additionally, an experimental paradigm that promotes true guessing behavior may indeed still best be explained by MTS, while an experiment where guessing never leads to satisfactory behavior may be best explained by RCA. Under this view, the best explanation of SAT may be a mixture of RCA and MTS. Nevertheless, the current model and analyses strongly suggests an important role for adjusting control when people are confronted with situations in which the importance of response speed varies.

To disentangle the MTS and RCA theories, I took advantage of the different predictions that these two models make with respect to mixtures of behaviors. The fixed-point property provides an excellent tool to test these predictions.³ Similar predictions may be found in other domains where multiple strategies for a task may (or may not) be expected. Examples include multiple reasoning strategies that may be involved in reasoning tasks (Meijering et al., 2010) or varying proportions of fast-and-automatic processing and slow and deliberate processing, such as can be found in motor sequence learning (Rhodes et al., 2004) or developmental transitions (Van Rijn et al., 2003). For these kinds of response time data, the presence or absence of the fixed-point property seems to be an easy test of multiple competing task processes.

³Van Maanen et al. (2014) includes R code for testing the fixed-point property.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Birte Forstmann for providing the data and to Hedderik van Rijn voor providing comments on an earlier version of this paper.

References

- Anders, R., Alario, F. X., & Van Maanen, L. (2015). An instrumental cognitive model for speeded and/or simple response tasks. In N. A. Taatgen, M. Van Vugt, J. P. Borst, & K. Mehlhorn (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Cognitive Modeling*.
- Boehm, U., Van Maanen, L., Forstmann, B. U., & Van Rijn, H. (2014). Trial-by-trial fluctuations in CNV amplitude reflect anticipatory adjustment of response caution. *Neuroimage*, *96*, 95–105.
- Bogacz, R., Brown, E., Moehlis, J., Holmes, P., & Cohen, J. D. (2006). The physics of optimal decision making: a formal analysis of models of performance in two-alternative forced-choice tasks. *Psychological Review*, *113*, 700–765.
- Bogacz, R., Wagenmakers, E. J., Forstmann, B. U., & Nieuwenhuis, S. (2010). The neural basis of the speed-accuracy tradeoff. *Trends in Neurosciences*, *33*, 10–16.
- Donkin, C., & Van Maanen, L. (2014). Piéron's law is not just an artifact of the response mechanism. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *62-63*, 22–32.
- Dutilh, G., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Visser, I., & van der Maas, H. L. J. (2011). A phase transition model for the speed-accuracy trade-off in response time experiments. *Cognitive Science*, *35*, 211–250.
- Falmagne, J. (1968). Note on a simple fixed-point property of binary mixtures. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *21*, 131–132.
- Forstmann, B. U., Anwander, A., Schäfer, A., Neumann, J., Brown, S. D., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Bogacz, R., & Turner, R. (2010). Cortico-striatal connections predict control over speed and accuracy in perceptual decision making. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *107*, 15916–15920.

- Forstmann, B. U., Dutilh, G., Brown, S., Neumann, J., von Cramon, D. Y., Ridderinkhof, K. R., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2008). Striatum and pre-SMA facilitate decision-making under time pressure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *105*, 17538–17542.
- Heathcote, A. (2004). Fitting wald and ex-wald distributions to response time data: an example using functions for the s-plus package. *Behavior Research Methods Instruments & Computers*, *36*, 678–694.
- Ho, T. C., Brown, S., van Maanen, L., Forstmann, B. U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., & Serences, J. T. (2012). The optimality of sensory processing during the speed-accuracy tradeoff. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *32*, 7992–8003.
- Meijering, B., Van Maanen, L., Van Rijn, H., & Verbrugge, R. (2010). The facilitative effect of context on second-order social reasoning. In C. R., & S. Ohlsson (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*.
- Meyer, D. E., Irwin, D. E., Osman, A. M., & Kounios, J. (1988). The dynamics of cognition and action: mental processes inferred from speed-accuracy decomposition. *Psychological Review*, *95*, 183–237.
- Mulder, M., Bos, D., Weusten, J., van Belle, J., van Dijk, S., Simen, P., van Engeland, H., & Durston, S. (2010). Basic impairments in regulating the speed-accuracy tradeoff predict symptoms of ADHD. *Biological Psychiatry*, *68*, 1114–1119.
- Mulder, M., Keuken, M., Van Maanen, L., Boekel, W., Forstmann, B. U., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2013). The speed and accuracy of perceptual decisions in a random-tone pitch task. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, *75*, 1048–1058.
- Mulder, M., Van Maanen, L., & Forstmann, B. U. (2014). Perceptual decision neurosciences – a model-based review. *Neuroscience*, (pp. 872–884).
- Ollman, R. (1966). Fast guesses in choice reaction time. *Psychonomic Science*, *6*, 155–156.
- Palmer, J., Huk, A. C., & Shadlen, M. N. (2005). The effect of stimulus strength on the speed and accuracy of a perceptual decision. *Journal of Vision*, *5*, 376–404.
- Rae, B., Heathcote, A., Donkin, C., Averell, L., & Brown, S. (2014). The hare and the tortoise: Emphasizing speed can change the evidence used to make decisions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *40*, 1226–1243.
- Ratcliff, R. (1978). A theory of memory retrieval. *Psychological Review*, *85*, 59–108.
- Ratcliff, R. (1988). A note on mimicking additive reaction time models. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *32*, 192–204.
- Ratcliff, R., & McKoon, G. (2008). The diffusion decision model: Theory and data for two-choice decision tasks. *Neural Computation*, *20*, 873–922.
- Ratcliff, R., Philiastides, M. G., & Sajda, P. (2009). Quality of evidence for perceptual decision making is indexed by trial-to-trial variability of the eeg. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *106*, 6539–6544.
- Ratcliff, R., & Smith, P. L. (2004). A comparison of sequential sampling models for two-choice reaction time. *Psychological Review*, *111*, 333–367.
- Rhodes, B. J., Bullock, D., Verwey, W. B., Averbeck, B. B., & Page, M. P. A. (2004). Learning and production of movement sequences: behavioral, neurophysiological, and modeling perspectives. *Human Movement Science*, *23*, 699–746.
- Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D., Speckman, P. L., & Province, J. M. (2012). Default Bayes factors for ANOVA designs. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *56*, 356–374.
- Schneider, D. W., & Anderson, J. R. (2012). Modeling fan effects on the time course of associative recognition. *Cognitive Psychology*, *64*, 127–160.
- Schouten, J. F., & Bekker, J. A. (1967). Reaction time and accuracy. *Acta Psychologica*, *27*, 143–153.
- Van Maanen, L., Brown, S. D., Eichele, T., Wagenmakers, E. J., Ho, T. C., Serences, J. T., & Forstmann, B. U. (2011). Neural correlates of trial-to-trial fluctuations in response caution. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *31*, 17488–17495.
- Van Maanen, L., De Jong, R., & Van Rijn, H. (2014). How to assess the existence of competing strategies in cognitive tasks: a primer on the fixed-point property. *PLoS One*, *9*, e106113.
- Van Maanen, L., Grasman, R. P. P. P., Forstmann, B. U., Keuken, M., Brown, S. D., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2012a). Similarity and number of alternatives in the random-dot motion paradigm. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, *74*, 739–753.
- Van Maanen, L., Grasman, R. P. P. P., Forstmann, B. U., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2012b). Piéron's law and optimal behavior in perceptual decision-making. *Frontiers in Decision Neuroscience*, *5*, article 143.
- Van Rijn, H., Van Someren, M., & Van der Maas, H. L. J. (2003). Modeling developmental transitions on the balance scale task. *Cognitive Science*, *27*, 227–257.
- Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ratcliff, R., Gomez, P., & McKoon, G. (2008). A diffusion model account of criterion shifts in the lexical decision task. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *58*, 140–159.
- Wickelgren, W. (1977). Speed-accuracy tradeoff and information-processing dynamics. *Acta Psychologica*, *41*, 67–85.
- Winkel, J., Van Maanen, L., Ratcliff, R., Van der Schaaf, M., Van Schouwenburg, M., Cools, R., & Forstmann, B. U. (2012). Bromocriptine does not alter speed-accuracy trade-off. *Frontiers in Decision Neuroscience*, *6*, Article 126.