

**EVENT-RELATED POTENTIAL INDICATORS OF  
WORKING MEMORY ACTIVITY DURING SUBITIZING**

Peter Quain, B.Psyc.(Hons)

School of Psychology  
University of New England  
Australia

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2012

## Contents

Abstract .....	vii
Statement of Originality .....	ix
Acknowledgments .....	x
CHAPTER 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Working Memory.....	1
1.1.1 Structure of the WM System.....	4
1.1.1.1 Modalities: Verbal and Spatial.....	4
1.1.1.2 Storage and Processing .....	7
1.1.1.3 Engle’s Model.....	10
1.1.1.4 Baddeley’s Model .....	10
1.1.1.5 Cowan’s Model.....	13
1.1.2 The Activation Model .....	14
1.1.2.1 The Range of Attention.....	17
1.1.3 Summary .....	18
1.2 Item Enumeration and Subitizing .....	18
1.2.1 Subitizing and Counting .....	18
1.2.2 The Non-Linear Subitizing Slope .....	25
1.2.3 The Serial Counting Explanation.....	26
1.2.4 Attentional Involvement in Subitizing.....	28
1.2.5 The FINST Hypothesis .....	36
1.2.6 Modular Views and Neural Activity.....	40
1.2.7 Canonical Patterns and Pattern Matching .....	45
1.3 Summary and Progression .....	50
CHAPTER 2 Event-related Potentials .....	54
2.1 Introduction.....	54
2.1.1 Making Inferences From ERPs.....	57
2.1.2 Inferential Approach .....	58
2.1.3 Type of Item Enumeration Task .....	58

2.1.4	ERPs and Item Enumeration .....	59
2.1.5	The Late Positive Complex.....	65
2.1.5.1	The P3b .....	67
2.1.5.1.1	Latency and Sensitivity to RT .....	68
2.1.5.1.2	Amplitude.....	72
2.1.5.2	Fronto-central Negativities: The N2 .....	78
2.1.5.3	The P2 .....	85
2.1.5.4	The P2-N2 Complex .....	88
2.2	Summary and Progression .....	91
2.2.1	Summary .....	91
2.2.2	Progression.....	94
CHAPTER 3 Technical Considerations and Methods.....		96
3.1	Laboratory Configuration .....	96
3.1.1	Biopac System .....	97
3.1.2	NuAmps System .....	97
3.2	Stimulus Presentation.....	99
3.2.1	E-Prime Software.....	99
3.2.2	Timing Integrity .....	100
3.2.3	Millisecond Precision.....	101
3.2.4	Human Variance .....	102
3.2.5	Machine Variance .....	102
3.2.5.1	Control Computer .....	102
3.2.5.2	TTL Communication .....	104
3.2.6	Considerations.....	104
3.2.7	Implementing Millisecond Precision .....	105
3.3	Data Handling and Interpretation.....	107
3.3.1	Data Extraction .....	107
3.3.2	Effect Sizes .....	107
CHAPTER 4 Experiment 1: ERP Activity During Item Enumeration.....		108
4.1	Rationale, Aims, and Hypotheses .....	108
4.2	Method .....	119

4.2.1	Participants.....	119
4.2.2	Task.....	119
4.2.3	Procedure .....	120
4.2.4	EEG Recording .....	122
4.2.5	EEG Data Reduction.....	122
4.3	Results and Discussion .....	123
4.3.1	Data Screening .....	123
4.3.2	Behavioural Data .....	124
4.3.3	EEG Data .....	126
4.3.3.1	P3b .....	129
4.3.3.2	P2 .....	135
4.3.3.3	N2.....	138
4.3.3.4	Interim Summary and Discussion.....	142
4.3.3.5	Span Groups.....	151
4.3.4	Conclusions.....	156
CHAPTER 5 Experiment 2: ERP Activity During Item Enumeration.....		161
5.1	Rationale, Aims, and Hypotheses .....	161
5.2	Method .....	166
5.2.1	Participants.....	166
5.2.2	Task.....	166
5.2.3	Procedure .....	167
5.2.4	EEG Recording .....	167
5.2.5	EEG Data Reduction.....	167
5.3	Results and Discussion .....	168
5.3.1	Behavioural Data .....	168
5.3.2	EEG Data .....	172
5.3.2.1	P2 .....	175
5.3.2.2	P3b and N2 Latency.....	176
5.3.2.2.1	P3b.....	176
5.3.2.2.2	N2 .....	186
5.3.2.3	P3b and N2 Amplitude.....	190
5.3.2.3.1	P3b.....	190

5.3.2.3.2	N2 .....	191
5.3.2.4	Summary .....	193
5.3.2.5	Span groups.....	196
5.3.2.5.1	Difference Waves .....	203
5.4	Conclusions.....	206
CHAPTER 6 Experiment 3: Configuration and Item Load.....		212
6.1	Rationale, Aims, and Hypotheses .....	212
6.2	Method .....	215
6.2.1	Participants.....	215
6.2.2	Tasks .....	216
6.2.3	Procedure .....	217
6.2.4	EEG Recording and Data Reduction .....	218
6.3	Results.....	218
6.3.1	Behavioural Data .....	218
6.3.2	EEG Data .....	221
6.3.2.1	N2 Amplitude and Latency .....	224
6.3.2.2	P3b Latency and Amplitude.....	227
6.4	Discussion.....	231
CHAPTER 7 Working Memory Load During Subitizing .....		235
7.1	Rationale, Aims, and Hypotheses .....	235
7.2	Experiment 4: Verbal Load.....	240
7.2.1	Method .....	240
7.2.1.1	Participants.....	240
7.2.1.2	Stimuli.....	240
7.2.1.3	Task.....	241
7.2.1.4	Procedure .....	243
7.2.1.5	EEG Recording and Data Reduction .....	244
7.2.2	Results and Discussion .....	244
7.2.2.1	Behavioural Data .....	244
7.2.2.2	EEG Data .....	246
7.2.2.2.1	P3b and N2 Latency .....	251

7.2.2.2.2	P3b and N2 Amplitude .....	254
7.2.3	Discussion .....	257
7.3	Experiment 5: Spatial Load .....	261
7.3.1	Method .....	261
7.3.1.1	Participants .....	261
7.3.1.2	Stimuli .....	261
7.3.1.3	Task .....	262
7.3.1.4	Procedure .....	264
7.3.1.5	EEG Recording and Data Reduction .....	264
7.3.2	Results and Discussion .....	265
7.3.2.1	Behavioural Data .....	265
7.3.2.2	EEG Data .....	267
7.3.2.2.1	P3b and N2 Latency .....	270
7.3.2.2.2	P3b and N2 Amplitude .....	272
7.4	Discussion and Conclusions .....	274
CHAPTER 8 Summary and Conclusions .....		280
8.1.1	Summary .....	280
8.1.2	Functional Significance of the LPC .....	292
8.1.3	Conclusions .....	293
References .....		297

## Abstract

Subitizing has been generally defined as the capacity limited process involved in swiftly, accurately, and effortlessly apprehending the numerosity of small collections of perhaps three or four items. Competing explanations have appealed to perceptual, configural, or WM processing mechanisms to explain subitizing. Over five experiments this thesis used event-related potential data to investigate whether working memory (WM) activity is involved in subitizing response contingent item arrays, and the related question of whether subitizing limits might be determined by some capacity constraints in WM.

Experiment 1 presented a response contingent enumeration task where both accuracy and speed of response were stressed. EEG was recorded from two anterior scalp sites Fz, and Cz. RTs for the combined sample showed the classic non-linear subitizing slope, and evidence of a discontinuity between subitizing and counting for all subjects. P3b latencies increased significantly across the slope and were closely associated with corresponding RT increments, suggesting WM involvement in generating the slope. At three items a strong N2 component and reduced amplitude P3b peak were evident, further suggesting WM involvement during subitizing.

Experiment 2 replicated the first experiment with Neuroscan equipment. ERP behaviour was very similar to Experiment 1, indicating robust component presentation during item enumeration. The predominantly anterior distribution of the LPC was confirmed. The sample generated a non-linear subitizing slope, but there was no direct support for a relationship between P3b latency increases and RT increases along the subitizing slope. However, at a load of three items there was P3b

latency increase and amplitude decrease, along with a pronounced N2 component, suggesting WM activity.

Experiment 3 contrasted ERP behaviour while subitizing one, three, or four items while recognising and naming dot patterns (Dot; Triangle; Square).

Enumerating three and four items generated pronounced N2 components whereas identifying the same number of items as 'Triangle' or 'Square' produced none. P3b latency was also longer when enumerating. This suggested that processes related to quantification and not pattern recognition or association generate the robust ERP profile evident in the first two experiments.

The final two experiments contrasted ERP behaviour while subitizing one, two, and three item arrays without, and with a concurrent WM load of either verbal (Experiment 4) or spatial (Experiment 5) information. Verbal load generated increased P3b latencies along with marked N2 deflections when enumerating one, two, or three items. Spatial load generated latency effects in the P3b window but with no other clear effects on the LPC.

These results supported the functional interpretation of the P3b and N2 components proposed throughout the thesis as indexing time consuming, effortful processing in WM. This therefore suggested that effortful WM activity is involved in subitizing, supporting the serial counting explanation of subitizing over perceptual, or pattern matching explanations.



## **Acknowledgments**

First and foremost I'd like to thank my supervisor Bruce Stevenson, without whose support, encouragement, and capacity to put up with my foibles this project would never have begun, and most certainly would never have been finished.

During the course of setting up the EEG laboratory and collecting data for this project a number of UNE students and staff volunteered for what were reasonably demanding sessions. I'd like to thank all participants for their involvement.

Thanks are also in order to all fellow postgraduates who provided support during the ups and downs over the years this project extended, and to my few close friends who stuck by through thick and thin.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my family, my brother, sister, and father, who never gave up on me, and my mother, my greatest supporter and source of strength, who sadly did not live to see this thesis completed.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Lois and Brian Quain. May you rest in peace Mum, and Dad, may it be a while until you do.