LANGUAGE MONOGRAPHS

PUBLISHED BY THE

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING
Ohio State University

HANS KURATH
Ohio State University

SAMUEL MOORE
University of Michigan

EDWARD SAPIR
Yale University

NUMBER XI MARCH, 1932

THE RELATION BETWEEN LINGUISTIC STRUCTURE AND ASSOCIATIVE INTERFERENCE IN ARTIFICIAL LINGUISTIC MATERIAL

BY

DAEL LEE WOLFLE
Ohio State University

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA

1932

Reprinted with the permission of the original publishers

KRAUS REPRINT CORPORATION
New York
1966

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850732099826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850732099826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

LANGUAGE MONOGRAPHS

PUBLISHED BY THE

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING
Ohio State University

HANS KURATH
Ohio State University

SAMUEL MOORE
University of Michigan

EDWARD SAPIR
Yale University

NUMBER XI — MARCH, 1932

THE RELATION BETWEEN LINGUISTIC STRUCTURE AND ASSOCIATIVE INTERFERENCE IN ARTIFICIAL LINGUISTIC MATERIAL

BY

DAEL LEE WOLFLE
Ohio State University

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA

1932

Reprinted with the permission of the original publishers

KRAUS REPRINT CORPORATION
New York
1966

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850732099826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Printed in U.S.A.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850732099826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	5
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	6
I.	HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	7
II.	PURPOSE	9
III.	METHOD	10
	General, 10; Apparatus, 10; Experimental technique, 12.	
IV.	RESULTS	17
	Special conditions of experiment I, 17; An analysis of learning in experiment I, 17; Analysis of wrong responses, 18; Stimulus name and associates, 23; Errors and associates, 23; Variant responses, 25; Summary of experiment I, 32.	
	Special conditions of experiment II, 33; An analysis of learning in experiment II, 35; Analysis of errors, 37; Stimulus name and associate, 40; Errors and associates, 42; Variant responses, 43; Retention of the language, 52; Summary of experiment II, 52.	
V.	CONCLUSIONS	54
	APPENDIX	55

FIGURES

		Page
1.	The Bradyscope ..... opposite	10
2.	The forms used as stimulus figures	12
3.	Plan of experimental room	13
4.	Average learning curves for both languages	19
5.	Relation of stimulus name to associates	24
6.	Relation of associates to errors	24
7.	Relation of stimulus name to associates	41
8.	Relation of associates to errors	41

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850732099826 Published online by Cambridge University Press