Background

If selection is influenced by ease of access, phonological interference should increase naming latency for dominant words, and use of other names.

Exp 1: Dominant and Secondary Name Interference

Trial structure. Phonological interference preceded low name-agreement pictures with clear dominant and secondary names.

Word Choice
Phonological interference predicts proportion of dominant names produced (all tests, p < .05).

Naming Latency
- Dominant names faster, p < .01
- Interference and Interaction, ns

Exp 2: Interference Across Name Agreement

Dominant / No Interference preceded a range of name-agreement pictures

Word Choice
Percent of dominant picture names used as a function of interference and name agreement. Points reflect raw means for each picture. The dominant name was used significantly less in the Dominant than in the No Interference condition (p < .05).

Naming Latency
Naming latency for dominant and other words said as a function of no interference or dominant interference. Top solid line is onset latency for Other words said in Dominant interference. Interference, Name agreement, Dominant vs Other word said predict latency (all p < .05). Interaction of name agreement and word used was also significant, all others ns.

Summary/Conclusions
- Word choice was significantly affected by phonological interference in low-agreement (Exp1) and a range of name agreement pictures (Exp2). Phonological overlap influences latency (Exp2).
- Accessibility affects online production across single-word messages.
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