rule. One problem with this solution is that reduplication has all of the properties of a regular word formation rule and regular word formation rules can be ordered to precede all phonological rules. Ordering reduplication after certain phonological rules implies that one can place a derivational or inflectional affixing rule somewhere in the middle of the phonology, an option that is, apparently, not otherwise needed.18

In addition to loosening constraints on the organization of grammar, the ordering solution to the overapplication of phonological rules to reduplicated forms cannot be extended to explain the underapplication of certain rules to these forms. To take another example from Dakota: certain word-final as in Dakota change to e before a number of morphemes including the phrase-ending morpheme, /\.

(44) a. háska19 ‘to be tall’
   b. čuq-kj jyúha háske-2 ‘all the trees are tall’

However, the final a of at least certain class of reduplicated verbs does not change to e before these same morphemes even when the final a of their unreduplicated roots does change. Thus, despite the fact that the final a of háska changes to e before -2, as shown in (44b), the final a of its reduplicated form, háska-ska, does not change to e before -2, as shown in (45).

(45) čuq-kj háska-ska-2 ‘the trees are tall’

If reduplication were ordered after the rule changing a to e, we would expect *háske-ske-2 in (45); if before, we would expect *háske-šče-2. Since rule ordering provides no explanation for the underapplication of rules to reduplicated forms, it is a questionable solution to their overapplication. One would expect the same analysis to cover both cases of irregular rule interaction.

Wilbur herself offers a reason for the fact that rules over- and underapply to reduplicated forms. She attributes this special behavior of reduplicated forms to the Identity Constraint (Wilbur (1973, 58)):

(46) The Identity Constraint

There is a tendency to preserve the identity of R, [what is copied in reduplication] and R, [the copy] in reduplicated forms.

Wilbur suggests that the Identity Constraint may be realized as a global condition on the rules which over- and underapply to reduplicated forms. A rule which overapplies would be written to apply both to a segment in R, and to the corresponding segment in R, if the rule’s environment is met for the segment in R, A rule which underapplies would be written to apply to a segment in R, only if the corresponding segment in R,

18 An anonymous LI reviewer has pointed out that, even setting aside reduplication, some morphological rules have been argued to “follow” phonological rules in some sense. I know of no convincing arguments to this effect consistent with the restrictive theories of phonology and morphology I am assuming here (but see Anderson (1975)).

19 A vowel with a superimposed comma, e.g. q, represents a nasalized vowel in this orthography.

Thus, v Deletion appears to underapply in reduplicated forms. However, Wilbur’s Iden-
The current problem discussed in section 7.2 of the paper is the quantification of the impact of coordination on cognitive performance. The paper proposes a model to measure the impact of coordination on cognitive performance and to predict the level of coordination required for optimal cognitive performance. The model is based on the hypothesis that coordination improves cognitive performance by reducing the load on working memory. The model is tested on a set of tasks designed to evaluate cognitive performance, and the results show a significant improvement in performance with increased coordination. The model is further extended to include the impact of external factors such as noise and distraction on cognitive performance. The results suggest that coordination is a crucial factor in improving cognitive performance and that appropriate coordination strategies can enhance cognitive performance in various tasks.
In the context of a previous study, we would expect the effect of a parameter on the outcome to be consistent across different conditions. However, our current findings suggest that the relationship between the parameter and the outcome is more complex. Specifically, we observed a significant interaction effect between the parameter and another variable, indicating that the influence of the parameter on the outcome depends on the level of this second variable. Further analysis is required to understand the nature of this interaction and its implications for our study.

Furthermore, our results highlight the importance of considering potential confounders in the analysis. While we controlled for several variables, there may still be residual effects that could influence the observed outcomes. Future research should aim to address these limitations by incorporating additional controls or using alternative methodologies.

In conclusion, our findings suggest that the parameter of interest has a more nuanced effect on the outcome than initially anticipated. However, the observed interaction effect and the potential confounding variables underscore the need for caution in interpreting these results. Further investigation is warranted to elucidate the underlying mechanisms and to refine our understanding of the relationship between the parameter and the outcome.