

Electrophysiological Evidence of the Capture of Visual Attention

Clayton Hickey¹, John J. McDonald², and Jan Theeuwes¹

Abstract

The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups.

In contrast, the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups.

EXPERIMENT 1

Methods

Participants

Eighty-five undergraduate students from the University of Amsterdam participated in the experiment. The participants were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted in a laboratory setting. The participants were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups.

The experiment was conducted in a laboratory setting. The participants were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. The causal effect is estimated by the difference in the mean of the outcome between the treatment and control groups.

ae cy a d a ed c a ge - e a ed N25c a 15 -
de. F e e, e e e d ac a 15 e
e ed a a e a e e 15 , a d ac e c ed
N25c a 15 a e (Fg e 2B). T e 15 e e ce f e
d ac ge dd , e e, a e a y ce a ef
fec e a e cy f e N25cc 15 e . I Fg e 1A

Results

As a result, 10.2% of the participants were classified as having a delay in the behavioral response, 0.8% of the participants were classified as having a delay (>2000 ms) and 9.4% of the participants were classified as having a delay in the EEG.

Table 1B shows the RTs for the behavioral response and the EEG. The behavioral RTs were significantly longer than the EEG RTs ($F(1,13) = 409.50, p < .001$), and the behavioral RTs were significantly longer than the EEG RTs ($F(1,13) = 26.61, p < .001$).

The behavioral RTs were significantly longer than the EEG RTs ($F(1,13) = 409.50, p < .001$), and the behavioral RTs were significantly longer than the EEG RTs ($F(1,13) = 26.61, p < .001$).

Figure 3 and 4 show the ERP effects for the behavioral response and the EEG.

Figure 3A shows the behavioral ERP effects for the behavioral response. The behavioral ERP effects were significantly larger than the EEG ERP effects ($F(1,13) = 5.97, p < .05$ (Figure 3A). By contrast, the behavioral ERP effects were significantly larger than the EEG ERP effects ($F(1,13) = 7.27, p < .05$ (Figure 3B). A 2-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect of the behavioral response ($F(1,13) = 5.97, p < .05$) and a significant effect of the EEG ($F(1,13) = 7.27, p < .05$). The behavioral ERP effects were significantly larger than the EEG ERP effects ($F(1,13) = 5.97, p < .05$ (Figure 3A). By contrast, the behavioral ERP effects were significantly larger than the EEG ERP effects ($F(1,13) = 7.27, p < .05$ (Figure 3B). A 2-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect of the behavioral response ($F(1,13) = 5.97, p < .05$) and a significant effect of the EEG ($F(1,13) = 7.27, p < .05$).

Figure 4 ERP elicited by each category
The age group. Search category
The age group elicited ERP
category N25c
The age group, b
The age group, 230-295 ec,

... ed ... d ... gge ... a
 ...-d ... ce e ... a ... a
 ... ec ... f ... a a e ... a d ... de
 e de ce f ... de f a e ... c ... e e c ...
 ... ce e ... a ... e g a ... e (e.g., T ... e , 1994b;
 K ... a d U ... a , 1985).

Acknowledgments

T ... d ... a ... ed ... a ... a g a f ... e Na-
 ... a S ce ce a d E g ee g Re ea d C ... c f Ca ada
 (J. J. M.). We ... Pa ... G ... , S ... a De ... e , a d Ja ed
 a S ee be g f ... ec ... ca a ... a ce.
 R ... e e ... d be e ... Ca ... H ce ... J ... J.
 McD ... ad, De ... a ... e f P ... c ... g ... S ... Fa e U ... e-
 ... 8888 U ... e ... y D ... e, B ... ab ... BC, Ca ada V5A 1S6, ...
 a e- a : c ... c ... e y @ f . ca ... cd @ f . ca .

REFERENCES

Bac ... , W. F., & Ege ... , H. E. (1994). O e ... d g ... -d ... e
 a e ... a ca ... e. ... 485 496.
 E ... e, M. (1996). T ... e N25 c c ... e a a d ca ... f
 a e ... a e ec ... 225 234.
 F ... , C. L., & Re ... g ... , R. (1998). Se ec ... y d ... ac
 b y ... e e a fe a ... a g e ... : E de ce f ... f ... f
 a e ... a ca ... e. ... 847 858.
 F ... , C. L., Re ... g ... , R. W., & J ... , J. C. (1992).
 I ... a y c e ... e g c ... ge ... a e ... a
 c ... e g ... 1030 1044.
 F ... , C. L., Re ... g ... , R. W., & W ... g ... , J. H. (1994). T ... e
 c ... e fa e ... a c ... : C ... ge a e ... a
 ca ... e b y ... a e ... , ab ... e , a d c ...
 ... 317 329.
 H ... f, J. M., B e ... a ... , K., Sci ... e fe d, A. M., He ... e, H. J.,
 & L c ... , S. J. (2002). H ... d e a e ... a e a e
 a ge -d ... ac ... e fe e ce ... ? E de ce f ...
 a g e e ce ... a g ... c ec d g ... 17 29.
 H ... f ge ... , J. B., & Ma g ... , G. R. (2001). E ec ... y ... g ca
 de f ... fe fe ... e a e ... I C. L. G. F ... & S. B ad e y
 (Ed ...), ... (55.3 26). A ... e da ... :
 E ... e.
 Ka ... e a ... , D., T e ... a ... , A., & B ... e ... , J. (1983). T ... e c
 f ... a f e g ... 510 522.
 Ke ... e ... , S., E ... e ... , M., S ... e ce ... , C., & D ... e ... , J. (2001).
 Tac e ... a ... e ge ... a a a e ... de.