Accurate expectancies diminish perceptual distraction during visual search

Jocelyn L Sy, Scott A Guerin, Anna Stegman and Barry Giesbrecht

Journal Name:	Frontiers in Human Neuroscience
ISSN:	1662-5161
Article type:	Original Research Article
Received on:	28 Jan 2014
Accepted on:	03 May 2014
Provisional PDF published on:	03 May 2014
www.frontiersin.org:	www.frontiersin.org
Citation:	Sy JL, Guerin SA, Stegman A and Giesbrecht B(2014) Accurate expectancies diminish perceptual distraction during visual search. <i>Front. Hum. Neurosci.</i> 8:334. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00334
/Journal/Abstract.aspx?s=537& name=human%20neuroscience& ART_DOI=10.3389 /fnhum.2014.00334:	/Journal/Abstract.aspx?s=537&name=human%20neuroscience& ART_DOI=10.3389/fnhum.2014.00334
	(If clicking on the link doesn't work, try copying and pasting it into your browser.)
Copyright statement:	© 2014 Sy, Guerin, Stegman and Giesbrecht. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative Commons</u> <u>Attribution License (CC BY)</u> . The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or

This Provisional PDF corresponds to the article as it appeared upon acceptance, after rigorous peer-review. Fully formatted PDF and full text (HTML) versions will be made available soon.

ccurate expectancies diminish perceptual distraction during visual search
lyn L. Sy ¹ , Scott A. Guerin ² , Anna Stegman ³ , & Barry Giesbrecht ^{3,4}
 Department of Psychological Sciences, Vanderbilt University Department of Psychology, Yale University Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies, University of California, Santa Barbara
eviated title: Diminished distraction
esponding author: lyn L. Sy, PhD doctoral fellow artment of Psychological Sciences, Vanderbilt University 407817 Vanderbilt Place nville, TN 37240-7817 il: Jocelyn.L.Sy@vanderbilt.edu
nts: es: 3 res: 5 es: 66 ract: 219 words
v: 1182 words (Introduction) + 2574 words (Methods) + 5680 words (Results) 17 words (Discussion) ions: 580 words (Figures) + 56 words (Tables) rences: 93 (2091 words)
words: selective attention, distraction, dorsal attention network, visual cortex

1

Abstract

2 The load theory of visual attention proposes that efficient selective perceptual 3 processing of task-relevant information during search is determined automatically 4 by the perceptual demands of the display. If the perceptual demands required to 5 process task-relevant information are not enough to consume all available 6 capacity, then the remaining capacity automatically and exhaustively "spills-over" 7 to task-irrelevant information. The spill-over of perceptual processing capacity 8 increases the likelihood that task-irrelevant information will impair performance. 9 In two visual search experiments, we tested the automaticity of the allocation of 10 perceptual processing resources by measuring the extent to which the 11 processing of task-irrelevant distracting stimuli was modulated by both perceptual 12 load and top-down expectations using behavior, fMRI, and electrophysiology. 13 Expectations were generated by a trial-by-trial cue that provided information 14 about the likely load of the upcoming visual search task. When the cues were 15 valid, behavioral interference was eliminated and the influence of load on frontoparietal and visual cortical responses was attenuated relative to when the 16 cues were invalid. In conditions in which task-irrelevant information interfered 17 with performance and modulated visual activity, individual differences in mean 18 19 BOLD responses measured from the left intraparietal sulcus were negatively 20 correlated with individual differences in the severity of distraction. These results 21 are consistent with the interpretation that a top-down biasing mechanism 22 interacts with perceptual load to support filtering of task-irrelevant information.

1 Coping with the vast amount of complex information that is present in the 2 environment requires the ability to selectively attend to information that is 3 relevant for one's behavioral goals while ignoring information that is irrelevant 4 (Mangun and Buck, 1998; Chun and Marois, 2002). While selective processing is 5 typically successful, attention can fail. These failures can result in interference or 6 distraction from competing task-irrelevant features and objects (e.g., Stroop, 7 1935; Eriksen and Eriksen, 1974). Counterintuitively, increasing task demands at 8 perceptual stages of visual processing can prevent these failures of selective 9 attention (e.g., Norman and Bobrow, 1975; Yantis and Johnston, 1990; Lavie & 10 Tsal, 1994; Lavie, 1995). For instance, in visual search tasks, increasing the 11 number of items or the visual similarity between the target and distractors can 12 reduce the behavioral interference caused by task-irrelevant objects (Lavie, 13 1995; Lavie and Cox, 1997). Similarly, decreasing the discriminability of task-14 relevant information can reduce the magnitude of neural responses evoked by 15 irrelevant stimuli (Rees, et al., 1997; Handy et al., 2001; Yi, et al., 2004; Rorden, 16 et al., 2008).

The load theory of attention is one prominent explanation of how increased perceptual processing demands can reduce distractor interference (e.g., Lavie & Tsal, 1994; Lavie, 1995; Lavie et al., 2004). According to load theory, perceptual distraction occurs because at early stages of processing, limited resources are first allocated to task-relevant information and then any unused resources exhaustively and automatically "spill-over" to process irrelevant information. Distraction is reduced when perceptual demand, or load, is

1 increased because fewer resources are available to "spill-over". Critically, this 2 explanation rests on two critical assumptions. First, the task-relevant and task-3 irrelevant information must be distinguishable in some fashion (e.g., by spatial 4 location, color, size). Physical distinctiveness is important because it allows for 5 top-down priorities to be set for allocating processing capacity to task-relevant 6 information. Second, and most important for the present work, if relevant and 7 irrelevant information are physically distinguishable, then the allocation of 8 processing capacity to task-irrelevant information is determined automatically by 9 the inherent perceptual demands imposed by the task-relevant information 10 (Lavie, 1995; Lavie, 2005; Lavie & Torralbo, 2010).

11 Although there is ubiquitous evidence demonstrating that task demands 12 modulate distractor processing (Norman & Bobrow, 1975; Kahneman & 13 Chajczyk, 1983; Dark, et al., 1985; Lavie & Tsal, 1994; de Fockert, et al., 2001; Handy, et al., 2001; Lavie, 2005; Fu, et al., 2010; Lavie, 2010), several studies 14 15 have provided evidence that distraction is not determined solely by the perceptual demands of the search display (Paquet & Craig, 1997; Johnson et al., 16 2002; Theeuwes, et al., 2004; Biggs & Gibson, 2010; Benoni, et al., 2014; Chen 17 18 & Cave, 2013). For example, predictive spatial cues (Johnson et al., 2002) can 19 eliminate behavioral distraction under low load conditions. Similarly, prior 20 knowledge of the color of a target can influence both target and distractor 21 processing (Chen & Cave, 2013). These studies are more in line with evidence 22 that top-down expectancies can influence responses measured in visual cortex 23 that represent both task-relevant (Kastner, et al., 1998; Hopfinger, et al., 2000;

1 Giesbrecht, et al., 2006) and task-irrelevant information (Serences et al., 2004). 2 Interestingly, the blocked designs used in many load theory experiments suggest 3 distractor interference can occur even when an accurate expectancy could be 4 generated (e.g. Lavie, 1995). The difference between studies showing the 5 influence of expectancies on selectivity and the typical load theory experiment 6 may be that top-down expectations are used differently in experiments in which 7 they can be generated on a trial-by-trial basis and those in which they can be 8 generated for an entire block of trials (i.e., as in blocked-designs). Consistent 9 with this interpretation, load effects can differ between blocked and intermixed 10 designs, and trial-to-trial dependencies of load within intermixed experimental 11 designs differentially modulate the magnitude of interference from irrelevant 12 stimuli (Theeuwes et al., 2004; Biggs & Gibson, 2010; Benoni, et al., 2014). For 13 example, Theeuwes, et al. (2004) compared perceptual load effects on distractor 14 interference when load trials were blocked and intermixed. They found that the 15 blocked design replicated previous demonstrations that distractor interference 16 was larger under low load compared to high load. In contrast, the influence of perceptual load on flanker interference was not only less reliable in the 17 intermixed trial design, but flanker interference was also modulated by the 18 19 immediate trial history, suggesting that implicit task sets can impact flanker 20 processing.

Given the discrepancy between the strong predictions of load theory and the behavioral evidence showing that perceptual distraction is not only driven by the load of the search display (e.g., Johnson et al., 2002; Theeuwes et al., 2004)

1 and the neural evidence of top-down biases in visual responses (e.g., Kastner et 2 al., 1998; Hopfinger et al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Bressler et al., 3 2008; Szczepanski et al., 2010), the current work aimed to investigate the roles 4 of perceptual load and top-down expectancies in perceptual distraction and the 5 underlying neural mechanisms within an intermixed trial design. Specifically, the 6 present study was designed to test the load theory assumption that perceptual 7 processing capacity is allocated to irrelevant stimuli in an automatic and 8 exhaustive fashion when capacity is not completely consumed by task-relevant 9 information. In two experiments, observers performed a modified visual search 10 task in which the perceptual load of the search display was manipulated and a 11 task-irrelevant flanker was presented at a location where a target was never presented (e.g., Lavie and Cox, 1997). In other words, the task-relevant and 12 13 task-irrelevant stimuli were distinguished based on physical location and the 14 distinctiveness was constant across all conditions. The behavioral interference 15 caused by the irrelevant flanker was used as a behavioral measure of perceptual 16 distraction (e.g., Lavie, 1995). Critically, top-down expectancies were manipulated on each trial by presenting an explicit cue prior to the main search 17 display indicating the most likely load of the task. Experiment 1 (Exp.1) was an 18 19 fMRI experiment in which we investigated the extent to which responses in visual 20 cortex were modulated by cue-generated expectations and by the interaction 21 between cue validity and search difficulty. Moreover, we also measured the effect 22 of cue validity and search difficulty on BOLD responses in the dorsal attention 23 network because it is generally considered to mediate expectation-induced

1 modulations of visual cortical responses (e.g., Kastner et al., 1998; Hopfinger et 2 al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Bressler et al., 2008; Szczepanski et al., 3 2010). Experiment 2 was an event-related potential (ERP) experiment that 4 investigated the extent to which sensory processing of the flanker was modulated 5 by cue-generated expectations and search difficulty within the first 200 ms of 6 stimulus presentation. In both experiments we observed evidence for a reduction 7 of the behavioral distraction effect when cues were valid, even under low task 8 demands. Similarly, the neural evidence indicated more visuocortical selectivity 9 in favor of relevant stimuli over the task irrelevant flanker and that the dorsal 10 attention network was less affected by load when the cues were valid compared 11 to when the cues were invalid. Together this evidence supports the notion that 12 perceptual load was not the sole determinant of interference, but rather it is top-13 down expectations combined with the perceptual task demands that determine 14 the magnitude of perceptual distraction.

- 15
- 16

Methods

17 Experiment 1

18 Experiment 1A: Predictive Cue Visual Search Task

Participants. Fourteen volunteers from the University of California, Santa Barbara community were paid \$20/hour for their participation in the fMRI experiment (mean age=24.8; 7 female). All procedures conformed to a protocol approved by the University of California, Santa Barbara Human Subjects Committee. 1 Apparatus & Stimuli. Stimulus presentation was controlled using custom 2 scripts written in MATLAB (Mathworks, Inc., Boston, MA) using the Psychophysics Toolbox (Brainard, 1997). Each search display consisted of a 3 4 fixation circle (.52°) presented at the center of each display. The search items 5 were black upper case letters (Arial font, 0.52° tall) presented in the upper visual 6 field on an arch 1.25° from fixation, and 0.95° from each other. The irrelevant 7 flanker was also a letter (Arial font, 0.65° tall) and it was presented in the upper 8 left or upper right of the display, 2.21° away from fixation (equidistant from the 9 horizontal and vertical meridian).

10 **Procedure.** Each trial began when the fixation circle changed color for 11 500 ms. The specific color (blue or yellow) predicted the difficulty of the 12 upcoming search display (see Design). After the cue, there was either a 250 ms 13 or a 1000 ms delay during which the fixation point was white and remained on 14 the screen, followed by the presentation of the search display (250 ms). 15 Participants were instructed to discriminate whether an N or X was presented in 16 one of four relevant locations in the arch above fixation and to ignore the irrelevant flanker presented either to the upper left or right of the search array. 17 18 Participants were given a 1250 ms response interval to report the target. The 19 instructions to the participants emphasized that it was important to make active 20 use of the information provided by the cue on each trial, that it was important to 21 be as accurate as possible, and that it was also important to maintain fixation throughout the trial. Once the trial was terminated by a response or the end of 22 23 the response interval occurred, the fixation changed from white to an empty circle (a black outlined circle filled with the background color). A schematic of the trial
 sequence is shown in Figure 1.

3 **Design.** There were 3 critical manipulations. First, the perceptual load of 4 the search task was manipulated in a manner consistent with previous 5 manipulations that yielded results in favor of load theory (Lavie and Cox, 1997; 6 Lavie, 2005; Roper, Cosman, & Vecera, 2013). In the low load displays, the 7 identities of the search distractors (i.e. items in potential target locations) were 8 randomly selected from a set of letters that were featurally dissimilar to the 9 potential targets (C, O, G, or Q). All the distractors on a given low load trial had 10 the same identity (e.g., all O's; Lavie & Cox, 1997). In the high load displays, the 11 identities of the search distractors were randomly selected from a set of letters 12 that were featurally similar to the potential targets (F, H, J, K, M, P, S, U, and W). 13 The distractors on a given high load trial each had a unique identity (e.g., Lavie & 14 Cox, 1997). Second, the cue (color change at fixation) predicted the upcoming 15 load with 84% validity (16% invalid cue+target trials). The mapping of the cue 16 color (blue or yellow) to the difficulty condition (low or high load) was counterbalanced across subjects. Third, a to-be-ignored flanker letter was 17 18 presented unilaterally, either in the upper-left or upper-right of the search array 19 and it was either congruent with the presented target (e.g. 'X' target, 'X' flanker) 20 or incongruent (e.g. 'X' target, 'N' flanker). All factors were randomly intermixed 21 within each run.

In addition to the cue+target trials described above, there were also trials in which the cue was presented, but no search array was presented (cue-only;

1 16% of trials). On the cue-only trials, the cue changed color as in the cue-target 2 trials (e.g., blue for 500 ms, white for 1000 ms, and then empty until the next 3 trial). The cue-only trials were included to estimate the BOLD response to the 4 cues separately from the targets. There were also trials in which there were no 5 stimulus events, cue or search array (null-event; 25% of trials). The null-event 6 trials were included to facilitate the event-related analysis. Each participant 7 performed 7 fMRI scan runs, which included 96 total trials each (56 cue+target, 8 16 cue-only, and 24 null-event trials). Cue+target, cue-only, and null-event trials 9 were the same duration and randomly intermixed within each run. Each 10 experimental run started and ended with twelve seconds of blank fixation.

- 11
- 12

--- Insert Figure 1 about here ---

13

Behavioral performance analysis. Accuracy was chosen as the 14 15 dependent measure to maximize the experiment's sensitivity to changes in 16 perceptual processing and to minimize speed-accuracy tradeoffs and motor 17 biases that can occur when using reaction time as the dependent measure (e.g., Bisley & Goldberg, 2003; Santee & Egeth, 1982; Prinzmetal, McCool, & Parks, 18 19 2005). Accuracy measures have successfully demonstrated perceptual load 20 effects in distractor processing (Konstantinou & Lavie, 2013; Cartwright-Finch & 21 Lavie, 2007). Behavioral interference scores were established for each 22 participant as a function of cue validity and difficulty by calculating the difference 23 in accuracy between congruent and incongruent trials.

1

2 fMRI acquisition. All fMRI data were collected using a 3T Siemens Trio 3 MRI scanner equipped with a standard 12-channel phased-array head coil 4 located in the University of California, Santa Barbara Brain Imaging Center. 5 Whole-brain functional images were acquired using a T2*-weighted gradient-6 echo, echo-planar imaging sequence with a repetition time (TR) of 1.5 seconds, an echo time (TE)=30ms, and a 90° flip angle (FA). Each functional volume 7 8 consisted of 28 interleaved slices acquired parallel to the AC-PC line, voxel size 9 of 3x3x4mm, and field of view (FOV) of 192x192mm. Anatomical images were 10 acquired using a T1-weighted, spoiled gradient-echo sequence (MPRAGE; 11 TR=15ms, TE=4.2ms, FA=20°, voxel size of .9x.9x.9mm, FOV=240x240mm).

12 fMRI analysis. Standard spatial preprocessing was applied using SPM5 13 (http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/). Images were realigned to the first functional 14 image to correct for minor head motion. The mean functional image was 15 coregistered to the anatomical image and all functional images were coregistered 16 to the mean functional image. The functional and anatomical images were 17 normalized to conform to the MNI-152 template. The normalized functional images were then spatially smoothed with a 6-mm³ isotropic Gaussian kernel. 18 19 SPM5 was used to implement a voxel-wise least-squares general linear model 20 that did not assume an *a priori* shape for the hemodynamic response (Ollinger et 21 al., 2001a; Ollinger et al., 2001b). Regressors were included for eleven 22 peristimulus time-points associated with the cue onset. A unique set of 11 23 temporal parameters was modeled for high and low load valid cue, high and low load invalid cue, high and low load cue-only, and null-event trials irrespective of SOA. The data were concatenated across the 7 functional runs and stimulus effects were modeled by the same parameters across all runs; the model did not assume temporal continuity between runs. To correct for linear drift and mean run effects, a constant and a linear drift term were included separately for each run. All whole-brain contrasts compared model-estimates at the peak time-point, estimated to be 3-7.5 seconds after stimulus presentation.

8 Regions of interest (ROIs) were identified as those clusters that survived 9 the cue-only trials versus null-event contrast, thresholded at ρ <0.05 false-10 discovery rate (FDR) corrected with 10 contiguous voxels. Due to a response 11 recording error, all subsequent behavioral and neuroimaging analyses of the Exp. 1 and Exp. 2 data focused on the longer (1500 ms) cue+target SOA 12 13 condition. Within these cue-only ROIs, the average event-related hemodynamic 14 responses evoked by the cue+target and null-event trials were calculated. 15 Average event-related hemodynamic responses were converted to percent signal 16 change relative to a baseline that included the averaged signal intensity at the 17 onset of the cue display and the immediately preceding time-point. Overlap in the 18 hemodynamic responses to the search trials in this fast-rate design was 19 corrected by subtracting the hemodynamic responses corresponding to the null-20 event trials (Burock et al., 1998; Giesbrecht et al., 2013; Woldorff et al., 2004). 21 The resulting signal change data on cue+target trials were entered into separate 22 repeated-measures ANOVAs for each region, using cue validity, load, and 23 sampled time point as factors.

Individual differences in peak percent signal change on both valid and invalid low load cue+target trials within the ROIs identified by the cue-only contrast were also correlated with individual differences in behavioral interference scores. Correlation analyses were restricted to the low load conditions (valid and invalid cues) given that these were the conditions predicted, a priori, to have the greatest amount of interference.

7

8 Effect sizes. Effect sizes for all hypothesis tests conducted in each 9 experiment were computed. Specifically, for hypothesis tests conducted using 10 ANOVA, $\eta_{partial}^2$ is reported. For hypothesis tests using the t-statistic, Cohen's *d* is 11 reported. Small, medium, and large effects correspond to $\eta_{partial}^2$ values of 12 approximately 0.01, 0.06, and 0.14 and correspond to Cohen's *d* values of 13 approximately 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8, respectively (e.g., Cohen, 1992).

14

15 Spatial Localizer Task

Participants. The same fourteen volunteer participants in the cued search fMRI task were exposed to separate spatial localizer tasks in the same experimental session. One subject was excluded from all visual cortical analyses because portions of visual cortex were cut off during fMRI scans. Two other participants were excluded from the group localizer whole brain contrasts, due to missing event onsets for spatial localizer runs. However, these two participants were included in the selective averaging analysis using ROIs established by the
 group localizer contrasts.

Apparatus and stimuli. Each display consisted of a fixation cross in the center of screen and a flickering black and white checkered circle (0.52° in diameter) presented in each hemifield. The checkered circles were placed in spatial locations corresponding to the relevant search or irrelevant flanker locations in the cued search task. Black and white circles flickered in each relevant and irrelevant spatial location independently at 15 Hz. The color of fixation changed from white to red for 27 ms at random intervals.

10 **Procedure.** Participants were instructed to fixate on and press a button 11 when they detected a color change of the centrally presented fixation cross. Independent of the color detection task, spatial locations associated with relevant 12 13 search and irrelevant flanker locations in the cued search task were stimulated 14 with flickering black and white circles in both hemifields in approximately 12 15 second blocks. The duration a spatial location was stimulated ranged from 12-16 13.5 seconds depending on the number of fixation color changes that occurred in the block. Flickering stimuli were first presented in the two lateral search 17 locations, then two medial locations, and then two flanker locations, in 4 18 19 repetitions per localizer run. Participants performed 2 localizer runs, totaling 8 20 stimulus repetitions for each spatial location.

21

fMRI analysis. All fMRI data for the spatial localizer task were preprocessed in the same fashion as the fMRI data collected during the search

1 task. To correct for linear drift and mean session effects, a constant and a linear 2 drift term were included separately for each session. A canonical hemodynamic response function was used to model activation for each stimulated spatial 3 4 location. ROIs were identified as those clusters posterior in the brain that 5 survived the weighted contrast between 2 bilateral relevant spatial locations 6 versus 1 bilateral irrelevant spatial location (p<0.005, uncorrected, 10 contiguous 7 voxels). Within the surviving ROIs, the average event-related hemodynamic 8 response recorded during the cue-only and cue+target trials in the search task 9 was calculated and converted to percent signal change. The mean peak percent 10 signal change for cue-only trials in each visual cortical ROI was entered into a 11 repeated-measures ANOVA using ROI and predicted difficulty as factors. 12 Additionally, the mean peak percent signal change on cue+target trials in each 13 visual cortical ROI was entered into a repeated-measures ANOVA using ROI, 14 cue validity, and difficulty as factors.

15

16 Experiment 1B: Non-predictive Cue Visual Search Task

A different set of 36 volunteers (mean age=19.9; 28 female) participated in a non-predictive cue search task that served as a behavioral control group for the predictive cue search task described above. The stimuli and timing were exactly the same as the predictive cue task, except that the color of the fixation circle was not predictive of the upcoming load (or other display parameters). The nonpredictive control experiment was conducted in order to verify whether the task and display would sufficiently induce the typical interaction between perceptual difficulty and flanker interference (e.g., Lavie & Cox, 1997) when using accuracy as a dependent measure. Performance in the non-predictive group was used as a statistical baseline and was separately compared to validly and invalidly cued conditions in Experiment 1A. Difficulty and flanker-target congruency were used as within subjects factors and experimental group (predictive vs. non-predictive cues) as a between subjects factor in a repeated-measures ANOVA for behavioral analysis.

8

9 **Experiment 2**

Participants. Fifteen volunteers from the University of California, Santa Barbara community were paid \$10/hour for their participation (mean age = 20; 9 female). All procedures conformed to a protocol approved by the University of California, Santa Barbara Human Subjects Committee. Two participants were excluded from analyses because they failed to demonstrate a measurable positive P1 component.

Apparatus, Stimuli, Procedure, and Design. All aspects of this 16 17 experiment were the same as Exp. 1, except that one item was added to the display. This change was made to match the mean level of behavioral 18 19 performance in Exp. 1 because pilot testing revealed overall higher performance 20 in the EEG chamber compared to the scanning environment. The difference in 21 performance was likely due to the difference in display contrast and ambient 22 lighting in the scanner and EEG recording environments. The resulting five 23 search locations were evenly distributed in an arch (1.25°) above fixation, and 24 0.65° from each other. Participants were exposed to 11 experimental runs.

Behavioral performance analysis. Accuracy was analyzed as a function
 of cue validity, load, and flanker-target congruency using a repeated-measures
 ANOVA.

4 **EEG acquisition and analysis.** EEG activity was recorded inside an 8' x 5 10' electromagnetic field shielded chamber (ETS-Lindgren, Cedar Park, TX). 6 Data were sampled at 512 Hz using 32 Ag/AgCl sintered electrodes placed 7 according the International 10/20 System on the scalp and referenced offline to 8 the Cz electrode. Next, the EEG signal was band-pass filtered between 0.1 and 9 30Hz to exclude low and high frequency noise. To ensure fixation, trials 10 containing ocular artifacts, measured by the bipolar EOG amplitudes exceeding 11 $\pm 75 \mu$ V, were excluded from analysis. The mean percentage of rejected trials 12 across subjects was 6%. The remaining EEG signals were averaged from 100 13 ms prior to and 400 ms after the onset of the search display to produce the ERP 14 response.

The mean amplitude of the P1 ERP component was calculated as a 15 16 function of cue validity and difficulty. The mean amplitude of the P1 was 17 computed by first identifying the peak of the first positive deflection observed 18 between 75-200 ms after the onset of the search display. This was done for each 19 participant using the average waveform collapsed across all conditions over 20 posterior occipital electrodes (PO3, O1, PO4, O2; Heinze et al, 1990; Heinze and 21 Mangun, 1995; Wijers et al, 1997). On average, the mean latency of the P1 peak 22 amplitude measured at electrodes contralateral to the irrelevant flanker was 130 23 ms after the onset of the search display (Figure 5a). Finally, the mean amplitude

1	for each condition was computed within a 45 ms time window centered on the
2	identified peak. The mean P1 amplitude was entered into a repeated-measures
3	ANOVA with cue validity and load as within subjects factors.

- 4
- 5

Results

6 Experiment 1

7 We used the load-cue search task to investigate three possible effects that 8 top-down expectations could have on perceptual distraction. First, if the 9 processing of irrelevant information is automatically determined by perceptual 10 demands, as predicted by load theory, then flanker interference should be larger 11 under low load than high load conditions, regardless of the top-down expectancy engendered by the cue. Second, if the processing of irrelevant information is 12 13 driven solely by top-down biasing signals, then the expectations induced by the 14 cue should affect the amount of flanker interference and the neural responses evoked by the flanker. This top-down influence could take multiple forms. For 15 16 example, if perceptual distraction is driven entirely by top-down expectations 17 concerning the difficulty of the upcoming search display, then flanker interference 18 could be greater when participants expect low load (i.e., valid low and invalid 19 high demand trials) than when they expect high load (i.e. valid high and invalid 20 low demand trials). In other words, perceptual distraction could depend on one's 21 top-down expectations regardless of whether those expectations turn out to be 22 correct (i.e., on valid trials) or incorrect (i.e., on invalid trials). That said, previous 23 work shows that behavioral distraction (Johnson et al., 2002) and baseline

1 responses in regions of visual cortex that represent irrelevant spatial locations 2 (Serences et al., 2004) are reduced by expectations despite low perceptual 3 Thus, another form of top-down influence is that cued-induced demands. 4 expectancies will reduce or eliminate sensory processing of the flanker and the 5 corresponding behavioral interference when expectations are accurate (i.e., 6 valid) but not when they are inaccurate (i.e., invalid), and this effect will occur 7 regardless of the difficulty of the search task. In other words, when the cues are 8 valid, there will be no flanker interference in either the low or the high load 9 conditions, but when the cues are invalid, there could be more flanker 10 interference compared to valid trials. Third, the allocation of resources could be 11 determined by the interaction between top-down and more bottom-up perceptual 12 processing mechanisms. If true, then cue-evoked expectations may interact with 13 the difficulty of the search display to modulate both behavioral and neural 14 measures of distraction. For example, based on the work cited above (e.g. 15 Serences et al., 2004; Johnston et al., 2002), it could be the case that accurate (i.e., valid) top-down expectations concerning search difficulty may serve to 16 eliminate distraction regardless of the perceptual load of the display; in contrast, 17 inaccurate (i.e., invalid) top-down expectations may allow distraction to be more 18 19 strongly influenced by the perceptual load of the display.

Importantly, if load- and expectation-mediated effects on behavioral distraction reflect early sensory processing mechanisms, visual cortical responses measured with fMRI should mirror the behavioral modulations of distraction similar to one of the three possible effects outlined in the preceding paragraphs. In addition, we predicted that evidence for top-down influences on perceptual distraction would also be reflected at the level of large-scale cortical networks, including the frontal and parietal regions associated with the volitional control of attention (Kastner et al., 1998; Hopfinger et al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Yantis et al., 2002; Giesbrecht et al., 2003; Kincade, et al., 2005).

7

8 Behavioral Performance

9 Expectation-induced modulations of behavioral distraction. Behavioral distraction was indexed by the difference in accuracy when the irrelevant flanker 10 11 was congruent with the target versus when the flanker was incongruent. 12 Behavioral performance in the predictive cue search task (Exp. 1A) is shown in 13 Fig. 1b alongside the results of the non-predictive control condition (Exp. 1B) in 14 Fig. 1c. When cues accurately predicted load (e.g., low load cue, low load 15 display) there was a significant interaction between load, flanker congruency, and experimental group (F(1,48)=5.29, p=0.026, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.10). There were no other 16 main effects or interactions with experimental group (all p's>0.06, $\eta^2_{partial}$ <0.08). 17 In order to understand the nature of the significant three-way interaction, post-18 19 hoc analyses were conducted for the valid cue condition (Exp. 1A) and the non-20 predictive group (Exp. 1B) separately using difficulty and flanker congruency as 21 In the non-predictive group, there was a significant difficulty x factors. 22 congruency interaction, such that flanker interference was larger with low load displays than with high load displays (F(1,35)=4.43, p=0.042, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.11). The 23

observed interaction in the non-predictive group confirmed that the use of accuracy as a dependent measure successfully induced the pattern of behavior predicted by the load theory of attention, in the absence of top-down expectancy. In contrast to the non-predictive group, congruency had no main effect and did not interact with difficulty in the valid cue condition (all p's>0.16, $\eta_{partial}^2$ <0.14). The absence of a congruency effect indicated that distraction in both difficulty conditions was eliminated when difficulty expectations were accurate.

8 The analysis comparing the invalid cue condition to the non-predictive 9 group revealed a significant interaction between flanker congruency and difficulty (F(1,48)=6.75, p=0.012, $\eta_{partial}^2$ =0.12). This interaction was driven by more flanker 10 11 interference under low load compared to high load. No other main effects or interactions with experimental group were significant (all p's>0.17, $\eta^2_{partial}$ <0.04). 12 13 Critically, this analysis demonstrated that distraction was driven by the difficulty 14 induced by the search display when expectations were incorrect (Exp. 1A) or absent (Exp. 1B). 15

16

17 *fMRI*

The fMRI data were analyzed to address two key issues. The first was to determine whether the interaction between perceptual load and top-down expectation was present in BOLD responses in visual cortex. Second, we investigated whether regions of the dorsal attention network, typically associated with voluntary control (Kastner et al., 1998; Hopfinger et al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Kincade et al., 2005), play a role in mediating distraction.

1 Expectation-induced modulations in visual cortex. First, to investigate the 2 effect of expectations on visual sensory processing in our task, regions of visual 3 cortex that represented the relevant search and the irrelevant flanker locations 4 were identified using an independent spatial localizer (see Methods). The region 5 that responded more robustly to stimuli presented in the relevant search 6 locations than to stimuli presented in the irrelevant flanker locations included the 7 middle occipital gyrus (MOG_{rel>irrel}; Fig. 2a, Table 1). The region that preferentially 8 responded to stimuli presented in irrelevant flanker locations compared to 9 relevant search locations included the lingual gyrus (LinG_{irrel>rel}). Given the 10 predicted tradeoffs between relevant and irrelevant information processing (Lavie 11 & Tsal, 1994; Lavie, 1995; Lavie et al., 2004), perceptual selectivity in favor of 12 relevant information was indexed in the main experimental runs by larger mean 13 BOLD responses in MOG_{rel>irrel} than LinG_{irrel>rel}.

To determine if expectations influenced preparatory responses, BOLD responses on cue-only trials in regions of visual cortex that represented the search and flanker locations were analyzed as a function of region of interest (ROI, i.e., $MOG_{rel>irrel}$ and $LinG_{irrel>rel}$) and cued load. There were no significant main effects or interactions with either ROI or cued load (p>0.08; $\eta_{partial}^2$ <0.23; Fig. 2b).

To investigate the extent to which search load and expectation influenced visual sensory processing during visual search, visual cortical responses on cue+target trials were compared as a function of cue validity and load. There was a significant three-way interaction between ROI, load, and cue validity

(F(1,12)=14.64, p=0.002, $\eta_{partial}^2$ =0.55; Fig. 2c). Separate post-hoc repeated-1 2 measures ANOVAs revealed that the three-way interaction was driven by the fact 3 that there was an interaction between ROI and search load on invalidly cued trials (F(1,12) = 11.36, p=0.006, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.49). This interaction was due to a larger 4 5 BOLD response in MOG_{rel>irrel} than in LinG_{irrel>rel} on high load trials (t(12)=2.98, 6 p=0.012, *d*=0.84). The larger response in MOG_{rel>irrel} suggests perceptual 7 selectivity in favor of relevant search locations over irrelevant flanker locations. 8 On low load trials, however, the response in MOG_{rel>irrel} was not different from 9 LinG_{irrel>rel} (t(12)=0.83, p=0.42, d=0.23). The similar response magnitudes in 10 MOG_{rel>irrel} and LinG_{irrel>rel} suggest that there was relatively comparable levels of 11 visual processing in these locations and weak perceptual selectivity. The pattern 12 of activation on invalid trials is consistent with predictions of load theory and 13 previous demonstrations that perceptual load modulate visual responses (Rees. 14 et al., 1997; Handy et al., 2001; Yi, et al., 2004; Rorden, et al., 2008). In contrast to invalid trials, MOG_{rel>irrel} exhibited larger responses than LinG_{irrel>rel} on validly 15 cued trials (F(1,12)=6.40, p=0.026, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.35), but the difference between ROIs 16 did not interact with search load (F(1,12)=0.40, p=0.54, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.03). The larger 17 18 response in MOG_{rel>irrel} than in LinG_{irrel>rel} supports the notion that relevant search 19 locations were selectively enhanced compared to the irrelevant flanker locations 20 when the cue was valid, regardless of perceptual load. As a whole, the three-way 21 interaction between ROI, difficulty, and cue validity is consistent with the notion 22 that top-down expectation and perceptual load interact in visual cortex to 23 influence the extent to which relevant and irrelevant information is processed.

1 2 -- Insert Table 1 and Figure 2 about here--3 4 Expectation induced modulations in the dorsal attention network. To 5 investigate the role played by the dorsal attention network in mediating 6 distraction, we first identified regions that were engaged on trials that contained a 7 cue but no search display (Woldorff et al., 2004; Slagter et al., 2006). This 8 contrast isolated regions of activation within the dorsal frontoparietal voluntary 9 attention network—bilateral dorsal parietal areas, including the intraparietal 10 sulcus (IPS) extending into the superior parietal lobe (SPL), and bilateral dorsal 11 lateral prefrontal cortex, including the posterior aspect of the middle frontal gyrus

12 (MFG) extending into the precentral sulcus (PreCs; Figure 3a and Table 2).

- 13
- 14

-- Insert Figure 3 and Table 2 about here--

15

16 To assess the involvement of these regions in mediating distraction during 17 visual search, we extracted the percent signal change on cue+target trials within each ROI of the dorsal frontoparietal network identified by the cue-only contrast. 18 19 If the dorsal frontoparietal network is involved in mediating distraction, regions 20 within this network should exhibit interactions between cue-validity and load 21 similar to those observed in the patterns of behavioral performance and BOLD 22 responses in visual cortex. The resulting BOLD time-courses are shown in Figure 23 3b. Activity on cue+target trials within the bilateral dorsal parietal and frontal

1 regions associated with voluntary control revealed two key findings. First, the left 2 parietal region, IPS/SPL, demonstrated a significant interaction between cue validity, load, and time (F(10,130)=3.02, p=0.002, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.19). Separate post-3 4 hoc repeated-measures ANOVAs revealed that the three-way interaction was 5 driven by the fact that the BOLD response in this region was not influenced by load on validly cued trials (p>0.19, $\eta^2_{partial}$ <0.10), but was modulated by the 6 interaction between load and time on invalid trials (F(10,130)=2.34, 7 p=0.014, $\eta_{partial}^2$ = 0.15). Additionally, separate post-hoc repeated-measures 8 ANOVAs analyzing the difficulty conditions separately revealed no influence of 9 cue validity on high load trials (p>0.14, $\eta^2_{partial}$ <0.10), but did reveal that the 10 11 interaction between cue validity and time modulated the BOLD response in low load conditions (F(10,130)=2.70, p=0.005, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.17). There was an overall 12 larger response on invalidly cued low load trials compared to validly cued low 13 14 load trials. The pattern of activation in this region paralleled the pattern found in 15 behavior, such that the invalid low load condition produced both the largest 16 BOLD response and the largest behavioral distraction effect. The right parietal 17 ROI, including IPS/SPL, exhibited a qualitatively similar response, but the threeway interaction was not significant (F(10,130)=0.858, p<0.57, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.06). The 18 19 consistent interaction between cue validity and load observed in both behavior 20 and BOLD responses in the left dorsal parietal region suggests that this region-21 which has been previously associated with directing spatial attention (Posner et 22 al., 1984; Hopfinger, et al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Yantis et al., 2002; Woldorff et al., 2004), distractor inhibition (Friedman-Hill et al., 2003;
Mevorach et al., 2006; Akyürek et al., 2010; Melloni et al., 2012), calculating
perceptual saliency (Geng & Mangun, 2009), and working memory load (Todd
and Marois, 2004)–is unaffected by perceptual difficulty when cues are valid but
is affected by perceptual difficulty when cues are invalid.

6 The second key finding was that there were also significant interactions 7 between cue validity, load, and time in both left (F(10,130)=3.90, p<0.001, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.23) and right (F(10,130)=2.70, p=0.005, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.18) dorsal lateral 8 9 prefrontal ROIs (MFG/PreCs). The pattern of these interactions did not parallel 10 the pattern of behavioral and perceptual distraction but did reveal that these regions had a larger response at later time points on invalidly cued high load 11 12 trials compared to all other conditions. The interactions between cue validity. 13 load, and time in dorsal frontal regions suggests that areas previously associated 14 with global task difficulty (Demeter, et al., 2011) and online switches of the task 15 set in response to violations of expectancy (Sohn et al., 2000; Koechlin et al., 2003; Sylvester et al., 2003) are engaged for a longer period of time on invalidly 16 17 cued high load trials. While it is difficult to make strong inferences about the 18 temporal dynamics of neural activity based on BOLD responses, the greater 19 response at later time points on invalid high load trials may index differences in 20 task difficulty and implicate greater demand on invalid high conditions compared 21 to valid high, valid low, and invalid low load conditions. However, a post-hoc 22 comparison of behavioral accuracy between valid (M=0.85) and invalid high 23 (M=0.84) load trials demonstrated no significant differences in overall accuracy 1 (t(13)=0.28, p=0.78, d=0.08) suggesting that the tasks were relatively equated in 2 difficulty. Alternatively, the larger response in MFG/PreCs in later time points 3 may also reflect a readjustment of the task set from an easy strategy consisting 4 of searching for a salient feature to a more effortful search strategy requiring the 5 conjunction of multiple features and the examination of several likely targets 6 (Treisman and Gelade, 1980; Wolfe, 1994). It is possible that this later response 7 is not present on invalid low load conditions because a salient target can be 8 efficiently detected whilst maintaining the more difficult conjunction search 9 strategy, thereby not requiring a switch in task set.

- 10
- 11

-- Insert Figure 3 about here --

12

13 Individual differences in distraction. Parietal cortex, including both IPS and 14 SPL, is functionally heterogeneous. For instance, dorsal parietal regions have 15 previously been associated with the 1) orienting of attention toward relevant 16 (Posner et al., 1984; Hopfinger, et al., 2000; Corbetta, et al., 2000; Yantis, et al., 2002; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Woldorff et al., 2004) and away from 17 irrelevant information (Friedman-Hill et al., 2003; Mevorach et al., 2006; Akyürek 18 19 et al., 2010; Melloni et al., 2012); 2) efficient perceptual decision making (Kayser 20 et al., 2011; Liu & Pleskac, 2011; Hebart et al., 2012); 3) integrating top-down 21 and bottom-up saliency (Geng & Mangun, 2009); and 4) indexing the complexity 22 or amount of information held within working memory (e.g., Todd & Marois, 23 2004). These proposed roles of parietal cortex make opposing predictions about

1 the correlation between individual differences in behavioral distraction and BOLD 2 responses within parietal cortex. Specifically, if the parietal cortex BOLD responses observed here are associated with successful attentional control or 3 4 efficient perceptual decision making, then increases in the BOLD response 5 should be associated with less perceptual distraction (i.e., a negative correlation). In contrast, if the parietal cortex BOLD responses observed here are indexing 6 7 working memory load, then increases in the BOLD response should be 8 associated with more perceptual distraction because the inclusion of the 9 irrelevant flanker in working memory would also increase its potential for 10 behavioral interference (i.e., a positive correlation).

11 To test these competing predictions, correlations between individual 12 differences in behavioral distraction and responses in the voluntary control 13 network were performed. The analyses correlated each individual's peak percent 14 signal change on cue+target trials within each of the four dorsal frontoparietal 15 ROIs (identified by the cue-only contrast) with the size of each individual's 16 distraction effect observed in the valid and invalid low load conditions of Experiment 1A. Behavioral distraction was indexed by computing the 17 performance (i.e., accuracy) difference between the congruent and incongruent 18 19 flanker conditions. The correlation analyses were restricted to the low load 20 conditions because this was the condition predicted to show behavioral distraction. All correlations were Bonferroni corrected (p<0.05, two-tailed) for 21 eight comparisons (4 ROI locations x 2 validity conditions), resulting in a 22

threshold of p=0.00625 for each test. The results of this correlation analyses are
 presented in Table 3 and Figure 4.

3 The percent signal change in the left parietal ROI and behavioral 4 interference on invalidly cued low load trials had a strong negative correlation, 5 r(12)=-0.81, p<0.001, showing that individuals that exhibited relatively large 6 BOLD responses in left IPS/SPL tended to exhibit smaller amounts of flanker 7 interference. This correlation is consistent with the notion of a top-down biasing 8 signal and efficient perceptual processing, suggesting that across individuals. 9 increased involvement of dorsal partial cortex corresponds to reduced behavioral 10 distraction. Interestingly, despite the identical display on validly cued low load 11 trials, there was no correlation between BOLD responses and behavioral 12 performance (r(12) = -0.14, p=0.633). Moreover, a direct comparison between 13 the two correlation coefficients revealed that the correlation on invalid low load 14 trials was different than the correlation on valid low load trials (z=2.31, p=0.01). There was also a trend for a similar relationship in the right parietal region, but it 15 16 failed to reach significance when corrected for multiple comparisons (valid trials: 17 r(12) = 0.11, p=0.71; invalid trials: r(12) = -0.55, p=0.04). These results contrast 18 previous findings by Kim & Hopfinger (2010) that the activation of the right dorsal 19 parietal cortex positively correlated with attentional capture of novel objects and 20 may reflect different sub-functions of this region (Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; 21 Mevorach et al., 2006). The correlation between IPS/SPL BOLD responses and 22 individual differences in distraction suggests that the interaction between validity 23 and difficulty in this region is not due to more information being encoded into

1	working memory. Rather, the results observed in IPS/SPL could represent more
2	efficient filtering of task-irrelevant information or perceptual decision-making
3	when faced with unexpected task demands.

- 4
- 5

-- Insert Figure 4 and Table 3 about here --

6

7 Experiment 2

8 Experiment 2 (Exp.2) was an ERP experiment that used the same task to 9 investigate the extent to which sensory processing of the flanker within the first 10 200 ms after the presentation of the search display was modulated by the 11 interaction between cue-generated expectations and task demands. Exp. 2 12 focused on temporally early measures of sensory processing in order to establish 13 if the effects of expectation and perceptual difficulty observed in Exp. 1 were 14 representative of post-perceptual feed-back mechanisms involved in cognitive control (Lavie, et al., 2004; Kelley & Lavie, 2011) or representative of early 15 16 selection mechanisms associated with sensory processing. The difficulty of target processing has previously been shown to modulate the amplitude of the 17 P1 event-related potential (ERP) evoked by an irrelevant stimulus (Handy et al. 18 19 2001) and to a non-predictive peripheral spatial cue (Fu, et al., 2010). Given the 20 prior evidence supporting perceptual load modulations of the P1 and our primary 21 interest in temporally early sensory processing, we measured the P1 ERP 22 component at electrodes contralateral to the position of the irrelevant flanker. The 23 P1 component is the first positive deflection in the ERP measured at lateral occipital scalp locations contralateral to the presentation of a visual stimulus and
it is typically larger when the stimulus is attended relative to when it is unattended
(Van Voorhis & Hillyard, 1977; Mangun & Hillyard, 1991; Heinze et al., 1994).

4 We hypothesized three possible effects of expectation and task load on 5 the magnitude of the P1 associated to the irrelevant flanker. First. if the 6 allocation of early visual processing resources depends on the perceptual load 7 induced by task-relevant information alone, as predicted by load theory, then the 8 amplitude of the P1 component measured at electrodes contralateral to the side 9 of the irrelevant flanker should be modulated by load alone and should not be 10 modulated by cue validity or expected load. As a result, any interactions 11 between perceptual load and top-down expectation found in Experiment 1 would 12 likely to represent top-down biases in later stages of cognitive control and 13 selection from working memory (Lavie, et al., 2004; Kelley & Lavie, 2011). 14 Therefore, any influence of expectation should occur in ERP components 15 associated with later cognitive stages of information processing. A second 16 possible outcome is that expectations of difficulty solely influence early sensory 17 processing and attentional selection. If top-down expectation dictates distraction, 18 cue meaning (i.e., low load vs. high load) or validity should modulate the 19 amplitude of the P1. Finally, if early sensory processing is mediated by the 20 combination of expectations and perceptual demands, then the amplitude of the 21 P1 should be modulated by the interaction between cue validity and load.

22

23 Behavioral Performance

1 The proportion of correct responses in Experiment 2 is shown in Figure 2 1d. Importantly, the pattern of behavioral results replicated Exp. 1. Consistent with an influence of top-down control on distraction, there was a significant 3 4 interaction between validity, load, and congruency (F(1,12)=5.73, p=0.034, $\eta_{partial}^2$ =0.32). Specifically, behavioral distraction was eliminated on valid cue 5 trials: there were no significant main effects or interactions of flanker congruency 6 when cues were valid (p>0.08, $\eta^2_{partial}$ <0.24). In addition, there was a significant 7 8 interaction between flanker congruency and load when cues were invalid (F(1,12)=8.60, p=0.013, $\eta^2_{partial}$ = 0.42). Post-hoc t-tests revealed that this 9 10 interaction on invalid trials was driven by a significant effect of flanker 11 congruency under low load conditions (M=0.05, SEM=0.01, t(12)=3.12, p=0.009, 12 d=0.87). In contrast, there was no effect of flanker congruency under high load 13 conditions (M=-0.04, SEM=0.03, t(12)=-1.58, p=0.14, d=0.44).

14

15 Event-Related-Potentials

16 The group average ERPs and P1 mean amplitudes recorded at occipital and 17 parietal-occipital electrodes contralateral to the position of the task-irrelevant 18 flanker are plotted as a function of cue validity and search load in Figure 5. Visual 19 inspection of both the ERP time-course and mean amplitudes suggest that there 20 was an interaction between search load and top-down expectation during early 21 sensory processing. When perceptual load was low, the P1 to the flanker was 22 larger when the cue was invalid compared to when it was valid. When perceptual load was high, there was little or no difference in the P1 amplitude as a function 23

1 of cue validity. There was also a significant interaction between validity and load on the P1 mean amplitudes (F(1,12) = 5.01, p=0.045, $\eta_{partial}^2$ =0.30). Post-hoc t-2 3 tests indicated that this interaction was driven by the smaller P1 amplitude on valid low load trials (M=3.43 μ V) compared to the invalid low load trials (M=4.32 4 5 μ V; t(12)=-4.25, p=0.001, d=1.17), but no influence of cue validity under high load 6 (t(12)=0.72, p=0.49, d=0.20). Also consistent with the interpretation that accurate 7 expectations eliminate behavioral distraction regardless of perceptual load, there 8 was no difference between low and high load P1 amplitudes associated with the 9 flanker on valid trials (t(12)=0.35, p=0.734, d=0.09). An additional analysis was 10 also conducted on the mean amplitude of the N1 ERP component and it 11 exhibited a qualitatively similar, but not statistically reliable, pattern. Taken 12 together, the results from Experiment 2 support the interpretation that top-down 13 expectation and perceptual processing demands interacted to influence sensory 14 processing of the irrelevant flanker within the first 130 ms after the search display 15 was presented.

16

17

- -- Insert Figure 5 about here --
- 18

19 Control Analyses

Overall, the observed patterns of behavioral performance, fMRI responses in the dorsal attention network, and visual cortical responses measured with both fMRI and EEG are consistent with the idea that perceptual distraction is determined by the interaction between perceptual load and top-down

1 expectations about task demands. The finding that predictive cues eliminated 2 distraction under low load is inconsistent with a strict interpretation of the load 3 theory assumption that the allocation of perceptual resources is automatic and 4 exhaustive. However, load theory could potentially account for the interaction 5 between perceptual difficulty and top-down expectation if it were assumed that 6 the size of the resource pool is flexible and may change due to alertness and 7 other factors (Lavie & Tsal, 1994). According to this modified load theory view. 8 the predictive cues used here may result in the recruitment of a smaller resource 9 pool when the cue indicates that the difficulty of the search display is likely to be 10 low and a larger resource pool when the cue indicates that the likely difficulty will 11 be high. Once the size of the resource pool is determined, the available resources are then distributed according to the automatic and exhaustive 12 13 allocation scheme. This alternative account, which we refer to as the flexible 14 resource pool hypothesis, makes a number of specific predictions about the 15 effect of the cues on behavioral performance, cue-evoked BOLD responses in the dorsal attention network, and responses in visual cortex. 16

17

Behavioral Performance. The flexible resource pool hypothesis makes four predictions about the effect of the cues on overall performance and an additional four predictions about the effect of the cues on the magnitude of flanker interference. First, if more resources are recruited when participants are given a high load cue, additional resources should be available to identify the target and overall accuracy should be higher on valid high load trials than invalid

1 high load trials. However, there was no effect of cue validity on high load trials in 2 Exp. 1A (t(13)=0.28, p=0.78, d=0.07) or in Exp. 2 (t(12)=0.22, p=0.83, d=0.06). 3 The lack of a difference in these conditions is unlikely due to floor effects 4 because performance is well above chance. Second, if more resources are 5 recruited when given a high load cue, additional resources should be available to 6 identify the target and accuracy should be higher on valid high load trials 7 compared to when no expectation is generated, as in the non-predictive high 8 load trials. Contrary to this prediction, overall performance did not differ between 9 the high load valid and high load non-predictive conditions (Exp. 1A versus Exp. 1B; t(48)=-0.37, p=0.27, d=0.12). Similarly, there was no difference in overall 10 11 performance between the invalid and non-predictive low load groups (Exp. 1A 12 versus Exp. 1B; t(48)=0.79, p=0.43, d=0.25). Third, if fewer resources are 13 recruited when given a low load cue, insufficient resources should be available to 14 identify the target and accuracy should be lower on invalid high load trials 15 compared to the non-predictive high load group. However, overall accuracy between invalid and non-predictive high load conditions was not different (Exp. 16 1A versus Exp. 1B; t(48)=-0.53, p=0.29, d=0.17). Fourth, if fewer resources are 17 18 available when expecting low load, fewer resources should be available to 19 identify the target and accuracy should be lower on valid low load trials compared 20 to the non-predictive low load group. However, there was no difference in 21 performance between valid and non-predictive groups in the low load conditions 22 (Exp. 1A versus Exp. 1B; t(48)=1.10, p=0.28, d=0.35).

23

The predictions pertaining to flanker interference are as follows. First, if
1 fewer resources are available when expecting low load than when expecting high 2 load, there should be fewer excess resources to "spill-over" to irrelevant flankers 3 on valid low load trials compared to invalid low load trials (i.e., low load display 4 preceded by a high load cue). Consistent with this prediction, we observed less 5 interference under valid low load conditions than invalid low load conditions in Exp.1A (F(1,13)=12.22, p=0.004, $\eta_{partial}^2 = 0.48$) and Exp. 2 (F(1,12)=6.27, 6 p=0.028, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.34). Second, more interference should be observed in valid 7 8 high load conditions compared to invalid high load conditions because the high 9 load cue would result in the recruitment of more resources and subsequently 10 permit more excess resources to "spill over" to process the flanker. However, 11 there was no significant congruency effect (i.e., distraction effect) in the valid high 12 load condition in Exp. 1A (t(13)=0.33, p=0.746, d=0.40) or Exp. 2 (t(12)=1.04, 13 p=0.320. d=0.35). Similarly, an interaction between flanker congruency and cue 14 validity under high load displays was not observed in Exp. 1A (F(1,13)=0.25, p=0.625, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.02) or Exp. 2 (F(1,12)=2.93, p=0.113, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.20). Third, a 15 16 smaller resource pool following a low load cue should result in a smaller amount 17 of "spill-over" on valid low load trials compared to non-predictive low load 18 conditions. Consistent with this interpretation, there was a significant difference 19 between experiments Exp. 1A and Exp. 1B in flanker interference (F(1,48)=8.62, p=0.005, $\eta^2_{partial}$ =0.15). Direct comparisons revealed that this effect was driven by 20 21 a difference in performance between congruent and incongruent flanker 22 conditions in the non-predictive experiment (M=0.05, SEM=0.01, t(35)=4.57, 23 p < 0.001, d = 0.76), but not in the valid cue condition of Exp. 1A (M=0.01, SEM =

1 0.02, t(13)=0.58, p=0.57, *d*=0.15). Fourth, the recruitment of extra resources in 2 response to a high load cue predicts more flanker interference on invalid low load 3 trials than on non-predictive low load trials. Contrary to this prediction, there was 4 no difference in flanker interference between invalid low and non-predictive low 5 load conditions (Exp 1A versus Exp 1B; F(1,48)=2.60, p=0.11, $\eta_{partial}^2$ =0.05).

6 Cue-evoked BOLD responses in the dorsal attention network. The flexible 7 resource pool hypothesis predicts that high load cues should recruit more 8 resources, a recruitment likely mediated by attentional control systems. This 9 predicts that high load cues should generally result in larger BOLD responses 10 than low load cues. We tested this hypothesis by conducting a whole-brain 11 analysis directly comparing high load cue-only trials versus low load cue-only 12 trials. This contrast did not reveal any areas as being more active on high load 13 trials than low load trials.

14 BOLD and ERP responses in visual cortex. The flexible resource pool 15 hypothesis outlined above proposes that the pool of resources recruited should 16 be proportional to the expectation of the task demand (e.g., expect high load = 17 more resources recruited). Once a display is presented, resources are allocated 18 to relevant information and any unused resources are automatically allocated to 19 task-irrelevant information. This proposal makes four specific predictions about 20 the patterns of BOLD activity in regions of visual cortex that selectively represent 21 both relevant (MOG_{rel>irrel}) and irrelevant locations (LinG_{irrel>rel}). First. if expectations result in the differential recruitment of resources from a flexible 22 23 resource pool, high and low load cues should evoke different BOLD responses in

MOG_{rel>irrel} and LinG_{irrel>rel}. Direct comparisons between the cue-types (low vs. 1 2 high) within each ROI in visual cortex revealed that the cues did not differentially 3 modulate responses on cue-only trials within either $MOG_{rel>irrel}$ (t(12)=0.57, 4 p=0.58, d=0.15) or LinG_{irrel>rel}, (t(12)=0.50, p=0.63, d=0.16). Second, the flexible 5 resource hypothesis predicts that activity in LinG_{irrel>rel} should be greater on 6 invalid low load trials (cued high) than on valid low load trials because there 7 should be more available resources to "spill over" to irrelevant information, but no 8 difference was observed (t(12)=-0.75, p=0.47, d=0.21). Third, BOLD responses 9 in LinG_{irrel>rel} should be greater on valid high load trials than invalid high load 10 trials, but no difference was observed (t(12)=1.93, p=0.076, d=0.54). Fourth, the 11 flexible resource pool hypothesis predicts that there should be more excess 12 resources available on invalid low load trials than on invalid high load trials and. 13 as a result, activity in LinG_{irrel>rel} should be larger on invalid low load trials than 14 invalid high load trials. However, a direct comparison revealed no significant 15 difference in BOLD responses between low and high load on invalid trials (t(12)) 16 =1.63, p=0.13, d=0.45).

The flexible resource pool hypothesis makes two predictions about the pattern of ERP responses. First, the flexible resource hypothesis predicts that there should be more resources available to "spill over" to the irrelevant flanker on invalid low load trials compared to valid low load trials. Consistent with this prediction, the P1 ERP component contralateral to the flanker was greater for invalid compared to valid low load trials (t(12)=4.25, p=0.001, d=1.18). Second, this alternative hypothesis also predicts fewer resources should be available to "spill over" to the irrelevant flanker on invalid high load trials compared to valid high load trials. Contrary to the flexible resource hypothesis, cue validity had no effect on the P1 ERP component contralateral to the flanker on high load trials (t(12)=0.72, p=0.49, d=0.20).

5

6 Summary of control analyses. The flexible resource pool hypothesis 7 proposes that predictive cues flexibly engage different amounts of resources that 8 are automatically allocated based on the perceptual difficulty of the task-relevant 9 display. This hypothesis makes fifteen key predictions about behavior, visual 10 evoked responses measured with fMRI BOLD and measured with ERP. Overall, 11 only three of the 15 predictions were supported: 1) distraction was smaller when 12 cues validly predicted low load compared to when cues were invalid, 2) 13 distraction was smaller when cues validly predicted low load compared to the 14 distraction observed in the non-predictive control group, and 3) the P1 associated 15 with the irrelevant flanker was larger on invalid cue low load trials than on valid 16 cue low load trials. Importantly, while these three significant tests are consistent 17 with the flexible resource pool hypothesis of load theory, they are also consistent with the notion that the allocation of resources is mediated by the interaction 18 19 between the perceptual demands of the task and one's internal expectations. 20 Specifically, the smaller amount of behavioral interference observed when the 21 cues were valid compared to the behavioral interference observed when the cues 22 were invalid or non-predictive supports the interpretation that accurate top-down 23 expectation facilitates the filtering of task irrelevant information, even when perceptual difficulty is low. In addition, the larger sensory evoked P1
 contralateral to the irrelevant flanker on invalid low load trials supports the notion
 that load can dictate distraction when participants' expectations are violated.
 This violation results in greater distraction when perceptual load is low compared
 to when load was high.

6 Of course, given that many of the results did not support the flexible 7 resource pool hypothesis, it is tempting to conclude that this hypothesis is not a 8 viable explanation of the results reported here. However, because many of the 9 tests were null results, one could justifiably argue that the flexible resource 10 hypothesis was not supported because the experiments reported here were 11 underpowered. If the lack of support for the flexible resource hypothesis was 12 solely due to a lack of statistical power, then one could reasonably expect the 13 effect sizes for the null results to be in the medium or large range (Cohen, 1992). 14 However, the reported effect sizes generally do not support this claim. The 12 15 predictions of the flexible resource pool hypothesis that failed to receive support 16 were tested using 18 separate hypothesis tests. Only one of these tests had an 17 effect size considered to be large, four had medium effect sizes, and 13 had small effect sizes. Thus, while we cannot definitively rule out the flexible resource 18 19 hypothesis as an account for the observed pattern of data, the proportion of 20 predictions that were not confirmed, the distribution of effect sizes, and the fact 21 that the predictions that were confirmed are also explained by an interaction 22 between perceptual demand and top-down expectation support the notion that

1	the flexible resource hypothesis is a less parsimonious explanation of the effect
2	of top-down expectations on perceptual distraction.

3

4

Discussion

5 Accurate expectations diminish distraction

6 The experiments reported here tested load theory's assertion that the perceptual 7 processing of task-irrelevant information is determined by the automatic and 8 exhaustive "spill over" of resources dictated by the perceptual capacity required 9 to process task-relevant information. The primary result was that the extent to 10 which task-irrelevant information was processed — measured by behavior, fMRI, 11 and ERPs — was modulated by the interaction between the perceptual demands 12 of the task and the accuracy of one's explicit top-down expectations about the 13 task's difficulty. Behavioral distraction was driven by the perceptual demands of 14 the task only when perceptual load was invalidly cued or when the cues were 15 non-predictive. In contrast, when the cues were valid predictors of task 16 demands, there was no evidence of distraction, even under low load conditions. Paralleling the behavioral data, correct advance knowledge of search difficulty 17 eliminated any influence of perceptual load on fMRI responses in visual areas 18 19 and on ERP responses measured at electrodes contralateral to the flanker location. 20

In contrast to load theory, the evidence reported here suggests that taskirrelevant information was effectively filtered out when expectations were accurate, even when the perceptual task demands were low. However, perceptual processing of relevant and irrelevant information was determined by
 the demands of the task-relevant information when top-down expectations were
 violated or otherwise unavailable.

4 An alternative interpretation of load theory proposes that the amount of 5 resources available for perceptual processing is flexible and the quantity 6 recruited on a given trial depends on expected task demands. According to this 7 modified load theory view, the predictive cues used here may result in the 8 recruitment of a smaller resource pool when the cue indicates that the difficulty of 9 the search display is likely to be low and a larger resource pool when the cue 10 indicates that the likely difficulty will be high. Once the size of the resource pool is 11 determined, the available resources are then distributed according to the 12 automatic and exhaustive allocation scheme. This flexible resource pool 13 hypothesis makes 15 specific predictions about our data, but only three were 14 found to be consistent with this alternative account. Importantly, these three 15 predictions are also consistent with the notion that perceptual processing demands and top-down expectancies interact to determine the amount of 16 17 distraction. Based on both the main findings and the control analyses, load theory does not seem to offer the most parsimonious explanation for the data. 18 19 The cue-induced reduction in distraction in the low load condition also cannot be 20 explained by a dilution of processing resources (e.g., Tsal & Benoni, 2010) 21 because the search displays were the same on valid and invalid trials. Instead, the present results are more consistent with the notion that top-down biases, 22 23 which can be induced by either competitive interactions (e.g., Torralbo & Beck,

1 2008; Scalf et al., 2013) or expectation (Johnson et al., 2002; Theeuwes et al., 2 2004; Serences et al., 2004; McNab & Klingberg, 2007), play a major role in 3 mediating perceptual distraction. While the present results parallel studies 4 showing that predictive spatial and feature cues affect early perceptual 5 processing (e.g. Luck, et al., 1997; Kastner, et al., 1998; Hopfinger, et al., 2000; 6 Giesbrecht, et al., 2006), the novel contribution of the present work is the 7 demonstration that cues that engender explicit expectations about task difficulty 8 on a trial-by-trial basis can interact with perceptual demands to influence the 9 perceptual processing of task-irrelevant information. Specifically, our results 10 demonstrate that accurate top-down expectations resulted in effective perceptual 11 biasing in favor of relevant stimuli over irrelevant stimuli in both low and high load 12 conditions, and that perceptual load determined distractor processing when 13 explicit top-down expectations were violated or not available.

14 The finding that accurate trial-by-trial cue-generated expectations about 15 task difficulty can attenuate perceptual distraction reported here stands in 16 contrast to other studies in which search difficulty is blocked. In blocked tasks, 17 subjects presumably have accurate expectations about task difficulty on all trials, 18 yet perceptual distraction is typically observed (e.g., Lavie, 1995; Lavie & Cox, 19 1997; Lavie et al., 2004). There are two key aspects of our methods that may be 20 responsible for this apparent discrepancy in the results: 1) the trial-by-trial cueing 21 and 2) the instructions to actively use the information provided by the cue to 22 perform the task. When search load is blocked, participants may be less 23 motivated to actively use their knowledge about the difficulty of the task on a trial-

1 by-trial basis. Instead, they may adopt a more passive mode of attention, 2 allowing perceptual task demands to dictate the allocation of resources. In 3 contrast, the trial-by-trial cueing and the instruction to actively use the information 4 provided by the cue in the current experiment may have increased the 5 engagement of top-down attentional control systems that, in turn, facilitated 6 distractor filtering. While speculative, there is evidence consistent with this 7 interpretation showing that expectations about the spatial location of the target 8 generated by trial-by-trial cues and expectations about task demands generated 9 by trial history can modulate the amount of behavioral distraction (e.g., Johnson 10 et al., 2002; Theeuwes et al., 2004; Biggs & Gibson, 2010).

11 In addition to the intermixing of high and low load trials within the 12 experimental blocks, another key methodological difference between the present 13 experiments and many perceptual load studies reported in the literature is the 14 choice of dependent measure. Typical perceptual load studies (e.g., Lavie, 1995; 15 Lavie & Cox, 1997; Lavie et al., 2004), including those that have shown interactions between expectancies and the efficiency of selective attention (e.g., 16 Johnson et al., 2002; Theeuwes et al., 2004), use response time (RT) as the 17 dependent measure. In contrast, we used accuracy. The rationale for choosing 18 19 accuracy as the dependent measure rather than RT was to use a measure 20 sensitive to changes in perceptual processing while also minimizing speed-21 accuracy tradeoffs and motor biases that can occur when using reaction time as 22 the dependent measure (e.g., Bisley & Goldberg, 2003; Santee & Egeth, 1982; 23 Prinzmetal, McCool, & Parks, 2005). The present work is not the first to use

1 accuracy as a dependent measure to investigate perceptual load effects on 2 distractor processing (Konstantinou & Lavie, 2013; Cartwright-Finch & Lavie, 3 2007), but it is nevertheless important to consider the implications that this choice 4 has on the interpretation of our results. For instance, while we observed the 5 elimination of the congruency effect on valid trials it is possible that accuracy is 6 missing some aspect of flanker processing that can only be measured with RT 7 (we thank Reviewer 1 for raising this possibility). Importantly, the key implication 8 of our findings, namely that efficient selective attention depends on both accurate 9 expectancies and perceptual demands, does not hinge on the complete 10 elimination of the congruency effect. Indeed, while we can not rule out the 11 possibility that there is some residual flanker processing that could be detected 12 with RT, even an attenuated congruency effect on valid low load trials would be 13 inconsistent with a strong prediction of load theory. Moreover, we observed the 14 typical reduction in the congruency effect under high load in conditions in which 15 no expectations could be formed (Experiment 1B). Thus, while it may be the case 16 that some aspects of our results are unique to the use of accuracy as a dependent measure, our results nevertheless demonstrate that accurate 17 18 expectancies can mitigate some aspects of the interference caused by task-19 irrelevant information under low load conditions.

A final factor to consider when interpreting the results of the present experiments is the contribution of eye movements. Unfortunately, we did not have the capacity measure eye movements at the time Experiment 1 was conducted. Nevertheless, there are three reasons that rule out the confounding

1 effects of eve movements. First, when a saccade is made, the movement alters 2 the relative retinotopic position of the relevant and irrelevant spatial locations. If 3 this happened frequently during the experiment, then we should not have been 4 able to observe the greater perceptual selectivity (Relevant BOLD>Irrelevant 5 BOLD) in visual cortical responses under high load compared to low load 6 conditions in Experiment 1A. For example, if observers systematically moved 7 their eyes more on high load trials, this would result in more blurred BOLD 8 activations across stimulus locations and we might expect less selectivity under 9 high load compared to low load. Second, if the incentive to move ones' eyes was 10 greater in one load condition compared to the other, one might expect 11 differences in the high and low load BOLD responses in human FEF and parietal 12 cortex. However, this was not observed in the whole brain contrasts. Third, in 13 Experiment 2 we were able to monitor eye movements to some extent using 14 EOG and excluded trials in which eye movements and blinks occurred (see 15 Method). Importantly, Experiment 2 replicated the basic behavioral finding and showed modulation of the P1 ERP component. 16

17

18 Involvement of the dorsal attention network

19 If top-down control mechanisms mediate the pattern of behavioral 20 interference and visual cortical responses observed here, then regions of the 21 dorsal attention network should also be modulated by the interaction between 22 cue validity and task demands. Consistent with this line of reasoning, the dorsal 23 attention network was engaged by both low and high load cues. While activation

1 in this network did not show differential preparatory responses as a function of 2 the expected difficulty, activity in this network was influenced by the interaction 3 between perceptual demand and top-down expectation on trials that included a 4 search display. Indeed, left IPS/SPL exhibited a larger BOLD response on 5 invalidly cued low load trials compared to all other conditions. Importantly, this 6 condition also corresponded to the only condition in which there was behavioral 7 distraction, reduced perceptual selectivity measured with BOLD responses in 8 visual cortex, and enhanced sensory processing of the irrelevant flankers 9 measured with ERP. However, due to the low temporal resolution of fMRI, the 10 interaction in dorsal frontoparietal cortex is consistent with several possible 11 mechanisms: the top-down control over early perceptual selectivity, later post-12 perceptual distractor inhibition, or changes in the efficiency of sensory-motor 13 response transformations (Gnat & Anderson, 1988; Tunik et al., 2008; Martin et 14 al., 2011). However, the pattern of IPS/SPL activation, the observed patterns of 15 behavior and visual cortical responses measured with fMRI and ERP, and the 16 established role of dorsal parietal cortex in the control and orienting of selective 17 attention (Posner et al., 1984; Hopfinger, et al., 2000; Corbetta and Shulman, 2002; Friedman-Hill et al., 2003; Woldorff et al., 2004; Yantis et al., 2002; 18 19 Mevorach et al., 2006; Geng & Mangun, 2009; Akyürek et al., 2010; Melloni et 20 al., 2012) support the conclusion that the cue led to the recruitment of dorsal 21 parietal regions in support of filtering irrelevant information when expectations 22 were valid. In cases when expectations were invalid, behavioral distraction was more likely on low load trials. The increased likelihood of distraction on invalid 23

low load trials may have required a boosted response in dorsal parietal regions to
filter irrelevant information. This role may come in the form of top-down biasing
signals that influence visual processing (Bressler et al., 2008; Szczepanski et al.,
2010), remapping of visual saliency (Geng & Mangun, 2009; Jerde & Curtis,
2013), or perceptual decision-making processes (Liu & Pleskac, 2011; Kayser et
al., 2011; Hebart et al., 2012).

7 The interaction between perceptual demand and top-down expectation observed within dorsal frontal cortex (MFG/PreCs) revealed a larger response at 8 9 later time points on invalidly cued high load trials compared to all other 10 conditions. Given this region's association with cognitive control (Koechlin et al., 11 2003), updating of the task-set (Sylvester et al., 2003; Derrfuss et al., 2004) and 12 task difficulty (Demeter, et al., 2011), the later sustained response could indicate 13 the readjustment of the task set in order to cope with an unexpectedly more 14 difficult search task.

15

16 Correlations between IPS responses and individual differences in 17 distraction If IPS plays a role in providing top-down biasing signals to facilitate the 18 19 filtering of task-irrelevant information, then when there is an increased likelihood 20 for distraction, individuals with larger IPS/SPL responses should show less 21 distraction. In the present study, the largest flanker interference was observed 22 when a low-load search task was preceded by an invalid cue. We observed that 23 those individuals who experienced the least distraction in this condition also 24 exhibited larger BOLD responses in IPS/SPL compared to individuals who

1 experienced the most distraction. In other words, individuals who more effectively 2 recruited IPS/SPL after receiving incorrect information about the task were also 3 more successful in filtering and resolving competition from irrelevant information. 4 The negative correlation between behavioral interference and IPS/SPL 5 responses is consistent with previous work demonstrating that activity in dorsal 6 parietal cortex corresponds to conditions with greater attentional demand 7 (Wojciulik and Kanwisher, 1999; Nobre et al., 2003) as well as work indicating 8 that IPS is transiently involved when a shift in attention is required (Yantis et al., 9 2002). This finding is also consistent with proposals that IPS/SPL plays an 10 important role in maintaining the focus of attention to filter irrelevant information 11 when distraction is likely (Mevorach et al., 2006; Geng & Mangun, 2009; Melloni 12 et al., 2012), and in facilitating efficient perceptual discrimination (Liu & Pleskac, 13 2011; Kayser et al., 2010; Hebart et al., 2012).

14

15 **Conclusion**

We propose that the present findings are best explained by models of visual 16 attention constrained by knowledge of the underlying neural mechanisms (e.g., 17 Desimone & Duncan, 1995; Bundesen et al. 2005; Reynolds & Heeger, 2009). In 18 19 these frameworks, the allocation of perceptual resources to task-relevant and 20 task-irrelevant information is mediated by a combination of top-down biases that 21 are based on one's expectations and low-level competitive interactions (e.g., 22 Torralbo & Beck, 2008; Kyllingsbæk et al., 2011; Nordfang et al., 2012; Parks, 23 Beck, & Kramer, 2013; Scalf et al., 2013; Giesbrecht, Sy, Bundensen, & Kyllinsbæk, 2014). Importantly, behavioral and neural responses to taskirrelevant information are not dictated by either expectations or low-level factors
in isolation, but rather, determined by the dynamic interaction between these
factors.

1	Acknowledgements
2	We thank James Elliott, Tom Bullock, Christopher Angeloni, and Sonia
3	Poltoratski for their helpful comments on previous versions of this manuscript.
4	This research was generously supported by grant W911NF-09-0001 from the
5	U.S. Army Research Office (Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies, UC Santa
6	Barbara). The content of the information does not necessarily reflect the position
7	or the policy of the Government, and no official endorsement should be inferred.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	References
2	Akyürek, E.G., Vallines, I., Lin, E.J., Schubö, A. (2010). Distraction and target
3	selection in the brain: An fMRI study. Neuropsychologia, 48(11), 3335-
4	3342.
5	Benoni, H., Zivony, A., & Tsal, Y. (2014). Attentional sets influence perceptual
6	load effects, but not dilution effects. Q J Exp Psychol (Hove), 67(4), 785-
7	792.
8	Biggs, A.T., & Gibson, B.S. (2010). Competition between color salience and
9	perceptual load during visual selection can be biased by top-down set.
10	Atten, Percept Psychophys, 72, 53-64.
11	Brainard, D.H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. Spatial Vision, 10(4), 433-
12	436.
13	Bressler, S.L., Tang, W., Sylvester, C.M., Shulman, G.L., Corbetta, M. (2008).
14	Top-down control of human visual cortex by frontal and parietal cortex in
15	anticipatory visual spatial attention. J Neurosci, 28(40), 10056-10061.
16	Bundesen, C., Habekost, T., Kyllingsbæk, S. (2005). A neural theory of visual
17	attention: bridging cognition and neurophysiology. Psychol Rev, 112(2),
18	291-328.
19	Burock, M.A., Buckner, R.L., Woldorff, M.G., Rosen, B.R., Dale, A.M. (1998).
20	Randomized event-related experimental designs allow for extremely rapid
21	presentation rates using functional MRI. NeuroReport, 9, 3735-3739.
22	Cartwright-Finch, U. & Lavie, N. (2007). The role of perceptual load in
23	inattentional blindess. Cognition, 102(3), 321-340.

1	Chen, Z., & Cave, K.R. (2013). Perceptual load vs. dilution: The roles of
2	attentional focus, stimulus category, and target predictability. Front
3	<i>Psychol</i> , 4(327), doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00327.
4	Chun, M.M., Marois, R. (2002). The dark side of visual attention. Curr Opin
5	<i>Neurobiol,</i> 12, 184-189.
6	Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychol Bull, 112, 155-159.
7	Corbetta, M., Kincade, J.M., Ollinger, J.M., McAvoy, M.P., Shulman, G.L. (2000).
8	Voluntary orienting is dissociated from target detection in human posterior
9	parietal cortex. Nat Neurosci, 3, 292-297.
10	Corbetta, M., Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven
11	attention in the brain. Nat Rev Neurosci, 3, 201-215.
12	Dark, J.V., Johnston, W.A., Myles-Worsley, M., Farah, M.J. (1985). J Exp
13	Psychol Gen, 114(4), 472-497.
14	de Fockert, J.W., Rees, G., Frith, C.D., Lavie, N. (2001). The role of working
15	memory in visual selective attention. Science, 291(5509), 1803-1806.
16	Demeter, E., Hernandez-Garcia, L., Sarter, M., Lustig, C. (2011). Challenges to
17	attention: A continuous arterial spin labeling (ASL) study of the effects of
18	distraction on sustained attention. Neuroimage, 54, 1518-1529.
19	Derrfuss, J., Brass, B., von Cramon, D.Y. (2004). Cognitive control in the
20	posterior frontolateral cortex: evidence from common activations in task
21	coordination, interference control, and working memory. Neuroimage, 23,
22	604-612.

1	Desimone, R., Duncan, J. (1995). Neural mechanisms of selective visual
2	attention. Annu Rev Neurosci, 18, 193-222.
3	Eriksen, B.A., Eriksen, C.W. (1974). Effects of noise letters upon identification of
4	a target letter in a nonsearch task. Percept Psychophys, 16, 143-149.
5	Friedman-Hill, S.R., Robertson, L.C., Desimone, R., Ungerleider, L.G. (2003).
6	Posterior parietal cortex and the filtering of distractors. Proc Natl Acad Sci
7	USA, 100(7), 4263-4268.
8	Fu, S., Fedota, J., Greenwood, P. M., & Parasuraman, R. (2010). Dissociation of
9	visual C1 and P1 components as a function of attentional load: An event-
10	related potential study. Biol Psychol, 85(1), 171-178.
11	Geng, J.J, Mangun, G.R. (2009). Anterior Intraparietal Sulcus is sensitive to
12	bottom-up attention driven by stimulus salience. J Cogn Neurosci, 21,
13	1584-1601.
14	Giesbrecht, B., Sy, J.L., Bundensen, C., Kyllingsbæk, S. (in press). A new
15	perspective on the perceptual selectivity of attention under load. Y Cogn
16	Neurosci.
17	Giesbrecht, B., Sy, J. L., & Guerin, S. A. (2013). Both memory and attention
18	systems contribute to visual search for targets cued implicitly by spatial
19	context . Vision Research, 85, 80-89.
20	Giesbrecht, B., Weissman, D.H., Woldorff, M.G., Mangun, G.R. (2006). Pre-
21	target activity in visual cortex predicts behavioral performance on spatial
22	and feature attention tasks. Brain Res, 1080, 63-72.

1	Giesbrecht, B., Woldorff, M.G., Song, A.W., Mangun, G.R. (2003). Neural
2	mechanisms of top-down control during spatial and feature attention.
3	<i>Neuroimage</i> ,19, 496-512.
4	Handy, T.C., Soltani, M., Mangun, G.R. (2001). Perceptual load and
5	visuocortical processing: Event-related potentials reveal sensory-level
6	selection. <i>Psychol Sci</i> , 12(3), 213-218.
7	Hebart, M.N., Donner, T.H., & Haynes, JD. (2012). Human visual and parietal
8	cortex encode visual choices independent of motor plans. Neuroimage,
9	63(3), 1393-1403.
10	Heinze, H.J., Luck, S.J., Mangun, G.R., Hillyard, S.A. (1990). Visual event-
11	related potentials index focused attention within bilateral stimulus arrays. I.
12	Evidence for early selection. <i>Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol</i> , 75(6),
13	511-527.
14	Heinze, H.J., Mangun, G.R. (1995). Electrophysiological signs of sustained and
15	transient attention to spatial locations. Neuropsychologia, 33(7), 889-908.
16	Heinze, H.J., Mangun, G.R., Burchert, W., Hinrichs, H., Scholz, M., Münte, T.D.,
17	Gös, A., Scherg, M., Johannes, S., Hundeshagen, H., Gazzaniga, M.S.,
18	Hillyard, S.A. (1994). Combined spatial and temporal imaging of brain
19	activity during visual selective attention in humans. Nature, 372, 543-546.
20	Hopfinger, J.B., Buonocore, M.H., Mangun, G.R. (2000). The neural mechanisms
21	of top-down attentional control. Nat Neurosci, 3(3), 284-291.
22	Jerde, T.A., Curtis, C. (2013). Maps of space in human frontoparietal cortex. J
23	Physiol – Paris, in press. doi: 10.1016/j.jphysparis.2013.04.002.

1	Johnson, D., McGrath, A., McNeil, C. (2002). Cueing interacts with perceptual
2	load in Visual Search. Psychol Sci, 13(3), 284.
3	Kahneman, D., & Chajczyk, D. (1983). Tests of automaticity of reading: Dilutions
4	of Stroop effects by color-irrelevant stimuli. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept
5	<i>Perform</i> , 9(4), 497-509.
6	Kastner, S., De Weerd, P., Desimone, R., Ungerleider, L.G. (1998). Mechanisms
7	of directed attention in the human extrastriate cortex as revealed by
8	functional MRI. <i>Science</i> , 282(5386), 108-11.
9	Kayser, A.S., Erickson, D.T., Buchsbaum, B.R., & D'Esposito, M. (2010). Neural
10	representations of relevant and irrelevant features in perceptual decision
11	making. <i>J Neurosci</i> , 30, 15778-15789.
12	Kelley, T. A., Lavie, N. (2011). Working memory load modulates distractor
13	competition in primary visual cortex. Cereb Cortex, 21, 659-665.
14	Kim, S. M., Hopfinger, J. M. (2010). Neural basis of visual distraction. J Cogn
15	<i>Neurosci</i> , 22, 1894-1807.
16	Kincade, J. M., Abrams, R. A., Astafiev, S. V., Shulman, G. L., Corbetta, M.
17	(2005). An Event-Related fMRI Study of Voluntary and Stimulus-Driven
18	Orienting of Attention. J Neurosci, 25:4593-4604.
19	Koechlin, E., Ody, C., Kouneiher, F. (2003). The architecture of cognitive control
20	in the human prefrontal cortex. Science, 302, 1181-1185.
21	Konstantinou, N. & Lavie, N. (2013). Dissociable roles of different types of
22	working memory load in visual detection. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept
23	<i>Perform</i> , 39(4), 919–924.

1	Kyllingsbæk, S., Sy, J.L., Giesbrecht, B. (2011). Understanding the allocation of
2	attention when faced with varying perceptual load in partial report: a
3	computational approach. Neuropsychologia, 49(6), 1487-1497.
4	Lavie, N., Tsal, Y. (1994). Perceptual load is a major determinant of the locus in
5	visual attention. Percept Psychophys, 56, 183-197.
6	Lavie, N. (1995). Perceptual load as a necessary condition for selective attention.
7	J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform, 23, 451-468.
8	Lavie, N., Cox, S. (1997). On the efficiency of attentional selection: Efficient
9	visual search results in inefficient rejection of distraction. Psychol Sci, 8,
10	395-398.
11	Lavie, N., Hirst, A., de Fockert, J.W., Viding, E. (2004). Load theory of selective
12	attention and cognitive control. <i>J Exp Psychol Gen</i> , 133(3), 339-354.
13	Lavie, N. (2005) Distracted and confused?: selective attention under load. Trend
14	Cogn Sci, 9, 75-82
15	Lavie, N., Torralbo, A. (2010). Dilution: a theoretical burden or just load? A reply
16	to Tsal and Benoni (2010). J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform, 36,
17	1657-1664.
18	Lavie, N. (2010). Attention, Distraction and Cognitive Control under Load. Curr
19	Dir Psychol Sci 19(3), 143-148.
20	Liu, T., & Pleskac, T.J. (2011). Neural correlates of evidence accumulation in a
21	perceptual decision task. J Neurophysiol, 106, 2383-2398.
22	Loftus, G.R., Masson, M.E.J. (1994). Using confidence intervals in within-subject
23	designs. <i>Psychon Bull Rev</i> , 1(4), 476-490.

1	Luck, S.J., Chelazzi, L., Hillyard, S.A., Desimone, R. (1997). Neural mechanisms
2	of spatial selective attention in areas V1, V2, and V4 of macaque visual
3	cortex. J Neurophysiol, 77(1), 24-42.
4	Mangun, G.R., Buck, L.A. (1998). Sustained visual-spatial attention produces
5	costs and benefits in response time and evoked neural activity.
6	Neuropsychologia, 36(3), 189-200.
7	Mangun, G. R., Hillyard, S. A. (1991). Modulation of sensory-evoked brain
8	potentials provide evidence for changes in perceptual processing during
9	visual-spatial priming. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform, 17, 1057-
10	1074.
11	Martin, K., Jacobs, S., Frey, S.H. (2011). Handedness-dependent and -
12	independent cerebral asymmetries in the anterior intraparietal sulcus and
13	ventral premotor cortex during grasp planning. Neuroimage, 57(2), 502-
14	512.
15	McNab, F., Klingberg, T. (2007). Prefrontal cortex and basal ganglia control
16	access to working memory. Nat Neurosci, 11(1), 104-107.
17	Melloni, L., van Leeuwen, S., Alink, A., Müller, N.G. (2012). Interaction between
18	bottom-up saliency and top-down control: How saliency maps are created
19	in the human brain. Cereb Cortex, 22, 2943-2952.
20	Mevorach, C., Humphreys, G.W., Shalev, L. (2006). Opposite biases in salience-
21	based selection for the left and right parietal cortex. Nat Neurosci, 9(6),
22	740-742.

1	Nobre, A.C., Coull, J.T., Walsh, V., Frith, C.D. (2003). Brain activations during
2	visual search: contributions of search efficiency versus feature binding.
3	<i>Neuroimage</i> , 18(1), 91-103.
4	Nordfang, M., Dyrholm, M., & Bundesen, C. (2012). Identifying Bottom-up and
5	top-down components of attentional weights by experimental analysis and
6	computational modeling. J of Exp Psych: Gen, 142, 510-535.
7	Norman, D.A., Bobrow, D.G. (1975). On data-limited and resource limited
8	processes. Cogn Psychol, 7:44-64.
9	Ollinger, J.M., Corbetta, M., Shulman, G.L. (2001a). Separating processes within
10	a trial in event-related functional MRI II. Analysis. Neuroimage, 13, 218-
11	229.
12	Ollinger, J.M., Shulman, G.L., Corbetta, M. (2001b). Separating processes within
13	a trial in even-related functional MRI I. The method. Neuroimage, 13, 210-
14	217.
15	Paquet L., Craig G.L. (1997). Evidence for selective target processing with a low
16	perceptual lead flankers task. Mem. Cogni. 25 182–189.
17	Posner, M.I., Walker, J.A., Friedrich, F.A., Rafal, R.D. (1984). How do the parietal
18	lobes direct covert attention? Neuropsychologia, 25(1A), 135-45.
19	Rees, G., Frith, C.D., Lavie, N. (1997). Modulating irrelevant motion perception
20	by varying attentional load in an unrelated task. Science, 278, 1616-1619.
21	Reynolds, J.H., Heeger, D.J. (2009). The normalization model of attention.
22	<i>Neuron</i> , 61, 168-185.

1	Roper, J.J., Cosman, J.D., Vecera, S.P. (2013). Perceptual load corresponds
2	with factors known to influence visual search. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept
3	Perform, doi: 10.1037/a0031616 (epub ahead of print).
4	Rorden, C., Guerrini, C., Swainson, R., Lazzeri, M., Baylis, G.C. (2008). Event
5	related potentials reveal that increasing perceptual load leads to increased
6	responses for target stimuli and decreased responses for irrelevant
7	stimuli. Front Hum Neurosci, 2, 4.
8	Scalf, P.E., Torralbo, A., Tapia, E., & Bech, D.M. (2013). Competition explains
9	limited attention and perceptual resources: implications for perceptual load
10	and dilution theories. Front Psych, 4, DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00243
11	Serences, J.T., Yantis, S., Culberson, A., Awh, E. (2004). Preparatory activity in
12	visual cortex indexes distractor suppression during covert spatial orienting.
13	J Neurophysiol, 92, 3538-3545.
14	Slagter, H.A., Weissman, D.H., Giesbrecht, B., Kenemans, J.L., Mangun, G.R.,
15	Kok, A., Woldorff, M.G. (2006). Brain regions activated by endogenous
16	preparatory set shifting as revealed by fMRI. Cogn Affect Behav
17	<i>Neurosci</i> , 6(3), 175-189.
18	Stroop, J.R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. J Exp
19	<i>Psychol</i> , 18, 643-662.
20	Sylvester, C.Y., Wager, T.D., Lacey, S.C., Hernandez, L., Nicols, T.E., Smith,
21	E.E., Jonides, J. (2003). Switching attention and resolving interference:
22	fMRI measures of executive functions. Neuropsychologia, 41, 357-370.

1	Szczepanksi, S.M., Konen, C.S., Kastner, S. (2010). Mechanisms of spatial
2	attention control in frontal and parietal cortex. J Neurosci, 30, 148-160.
3	Theeuwes, J., Kramer, A.F., Belopolsky, A. (2004). Attentional set interacts with
4	perceptual load in visual search. Psychon Bull Rev, 11, 697-702.
5	Todd, J.J., Marois, R. (2004). Capacity limit of visual short-term memory in
6	human posterior parietal cortex. Nature, 428, 751-754.
7	Torralbo, A., Beck, D.M. (2008). Perceptual-load-induced selection as a result of
8	local competitive interactions in visual cortex. Psychol Sci, 19(10), 1045-
9	50.
10	Tsal, Y., Benoni, H. (2010). Diluting the burden of load: Perceptual load effects
11	are simply dilution effects. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform, 36(6),
12	1645-1656.
13	Treisman A, Gelade G. (1980). A feature integration theory of attention. Cogn
14	<i>Psychol</i> , 12, 97 – 136.
15	Tunik, E., Ortigue, S., Adamovich, S.V., Grafton, S.T. (2008). Differential
16	recruitment of anterior intrapareital sulcus and superior parietal lobule
17	during visually guided grasping revealed by electrical neuroimaging. J
18	<i>Neurosci</i> , 28(50), 13615-13629.
19	Van Voorhis, S. T., Hillyard, S.A. (1977). Visual evoked potentials and selective
20	attention to points in space. Percept Psychophys, 22, 54-62.
21	Wijers, A.A., Lange, J.J., Mulder, G. (1997). An ERP study of visual spatial
22	attention and letter target detection for isoluminant and nonisoluminant
23	stimuli. Psychophysiology, 34(5), 553-65.

1	Wojciulik, E., Kanwisher, N. (1999). The generality of parietal involvement in
2	visual attention. Neuron, 23(4), 747-764.
3	Woldorff, M.G., Hazlett, C.J., Fichtenholtz, H.M., Weissman, D.H., Dale, A.M.,
4	Song, A.W. (2004). Functional parcellation of attentional control regions
5	of the brain. J Cogn Neurosci, 16(1), 149-165.
6	Wolfe, J.M. (1994). Guided Search 2.0: A revised model of visual search.
7	Psychon Bull Rev, 1(2): 202-238.
8	Yantis, S., Johnston, J.C. (1990). On the locus of visual selection: Evidence from
9	focused attention tasks. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform, 16(1), 135-
10	149.
11	Yantis, S., Schwarzbach, J., Serences, J., Carlson, R., Steinmetz, M.A., Pekar,
12	J.J., Courtney, S. (2002). Transient neural activity in human parietal cortex
13	during spatial attention shifts. Nat Neurosci, 5, 995-1002.
14	Yi, DJ., Woodman, G.F., Widders, D., Marois, R., Chun, M.M. (2004). Neural
15	fate of ignored stimuli: Dissociable effects of perceptual and working
16	memory load. <i>Nat Neurosci</i> , 7(9), 992-996.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Figure Captions

2 Figure 1. A) A schematic of a cue+target trial sequence in Experiment 1 3 when participants were cued validly to a low load (left) or a high load (right) 4 display by the color of fixation (blue or yellow). The load of the search display 5 was manipulated while participants were instructed to discriminate whether an 'N' 6 or 'X' was presented in the arch above fixation. On low load trials, the identities of 7 the search distractors were randomly selected from a set of letters that had 8 features dissimilar to the potential targets and all distractors on a given trial had 9 the same identity. On high load trials, search distractors were randomly selected 10 from a set of letters that had features similar to the potential targets and all 11 distractors on a given trial had different identities. Behavioral interference and 12 sensory processing of a flanker presented in an irrelevant search location, which 13 was congruent or incongruent to the target, was used to index distraction. B) 14 Proportion of correct responses as a function of cue validity, load, and target-15 flanker congruency in Experiment 1A. Congruent trials are marked by squares, 16 and incongruent trials are marked by triangles in all panels in this figure. Error 17 bars represent the standard error of the mean (SEM). C) Proportion of correct responses in Experiment 1B, the non-predictive control group. Error bars 18 represent the SEM. D) Proportion of correct responses in Experiment 2. Error 19 20 bars represent the SEM.

Figure 2. A) Data from the spatial localizer task showing regions with greater selectivity to relevant search locations compared to irrelevant flanker locations. Scale corresponds to the t-value. The left side of the brain is depicted

on the left side of the figure. The peak percent signal change is plotted in blue
for low load and red for high load B) on cue-only trials within visual cortex ROIs
plotted as a function of ROI, and C) on cue+target trials within visual cortex ROIs
plotted as a function of cue validity and ROI. Error bars plotted within this figure
represents the standard error of the mean appropriate for within-subjects
comparisons (Loftus and Masson, 1994).

Figure 3. A) Regions demonstrating greater activations in cue-only trials compared to null-event baseline. The left side of the brain is depicted on the left side of the figure. Scale corresponds to the t-value. B) Time-course of BOLD signals on valid (blue) and invalid (red) cue+target trials as a function of load and time in the dorsal frontoparietal control network (bilateral MFG/PreCs and bilateral IPS/SPL). Error bars represent the mean squared error of the interaction between cue validity, load, and time.

Figure 4. Regression scatterplots that show the relationship between the peak percent signal change in the left IPS and the behavioral interference score for each individual subject on valid low load trials (left) and invalid low load trials (right).

Figure 5. A) The mean ERP-waveform over electrodes contralateral to the presentation of the irrelevant flanker between 100 msec prior to and 200 msec after the presentation of the search display. The gray bars indicate the average (45 msec) time window used to calculate the mean P1 amplitude. Valid trials are depicted with the solid line, invalid trials with the dashed line. B) The mean P1 amplitude contralateral to the irrelevant flanker, plotted as a function of cue validity (valid in black and invalid in gray) and load. Error bars plotted within this
 figure represent the standard error of the mean appropriate for within-subjects
 comparisons (Loftus and Masson, 1994).

- 1 Table 1. Regions of significant activation in the whole-brain contrast for the
- 2 spatial localizer task. MNI coordinates represent local t-maximum for clusters
- 3 thresholded at p<0.005 uncorrected, with 10 voxels spatial extent.

Region	X	У	Z	voxels	
Relevant > Irrelevant					
Left middle occipital gyrus	-30	-96	-3	82	
Right middle occipital gyrus	36	-78	-0	82	
Left precuneus	0	-51	57	23	
Left superior frontal gyrus	-12	12	57	10	
Irrelevant > Relevant					
Right anterior cingulate	15	18	24	14	
Left lingual gyrus	-12	-87	-9	25	
Right lingual gyrus	12	-87	-6	12	

Region	х	У	Z	voxels
Left middle occipital gyrus		-90	-3	194
Right middle frontal gyrus / Precentral sulcus		3	39	162
Right occipital / Fusiform		-66	-15	112
Left middle frontal gyrus / Precentral sulcus	-45	0	51	159
Left superior frontal gyrus	0	9	57	128
Right insula		21	12	37
Left posterior cingulate		-30	21	38
Right superior temporal gyrus		-36	15	70
Left intraparietal sulcus / Superior parietal	18	60	30	120
lobe	-10	-00	55	120
Left superior temporal gyrus	-51	-42	21	23
Right intraparietal sulcus /precuneus	30	-54	48	37

1 Table 2. *Whole-brain contrast for cue-only minus null-event activation.*

Note. MNI coordinates represent local t-maximum for clusters thresholded at
p<0.05 FDR corrected, with 10 contiguous voxels.

- 1 Table 3. Pearson correlations between peak frontoparietal activations and
- 2 behavioral interference scores under Low load conditions.

	Region	Valid Cue	Invalid Cue
	Left precentral gyrus / Middle frontal gyrus	0.25	-0.32
	Right middle frontal gyrus	0.39	-0.20
	Left precuneus / Superior parietal lobe	-0.14	-0.81**
	Right intraparietal lobule / precuneus	0.11	-0.55*
3	Note ** p<0.01 two-tailed, Bonferroni corrected; * p<0	0.05 two-tailed	, uncorrected
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			














