

# Electrophysiological Evidence of the Capture of Visual Attention

Clayton Hickey<sup>1</sup>, John J. McDonald<sup>2</sup>, and Jan Theeuwes<sup>1</sup>

Abstract



The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome.

In contrast, the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome.

## EXPERIMENT 1

### Methods

#### Participants

Eighty-four participants from the University of Amsterdam were recruited for the experiment. They were all students at the University of Amsterdam and were paid for their participation. The experiment was conducted in a laboratory setting. The participants were randomly assigned to two groups: a control group and an experimental group. The control group received a placebo, while the experimental group received the treatment. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome was estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome.

#### Procedure

The experiment was conducted in a laboratory setting. The participants were randomly assigned to two groups: a control group and an experimental group. The control group received a placebo, while the experimental group received the treatment. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome was estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome.

The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome. The causal effect of the treatment on the outcome is estimated by the difference in the expected value of the outcome under the two conditions. This is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome.





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

Results

As a result, 10.2% of the participants showed a delay in the... 0.8% of the participants showed a delay in the... (>2000 ms) and 9.4% of the participants showed a delay in the... A further 16.6% of the participants showed a delay in the... EEG.

Table 1B shows the RT data for the... each of the... 2. The... RT... 1010 ms, the... RT... 689 ms. The... (1,13) = 409.50,  $p < .001$ , and... (1,13) = 26.61,  $p < .001$ .

The... 2... 1... Pa... E... 2... b... acc... (see Table 1),... g... a... abe... acc... ad... ff... d... be... e... g... .

Figure 3 and 4 show the ERP... The ERP... Fig...

Figure 3A... Figure 3B... ANOVA... (1,13) = 5.97,  $p < .05$  (Figure 3A). By... (1,13) = 7.27,  $p < .05$  (Figure 3B). A... ANOVA... (1,13) = 0.128.3-407.5 (e.)-326.40(B.12 e)

Figure 4. ERP elicited by each category of age-related words. Search category: aged. ERP (µV) for each age group (N25) is shown. Error bars represent standard error. \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\*p < .001.





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

## Acknowledgments

T ... d ... a ... ed ... a ... b ... a ... g ... a ... f ... e Na-  
... a ... S ... ce ... a ... d ... E ... g ... ee ... g ... Re ... ea ... c ... C ... c ... f ... Ca ... da  
(J. J. M.). We ... a ... Pa ... G ... , S ... a ... De ... e , a ... d ... Ja ... ed  
... a ... S ... ee ... be ... g ... f ... ec ... ca ... a ... a ... c ... e.

R ... e ... e ... d ... be ... e ... Ca ... y ... H ... ce ... y ... J ... J ...  
McD ... ad ... De ... a ... e ... f ... P ... c ... g ... y ... S ... Fa ... e ... U ... e ...  
... y ... 8888 U ... e ... y ... D ... e , B ... ab ... y ... BC , Ca ... da ... V5A ... 1S6 ,  
... a ... e ... a ... : ... c ... c ... e ... y ... @ ... f ... ca ... . ... cd ... @ ... f ... ca ... .

## REFERENCES

Bac ... , W. F., & Ege ... , H. E. (1994). O ... e ... d ... g ... -d ... e  
... a ... e ... a ... ca ... e ... . 485-496.

E ... e ... , M. (1996). T ... e ... N ... c ... c ... e ... a ... a ... d ... ca ... f  
... a ... e ... a ... e ... ec ... . 225-234.

F ... , C. L., & Re ... g ... , R. (1998). S ... ec ... y ... d ... ac  
... b ... y ... ee ... a ... fe ... a ... ge ... : E ... de ... ce ... f ... f ... f  
... a ... e ... a ... ca ... e ... . 847-858.

F ... , C. L., Re ... g ... , R. W., & J ... , J. C. (1992).  
I ... a ... y ... c ... e ... e ... g ... c ... ge ... a ... e ... a  
... c ... e ... e ... g ... . 1030-1044.

F ... , C. L., Re ... g ... , R. W., & W ... g ... , J. H. (1994). T ... e  
... c ... e ... fa ... e ... a ... c ... : C ... ge ... a ... e ... a  
... ca ... e ... b ... y ... a ... e ... , ab ... e ... , a ... d ... c ... .  
317-329.

H ... f ... , J. M., B ... e ... a ... , K., Sci ... e ... fe ... d ... , A. M., He ... e ... , H. J.,  
& L ... c ... , S. J. (2002). H ... d ... e ... a ... e ... a ... e ...  
... a ... ge ... -d ... ac ... e ... fe ... e ... ce ... ? E ... de ... ce ... f ...  
... a ... ge ... e ... ce ... a ... g ... a ... c ... ec ... d ... g ... . 17-29.

H ... f ... ge ... , J. B., & Ma ... g ... , G. R. (2001). E ... ec ... y ... g ... ca  
... de ... f ... ef ... e ... e ... a ... e ... . I ... C ... L ... G ... F ... & S ... B ... ad ... e ... y  
(Ed ... ), (55.3-26). A ... e ... da ... :  
E ... e ... e ... .

Ka ... e ... a ... , D., T ... e ... a ... , A., & B ... e ... , J. (1983). T ... e ... c  
... f ... a ... f ... a ... fe ... g ... . 510-522.

Ke ... e ... , S., E ... e ... , M., S ... e ... ce ... , C., & D ... e ... , J. (2001).  
T ... ac ... e ... -a ... e ... e ... ge ... e ... a ... a ... e ... de ...