



**Subject Areas:**

Behaviour, evolution

**Keywords:**

visual search, optimal behaviour, eye movements

<sup>1</sup>

**Author for correspondence:**

Alasdair Clarke

e-mail: [a.clarke@essex.ac.uk](mailto:a.clarke@essex.ac.uk)

## Insert the article title here

Alasdair D. F. Clarke<sup>1</sup>, Jessica L Irons<sup>2</sup>,  
Warren James<sup>3</sup>, Andrew B Leber<sup>2</sup> and  
Amelia R Hunt<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Essex,  
Colchester, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University,  
Columbus, USA


<sup>3</sup>School of Psychology, University of Aberdeen,  
Aberdeen, UK

Some abstract goes here

## 1. Introduction

Anybody who has ever conducted a visual search experiment will be aware of the large differences from one participant to the next. These differences could be emerge from several different sources of variation: tiredness [11], information-processing ability, speed-accuracy trade-off, motivation, visual impairments, and search strategies [2]. Although their existence has previously been noted [11], a rigorous examination of individual differences in visual search has been largely ignored and questions about their importance and stability remain relatively under explored.

In the current study, we focus on one source of individual differences in visual search: strategy. By visual search strategies, we refer to a collection of behaviours that all observers can freely choose to engage in when they search a display, which is distinct from intrinsically unchanging characteristics such as information-processing ability and motivation. Perhaps surprisingly, previous literature has shown that both ideal observer [12] and stochastic [4] models can explain the number of fixations required by an average observer to locate a target in noise. These apparent contradictory results could potentially be explained by large individual differences. Search strategy can also vary in how systematic it is. For example it is common to see top-to-bottom and left-to-right scanning behaviour in scanpaths recorded during visual search [6], and the degree to which this occurs is in part related to the structure of the stimuli [1].



**Figure 1.** Example stimulus from the (a) *split-half*, (b) *adaptive choice* and (c) *foraging* paradigms

A striking example of the effect of strategy is given by [2]. They asked participants to monitor a cluttered display for an object changing colour or object onset. Large individual differences were found with respect to the number of saccades participants made while monitoring the stimulus, and this was negatively correlated with detection performance.

In our own work, we have previously shown that there are large differences between individuals in terms of the search strategies used to find a target among distracters. The Adaptive Choice Visual Search (ACVS) paradigm [8] examined strategies in the use of feature-based attention [7,8] .... Participants varied substantially along two key dimensions: how frequently they used the more effective target feature to search (varying from chance performance to nearly optimal), and how often they changed search features. Using a different paradigm [13], we aimed to discriminate between the optimal [12] and stochastic [4] search strategies. We found that while some participants initially searched the displays near optimally, others carried out strategies counter to this, failing to even match the performance of the stochastic searcher. Furthermore, the degree to which they made saccades in line with the optimal search strategy was strongly correlated with their reaction times. Examples of the stimuli are given in Figure 1.

Another example of differences in search strategy comes from the foraging literature [9,10]. Participants were asked to search through a set of items from four categories, two of which were classed as targets. In the conjunction condition (i.e. searching for red-horizontal and green-vertical line segments among red-vertical and green-horizontal distracters), most observers searched in runs of one target or another. This strategy has previously been observed in animal foraging literature [5]. However, a sub-set of observers, termed “super-searchers” showed no switch cost.

[14] demonstrated that the different weighting between top-down and bottom-up factors in a conjunction search task explained ... Interestingly, they found that around a third of participants were unaware of the search strategy they employed.

A common theme emerging from the studies is the observation that individual strategies vary in their degree of effectiveness or optimality. However, “visual search” encompasses a wide range of specific tasks, each tapping into a different aspect of behaviour (feature-based attention, [spatial/fixation patterns?]). The aim of the present study is to investigate the extent to which individual differences are stable across different visual search paradigms. Are observers who use the optimal strategy in the split-half search arrays also more optimal in the ACVS task? Does it make sense to talk about ‘super-searchers’ who show above average performance in a range of search tasks? Are the super-foragers consistently better or worse than more typical searchers in the other two paradigms? As a secondary question, we will measure the test-retest reliability of the differences found in the split-half array paradigm.

## 2. Methods

Experiment	Resolution	Size of stim
Adaptive Choice	1024 × 768	≈1.8°
Adaptive Choice	1400 × 1050	≈1.3°
Adaptive Choice	1600 × 1200	≈1.1°
Foraging	1024 × 768	≈1°
Foraging	1400 × 1050	≈0.7°
Foraging	1600 × 1200	≈0.6°

**Table 1.** Size of stimuli for each experiment and screen resolution

### (a) Participants

We aim to find 64 participants to volunteer to take part in this experiment. Participants will be students from the University of Aberdeen. Some will be compensated with course credit and some will be paid £15 for their time. Sample size was determined in part due to constraints with counter-balancing; there are 16 different possible orders of tasks/conditions; we will run four participants in each order for a total of 64. All participants will sign a form giving informed consent. The study has already been approved by the University of Aberdeen Psychology Ethics Committee.

A sample of 64 participants means we should be able to detect a correlations with  $r > 0.342$  with  $\alpha = 0.05$ ,  $\beta = 0.80$  between the different visual search paradigms. Given the nature of our results, we see no need to apply a conservative correction for multiple comparisons.

### (b) Materials and Procedures

The study consists of three different paradigms from the visual search literature in which large individual differences were found [8,10,13]. Example stimuli can be seen in Figure 1.

The display was presented on a 17-inch CRT monitor with a resolution of 1400 × 1050. However, due to a miscommunication, some participants (**get exact numbers from script**) were run at 1024 × 768 or 1600 × 1200. Stimulus generation, presentation and data collection were controlled by MATLAB and psychophysics toolbox [3] run on a Powermac.

A brief overview of each paradigm is given below, with full details in *supplementary materials*.

#### (i) Split-half Array Search

Stimuli consisted of arrays of black oriented line segments against a grey background. Each line segment had a length of ≈1.6° of visual angle irrespective of screen resolution. The target was oriented 45° clockwise, while the distractor items had a random orientation with a mean of 45° anti-clockwise. The variance was low (18°) on one half of the display to create a homogeneous texture, and high (95°) on the other side to create a heterogeneous texture. This means that when the target is present on the homogeneous side of the stimulus, it can be easily be detected with peripheral vision, but when it is in the heterogeneous half, it is much harder to detect. There were a total of 160 trials and homo- and heterogeneous sides of the display were randomly varied from trial to trial. The position of the dominant eye was recorded using a desktop-mounted EyeLink 1000 eye tracker (SR Research, Canada).

This paradigm was carried out twice to give us an estimate of how consistent participants are in their search strategy over time. The two sessions were identical.

#### (ii) Adaptive Choice Visual Search

The ACVS was based on the task described in [7], Experiment 1.

Each search display was composed of 54 small squares arranged in three concentric rings around fixation, with 12, 18 and 24 items in the inner, middle and outer rings respectively. The same screen was used as in the Split-half Array Search, however, due to changes of screen

resolution, the size of the squares changed. Participants, were sat  $\approx 47$ cm from the screen. Of the 54 squares, 13 were red, 13 were blue, 14 were green and 14 were "variable". Variable distractors change colours from trial-to-trial according to a 24 trial cyclical pattern: the distractors would be red for 5 trials (called a "red plateau"), then across a period of 7 trials, they would change colour from almost red to magenta (at the fourth trial in the transition) to almost blue. The variable distractor would then be blue for 5 trials (blue plateau), and then transition back from almost blue through magenta to almost red.

A white digit appeared inside each square. Two targets - a red square and a blue square each with a digit between 2 and 5 - were embedded in every search display. The two target digits were always different, to enable us to distinguish the chosen target. The remaining red, blue and variable squares all contained digits between 6-9. Green squares could contain any digit between 2-9. The location of the targets and distractor within the search display were randomized on each trial.

Participants were informed that the search displays would contain two targets on every trial, that they need only find one target on each trial and that they were always free to search for either one.

### (iii) Conjunction Foraging

The foraging task was based on [10] and [9]. Participants completed the feature foraging and conjunction foraging tasks on separate days, with the order counterbalanced (was it counterbalanced?).

In the feature foraging task, search displays contained 80 small circles, 20 red, 20 green, 20 blue and 20 yellow. Stimuli were arranged in a  $10 \times 8$  grid, but the position of each item within the grid space was jittered to create a more random spatial arrangement. The location of item colours to grid locations was completely randomized.

For half of the participants, targets were red and green circles, and for the other half of participants, targets were blue and yellow circles. Participants were asked to collect all of the targets within a trial by using the mouse to click on each target. Clicking on a target caused it to disappear from the display. If the participant clicked erroneously on a non-target, the trial was immediately ended and a replacement trial was begun.

In the conjunction foraging task, search displays were composed of both circles and squares. For half of the participants, the shapes were red and green (equal numbers of red circles, red squares, green circles and green squares), and for the remaining participants the shapes were blue and yellow. Targets were defined by conjunctions of colour and shape (e.g., red squares and green circles, with red circles and green squares as distractors). The assignment of targets and distractors was assigned at random for each participant. The procedure was otherwise identical to the feature foraging task.

## (c) Planned Analysis


### (i) Split-half array search

In order to characterise an individual's behaviour in this task, we will compute the proportion of the first  $n$  fixations that were on heterogeneous (difficult) side of the stimuli, over all target absent trials<sup>1</sup>. [13] demonstrated a strong correlation between an this metric (for  $n = 5$ ) and reaction times ( $r = .53$ ). However, a re-analysis of their data shows that an even stronger correlation is obtained with  $n = 3$ .

### (ii) Attentional Control

Participants with accuracy more than 3 SD below the group mean were excluded from analyses. For RT analyses, trials with RTs less than 300ms or more than 3 SD about the participant's mean were excluded.

<sup>1</sup>Only take correct trials?



**Figure 2.** Each point represents a participant and the error-bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. Correlation between the two sessions of the *split-half* paradigm for (a) accuracy (TP-heterogeneous trials only); (b) reaction times and (c) search strategy (TA trials only). (d) Initial search strategy correlates with reaction times in both sessions.

Two measures of individual strategy use were used: 1) Optimal choices, defined as percent of plateau trials in which the individual chose the optimal target (i.e., the target with the fewest distractors. When the variable distractor was red, the optimal choice was blue, and vice versa), and 2) Switch rate, the percent of trials in which the individual switched target colour (i.e., the colour chosen on trial  $N$  was different to the colour chosen on trial  $N-1$ ).

### (iii) Conjunction Foraging

Only completed, accurate trials were analysed. RTs were defined across the entire trial (i.e., from the start of the trial until the final target was collected). The main measure of interest was average run length per trial. A run was defined as a succession of one or more of the same target type, which was followed and preceded by the other target or no target. The average run length was the average number of target selections in a run.

### (d) Exploratory Analysis

We will carry out additional analysis, above and beyond what has been documented above, but the exact nature of this will be contingent on the nature of the results. Something like PCA may be interesting.


## 3. Results

### (a) Replication of each paradigm

#### (i) Split-half Array Search

Our results are broadly in line with [13]. The correlation between accuracy and reaction times between the two sessions is shown in Figure 2(a, b). We can clearly see that there are large differences from one participant to the next in terms of both the proportion of hard targets found, and reaction times. Furthermore, test-retest reliability appears to be reasonable, with Pearson's  $r \in [0.65 - 0.86]$  (95% confidence interval) for accuracy in finding targets on the hard heterogeneous half of the display. We get similar scores for the correlation between sessions  $a$  and  $b$  for heterogeneous targets, ( $r \in [0.66 - 0.87]$ ), homogeneous targets ( $r \in [0.56 - 0.82]$ ) and target absent ( $r \in [0.65 - 0.86]$ ). The reduced correlation for the homogeneous targets is likely due to the restricted range.

We can also look at the initial search strategies adopted by our participants 2(c, d). Again, we see large and stable individual differences across the two sessions (test-retest  $r \in [0.57, 0.83]$  for the proportion of the first five saccades to the heterogeneous half of the display for target absent



**Figure 3.** Correlation between the split-half and adaptive choice paradigms for (a) reaction times and (b) optimal behaviour.

151 trials). More importantly, as with [13], we see that the search strategies give a good correlation  
 152 with reaction times in both session a,  $r \in [0.56, 0.84]$  and session b,  $r \in [0.50, 0.81]$ .

### 153 (ii) Adaptive Choice

154 The results for the ACVS were consistent with our previous findings [7,8] (see Figure 3?).

### 155 (iii) Conjunction Foraging

156 The multiple-target foraging results were also in line previous findings [9,10]. As expected, run  
 157 lengths were shorter for feature foraging ( $M = 3.24$ ,  $SD = 3.19$ ) than conjunction foraging ( $M =$   
 158  $10.64$ ,  $SD = 7.01$ ),  $t(55) = 8.03$ ,  $p < .001$  (PREFER DIFFERENT STATS HERE? CI [-9.25,-5.55])  
 159 suggesting more frequent foraging for multiple targets concurrently when those targets were  
 160 defined by features than by conjunctions. However, both showed significant individual variation:  
 161 Feature run length varied between 1.87 and 20, and conjunction run length varied between 1.00  
 162 and 19.67. Figure 4 (?) depicts run length across the trials separately for each individual. Twenty  
 163 “super-searchers” were revealed, identified by short run lengths for both feature and conjunction  
 164 targets [THAT NUMBER IS JUST BASED ON EYE-BALLING THE FIGURE, BUT WE COULD  
 165 COME UP WITH SOME SORT OF PRECIOUS CUT OFF ÅŠ WHAT DO YOU THINK?].

## 166 (b) Correlations Between Paradigms

167 The results above demonstrate that we have successfully replicated the previous findings  
 168 around individual differences in visual search strategy. As an initial sweep, we look at overall  
 169 performance in terms of RT (note that this can be influenced not only by strategy, but also  
 170 by individuals’ abilities, such as their information-processing speed and their ability to ignore  
 171 distractors). Are individuals who are fast on one visual search task fast on another? In all  
 172 comparisons the correlations are weak, typically  $0.27 < r < 0.30$  but positive (Figure 3). None  
 173 of these correlations are statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). Even if we optimistically take all the  
 174 data together as suggesting a robust correlation in reaction times from paradigm to paradigm,  
 175 the upper bound of  $r = 0.30$  this correlation only accounts for at best 10%<sup>2</sup> an individual’s  
 176 performance.

177 [I WONDER IF THIS SHOULD GO BEFORE THE RT CORRELATIONS? SINCE AS YOU  
 178 SAY, THIS IS THE MAIN AIM OF THE PAPER. THEN RT CORRELATIONS COULD GO AS A  
 179 SECONDARY AIM] Given the low correlations between reaction times, it seems unlikely that we  
 180 will find that individuals who search efficiently and optimally in one paradigm will search well  
 181 in another (the original motivation for our study) [I WOULD BE INCLINED NOT TO SAY THIS,  
 182 BECAUSE IT SEEMS TO MINIMIZE THE PURPOSE OF LOOKING AT STRATEGY AT ALL. IE  
 183 IT SUGGESTS THAT ALL OF THE VARIATION IN STRATEGY COULD BE ENCAPSULATED

<sup>2</sup>i.e.,  $R^2 = 0.3^2 = 0.09$

BY RT. BUT THERE ARE OTHER FACTORS THAT ALSO INFLUENCE RT]. The analysis supports this hypothesis. For example, the correlation between the proportion of fixations to the heterogeneous side of the display in the split-half paradigm, and proportion of optimal targets found in the adaptive choice task is  $r = -0.03$ . Further results are presented in supplementary materials.

## 4. Discussion

The results presented above are somewhat surprising.

I think he sees it as a positive thing that they tasks don't correlate, because it suggests they capture unique variation in behaviour glass half full approach

Mention [16]. From [14] - *Vogel and colleagues have found that an individual's ability to remember a greater number of items using working memory is related to a filtering capacity in visual search that suppresses attentional capture by distracting visual information [10,11,12]. Behavioral work in visual search has extended this research to demonstrate that working memory correlates only with top-down visual search performance where task relevance is crucial, but not with bottom-up visual search tasks where salience in the environment guides attention [15]*

## References

1. Tatiana A Amor, Mirko Luković, Hans J Herrmann, and José S Andrade.  
Influence of scene structure and content on visual search strategies.  
*Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 14(132):20170406, 2017.
2. Walter R Boot, Arthur F Kramer, Ensar Becic, Douglas A Wiegmann, and Tate Kubose.  
Detecting transient changes in dynamic displays: The more you look, the less you see.  
*Human Factors*, 48(4):759–773, 2006.
3. David H Brainard.  
The psychophysics toolbox.  
*Spatial vision*, 10:433–436, 1997.
4. Alasdair DF Clarke, Patrick Green, Mike J Chantler, and Amelia R Hunt.  
Human search for a target on a textured background is consistent with a stochastic model.  
*Journal of vision*, 16(7):4–4, 2016.
5. Marian Dawkins.  
Shifts of 'attention' in chicks during feeding.  
*Animal Behaviour*, 19(3):575 – 582, 1971.
6. Iain D Gilchrist and Monika Harvey.  
Evidence for a systematic component within scan paths in visual search.  
*Visual Cognition*, 14(4-8):704–715, 2006.
7. Jessica L Irons and Andrew B Leber.  
Characterizing individual variation in the strategic use of attentional control.  
*Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, pages 1–18, 2016.
8. Jessica L Irons and Andrew B Leber.  
Choosing attentional control settings in a dynamically changing environment.  
*Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 2018.
9. Ómar I Jóhannesson, Ian M Thornton, Irene J Smith, Andrey Chetverikov, and Arni Kristjánsson.  
Visual foraging with fingers and eye gaze.  
*i-Perception*, 7(2):2041669516637279, 2016.
10. Árni Kristjánsson, Ómar I Jóhannesson, and Ian M Thornton.  
Common attentional constraints in visual foraging.  
*PloS one*, 9(6):e100752, 2014.
11. Norman H Mackworth.  
The breakdown of vigilance during prolonged visual search.  
*Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1(1):6–21, 1948.
12. Jiri Najemnik and Wilson S Geisler.  
Eye movement statistics in humans are consistent with an optimal search strategy.



- 236 *Journal of Vision*, 8(3):4–4, 2008.
- 237 13. Anna Nowakowska, Alasdair D F Clarke, and Amelia R Hunt.
- 238 Human visual search behaviour is far from ideal.
- 239 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 2017.
- 240 14. Michael J Proulx.
- 241 Individual differences and metacognitive knowledge of visual search strategy.
- 242 *PLoS One*, 6(10):e27043, 2011.
- 243 15. Kenith V Sobel, Matthew P Gerrie, Bradley J Poole, and Michael J Kane.
- 244 Individual differences in working memory capacity and visual search: The roles of top-down
- 245 and bottom-up processing.
- 246 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14(5):840–845, 2007.
- 247 16. Edward K Vogel and Edward Awh.
- 248 How to exploit diversity for scientific gain: Using individual differences to constrain cognitive
- 249 theory.
- 250 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(2):171–176, 2008.