[1]
Author for correspondence:
Alasdair Clarke
e-mail: a.clarke@essex.ac.uk

Insert the article title here

Alasdair D. F. Clarke[1], Jessica L Irons[2], Warren James[3], Andrew B Leber[2] and Amelia R Hunt[3]

[1]Department of Psychology, University of Essex, Colchester, UK
[2]Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA
[3]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 [10], information-processing ability, speed-accuracy trade-off, motivation, visual impairments, and search strategies [3]. Although their existence has previously been noted [10], 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 oberver [11] and stochastic [5] models can explain the number of fixations required by an average observer to locate a target in noise. These apparent contradictory results could potentially expained by large individual differences.

A striking example of the effect of strategy is given by [2,3]. They found differences in visual search performance could be explained by whether observers used a [active?] scanning strategy, or simply fixated the centre of the stimulus and used covert attention to search peripheral vision.

of the search strategies used to find a target among distracters. The Adaptive Choice Visual Search (ACVS) paradigm [7] examined strategies in the use of feature-based attention [?,7] . . . . 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. Even larger differences

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

Mention [1]

Another example of differences in search strategy comes from the foraging literature [8,9]. 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 observers in animal foraging literature [6]. However, a sub-set of observers, termed "super-searchers" showed no switch cost.

[MAYBE THERE SHOULD BE SOMETHING ELSE TO SET UP THE RESEARCH Q?] A common theme emerging from the studies in the observation that individual strategies vary in their degree of effectiveness or optimality [IF THAT IS EVEN A WORD]. However, each task taps into a different aspect of visual search behavior (feature-based attention, [spatial/fixation patterns??]). The aim of the present study is to investigate the extent to which these 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? 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

(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 [7,9,12]. 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

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

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

run at 1024×768 or 1600×1200. Stimulus generation, presentation and data collection were controlled by MATLAB and psychophysics toolbox [4] 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 $\approx 1.6°$ 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 [?], 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 ≈ 47cm 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 [9] and [8]. 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 x 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[1]. [12] 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.

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.

---

[1] 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.

(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 [12]. 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 trials). More importantly, as with [12], we see that the search strategies give a good correlation with reaction times in both session a, $r \in [0.56, 0.84]$ and session b, $r \in [0.50, 0.81]$.

(ii) Adaptive Choice

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

(iii) Conjunction Foraging

The multiple-target foraging results were also in line previous findings [8,9]. As expected, run lengths were shorter for feature foraging ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 3.19$) than conjunction foraging ($M = 10.64$, $SD = 7.01$), $t(55) = 8.03$, $p < .001$ (PREFER DIFFERENT STATS HERE? CI [-9.25,-5.55]) suggesting more frequent foraging for multiple targets concurrently when those targets were defined by features than by conjunctions. However, both showed significant individual variation: Feature run length varied between 1.87 and 20, and conjunction run length varied between

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

144 1.00 and 19.67. Figure 4 (?) depicts run length across the trials separately for each individual.
145 Twenty âĂIJsuper-searchersâĂİ were revealed, identified by short run lengths for both feature
146 and conjunction targets [THAT NUMBER IS JUST BASED ON EYE-BALLING THE FIGURE,
147 BUT WE COULD COME UP WITH SOME SORT OF PRECIOUS CUT OFF âĂŞ WHAT DO YOU
148 THINK?].

(b) Correlations Between Paradigms

150 The results above demonstrate that we have successfully replicated the previous findings
151 around individual differences in visual search strategy. As an initial sweep, we look at overall
152 performance in terms of RT (note that this can be influenced not only by strategy, but also by
153 individualsâĂŹ abilities, such as their information-processing speed and their ability to ignore
154 distractors). Are individuals who are fast on one visual search task fast on another? In all
155 comparisons the correlations are weak, typically $0.27 < r < 0.30$ but positive (Figure 3). None
156 of these correlations are statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Even if we optimistically take all the
157 data together as suggesting a robust correlation in reaction times from paradigm to paradigm,
158 the upper bound of $r = 0.30$ this correlation only accounts for at best 10%[2] an individual's
159 performance.
160 [I WONDER IF THIS SHOULD GO BEFORE THE RT CORRELATIONS? SINCE AS YOU
161 SAY, THIS IS THE MAIN AIM OF THE PAPER. THEN RT CORRELATIONS COULD GO AS A
162 SECONDARY AIM] Given the low correlations between reaction times, it seems unlikely that we
163 will find that individuals who search efficiently and optimally in one paradigm will search well
164 in another (the original motivation for our study) [I WOULD BE INCLINED NOT TO SAY THIS,
165 BECAUSE IT SEEMS TO MINIMIZE THE PURPOSE OF LOOKING AT STRATEGY AT ALL. IE
166 IT SUGGESTS THAT ALL OF THE VARIATION IN STRATEGY COULD BE ENCAPSULATED
167 BY RT. BUT THERE ARE OTHER FACTORS THAT ALSO INFLUENCE RT]. The analysis
168 supports this hypothesis. For example, the correlation between the proportion of fixations to the
169 heterogeneous side of the display in the split-half paradigm, and proportion of optimal targets
170 found in the adaptive choice task is $r = -0.03$. Further results are presented in supplementary
171 materials.

4. Discussion

173 The results presented above are somewhat surprising.
174 I think he sees it as a positive thing that they tasks don't correlate, because ti suggests they
175 capture unique variation in behaviour glass half full approach
176 In the related field of memory, individual differences have received more attention, for
177 example [14].

[2]i.e., $R^2 = 0.3^2 = 0.09$

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, Ensar Becic, and Arthur F Kramer.
   Stable individual differences in search strategy?: The effect of task demands and motivational factors on scanning strategy in visual search.
   Journal of Vision, 9(3):7–7, 2009.

3. 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.

4. David H Brainard.
   The psychophysics toolbox.
   Spatial vision, 10:433–436, 1997.

5. 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.

6. Marian Dawkins.
   Shifts of âĂŸattentionâĂŹ in chicks during feeding.
   Animal Behaviour, 19(3):575 – 582, 1971.

7. Jessica L Irons and Andrew B Leber.
   Choosing attentional control settings in a dynamically changing environment.
   Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, pages 1–18, 2016.

8. 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.

9. Árni Kristjánsson, Ómar I Jóhannesson, and Ian M Thornton.
   Common attentional constraints in visual foraging.
   PloS one, 9(6):e100752, 2014.

10. Norman H Mackworth.
    The breakdown of vigilance during prolonged visual search.
    Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1(1):6–21, 1948.

11. Jiri Najemnik and Wilson S Geisler.
    Eye movement statistics in humans are consistent with an optimal search strategy.
    Journal of Vision, 8(3):4–4, 2008.

12. Anna Nowakowska, Alasdair D F Clarke, and Amelia R Hunt.
    Human visual search behaviour is far from ideal.
    Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2017.

13. Michael J Proulx.
    Individual differences and metacognitive knowledge of visual search strategy.
    PLoS One, 6(10):e27043, 2011.

14. Kenith V Sobel, Matthew P Gerrie, Bradley J Poole, and Michael J Kane.
    Individual differences in working memory capacity and visual search: The roles of top-down and bottom-up processing.
    Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 14(5):840–845, 2007.