

Brief article

# Errors, efficiency, and the interplay between attention and category learning

Mark R. Blair<sup>a,\*</sup>, Marcus R. Watson<sup>b</sup>, Kimberly M. Meier<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>

---

---

---

---

---

---



### 2.3. Procedure

We used a Tobii X50 sampling at 50 Hz to collect direct and fine-grained spatial and temporal information about participants' gaze. The experiment consisted of a series of categorization trials. Participants began each trial by clicking a fixation cross that appeared in the center of the screen, after which a stimulus was displayed. Participants decided the category to which the stimulus belonged, then clicked the mouse button. This removed the stimulus and revealed response boxes in the four corners of the screen. The category labels (A1, B1, etc.) were randomly assigned to boxes in different corners on each trial to avoid biasing fixations during stimulus presentation. Once a box was clicked, it either turned green to indicate that the response

reflects the aggregate trend of continuous, gradual improvement throughout the post-criterion trials.

There was no external feedback indicating errors during the post-criterion phase and therefore models of attentional learning that require an external error signal cannot account for the observed error-free optimization. It is possible, however, that an internally generated error signal might allow performance error a role in driving attentional change. If this were happening, then we would expect optimization to occur only in those participants who made performance errors during the post-criterion stage. To investigate this possibility we examined just the 14 participants who made no errors at all during the final 96 trials

to 0.31 (SD = 0.29) for the six post-learning trials:  $t(21) = 3.53$ ,  $p < .01$ . This jump in optimization centered on the learning point of each category is numerically larger than the increase in optimization shown in the entire post-criterion phase of the experiment. These results indicate that on trials where participants were presented with stimuli whose category membership they were unsure of, they did not optimize at all, but within one trial of learning a category they began optimizing to a significant extent.

The dip in optimization one trial before the learning point may be interesting. Optimization on this trial is significantly lower than the average of the five previous trials:  $t(21) = 2.27$ ,  $p < .05$ . The definition of learning points guarantees that this trial will be incorrect, and it could be that before learning there is a very slight correlation between optimization and accuracy. Given the sample size, how-



- Kruschke, J. K. (1992). ALCOVE: An exemplar-based connectionist model of category learning. *Psychological Review*, 99(1), 22–44.
- Kruschke, J. K. (1996). Base rates in category learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(1), 3–26.
- Kruschke, J. K. (2001). Toward a unified model of attention in associative learning. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 45(6), 812–863.
- Kruschke, J. K., & Johansen, M. K. (1999). A model of probabilistic category learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25(5), 1083–1119.
- Kruschke, J. K., Kappenman, E. S., & Hetrick, W. P. (2005). Eye gaze and individual differences consistent with learned attention in associated blocking and highlighting. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31(5), 830–845.
- Kurtz, K. J. (2007). The divergent autoencoder (DIVA) model of category learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 14(4), 560–576.
- Love, B. C., Medin, D. L., & Gureckis, T. M. (2004). SUSTAIN: A network model of human category learning. *Psychological Review*, 111, 309–332.
- Maddox, W. T., & Dodd, J. L. (2003). Separating perceptual and decisional attention processes in the identification and categorization of integral-dimension stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 29(3), 467–480.
- Maddox, W. T., & Ing, A. D. (2005). Delayed feedback disrupts the procedural-learning system but not the hypothesis-testing system in perceptual category learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31(1), 100–107.
- Maddox, W. T., Ing, A. D., & Lauritzen, J. S. (2006). Stimulus modality interacts with category structure in perceptual category learning. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 68(7), 1176–1190.
- McPeck, R. M., Maljkovic, V., & Nakayama, K. (1999). Saccades require focal attention and are facilitated by a short-term memory system. *Vision Research*, 39(8), 1555–1566.
- Minda, J. P., & Smith, J. D. (2002). Comparing prototype-based and exemplar-based accounts of category learning and attentional allocation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 28(2), 275–292.
- Myles-Worsley, M., Johnston, W. A., & Simons, M. A. (1988). The influence of expertise on X-ray image-processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 14(3), 553–557.
- Nosofsky, R. M., Palmeri, T. J., & McKinley, S. C. (1994). Rule-plus-exception model of classification learning. *Psychological Review*, 101(1), 53–79.
- Oliveira, F. T. P., McDonald, J. J., & Goodman, D. (2007). Performance monitoring in the anterior cingulate is not all error related: Expectancy deviation and the representation of action-outcome associations. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19(12), 1994–2004.
- Pauli, W. M., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2008). Attentional control of associative learning: A possible role of the central cholinergic system. *Brain Research*, 1202, 43–53.
- Posner, M. I., & Dehaene, S. (1994). Attentional networks. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 17(2), 75–79.
- Posner, M. I., & DiGirolamo, G. J. (1998). Executive attention: Conflict, target detection, and cognitive control. In R. Parasuraman (Ed.), *The attentive brain* (pp. 401–423). MIT Press.
- Posner, M. I., & Petersen, S. E. (1990). The attention system of the human brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 13, 25–42.
- Rehder, B., & Hoffman, A. B. (2005a). Eyetracking and selective attention in category learning. *Cognitive Psychology*, 51(1), 1–41.
- Rehder, B., & Hoffman, A. B. (2005b). Thirty-something category learning results explained: Selective attention, eyetracking, and models of category learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31(5), 811–829.
- Rehder, B., & Murphy, G. L. (2003). A knowledge-resonance (KRES) model of category learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 10(4), 759–784.
- Reingold, E. M., Charness, N., Pomplun, M., & Stampe, D. M. (2001). Visual span in expert chess players: Evidence from eye movements. *Psychological Science*, 12(1), 48–55.
- Rushworth, M. F. S., Walton, M. E., Kennerley, S. W., & Bannerman, D. M. (2004). Action sets and decisions in the medial frontal cortex. *Trends in Cognitive Neurosciences*, 8(9), 410–417.
- Underwood, G., Chapman, P., Brocklehurst, N., Underwood, J., & Crundall, D. (2003). Visual attention while driving: Sequences of eye fixations made by expert and novice drivers. *Ergonomics*, 46(6), 629–646.
- Williams, A. M., & Davids, K. (1998). Visual search strategy, selective attention, and expertise in soccer. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 111–128.