



Prospective memory in a virtual environment: beneficial effects of cue saliency

Journal:	<i>Journal of Cognitive Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID:	JCP-BA 13-21.R1
Manuscript Type:	Brief Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Sep-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Trawley, Steven; Edinburgh University, Psychology Law, Anna; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Natural Sciences and Psychology Brown, Louise; Nottingham Trent University, Psychology Niven, Elaine; University of Edinburgh, Psychology Logie, Robert; Edinburgh University, Psychology
Keywords:	prospective memory, delayed intentions, cue saliency, virtual environment, EVET, naturalistic task

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title Page

Prospective memory in a virtual environment: beneficial effects of cue saliency

Steven L. Trawley¹, Anna S. Law², Louise A. Brown³,

Elaine H. Niven¹, and Robert H. Logie¹

¹ Human Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Edinburgh, UK

² School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

³ Division of Psychology, Nottingham Trent University, UK

Corresponding author

Anna Law

School of Natural Sciences and Psychology

Liverpool John Moores University

Byrom Street

Liverpool, L3 3AF

UK

e-mail: A.Law@ljmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Prospective Memory (PM) research focuses on how the cognitive system successfully encodes and retains an intention, before retrieving it at a particular future time or in response to a particular future event. Previous work using 2D text stimuli has shown that increasing the saliency of the retrieval cue can improve performance. In the present work, we investigated the effect of increased cue saliency in a more ecologically valid 3D virtual environment. The findings indicate that increased perceptual saliency of the cue does benefit PM in a dynamic and visually rich environment, but that the impact of cue saliency does not interact with attentional load.

Keywords: prospective memory; delayed intentions; cue saliency; virtual environment; EVET; naturalistic task

Word count: 3999.

Reference count: 20

INTRODUCTION

When an individual encounters a situation that is conducive to completing a previously established goal, the anticipated prospect is that they will remember and complete the task. An example would be remembering an earlier intention to buy milk while driving towards a supermarket. However, a successful outcome is not guaranteed and many factors could contribute to failure. In recent years, researchers have reported a variety of situations that can influence an individual's ability to correctly retrieve such prospective memories (PM). A number of these findings are incorporated into an influential theory known as the multiprocess framework (MPF) that attempts to incorporate the results into a coherent model with distinct predictions about PM performance (Einstein & McDaniel, 2005). This framework distinguishes between two retrieval processes; a strategic process that actively monitors for the appropriate situation to retrieve the intention whilst concurrently performing any ongoing task, and an automatic process that spontaneously retrieves the intention in response to cue presentation. The visual distinctiveness or saliency of the PM cue is one of these parameters that determines the automaticity (or failure) of PM retrieval, and is the focus of the present study. The suggestion is that a perceptually salient PM cue, which attracts attention automatically by standing out in relation to non-cue stimuli, would cue retrieval of a delayed intention without the need for any conscious monitoring. In the example of purchasing milk on the drive home, according to the MPF, there is greater chance of success if the driver encountered a prominent colourful roadside advertisement for milk that was adjacent to the supermarket. Such

1
2
3 a cue, by nature of its visual saliency, would result in increased evaluation and, thus,
4
5 would increase the likelihood that the driver would remember its significance in time
6
7 to respond.
8
9

10
11 In order to explore what factors influence PM, researchers typically use a dual-task
12
13 paradigm (Einstein & McDaniel, 1990). This consists of an ongoing task (e.g., lexical
14
15 decision) and PM task (e.g., press spacebar if you see the word “orange”). Using this
16
17 approach, there is evidence for the benefits of increased visual cue saliency. For
18
19 example, Brandimonte and Passolunghi (1994) found that PM was improved when
20
21 the PM cue was presented in uppercase, in contrast to the other items involved in the
22
23 ongoing task being in lowercase.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 A natural extension of the above work is to explore whether the performance benefits
31
32 of increased visual saliency can be observed in more ecologically valid scenes. The
33
34 typical laboratory dual-task paradigm provides precise experimental control and
35
36 measurement of ongoing task performance but in this type of task, two-dimensional
37
38 stimuli are passively presented to participants who have no influence over cue
39
40 presentation rate or order. The specific question this paper addresses is whether the
41
42 benefits of PM cue saliency are replicable in a more **ecologically valid**, yet complex
43
44 and cluttered visual environment (i.e., navigating around a large building).
45
46

47
48 Furthermore, in everyday life we have a significant influence over what stimuli we
49
50 are presented with and when, by virtue of our movements in a navigable environment.

51
52 Trawley, Law and Logie (2011) have addressed both of these issues by providing
53
54 participants with full autonomy to navigate a 3D virtual building. This task, known as
55
56 the Edinburgh Virtual Errands Task or EVET (Law, Trawley, Brown, Stephens, &
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Logie, 2013; Logie, Trawley & Law, 2011) requires participants to perform a series
4 of errands (e.g., collect a newspaper) in specific locations in a large virtual building.
5
6
7 The EVET was considered the most appropriate technique for exploring the role of
8 planning in PM, as it afforded participants the opportunity to choose their own path
9 through a virtual building. Trawley et al. (2011) found that participants whose
10 decisions deviated from their original plans exhibited more **PM omission errors**. One
11 potential limitation of this study, however, is that it did not involve a traditional
12 ongoing task as prescribed by the typical dual-task PM paradigm. Nevertheless,
13 results from Trawley et al., (2011) and other studies with EVET (Law et al., 2013;
14 Logie et al., 2011) suggested that the navigational requirement was sufficiently
15 attentionally demanding to function as an ongoing task. Thus, the ongoing (i.e.,
16 navigating to errand location) and PM (i.e., remembering to perform errand at
17 location) tasks were combined (for a similar approach, see Titov and Knight, 2000).
18
19 Although this approach was suitable for the issues addressed previously, there are
20 distinct advantages of separating the ongoing task from the PM task. First, studies
21 have used ongoing task performance as a measure of PM cost (e.g., Marsh, Hicks,
22 Cook, Hansen, & Pallos, 2003; Smith, 2003), which can help to answer the question
23 of whether PM retrieval is strategic or automatic in a particular experimental
24 situation. Second, the PM cue can be separated geographically and conceptually from
25 the locations that the participant is required to visit to complete the EVET.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 With this new approach we examined the benefit of increased visual cue saliency on
50 PM performance. In the adapted version reported here, participants were given two
51 types of errands; location specified (e.g., deliver newspaper to room T4) and location
52 unspecified (e.g., if you see picture press the button). The location specified tasks
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 would function as the ongoing task, mirroring its role in traditional PM tests, while
4 the location unspecified tasks function as the PM retrieval cue. We compared PM and
5 ongoing task performance with high and low PM cue saliency as a between-subjects
6 manipulation. Furthermore, to examine the importance of attention in the effect of cue
7 saliency on PM performance we asked participants to perform the EVET twice; once
8 concurrently with a verbal task and once without. The verbal task we used was
9 random generation, which previous work by our lab has shown causes a reliable
10 disruption of EVET performance (Law et al., 2013).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 Based on the reported attentional consequences of manipulating perceptual saliency,
24 our predictions were that salient PM cues would improve PM performance and that
25 this beneficial effect would be greater in conditions of increased attentional demand
26 (dual task conditions). This interaction is predicted by the MPF, in which the
27 beneficial effects of saliency should be most apparent when attentional resources are
28 limited. At this point it is important to consider a contrasting view put forward by
29 Smith (2003) who propose the preparatory attentional and memory processes (PAM)
30 theory, which in contrast to the MPF, argues that successful PM retrieval always
31 requires cognitive capacity. This position is based upon the observation that average
32 ongoing task response times for non-cue trials were significantly slower when
33 participants were given a PM task to perform. Smith (2003) argues that slower
34 ongoing task response times indicate monitoring or other preparatory processes.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 As far as the authors are aware, this is the first reported test of the PM saliency
6
7 hypothesis in such a setting, in which the participants have complete navigational
8
9 freedom.
10

11 12 13 14 **METHOD**

15 16 **Participants**

17
18 **Forty participants (20 female)** were recruited from the undergraduate psychology
19
20 course at the University of Edinburgh. **The mean age was 21.5 years ($SD = 2.3$).** All
21
22 participants were compensated with course credit.
23

24 25 **Materials**

26
27 *The Edinburgh Virtual Errands Task (EVET)*. The EVET is a desktop virtual
28
29 environment that requires the performance of eight errands within eight minutes. The
30
31 errands are located throughout a large office building with four storeys that
32
33 participants navigate via keyboard and mouse. Further details of the virtual building
34
35 and its construction are given in Logie et al., (2011). The EVET has building rules
36
37 that require participants to use the left stairs for travelling down and the right stairs for
38
39 travelling up, to avoid entering any non-task rooms, and to avoid picking up any non-
40
41 task objects.
42
43
44

45
46
47 Prior to completing the EVET for the first time all participants completed a practice
48
49 session followed by a skill test. The former involved following a series of onscreen
50
51 errand commands, which were similar to, but not the same as, those used in the main
52
53 testing session (onscreen commands were only present for initial training). The latter
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was similar to the EVET practice but only half as long, and designed to provide an
4
5 index of how effectively they could perform a series of errands.
6
7

8
9
10 The standard list of eight errands given to participants (e.g., “Pick up brown package
11
12 in T4 and take to G6”) constituted the location specified errands described earlier. For
13
14 the prospective memory task (i.e., the location non-specified errand) participants were
15
16 instructed that if they saw any wall pictures in the building they were to press the
17
18 large button underneath the picture. They were told to do this only once per picture
19
20 and that this task was equally as important as the other errands. This PM information
21
22 was also printed at the bottom of the errands list. The pictures (five in total) were
23
24 placed in locations found to have high dwell time for participants performing the
25
26 EVET in our previous studies. As participants performed the EVET twice, two
27
28 different errand lists were used (referred to as List A and B; see Logie et al., 2011 for
29
30 details). These lists contained the same type of errands but used different rooms and
31
32 initial start point. For list A, each floor had one picture with the exception of the third
33
34 floor that had two. List B was the opposite, with two pictures located in the ground
35
36 floor. Saliency maps were generated, using Itti and Koch's (2000) model with
37
38 standard parameters, to objectively assess each of the five PM cues in their high and
39
40 low saliency between group conditions (see Figure 1).
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 <insert Figure 1 about here>
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Random Generation Task.

Participants were required to speak aloud random months of the year at the rate of once per second. In addition to performing this concurrently with the EVET in the dual task condition, they performed this by itself for two minutes to establish baseline performance. All verbal responses were recorded on audiotape for later transcription. Random Number Generation (RNG) score was calculated using RGCcalc (Towse & Neil, 1998). This RNG measure is based on the frequency with which particular response pairings occur in the data and varies between 0 and 1, with lower scores indicating greater equality of possible response pairings.

Gaming experience. Two questions were asked of each participant following Moffat, Hampson, and Hatzipantelis (1998); a general self-assessment of gaming experience and a more specific self-assessment of 3D gaming experience. Each question was rated on a seven-point scale. The mean of both scores was taken as a measure of gaming experience. However, there was no significant relationship between game experience (or EVET skill) and the PM performance measure, therefore these data are not discussed further.

Procedure and Design

All testing was conducted over a one-hour session with each participant tested individually. Half of the participants received the high PM cue saliency version of the EVET and half received the low saliency version. The combination of task list, and order of testing (i.e., whether participants started with single or dual task conditions) were fully counterbalanced. At the start of the test session participants rated their gaming experience. Next, participants completed the EVET practice and skill test.

1
2
3 Participants were then given their errand list to study along with a schematic map of
4 the building. The procedure was as follows: an initial two minute period of study;
5 the building. The procedure was as follows: an initial two minute period of study;
6 the building. The procedure was as follows: an initial two minute period of study;
7 immediate free recall of the errands; a further study period of five minutes; cued
8 recall of the errands. At the end of this period participants were asked to verbally
9 recall the errand list and building rules. Any mistakes were corrected, and this process
10 was repeated until recall of the list was at 100% (typically, this required a further two
11 minutes of study time). Thus, including the initial learning phase and final checking,
12 each participant spent approximately twelve minutes working with the errand list
13 before starting the EVET. This minimised the risk that participants would fail to
14 complete errands simply because they could not recall them. The delay between PM
15 encoding and PM retrieval was approximately 2-3 minutes due to the lag in starting
16 the EVET and depending on when the participant's movements brought them into
17 contact with the first PM cue. The EVET lasted for eight minutes, and neither the task
18 list nor building map were present during the test. Performance was scored with a
19 weighted scoring procedure (see Logie, et al, 2011). With the exception of the skill
20 and practice sections, participants performed this sequence once with EVET alone
21 (half with list A, half with list B) and once with the alternative list while they
22 performed the random generation task.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 RESULTS

48 Descriptive statistics and correlations between the variables are shown in Table 1. In
49 the following sets of results, the effects of cue type and attentional demand on
50 performance were analysed (see Table 2 for summary data). Unless otherwise stated
51 the results were analysed using a two-way mixed design ANOVA with attentional
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 load (single or dual; within participants) and cue saliency (high or low; between
4 participants) as the main factors.
5
6
7

8
9
10 <Insert Table 1 about here>
11

12
13
14
15
16 <Insert Table 2 about here>
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 *PM EVET performance:* The PM performance index comprised a ratio between the
24 number of times a participant navigated within the proximity of a PM cue and the
25 number of times they correctly pressed the button. This ratio represented successful
26 performance for participants whilst controlling for cue exposure as a consequence of
27 their movements around the EVET building. Failure to press a button, that had not
28 been pressed before, was considered an error of omission. Errors of commission (see
29 Scullin, Bugg, & McDaniel, 2012; Scullin & Bugg, 2013) were recorded but
30 frequency was so low that no meaningful results concerning these types of PM errors
31 could be obtained. All participants successfully recalled the PM task instructions at
32 the end of the test session. There was no effect of counterbalancing for dual/single
33 start order, so for this analysis the reported results are collapsed across this variable.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 There was a significant main effect of load, $F(1,38) = 12.15$, $MSE = .038$, $p < .001$,
50 $\eta^2_p = .242$; single EVET PM omission errors $M = .43$, $SD = .35$; dual EVET PM
51 omission errors $M = .27$, $SD = .29$ and for cue type, $F(1,38) = 10.49$, $MSE = .132$, p
52 $= .002$, $\eta^2_p = .216$; Low saliency $M = .22$ $SD = .21$; High saliency $M = .48$ $SD = .35$.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There was no significant interaction between the two factors, $F(1,38) = 0.25, p = .62,$
4
5 $\eta^2_p = .006.$
6
7

8
9
10 The failure to obtain an interaction effect here was surprising as it was predicted by
11
12 the MPF and creates a difficult situation with regard to the interpretation of a null
13
14 effect. An alternative approach is to reconsider this interaction from a Bayesian
15
16 perspective. The R package *BayesFactor* (Rouder, Morey, Speckman, and Provine,
17
18 2012) provides a Bayes factor for each combination of our factors, which allows us to
19
20 directly contrast competing models. Our model of main effects only (load and cue
21
22 type) produced the greater Bayes factor ($BF = 11.8 \times 10^6, \pm 2.1\%$), compared with the
23
24 model that included the interaction ($BF = 3.70 \times 10^6, \pm 2.5\%$). The main effect only
25
26 model was preferred by a factor of nearly 4 ($3.97, \pm 1.29\%$).
27
28
29

30
31
32 *EVET score*: This measure was based on the same scoring procedure as that reported
33
34 in previous studies (Logie et al., 2011; Law, et al., 2013) and is designed to index
35
36 efficient errand completion. Points were allocated for performing errands and were
37
38 removed for rule breaks, such as breaking the stair rule. This measure did not include
39
40 any PM responses. There was a significant main effect of load, $F(1,38) = 4.67, MSE$
41
42 $= 18.42, p = .037, \eta^2_p = .11$; single EVET score $M = 10.53, SD = 6.34$; dual EVET
43
44 score $M = 8.45, SD = 6.16$. There was no main effect of cue type, $F(1,38) = 0.06, p =$
45
46 $.81, \eta^2_p = .002$, or interaction between the two factors, $F(1,38) = 0.83, p = .37, \eta^2_p =$
47
48 $.021.$
49
50
51

52
53
54 *EVET travel time*: This indicated the total amount of time each participant spent
55
56 travelling around the EVET building. Time spent within a room was excluded (i.e.,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the time spent completing a specific errand), therefore it was predicted that this
4
5 measure would directly index each participant's ability to navigate effectively within
6
7 the virtual building. There was no effect of counterbalancing for dual/single start
8
9 order, so the reported results are collapsed across this variable. The main effect of
10
11 load was significant, $F(1,38) = 4.41$, $MSE = 1121.33$, $p = .042$, $\eta^2_p = .104$; single
12
13 EVET travel time $M = 321.68$ seconds, $SD = 36.27$; dual EVET travel time $M =$
14
15 337.40 seconds, $SD = 36.99$. There was no main effect of cue type, $F(1,38) = .001$,
16
17 $MSE = 1629.19$, $p = .97$, $\eta^2_p = .000$, and no interaction, $F(1,38) = 0.11$, $p = .74$, $\eta^2_p =$
18
19 $.003$.

20
21
22
23
24
25 *Randomness of secondary task responses:* Baseline performance was compared to
26
27 dual-task performance using mixed ANOVA (the between- participants factor being
28
29 cue type). There was a significant main effect of load, $F(1,38) = 52.81$, $MSE = 0.007$,
30
31 $p < 0.001$, with participants producing significantly less random responses in the dual-
32
33 task condition ($M = .27$, $SD = .10$) than during baseline random generation
34
35 performance ($M = .41$, $SD = .10$). There was no main effect of cue type or interaction.

36
37
38
39
40
41 Graphical representation of participant movement patterns collapsed across all floors
42
43 can be seen in Figure 2. High/low cue type groups and single/dual attentional load
44
45 conditions are each represented as a 3D plot derived from kernel-density estimation
46
47 (Cao, 2008). Each plot represents the probability of that location being occupied by
48
49 participants from that group. In short, a high peak indicates an area in which
50
51 participants from that group dwelled, whereas flatter troughs represent areas of travel
52
53 with no stops. In line with the main effect of load on travel time, the left lower plot
54
55 highlights the additional time participants in the dual task condition spent navigating
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from errand to errand along the corridors. In contrast, participants in the single task
4
5 condition appeared to focus their time in the folder sorting room (left upper plot). The
6
7 plots on the right, however, are closer in appearance. This suggests that the salience of
8
9 the PM cue did not have a discernable effect on their movement through the building.
10
11 This is in line with the non-significant effect of cue type on the EVET travel time
12
13 measure.
14
15

16
17
18 <insert figure 2 about here>
19
20

21 22 23 **DISCUSSION**

24
25 The results support the cue saliency hypothesis in a more dynamic situation than used
26
27 previously. The benefit of cue saliency and the detrimental effect of increased
28
29 attentional load on PM performance are in line with the MPF. However, the absence
30
31 of an interaction contrasts with the MPF prediction that increased salience would be
32
33 most beneficial when attentional resources are limited (for a similar MPF
34
35 saliency/attention prediction see Rendell et al, 2012). The interaction effect size was
36
37 small, suggesting that sample size was not an issue here. Furthermore, a Bayesian
38
39 analysis gave no reason to believe that an interaction was present. These findings may
40
41 be more consistent with the PAM theory than with the MPF. Smith et al. (2007)
42
43 argued that salient cues do not lead to automatic retrieval of the intention, but rather
44
45 recruit extra resources to the PM task which can be utilised in preparatory processing,
46
47 leading to enhanced PM performance. Therefore, if resources were scarce due to the
48
49 presence of a competing random generation task, one might then expect cue saliency
50
51 to have *less* benefit in the dual-task condition than it did in the single-task condition.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, there was no evidence of a significant modulation of the effect in either
4
5 direction.
6
7
8

9
10 One possible explanation is that the PM cues were within the focus of attention
11 required for the EVET task. Einstein and McDaniel (2005) argue that processing
12 overlap increases the probability that the cue will automatically prompt retrieval. For
13 example, Einstein and McDaniel (2005; Ex1) used a famous faces task to manipulate
14 whether the ongoing task (categorization) did overlap with the PM cue (word cue) or
15 did not (vowel cue). They found manipulations of attention were only effective with
16 non-focal cues. Similarly, Hicks, Cook and Marsh (2005) showed that manipulations
17 of cue saliency were only effective with non-focal cues. With this in mind, the
18 appearance and position of the PM cues were similar to the number signs outside each
19 room. This similarity to an essential aspect of the building for EVET performance
20 may have brought the PM cues into the focus of attention, and therefore limited the
21 favourable changes in cue detection brought about by cue saliency. The benefit of
22 increased cue saliency was already at a functional ceiling level during the single task
23 condition and could not increase performance any further under dual task conditions.
24 The methodology used here is particularly suitable for manipulating PM cue focus
25 due to the greater number of peripheral stimuli presented to the participant. Another
26 explanation is that the demand exerted by performing the EVET alone was enough for
27 the beneficial effects of increased cue saliency to be demonstrated. Trawley et al.
28 (2011) examined PM performance with only the EVET, assuming the navigational
29 requirement was demanding enough to function as an ongoing task. Future studies
30 with a less demanding EVET (e.g., reduced number of tasks) would address this
31 point. Additionally, in the current design participants have, in effect, one PM task (the
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 standard predetermined location based EVET errands) embedded in another
4
5 (responding to pictures in an undetermined location). Whether we would find the
6
7 same effects for cue saliency or attentional load with an ongoing activity that had no
8
9 PM element (e.g., a simple follow-task) is an interesting issue for future studies.¹
10

11
12
13
14 The significant effect of attentional load on EVET performance is in line with that
15
16 found previously (Law et al., 2013). Furthermore, travel time between dual and single
17
18 task groups was significant, demonstrating increased time spent navigating between
19
20 rooms for participants under dual task conditions. The absence of any discernable
21
22 difference between EVET performance (score or movement patterns) for the high and
23
24 low cue saliency groups suggests that participants did not alter task priorities in
25
26 response to increased or decreased cue perceptual saliency. Rather, as is the aim for
27
28 any PM study, the PM task was secondary to the demanding ongoing task of
29
30 completing the EVET. The contrast between the EVET and PM tasks, with regard to
31
32 one being location specific and the other non-specific may be partly responsible. At
33
34 the start of both EVET sessions, participants were unaware of PM cue location. In
35
36 contrast, with a typical PM experiment the eventual physical location of the cue is
37
38 known to the participant (e.g., within the stream of central presented words during a
39
40 lexical decision task). PM cues that are location specific may encourage a monitoring
41
42 approach, whereas this strategy would seem less attractive with location non-specific
43
44 cues. The relationship between reduced travel time and higher EVET performance
45
46 supports our previous work (Logie et al, 2011; Trawley et al, 2011). In the latter
47
48 paper, the issue of plan following and how that is important for successful PM was
49
50 addressed. However, another suggestion is that with increased execution speed the
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ¹ We thank an anonymous reviewer for this point.
58
59
60

errands would be less susceptible to forgetting. This would be an interesting area of further research.

This research identifies a practical way to explore the effects of increased perceptual saliency on PM performance in an ecologically valid, yet controlled environment. A variety of applied research topics that extend beyond a simple high/low saliency contrast are relevant for future consideration (e.g., location familiarity). Few studies have addressed the relevance of context familiarity in PM performance (although see Sellen, Louie, Harris and Wilkins, 1997). Furthermore, manipulation of visual saliency has a variety of applied implications. How these applied issues can be considered from a PM perspective is a potentially productive area for further research.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Matthew Logie for undertaking the programming to create the EVET environment. We acknowledge Leverhulme Trust research grant number F/00 158/W which supported the research that we report here.

References

Brandimonte, M. A., & Passolunghi, M. C. (1994). The effect of cue-familiarity, cue-distinctiveness, and retention interval on prospective remembering. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 47(3), 565-587.

1
2
3 Cao, Y. (2008). "Bivariant Kernel Density Estimation." Retrieved 17 Nov, 2011,
4
5 from [http://www.mathworks.co.uk/matlabcentral/fileexchange/19280-bivariant-
8
9 kernel-density-estimation-v2-0](http://www.mathworks.co.uk/matlabcentral/fileexchange/19280-bivariant-
6
7 kernel-density-estimation-v2-0).

10
11 Einstein, G. O., & McDaniel, M. A. (1990). Normal aging and prospective memory.
12
13 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 16(4), 717.

14
15 Einstein, G. O., & McDaniel, M. A. (2005). Prospective memory multiple retrieval
16
17 processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 286–290. doi:
18
19 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00382.x
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 Hicks, J. L., Cook, G. I., & Marsh, R. L. (2005). Detecting event-based prospective
28
29 memory cues occurring within and outside the focus of attention. *The American
30
31 Journal of Psychology*, 1-12.
32
33
34
35

36
37 Itti, L., & Koch, C. (2000). A saliency-based search mechanism for overt and covert
38
39 shifts of visual attention. *Vision research*, 40(10-12), 1489-1506.
40
41
42

43
44 Law, A. S., Trawley, S. L., Brown, L. A., Stephens, A. N., & Logie, R. H. (2013).
45
46 The impact of working memory load on task execution and online plan adjustment
47
48 during multitasking in a virtual environment. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental
49
50 Psychology*, 66(6), 1241-1258.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Logie, R. H., Trawley, S. L., & Law, A. S (2011). Multitasking: multiple, domain-
4 specific cognitive functions in a virtual environment. *Memory & cognition*, 39(8),
5 1561-1574.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Marsh, R. L., Hicks, J. L., Cook, G. I., Hansen, J. S., & Pallos, A. L. (2003).
12 Interference to ongoing activities covaries with the characteristics of an event-based
13 intention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,
14 29(5), 861.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Moffat, S. D., Hampson, E., & Hatzipantelis, M. (1998). Navigation in a “virtual”
23 maze: Sex differences and correlation with psychometric measures of spatial ability in
24 humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 19(2), 73-87.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Rendell, P. G., Henry, J. D., Phillips, L. H., de la Piedad Garcia, X., Booth, P.,
32 Phillips, P., & Kliegel, M. (2012). Prospective memory, emotional valence, and
33 multiple sclerosis. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 34(7), 738-
34 749.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D., Speckman, P. L., & Province, J. M. (2012). Default
44 Bayes factors for ANOVA designs. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 56, 356-
45 374.
46
47
48
49

50
51 Scullin, M. K., & Bugg, J. M. (2013). Failing to forget: Prospective memory
52 commission errors can result from spontaneous retrieval and impaired executive
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 control. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
4
5 *Cognition*, 39(3), 965.
6
7

8
9
10 Scullin, M. K., Bugg, J. M., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). Whoops, I did it again:
11
12 Commission errors in prospective memory. *Psychology and aging*, 27(1), 46.
13

14
15
16 Sellen, A. J., Louie, G., Harris, J. E., & Wilkins, A. J. (1997). What brings intentions
17
18 to mind? An in situ study of prospective memory. *Memory*, 5(4), 483-507.
19

20
21
22 Smith, R. E. (2003). The cost of remembering to remember in event-based
23
24 prospective memory: investigating the capacity demands of delayed intention
25
26 performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
27
28 *Cognition*, 29(3), 347.
29
30

31
32
33
34 Smith, R. E., Hunt, R. R., McVay, J. C., & McConnell, M. D. (2007). The cost of
35
36 event-based prospective memory: Salient target events. *Journal of Experimental*
37
38 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 33, 734-746. doi:10.1037/0278-
39
40 7393.33.4.734
41

42
43
44
45 Titov, N., & Knight, R. G. (2000). A video-based procedure for the assessment of
46
47 prospective memory. *Applied cognitive psychology*, 15(1), 61-83.
48

49
50
51
52 Towse, J. N., & Neil, D. (1998). Analyzing human random generation behavior: A
53
54 review of methods used and a computer program for describing performance.
55
56 *Behavior Research Methods*, 30(4), 583-591.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Trawley, S. L., Law, A. S., & Logie, R. H. (2011). Event-based prospective
6 remembering in a virtual world. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*,
7
8 64(11), 2181-2193.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations between measures.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 EVET skill test	174.5	37.8	-.39*	-.27	-.27	-.54**	-.36*	.433**	.22
2 Previous game experience	6.8	3.1		.19	.18	.30	.29	-.03	-.26
3 PM Performance (single)	.43	.35			.64**	.25	.17	-.25	.00
4 PM Performance (dual)	.27	.29				.15	.29	-.25	-.13
5 EVET Score (single)	10.5 (.53)	6.3 (.32)					.53**	-.51*	-.15
6 EVET Score (dual)	8.5 (.43)	6.2 (.31)						-.44**	-.50**
7 EVET travel time (single) in seconds	321.7 (.67)	36.3 (.07)							.18
8 EVET travel time (dual) in seconds	337.4 (.70)	37.0 (.08)							

Note: The EVET travel time and weighted performance score is reported as normal alongside a proportion of maximum (in brackets). Maximum EVET score is 20; maximum travel time is 480 seconds. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$

Table 2. Performance measures as a function of cue type and load conditions.

	Single Task		Dual Task		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
PM Performance (low cue saliency)	.30 (6.8)	.28 (1.5)	.13 (7.0)	.14 (1.7)	0.70
PM Performance (high cue saliency)	.55 (6.1)	.36 (1.4)	.42 (6.2)	.33 (1.2)	0.38
EVET Score (low cue saliency)	10.8 (.54)	6.5 (.33)	7.8 (.39)	6.9 (.35)	0.45
EVET Score (high cue saliency)	10.3 (.52)	6.3 (.32)	9.1 (.46)	5.4 (.27)	0.20
EVET travel time (low cue saliency)	322.8 (.67)	42.3 (.08)	336.0 (.70)	37.2 (.07)	0.33
EVET travel time (high cue saliency)	320.6 (.67)	30.2 (.06)	338.8 (.71)	37.6 (.08)	0.53

Note: Average number of proximate opportunities for PM performance is reported (in brackets). The EVET travel time and weighted performance score is reported as normal alongside a proportion of maximum (in brackets). Maximum EVET score is 20; maximum travel time is 480 seconds.

1
2
3
4
5 Figure Captions.
6
7
8

9
10 Figure 1. Example saliency maps showing contrast between high and low
11 saliency cues towards the left of each image.
12
13

14
15
16 Figure 2. Graphical representation of participant movement patterns collapsed
17 across all four floors and for all participants as a function of condition (high
18 peaks represent areas of the most frequent dwelling).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





Figure 1. Example saliency maps showing contrast between high and low saliency cues towards the left of each image.
73x67mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



73x62mm (300 x 300 DPI)

View Only