

This is a repository copy of *Negative priming 1985 to 2015 : A measure of inhibition, the emergence of alternative accounts, and the multiple process challenge.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/98888/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

D'Angelo, Maria, Thomson, David, Tipper, Steven Paul orcid.org/0000-0002-7066-1117 et al. (1 more author) (2016) Negative priming 1985 to 2015 : A measure of inhibition, the emergence of alternative accounts, and the multiple process challenge. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*. pp. 1890-1909. ISSN 1747-0226

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2016.1173077>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Negative priming 1985 to 2015: A measure of inhibition, the emergence of alternative accounts, and the multiple process challenge.

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-SIP 15-336.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	D'Angelo, Maria; Rotman Research Institute, Thomson, Dave; University of Toronto, Tipper, Steven; University of York, Psychology Milliken, Bruce; McMaster University,
Keywords:	negative priming, inhibition, episodic retrieval

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Running Head: NEGATIVE PRIMING 1985 TO 2015
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Negative priming 1985 to 2015:

14
15 A measure of inhibition, the emergence of alternative accounts, and
16
17 the multiple process challenge.
18
19
20
21

22 Maria C. D'Angelo¹, David R. Thomson², Steven P. Tipper³, and Bruce Milliken⁴
23
24
25

26 ¹Rotman Research Institute at Baycrest, Toronto

27 ²Dept of Psychology, University of Toronto

28 ³Dept of Psychology, University of York

29 ⁴Dept of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour, McMaster University
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Word Count: 8,604

45
46 Corresponding Author: Bruce Milliken (millike@mcmaster.ca)

47
48 Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour

49
50 McMaster University

51
52 Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4K1

53
54 Phone: 1-905-525-9140 x24361
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

In this article three generations of authors describe the background to the original article; the subsequent emergence of vigorous debates concerning what negative priming actually reflects, where radically different accounts based on memory retrieval were proposed; and a re-casting of the conceptual issues underlying studies of negative priming. What started as a simple observation (slowed RTs) and mechanism (distractor inhibition) appears now to be best explained by a multiple mechanism account involving both episodic binding and retrieval processes as well as an inhibitory process. Emerging evidence from converging techniques such as fMRI, and especially EEG, is beginning to identify these different processes. The past 30 years of negative priming experiments has revealed the dynamic and complex cognitive processes that mediate what appear to be apparently simple behavioural effects.

Negative priming 1985 to 2015:**A measure of inhibition, the emergence of alternative accounts, and
the multiple process challenge**

The initial research issue concerned how action can be selectively directed towards a relevant object in complex environments containing other objects competing for the control of action. One solution that would enable action to be directed towards an appropriate object at the right moment in time involves active inhibition of competing distractor representations. It was proposed that this inhibition could be observed by presenting a previous distractor as a target object shortly afterwards. If response to a target that was just previously a distractor requires access to recently inhibited information, then responses ought to be slowed. This inhibitory effect was termed negative priming (Tipper, 1985).

There has been extensive research on the topic of negative priming over the past three decades, and several excellent reviews of the negative priming (NP) literature (e.g., Fox, 1995; May, Kane & Hasher, 1995; Mayr & Buchner, 2007). In particular, a very recent review by Frings, Schneider and Fox (2015) has carefully considered research conducted over the 20 years subsequent to the two reviews published in 1995. Therefore when asked by the current editor of QJEP to write an article for a special issue, it was not clear what contribution this paper could make. A comprehensive review of the literature would be somewhat redundant in light of the excellent review published recently (Frings et al., 2015). Hence this article aims instead to provide an historical and personal background concerning the emergence of the 1985 paper, a brief summary of the emergence of alternative accounts, and a discussion of how the challenge of an effect driven by multiple processes might be met.

Negative priming: A measure of inhibitory selection processes

When Tipper applied to do his PhD at Oxford University he was interested in the problem of selection-for-action. That is, with complex perceptual inputs where many objects could be present and competing for the control of action, how was action directed to the appropriate object at the appropriate moment in time? This was of course a long-standing issue (e.g., Broadbent, 1958) and the dominant view at that time was the spotlight account. The basic idea was that early perceptual inputs were represented in parallel. An attentional spotlight could then move across a map of these inputs, and facilitate the processing of stimuli that it highlighted. There were two salient features of this model: first, competing internal representations of the distractor objects were presumed to decay passively, and second, the spotlight was presumed to be spatial in nature, moving from one location to another.

However, Tipper wondered whether these properties of the spotlight account were correct, in particular whether there could be a dual selection process. That is, rather than target stimulus activation being increased by the spotlight and distractor representations passively decaying in activity, perhaps distractors were actively inhibited. Certainly this dual process model, excitation of the target representations and simultaneous inhibition of competing distractors, would be much more efficient, better explaining the rapidity with which selection could be achieved; and of course it better matched the building blocks of interactions between excitation and inhibition in the brain.

Curiously, after arriving in Oxford he initially forgot about the idea of active inhibition of distracting information. Rather, Tipper became intrigued by the priming literature. Attending to a stimulus could produce positive priming effects, facilitating processing of the same or a

1
2
3 semantically related stimulus (e.g., Carr, McCauley, Sperber & Parmelee, 1982; Meyer,
4
5 Schvandeltd & Ruddy, 1975). Such observations proved to be useful for models such as
6
7 spreading activation in semantic networks. However, what he found especially intriguing was
8
9 the work of Tony Marcel who was reporting demonstrations of subliminal priming effects
10
11 (Marcel, 1983). That is, a prime stimulus such as a word could be pattern masked so that
12
13 participants were unaware of its identity, but nevertheless it could still produce semantic priming
14
15 effects on a subsequently presented word. These observations supported ideas of sophisticated
16
17 processing, such as reading for meaning, without conscious awareness (e.g., Dixon, 1971).
18
19
20
21
22

23 But Tipper noted a gap in the market, where he thought he might get a publication, and
24
25 maybe even a PhD. Although there was a large literature investigating priming when people
26
27 could attend to supraliminal primes, and emerging evidence for subliminal priming, there was
28
29 little work examining the effects of primes that were ignored while selecting a target for action.
30
31 Hence experiments were designed where participants were presented with two drawings of
32
33 everyday objects. These objects were superimposed, one being red, which was the target to be
34
35 reported, and the other green, which was the distractor to be ignored, or vice versa (see Figure 1
36
37 of the accompanying article). Tipper felt that although participants were typically unaware of
38
39 the identity of the green distractor, reflecting the remarkable efficiency of the selection processes,
40
41 the distractor must nevertheless be encoded. Furthermore, he assumed that active representations
42
43 of the encoded distractor ought to produce positive priming effects, facilitating processing of a
44
45 subsequent target requiring those same representations. For example, if a picture of a table was
46
47 ignored in a prime display, processing of the same picture presented in a probe display a few
48
49 seconds later ought to be facilitated, as observed in other priming techniques.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Of course, we now know the opposite result was observed. After ignoring a picture,
4 processing of the same picture shortly afterwards was impaired. Initially Tipper was somewhat
5 baffled by this new finding, and didn't actually believe it could be true. Hence a replication and
6 extension study was undertaken, which also produced this slowing of response. It was some
7 days later, during the mid-morning coffee break in the Psychology department, that it suddenly
8 dawned on him: Of course, this impaired processing of a subsequent probe could reflect the
9 inhibition of distractors that was initially proposed when applying for the PhD in the first place.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 This was a slightly odd situation. Exactly the right experiment was undertaken to test the
21 distractor inhibition hypothesis, even though Tipper had been side tracked by his new interest in
22 priming effects, and was no longer thinking about inhibition. This seemed like rather a
23 coincidence. However, there was a further point in the first experiment that was also crucial. In
24 those days computers were somewhat rare and exotic devices, and experiments were still being
25 conducted with tachistoscopes. For this particular experiment, the materials presented in the
26 tachistoscope were hand drawn using red and green pens (quite a demanding task for a color
27 blind experimenter). There were two sets of cards: The primes contained the red target and
28 green distractor, while the subsequently presented probes only contained red targets. The
29 experiment was ready to start, but the evening before Tipper decided that maybe it would be
30 better to maintain the selection processes constant within a trial, with a red target selected from a
31 competing green distractor in both the prime and the subsequent probe display. So he added
32 green distractors to the probe display at the last minute.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Selection in the probe display turned out to be critical in this experiment, and in many
53 subsequent studies of negative priming. In these studies, when selection of a target from a
54 distractor in the probe is required, then negative priming is observed. In contrast, if no probe
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 selection is required, then no priming, or even facilitation is often observed (D'Angelo &
4 Milliken, 2012; Lowe, 1979; Milliken, Thomson, Bleile, MacLellan, & Giammarco, 2012;
5
6 Moore, 1994; Tipper & Cranston, 1985; but see Frings & Spence, 2011; Frings & Wentura,
7
8 2006; Moore, 1994; Milliken, Lupianez, Debner & Abello, 1999; Neill, Terry & Valdes, 1994).
9
10 Hence, although it is now clear that not all procedures used to measure negative priming require
11
12 probe selection, if this last minute change had not been made to the specific task described above,
13
14 we would not be writing this paper now.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 It turned out there were previous reports of similar effects in the literature. As far back as
22
23 1966, Dalrymple-Alford and Budayr investigated a range of Stroop colour word conditions, one
24
25 of which was a trial where the previously ignored word was the same as the subsequent to-be-
26
27 named ink colour on the next trial. They noted that performance in this condition was slower
28
29 than in a baseline condition in which there was no relationship between the prime and probe
30
31 display. Subsequently Greenwald (1972), Neill (1977) and Lowe (1979) replicated and extended
32
33 these effects. It is not clear why there was little interest in this topic until after the Tipper (1985)
34
35 paper. Perhaps the imagination of readers was caught by the demonstration of semantic negative
36
37 priming effects, where ignoring a picture (e.g., cat) that was semantically related to a subsequent
38
39 target (e.g., dog) also slowed responses (see Figure 2 in the accompanying article – interestingly,
40
41 semantic negative priming effects have proven to be somewhat difficult to produce with other
42
43 methods; see Chiappe & MacLeod, 1995; MacLeod, Chiappe & Fox, 2002). In any case, the
44
45 point to note is that the negative priming effect reported by Tipper (1985) was not without
46
47 precedent in the literature.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 It was decided that a label describing the effect and highlighting its contrast with other
56
57 priming effects would be useful. Initially “inhibitory priming” was pondered. However, it was
58
59
60

1
2
3 felt that this label was too theoretically loaded, as perhaps future studies would show that the
4
5 impaired processing did not reflect inhibitory selection mechanisms, the right decision in
6
7 hindsight. Therefore “negative priming” was felt to be more neutral, simply describing the
8
9 slowed processing of subsequent probes, contrasting with the “positive priming” literature where
10
11 processing of subsequent probes was facilitated. Interestingly, other authors (e.g., Mayr &
12
13 **Buchner**, 2007) felt that “negative priming” reflected a particular explanatory construct, and
14
15 indeed was a “saucy” label. Although the label seems to have spiced up the lives of some
16
17 academics, at least it helped to link an increasingly divergent literature over the subsequent years.
18
19
20
21
22

23 Over the next few years new studies focused on identifying further properties of negative
24
25 priming, such as the level of processing received by distractors, and the nature of representations
26
27 upon which the inhibition acted. In terms of the level of processing of distractors, Tipper and
28
29 Driver (1988) demonstrated that even when a picture was ignored and the subsequent probe was
30
31 a word, negative priming was observed. Such a result further supported the idea that inhibition
32
33 was associated with semantic properties of a stimulus and not with early perceptual features. A
34
35 further study (Tipper, McQueen & Brehaut, 1988) demonstrated that the effect could also be
36
37 detected when response to the prime was a finger key-press, and response to the subsequent
38
39 probe was verbal naming, and vice versa. The transfer between response output systems also
40
41 supported a central locus for the inhibition. And finally, new data challenged the core idea that
42
43 selection was achieved via moving a spotlight over a spatial map. When a competing distractor
44
45 stimulus moved, disappeared behind an occluding surface, and then reappeared, negative priming
46
47 was still observed when a response was subsequently directed to it. This observation confirmed
48
49 that the mechanisms underlying negative priming were object-based, and able to move with a
50
51 distractor object (Tipper, Brehaut & Driver, 1990).
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

However, the idea that the putative inhibition process might be fixed at a semantic level of encoding changed quite quickly. It was later argued that inhibition of competing distracting information was not fixed at a specific point in the flow of information from perception to action. Rather, inhibition was flexible, selectively suppressing information that specifically competed for the control of action. For example, in a selective reaching task (Tipper, Lortie & Baylis, 1992) it was demonstrated that distractors closer and ipsilateral to the reaching hand competed more and hence required greater levels of inhibition to achieve the goal of grasping the target object. Indeed, inhibition appeared to be hand-centered, based on the spatial position of the reaching hand. As the hand moved to new starting locations, the pattern of negative priming completely changed, even though all other frames of reference (e.g., retinotopic, head or body-centered) remained constant (see Figure 1). In sharp contrast, in tasks requiring semantic processing, such as classifying the superordinate category of an object, semantic information competed and was suppressed.

Insert Figure 1 about here

The demonstration of negative priming effects in more real-world situations, where people actually reach out and touch target objects in the presence of competing distractors (Tipper et al, 1992), is curiously neglected in many of the subsequent accounts. That negative priming reflected competition for action was also demonstrated by presenting obstacles in front of objects (Tipper, Meegan & Howard, 2002). Reaching around the obstacle significantly slowed down responses. When this stimulus was a distractor to be ignored, its competition for the

1
2
3 control of action was reduced, as reflected in less interference; hence less inhibition was required,
4
5 as reflected in reduced NP. These results may also be interpreted in terms of action ‘affordances’,
6
7 whereby interference occurs only for actions that are possible to produce (Wesslein, Spence, &
8
9 Frings, 2015). Such action-centred processes can even be detected when observing someone else
10
11 selectively reach for a target while ignoring a distractor (Frischen, Loach & Tipper, 2009),
12
13 providing evidence for the simulation of another person’s selection processes, as predicted by
14
15 mirror systems. Such studies have greater ecological validity and appear to provide some
16
17 evidence for the role of inhibition in the selection-for-action problem, and may be worth
18
19 reconsideration in future investigations.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 During this period in the early 1990s, Tipper collaborated with George Houghton.
27
28 Houghton had been developing computational models of language, and together they realized
29
30 that similar selection processes might be required across a range of situations, which led them to
31
32 apply Houghton’s ideas to the selection-for-action problem. This was the first attempt to
33
34 formally describe the inhibitory processes that enable selective action. The model described a
35
36 reactive inhibition process, where the inhibition was adjusted automatically to deal with
37
38 distractors of different potency via self-feedback mechanisms. An emergent property of this
39
40 model was that it also accounted for inhibition of return effects (Posner & Cohen, 1984), a
41
42 closely related attentional inhibition phenomenon (e.g., Milliken, Tipper, Houghton & Lupiáñez,
43
44 2000). It could be argued that Houghton and Tipper (1994) was one of the more important papers
45
46 published on the topic of negative priming; the formal computational model was capable of
47
48 simulating existing negative priming effects and made numerous predictions that were
49
50 subsequently confirmed. This model has also provided a framework for studies on selection more
51
52 generally, beyond that focus solely on negative priming (e.g., Frings, Wentura, & Wühr, 2012;
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Frings & Wühr, 2014). And although it was a book chapter that is not easily accessed, it
4
5 nevertheless had, and continues to have (e.g., Wyatt & Machado, 2013), a wide impact.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Negative Priming: The role of episodic memory** 13

14
15 Much of the early research on negative priming followed a convention for interpreting
16
17 priming effects introduced in seminal studies of word identification (Morton, 1969; Scarborough,
18
19 Cortese & Scarborough, 1977). Specifically, word identification was assumed to hinge on the
20
21 activation state of a corresponding abstract lexical representation reaching a threshold value. By
22
23 this view, prior presentation of the same word gives activation a ‘head-start’ toward that
24
25 threshold value. By this same logic, an inhibition process might suppress the activation state of a
26
27 lexical representation below baseline levels, effectively producing the opposite of a head-start
28
29 toward the threshold value.
30
31
32
33

34
35 However, by the early 1990’s, Logan’s (1988) instance theory of automaticity had
36
37 encouraged an alternative view. In particular, researchers had begun to entertain the idea that
38
39 priming and other related cognitive phenomena might hinge on the retrieval of specific episodic
40
41 representations of prior experience, rather than on the activation and inhibition of abstract
42
43 knowledge representations (see also Brooks, 1978; Hintzman, 1986; Jacoby & Brooks, 1984;
44
45 Medin & Schaeffer, 1978).
46
47
48
49

50
51 In the case of negative priming, there were hints of this shift in framework even before it
52
53 was introduced formally to the literature. In particular, in a study focusing on the time-course of
54
55 negative priming effects, Tipper, Weaver, Cameron, Brehaut and Bastedo (1991) somewhat
56
57 surprisingly found that negative priming effects did not diminish in magnitude with increases in
58
59
60

1
2
3 the temporal interval between prime and probe. These results led Tipper and colleagues to
4 speculate that ignoring a distractor might not merely result in a transient suppression of its
5 abstract representation, but rather ignoring a distractor might fundamentally alter the long-term
6 memory representation of that experience.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Neill and colleagues (Neill & Valdes, 1992; Neill, Valdes, Terry & Gorfein, 1992) took
14 the field an important step further, and formalized an episodic retrieval account of negative
15 priming. Drawing from Logan's (1988) instance theory, they proposed that prime encoding
16 involves the binding together of semantic/perceptual information with response information. As
17 a result, the episodic representation of an ignored prime distractor might include some form of
18 code indicating that the item was ignored. Although it was not clear how this coding would take
19 place, it seemed possible that an inhibitory tag (e.g., "ignore this stimulus") could be linked
20 together with other perceptual and semantic codes for the prime. Onset of a probe target that
21 matched the previous distractor would then result in the retrieval of this prime episode. The
22 mismatch between the current requirement to attend and respond to the target, and the retrieved
23 response information for that same item ("ignore this stimulus"), would then be responsible for
24 negative priming.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 In support of this episodic view, Neill et al. (1992; Neill & Valdes, 1992) reported that
44 the time course of negative priming is not related merely to the interval between prime and probe,
45 but also to the interval between a prime and the most recent preceding probe. In other words,
46 these results demonstrated that negative priming can hinge on the temporal distinctiveness of the
47 encoded prime episode. In theory then, negative priming could last for an arbitrarily long
48 duration, as long as the probe cues the retrieval of an episodic representation of an ignored prime.
49 Indeed, DeSchepper and Treisman (1996) subsequently reported negative priming effects in a
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 same/different classification task with nonsense geometric shapes that lasted as long as a month.
4
5 Other studies have since reported negative priming effects that depend on the contextual
6
7 similarity of prime and probe, a finding that strongly implicates retrieval of the prime episode in
8
9 negative priming (Fox & deFockert, 1998; Grison, Tipper & Hewitt, 2005; Neill, 1997).
10
11 Together, these results and others offer good support for the view that episodic retrieval can
12
13 contribute to negative priming.
14
15
16
17

18
19 An episodic approach assumes that priming effects are the product of an
20
21 encoding/retrieval interaction. This principle fits with the troubling finding noted above, that
22
23 negative priming often hinges on the selection requirements of the probe task (Lowe, 1979;
24
25 Moore, 1994; Neill et al., 1994; Tipper & Cranston, 1985). In a study aimed at highlighting the
26
27 importance of this property of negative priming, Milliken, Joordens, Merikle and Seiffert (1998)
28
29 demonstrated that a single ignored prime word (as well as a briefly presented and pattern masked
30
31 single prime word) can produce negative priming, as long as the following probe requires
32
33 selection between a target and distractor. One implication of these results is that negative
34
35 priming is not limited to a specific set of prime encoding requirements that involve selective
36
37 attention between a target and distractor. Rather, there appear to be an array of prime-
38
39 encoding/probe-retrieval interactions that produce negative priming.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 In line with this idea, Neill and Mathis (1998; see also Wood & Milliken, 1998)
47
48 expanded on the original episodic retrieval hypothesis by suggesting that negative priming
49
50 constitutes an example of “transfer inappropriate processing.” The transfer appropriate
51
52 processing principle was introduced by Morris, Bransford and Franks (1977) to describe the
53
54 dependence of remembering performance on the particular demands of the remembering task,
55
56 and the consistency of those task demands with the processing of the study items. In general, the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 idea was that negative priming could result from such processing inconsistencies, broadly
4 defined, rather than from the specific inconsistency of ignoring a prime, and then attending to an
5 identical or related probe. Subsequent studies that have demonstrated a role for stimulus-
6 response binding mismatches in negative priming comfortably fit within this transfer
7 (in)appropriate processing framework, although some might prefer that a stimulus-response
8 retrieval account remain separate from this broader view (Rothermund, Wentura & de Houwer,
9 2005; see also Frings et al., 2015).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Application of the transfer appropriate processing principle to negative priming comes
22 with both benefits and costs. On the one hand, a benefit of the transfer appropriate processing
23 framework is its potential as an organizing principle for large amounts of data that cross
24 paradigm boundaries. A single principle that can accommodate a wide array of data from
25 multiple experimental paradigms is ultimately quite powerful. At the same time, a cost of the
26 transfer appropriate processing framework is that the negative priming effect no longer
27 constitutes a specific tool to study the ignoring of distraction. If ignoring-and-then-attending is
28 one of many diverse processing inconsistencies that produce inappropriate transfer, then the
29 negative priming effect loses its utility as a tool to study the ignoring of distractors. Suffice it to
30 say that studies of episodic contributions to negative priming unearthed a more complex link
31 between effect and mechanism than originally envisioned (see Tipper, 2001).

42 43 44 45 46 47 48 **Negative Priming: A measure of more than one process?**

49
50
51 One source of the conceptual complexity associated with the NP effect is that it may
52 involve more than one process. This is not a novel observation; it has been made routinely in the
53 literature going back to the two review papers published in 1995 (Fox, 1995; May, Kane &
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hasher, 1995), and was echoed in the recent review by Frings et al. (2015). Our aim here is to
4 draw attention to a particular dual process framework that may be useful in future work on
5 negative priming. This framework identifies two relatively broad processing principles, each of
6 which may capture aspects of performance to varying degrees across a wide array of tasks. The
7 processing principles should not be thought of as aligned with particular types of tasks; we
8 assume that one or both principles may be operative in all tasks used to measure NP. A
9 noteworthy implication is that NP effects in identification and spatial localization variants of the
10 NP procedure are attributed to the same processing principles.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Consider the spatial localization variant of the NP procedure introduced by Tipper et al.
24 (1990). This procedure presents participants with four marked locations (e.g., lines or boxes to
25 mark locations at which targets can appear), with a target stimulus (e.g., an 'O') appearing at one
26 of the locations and a distractor (e.g., an 'X') appearing at a second location (see Figure 2). In
27 the ignored repetition (IR) condition, a target 'O' in the probe display appears in the location
28 occupied by a distractor 'X' in the preceding prime display. Performance in this condition is
29 compared to that in a control condition in which the probe target and distractor appear in
30 locations that were unoccupied by the prime target and distractor. Tipper et al. noted that
31 performance was slower in the IR condition than in the control condition, and they attributed this
32 effect to inhibition of the prime distractor object.
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

Insert Figure 2 about here

1
2
3 Park and Kanwisher (1994) subsequently reported a study that challenged the distractor
4 inhibition account of this effect. They noted that the probe target 'O' in the IR condition appears
5 in a location occupied by a different identity (i.e., the 'X'). As such, rather than distractor
6 inhibition, this NP effect could be due to the mismatch in identities that are bound to a single
7 location across prime and probe trials (see also Kahneman, Treisman and Gibbs, 1992 for a
8 similar account). However, subsequent studies (e.g., Milliken, Tipper & Weaver, 1994; Tipper,
9 Weaver & Milliken, 1995) demonstrated that NP can occur even when the ignored distractor and
10 subsequent target are perceptually identical. Hence, although perceptual mismatches may
11 produce a performance cost, they cannot be the only source of NP.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Hommel (1998) later showed that it is not just location-identity mismatches in spatial
26 localization tasks that produce performance costs. Rather, binding mismatches generally,
27 including those that involve diverse stimulus and response codes, can impair performance in
28 many straightforward trial-to-trial priming procedures. These results led Hommel to extend the
29 object file framework introduced by Kahneman et al. (1992) to event files, or episodic
30 representations defined by bindings of both stimulus and response codes. A vast amount of
31 empirical evidence has now accumulated in support of this view (e.g., Hommel, 2004; Hommel,
32 Müsseler, Aschersleben & Prinz, 2001). Of particular relevance here, Rothermund, Wentura and
33 DeHouwer (2005) demonstrated that incidental retrieval of stimulus-response associations can
34 contribute to NP effects.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 All told, it seems clear that episodic binding mismatches can contribute to both spatial
50 and non-spatial NP effects, whether through prime-probe mismatches in perceptual codes or
51 some combination of perceptual and response codes. By this view, onset of a probe cues the
52 retrieval of a prime episode in which the recently created bindings may be either consistent or
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 inconsistent with those needed to respond correctly to the probe. If consistent (appropriate)
4 bindings are retrieved then performance will be facilitated relative to a control condition. If
5
6 inconsistent (inappropriate) bindings are retrieved then interference will slow performance
7
8 relative to a control condition. Described in this manner, these episodic binding and retrieval
9
10 effects appear to fit with the broad transfer (in)appropriate processing principle.
11
12
13
14

15
16 However, as noted above, a drawback to attributing NP effects wholesale to episodic
17
18 binding and retrieval processes is that NP effects lose their utility as tools to study attention
19
20 processes. Might another process, one that has an attentional function, also contribute to NP? A
21
22 candidate attentional process that may contribute to NP is one that produces the inhibition of
23
24 return effect in spatial orienting (Posner & Cohen, 1984). Inhibition of return is commonly
25
26 attributed to an attentional process that biases orienting in favour of novel events over events that
27
28 have recently been attended. Here we entertain the possibility that such a process might
29
30 contribute to NP above and beyond the putative influences of episodic binding and retrieval
31
32 outlined above. *Although this idea has been forwarded previously to account for spatial NP*
33
34 *(Christie & Klein, 2001; Milliken et al., 2000; but see Buckolz, Fitzgeorge & Knowles, 2012),*
35
36 *we propose here that it may also apply to non-spatial forms of NP.*
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Consider first* the attended repetition (AR) effects that occur in studies of spatial NP.
43
44 Recall that an AR trial is one in which the location of a probe target matches that of a prime
45
46 target. If the process responsible for inhibition of return contributes to performance in studies of
47
48 spatial NP, then it follows that it should slow performance for AR trials. And if this were the
49
50 case, then performance for AR trials might well look a lot like that for IR trials; that is,
51
52 performance for both of these conditions would be slow relative to a control condition. Indeed,
53
54 this result has been observed in several studies (e.g., Christie & Klein, 2001; Milliken et al.,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2000; Shapiro & Loughlin, 1993). Furthermore, the simplest account of this result is that
4 performance is slowed in the AR and IR conditions for one and the same reason, by an
5 attentional bias that favours encoding of novel over previously attended events (Houghton &
6
7
8
9
10
11 Tipper, 1994; Milliken et al., 2000; Christie & Klein, 2001).

12
13 Yet, it has been clear from the outset that a single process could not possibly account for
14 both AR and IR effects in all experimental contexts, because AR and IR effects often differ
15 substantially (e.g., Tipper et al., 1990). In particular, AR trials often produce positive priming
16 while IR trials produce negative priming. The key issue concerns how to interpret AR trial
17 performance that varies from positive to negative priming across experimental contexts, while IR
18 trial performance more consistently reveals negative priming. A straightforward solution is to
19 assume that performance in both AR and IR conditions measures the joint influence of two
20 processes on performance: (1) episodic binding and retrieval processes that typically facilitate
21 performance on AR trials and interfere with performance on IR trials, in accord with notions of
22 transfer appropriate processing; and (2) an inhibitory process that biases attentional orienting,
23 and thus perceptual encoding, in favour of novel events. By this view, both AR and IR
24 conditions might be affected by both of these processes. Further, if one assumes that the
25 contribution of episodic binding and retrieval to performance varies from one experimental
26 context to another, in accord with subtle changes in task demands, then a wide array of data
27 patterns are possible (e.g., Milliken, Tipper & Weaver, 1994).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 All told, we have highlighted two processes that may jointly contribute to a complex
50 array of results that have been reported in spatial NP studies: (1) episodic binding and retrieval
51 processes that produce effects on performance that are consistent with the transfer
52
53
54
55
56 (in)appropriate processing principle (Morris, Bransford & Franks, 1977; see also Neill & Mathis,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1998; Wood & Milliken, 1998); and (2) an attentional orienting process that favours perceptual
4
5 encoding of novel events (Posner & Cohen, 1984). As described, it would appear that this
6
7 particular dual process proposal could only possibly apply to spatial NP effects, as inhibition of
8
9 return is widely regarded to be an effect limited to spatial orienting. However, there are a
10
11 growing number of studies that have reported inhibition of return-like results in studies aimed at
12
13 non-spatial stimulus repetition (Hu & Samuel, 2011; Francis & Milliken, 2003; Law, Pratt &
14
15 Abrams, 1995; Spadaro, He & Milliken, 2012), and a growing number of theoretical treatments
16
17 of inhibition of return that point to broad mechanisms that favour orienting to novelty (e.g.,
18
19 Dukewich, 2009; Lupiáñez, 2010). As such, a dual process framework worth pursuing is one in
20
21 which episodic binding and retrieval processes on the one hand, and an inhibitory attentional
22
23 mechanism that favours encoding of novel events on the other hand, together contribute to **both**
24
25 **spatial and non-spatial** NP effects.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Negative Priming: Meeting the multiple process challenge**

35
36
37 The idea that NP effects in behavioural studies have more than one cause makes it
38
39 problematic to link behavioural effects with underlying mechanisms. One way to meet this
40
41 challenge is to look for converging evidence from measures of brain activity. Indeed, the past
42
43 decade or so has seen the emergence of literatures on both EEG and fMRI studies of NP. As the
44
45 fMRI literature is still relatively early in its development, we focus here on studies that have used
46
47 EEG to measure ERP correlates of behavioural NP effects to meet the multiple process challenge.
48
49 Our discussion also focuses on how EEG studies ought to be designed to address the specific
50
51 dual process proposal discussed in the previous section. The interested reader will find a useful
52
53 review of both the EEG and fMRI literatures in the Frings et al. (2015) review article.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The fine temporal resolution offered by EEG holds the potential to tease apart
4 mechanisms that contribute to performance at different points in time. If we know when (and
5 perhaps where) certain processes ought to produce their effects, EEG data may be able to
6 arbitrate whether a behavioural effect is caused by one or another process. Indeed, researchers
7 have attempted to capitalize on this potential by looking at ERP correlates of NP to see whether
8 the “when and where” of those ERP correlates fit better with one or another theoretical
9 framework.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 To this end, some researchers have proposed that inhibition ought to impact processing
21 relatively early after stimulus onset (e.g., Frings & Groh-Bordin, 2007; Mayr, Niedeggen,
22 Buchner, & Pietrowsky, 2003)¹. One basis for this proposal is an enhanced N200 component in
23 frontal areas for incompatible flanker trials (Yeung, Botvinick, & Cohen, 2004), which
24 presumably reflects an increased need for response inhibition on these trials. Translating this
25 effect to a negative priming task, a probe target that matches an immediately preceding prime
26 distractor is apt to be particularly vulnerable to interfering effects of an accompanying probe
27 distractor, which in turn would invite an up-regulation of response inhibition.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In contrast, it might be argued that retrieval of a prime episode would occur at a longer
41 latency following probe onset². By this view, NP effects caused by episodic binding and
42 retrieval ought to be captured by later ERP correlates that reflect comparison and evaluation of
43 sensory stimuli with information retrieved from memory. This proposal fits with the view that
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ¹ Note that an argument can be made for later ERP components for inhibition, if operating at the
52 level of response execution, as is observed in the stop-signal paradigm (e.g., Verbruggen &
53 Logan, 2008).

54 ² In contrast to this argument, it has been argued that episodic retrieval can influence current
55 processing automatically, allowing for a rapid by-pass of slower response computation (e.g.,
56 Logan, 1988).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 although context-free retrieval may be quick, context-dependent retrieval that underlies
4
5 recollection of particular episodes occurs more slowly (e.g., Boldini, Russo, & Avons, 2004).
6
7 Consistent with this proposal, studies of recognition memory have found that context-free
8
9 familiarity is associated with earlier ERP components, such as the N400, relative to the later ERP
10
11 components typically associated with context-dependent recollection, such as the late positive
12
13 component (LPC) (e.g., Paller, Kutas, & McIsaac, 1995, Rugg, Mark, Walla, Schloerscheidt,
14
15 Birch, & Allan, 1998).
16
17
18
19

20
21 Pulling these two proposals together offers a seemingly straightforward heuristic for
22
23 using ERP methods to evaluate the mechanisms that underlie NP effects. Specifically, NP
24
25 effects with early ERP correlates might be attributed to inhibition processes, while NP effects
26
27 with later ERP correlates might be attributed to episodic binding and retrieval processes. Below,
28
29 we offer a brief summary of ERP studies of NP, many of which have relied on this heuristic.
30
31 However, two important shortcomings of this heuristic should be noted prior to considering these
32
33 studies.
34
35
36
37

38 First, it may simply be incorrect to assume that episodic binding and retrieval processes
39
40 necessarily occur slowly, and therefore ought to be associated with late ERP correlates.
41
42 Although deliberate, strategic searching of memory that accompanies a great deal of conscious
43
44 recollection may well occur relatively slowly, and have late ERP correlates, many other
45
46 behavioural phenomena implicate memory retrieval processes that are **rapid and** context-specific.
47
48 For example, contextual cueing effects in visual search (Chun & Jiang, 1998), context-specific
49
50 proportion congruent effects in Stroop and other distractor interference tasks (Crump, Gong &
51
52 Milliken, 2006), and context-specific conflict adaptation effects in distractor interference tasks
53
54 (Spapé & Hommel, 2008) all suggest that context-specific learning and memory retrieval
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 processes mediate visual attention processes quickly and automatically after stimulus onset.

4
5 These findings are also consistent with models of instance retrieval (e.g., Logan, 1988), which
6
7 argue for rapid and automatic retrieval of prior instances, and together point to a need for
8
9 additional research on the timing of ERP correlates of episodic binding and retrieval.
10
11

12
13
14 Second, and most relevant to the dual process proposal described above, there are
15
16 actually two different “inhibition” frameworks that might be evaluated using ERP methods. On
17
18 the one hand, the inhibition framework that has guided most research on NP is the distractor
19
20 inhibition framework. By this view, inhibition is directed at processing of distractors to amplify
21
22 target processing relative to distractors. Importantly, this framework assumes that targets are
23
24 subject to very different processing than distractors, and therefore an ERP correlate of NP that
25
26 taps this inhibition process ought to be unique to IR trials. On the other hand, the dual process
27
28 framework introduced above assumes that an inhibition process biases attentional orienting in
29
30 favour of novel events, that this process affects the processing of both IR and AR trials
31
32 (Houghton & Tipper, 1994), and that this process operates together with episodic binding and
33
34 retrieval processes to determine priming effects (Christie & Klein, 2001; Milliken et al., 2000).
35
36 According to this alternative view, an ERP correlate of NP that taps this inhibition process ought
37
38 to be present for both IR and AR trials.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 To address this latter distinction, EEG studies of NP require inclusion of both IR and AR
47
48 trials, in addition to control trials against which the two repetition conditions can be compared.
49
50 An ERP correlate of the NP effect that is unique to the IR condition would then point to a
51
52 different inhibition mechanism than an ERP correlate that is shared by both the IR and AR
53
54 conditions. Specifically, if an ERP correlate were to occur for both IR and AR trials, it might be
55
56 attributed to stimulus repetition generally, and perhaps to fundamental issues related to serial
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ordering of behaviour, rather than to repetition of a previous distractor as a target (see Houghton
4 & Tipper, 1994). In the following review of ERP studies of NP, we have paid particular
5
6 attention to this distinction, as we view it as critical to evaluating dual process accounts of NP.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **ERP studies of identity-based negative priming** 15 16

17
18 Several studies have found ERP correlates of identity-based NP in early frontal
19 components (Frings & Groh-Bordin, 2007; Gibbons & Stahl, 2010; Hinojosa, Pozo, Méndez-
20 Bértolo, & Luna, 2009). However, there is disagreement across studies in whether this early
21 frontal component is specific to NP, or reflects a more general stimulus repetition component. In
22 particular, Frings and Groh-Bordin (2007) found an enhanced N200 component in mid-frontal
23 regions on IR trials relative to control trials, whereas a more posterior N200 appeared to be
24 associated with the contrast between AR and control trials. Moreover, this NP correlate was
25 significant for the subset of participants who produced a NP behavioural effect, but not for the
26 participants who failed to show a NP behavioural effect. They argued that these results favour
27 an inhibition account of NP (see Hinojosa et al., 2009 for a similar argument). However, using a
28 similar procedure, Gibbons and Stahl (2010) found a decreased P2 and an enhanced N2 for both
29 IR and AR trials. As a result, they attributed these components to processes that are sensitive
30 generally to prime-probe similarity (P2) and retrieval of prime information (N2). Given the
31 inconsistent findings from these studies, at this point it remains unclear whether there is an early
32 frontal ERP correlate of the processes responsible for NP that is unique to NP and not shared
33 with AR effects.
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

Several studies using visual stimuli have also found P300 differences between IR and control trials (Behrandt et al., 2010; Gibbons 2009; Groh-Bordin & Frings 2009; Kathmann, Bogdahn, & Endrass, 2006; Stahl & Gibbons 2007). The first of these studies was reported by Kathmann et al. (2006), who had participants complete a number discrimination task with target and distractor numbers overlaid over one another. Although the authors attributed the increased P300 on IR trials to more effortful stimulus evaluation required to overcome inhibition from the previous display, a key to interpreting this P300 difference is again whether a similar difference is observed for AR trials. Unfortunately, Kathmann et al. did not include AR trials in their study. Subsequent studies that did include both IR and AR conditions have reported similar P300 effects for both. For example, Stahl and Gibbons (2007) found a decreased left posterior P300 in both IR and AR trials, relative to control trials. They suggested that this effect reflects the processing of prime-probe similarities, and is consistent with retrieval accounts of negative priming (see Gibbons, 2009 for a replication of this finding, and see Behrandt et al., 2010 for a similar result using a picture identification task).

Another late component that has been associated with retrieval explanations of NP effects is the LPC. For example, using a picture identification task (Tipper, 1985), Behrandt and colleagues (2010) found a decreased left posterior P300 for both IR and AR trials relative to control trials, as well as an increased LPC for IR trials only. These authors suggested that the increased LPC reflected effortful cognitive control and retrieval processes engaged when there is a mismatch between the prime and probe displays. This explanation must be regarded as tentative, as the effect has not been replicated, and in fact, the opposite result has been found in studies examining auditory NP effects – Mayr and colleagues reported reduced LPCs on IR trials relative to AR and control trials (Mayr et al., 2003; Mayr, Niedeggen, Buchner, & Orgs, 2006).

1
2
3 In addition to studies examining differences in the amplitudes and latencies of ERP
4
5 components for IR and control trials, differences between these trials have also been reported
6
7 with respect to lateralized readiness potentials (LRPs) (Frings, Bermeitinger, & Gibbons, 2011;
8
9 Gibbons 2006; Gibbons & Stahl 2008; Gibbons 2009). LRPs are thought to reflect the
10
11 preparation of motor activity on the left versus right side of the body (Coles, 1989), and have
12
13 been used to examine whether processing on IR trials is influenced by the congruency between
14
15 the response side required on prime and probe displays. In one study, Gibbons and Stahl (2008)
16
17 used a flanker design and found that when a pair of prime and probe trials required different
18
19 response hands, stimulus-locked LRPs were delayed for IR trials relative to control trials, while
20
21 the reverse was true on pairs of trials in which responses to the prime and probe were made with
22
23 the same response hand (see also Gibbons, 2009). Gibbons and Stahl argued that this influence
24
25 of prime-probe response congruency on LRPs supports retrieval accounts over inhibition
26
27 accounts; the response made on the previous trial was likely retrieved and sped up response
28
29 selection when the prime and probe required the same hand, and interfered with response
30
31 selection when the two responses were made with different hands. Gibbons and Stahl also
32
33 argued that this finding is inconsistent with the idea that a do-not-respond tag is retrieved during
34
35 probe processing, and that this result instead supports the prime-response retrieval account
36
37 proposed by Rothermund, Wentura, and De Houwer (2005). Interestingly, Frings and colleagues
38
39 (2011) replicated this finding in another task in which for every prime-probe pair, participants
40
41 were told to withhold their response to the prime stimuli until after they had made their response
42
43 to the probe. This latter finding suggests that stimulus-response bindings can be formed in the
44
45 absence of response execution, and that these bindings can still influence later probe
46
47 performance.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ERP studies of location-based negative priming

Less work has examined ERP correlates of location-based NP effects, but a relatively consistent set of results has emerged across these studies. Reduced P1 and/or N1 components in posterior areas (Gibbons, Rammsayer & Stahl, 2006; Kathmann et al., 2006; Kehler et al., 2009; Ruge & Naumann, 2006), a reduced N1pc component in posterior areas (Gibbons, Wiegand & Stahl, 2013; Kehler et al., 2009), an enhanced N2 in posterior areas (Gibbons, 2006; Ruge & Naumann, 2006), and an enhanced N2pc in posterior areas (Gibbons et al., 2013; Kehler et al., 2009; Ruge & Naumann, 2006), for IR relative to control trials, have all been reported in more than one study. If we follow the assumption that early posterior components favour an inhibition account, then there would appear to be plenty of evidence for such an account.

However, as noted above, this inference requires a comparison to an AR condition to ensure that these components are not simply related to stimulus repetition generally. Unfortunately, most of these studies did not report such comparisons. One study that did report this comparison found early posterior components that were similar for IR and AR trials (Gibbons, Rammsayer & Stahl, 2006). These researchers concluded that the mechanisms responsible for inhibition of return also contribute to location-based negative priming (see also Christie & Klein, 2001; Milliken et al., 2000; Houghton & Tipper, 1994; **but see Buckolz et al., 2012**). Thus, as with identity-based negative priming, additional work is needed to clarify whether there are early components that are uniquely related to IR effects, rather than shared with AR effects.

With respect to later components, a reduced P300 has been reported in several studies (Gibbons 2006; Gibbons et al., 2006; Gibbons et al., 2013), and has generally been interpreted as

1
2
3 consistent with an episodic retrieval account. The idea here follows from the view that the P300
4 taps into context updating (Donchin & Coles, 1988). If we assume that the updating of existing
5 event representations constitutes a form of context updating, then it follows that less updating
6 may be required for IR than for control trials.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Together, the combination of both early and late ERP correlates of NP is consistent with
14 the preliminary assumptions introduced earlier, that early ERP components must be inhibition-
15 related and later components are episodic retrieval-related. However, a recent study by Gibbons
16 et al. (2013) takes a very different stance. They found that the ERP correlates of location-based
17 NP were entirely different for a task that included probe distractors and a task that did not
18 include probe distractors. For the probe distractor-absent condition, IR trials were associated
19 with both a reduced P100 amplitude, and a reduced and broadly distributed P300. Conversely,
20 NP in the probe distractor-present condition was associated with an enhanced N2pc in a group of
21 participants showing strong NP effects. Importantly, they attribute both P100 and P300
22 correlates for the probe distractor-absent condition to episodic retrieval mechanisms, and the
23 N2pc effect for the probe distractor-present condition to inhibition processes. In effect, they
24 depart from the view that early components must reflect inhibition processes, while later
25 components reflect episodic retrieval processes. Instead, they conclude that location-based NP
26 can be produced by both sets of processes, that the task structure dictates which of those
27 processes drives performance, and that episodic retrieval involves both early and late
28 components.
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 **Summary**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is clear that there are both early and late ERP correlates of both identity-based and
4 location-based NP. To distinguish between the two inhibition frameworks described at the outset
5 of this section, additional work is needed to establish the extent to which early components are
6 uniquely associated with IR effects, rather than shared with AR effects. Additional work is also
7 needed to establish whether there is a set of ERP correlates that would distinguish between
8 inhibition and episodic retrieval accounts, as at present it seems that there is substantial
9 variability across studies in how the ERP components are interpreted. Of particular importance
10 is future research aimed at the time course of context-specific retrieval processes, as there appear
11 to be differing views on whether early ERP correlates could possibly tap episodic binding and
12 retrieval. Nonetheless, we view ERP research on NP as a promising avenue to address the
13 multiple process conundrum introduced to the NP literature over 20 years ago. Compelling data
14 that constrain multiple process interpretations of NP (e.g., Gibbons et al., 2013) appear to be
15 what the field needs.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 34 35 **Conclusion** 36 37

38 The paper published in 1985 was relatively simple in terms of experimental technique
39 and appeared to make a straightforward contribution to theory. That is, the priming procedure
40 was a variation on other approaches, and the effect – that processing of a previously ignored
41 distractor was impaired when it became the target on the following trial – was straightforward.
42 Similarly, the explanation for the negative priming effect seemed relatively obvious and
43 uncontroversial at the time. That is, the internal representations of irrelevant stimuli that were
44 competing with relevant stimuli for the control of action were actively inhibited. Hence
45 subsequent processing of a stimulus requiring the inhibited representations was impaired.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There was initial promise that a number of important issues could be tackled within the
4 negative priming framework. Take for instance the issue of the frame of reference within which
5 attention functions. Various negative priming studies demonstrated that the medium of attention
6 was not only spatial; rather, it appeared that attentional inhibition could be associated with
7 objects that moved through space; it could be action-centred, changing as the starting point of a
8 reach changed; and it was flexible, selectively inhibiting those representations that were directly
9 competing with the action goal. These contributions concerning the frame-of-reference within
10 which attention functions still stand today.
11
12

13 Similarly, there was early promise that the effect would aid our understanding of the
14 cognitive processes in populations such as older adults, children, and those with schizophrenia
15 and Alzheimer's disease, where declines in inhibitory control had been hypothesized. However,
16 over the subsequent years this simplicity has dissolved, as there is less clear evidence for
17 individual differences than originally appeared to be the case, and the simple inhibition account
18 has been challenged by competing accounts and research findings. The emergence of theoretical
19 accounts based on episodic binding and retrieval processes was particularly problematic to this
20 research area. The idea that a single empirical phenomenon might be driven by more than a
21 single underlying mechanism made the mapping between behaviour and population differences
22 massively more complex. If two or more processes contribute to the NP effect, and if the
23 relative contributions of those processes can vary in response to subtle shifts in stimulus or task
24 properties, then mapping the NP effect to individual differences in any one of those processes
25 may well be an insurmountable task without some conceptual refinement.
26
27

28 The needed conceptual refinement very likely requires additional task analysis. In other
29 words, we might start by admitting that the past 30 years has taught us that the conventional NP
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 task is not so simple after all. Instead, it is wonderfully (not dreadfully!) complex – but in need
4
5 of being carved at the joints to gain a clear view of how multiple processes combine to affect
6
7 behaviour. Combining behavioural methods with brain imaging tools offers a potentially
8
9 promising path forward, and we highlighted research on ERP correlates of the NP effect here as
10
11 an example of a field that has met the multiple process challenge head on. At the same time,
12
13 there are barriers to progress within that literature as well, such as an incomplete understanding
14
15 of when and where ERP correlates of episodic binding and retrieval processes might be observed.
16
17
18
19 Basic research issues such as this one seem like ripe territory for future work.
20
21
22

23 Although we have encouraged the view that the multiple process complexity of tasks
24
25 used to measure the NP effect is a challenge worth taking on, it might be argued instead that task
26
27 complexity is a burden better avoided, perhaps by moving on to study some entirely different
28
29 behavioural phenomenon more likely to be process pure. We suspect that this reply would turn
30
31 out to be folly, as it isn't just the NP task that is complex – much of cognition is complex. Task
32
33 effects that are driven by multiple processes rather than a single process are likely the norm in
34
35 cognition.
36
37
38
39

40 From this perspective, it can be argued that there are some broadly important lessons
41
42 about cognition to be learned from 30 years of research on the NP effect. At the same time,
43
44 research on the NP effect has also offered some specific lessons to researchers in the attention
45
46 and performance field. In the early 1990's it was proposed that episodic memory retrieval
47
48 contributes to NP effects (Neill et al., 1992), and the following 20 years saw similar proposals in
49
50 literatures on task switching (Allport & Wylie, 2000; Waszak, Hommel & Allport, 2003),
51
52 inhibition of return (Tipper, Grison & Kessler, 2003; Wilson, Castel & Pratt, 2006), conflict
53
54 adaptation (Spapé & Hommel, 2008), priming of popout (Hillstrom, 2000; Huang, Holcombe &
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Pashler, 2004; Thomson & Milliken, 2013), and stop signal inhibition (Verbruggen & Logan,
4
5 2008), to name a few. It seems likely that theoretical developments in the NP literature played
6
7 some role in the direction taken in these other literatures, even if only to point out the utility of
8
9 instance theory to the attention and performance domain (see also Brooks, 1978; Hintzman,
10
11 1986; Jacoby & Brooks, 1984; Logan, 1988; Medin & Schaeffer, 1978).
12
13
14
15

16 Ultimately, a satisfactory answer to the original curiosity-driven questions about the role
17
18 of inhibition in cognition will likely require us to embrace the full complexity of interplay
19
20 between memory and attention. If we dare to take on the most complex problem in science, and
21
22 attempt to understand the human brain, then even seemingly simple experimental questions will
23
24 reveal truly challenging problems.
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

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Allport, A., & Wylie, G. (2000). 'Task switching', stimulus-response bindings, and negative
7
8 priming. In S. Monsell & J. S. Driver (Eds.), *Attention and performance XVIII: Control of*
9
10 *cognitive processes* (pp. 35-70). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
11
12
13
14 Behrendt, J., Gibbons, H., Schrobsdorff, H., Ihrke, M., Herrmann, J. M., & Hasselhorn, M.
15
16 (2010). Event-related brain potential correlates of identity negative priming from
17
18 overlapping pictures. *Psychophysiology*, *47*, 921–930.
19
20
21 Boldini, A., Russo, R., & Avons, S. E. (2004). One process is not enough! A speed-accuracy
22
23 tradeoff study of recognition memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *11*(2), 353–361.
24
25
26 Botvinick, M. M., Cohen, J. D., & Carter, C. S. (2004). Conflict monitoring and anterior
27
28 cingulate cortex: □An update. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*, 539–546.
29
30
31 Broadbent, D.E. (1958). *Perception and Communication*. New York: Pergamon.
32
33
34 Brooks, L.R. (1978). Nonanalytic concept formation and memory for instances. In E. Rosch &
35
36 B.B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 169-211). New York: Wiley.
37
38
39 Buckolz, E., Fitzgeorge, L., & Knowles, S. (2012). Spatial negative priming, but not inhibition
40
41 of return, with central (foveal) displays. *Psychology*, *3*, 666-674.
42
43
44 Carr, T.H., McCauley, C., Sperber, R.D. & Parmalee, C.M. Words, pictures, and priming: On
45
46 semantic activation, conscious identification, and the automaticity of information
47
48 processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *8*,
49
50 757-777.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chiappe, D.L., & MacLeod, C.M. (1995). Negative priming is not task bound: A consistent
4
5 pattern across naming and categorization tasks. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2, 364-
6
7 369.
8
9
10
11 Christie, J., & Klein, R. (2001). Negative priming for spatial location? *Canadian Journal of*
12
13 *Experimental Psychology*, 55, 24-38.
14
15
16 Chun, M. M., & Jiang, Y. (1998). Contextual cueing: Implicit learning and memory of visual
17
18 context guides spatial attention. *Cognitive psychology*, 36(1), 28-71.
19
20
21 Coles, M. G. (1989). Modern mind-brain reading: Psychophysiology, physiology, and cognition.
22
23 *Psychophysiology*, 26, 251-269.
24
25
26 Crump, M. J., Gong, Z., & Milliken, B. (2006). The context-specific proportion congruent
27
28 Stroop effect: Location as a contextual cue. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13(2), 316-
29
30 321.
31
32
33
34 D'Angelo, M.C. & Milliken, B. (2012). Context-specific control in the single-prime negative-
35
36 priming procedure. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65, 887-910
37
38
39 Dalrymple-Alford, E.C. & Budayr, B. (1966). Examination of some aspects of the Stroop color-
40
41 word test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 23, 1211-1214.
42
43
44 Dempster, F.N. (1995). Interference and inhibition in cognition: An historical perspective. In
45
46 F.N. Dempster & C.J. Brainerd (Eds.), *Interference and Inhibition in Cognition* (pp. 3-26).
47
48 New York: Academic Press.
49
50
51
52 DeSchepper, B. & Treisman, A. (1996). Visual memory for novel shapes: Implicit coding
53
54 without attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory & Cognition*,
55
56 22, 27-47.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dixon, N.F. (1971). *Subliminal perception: The nature of a controversy*. London: McGraw-
4
5 Hill.
6
7
8
9 Dukewich, K.R. Re-conceptualizing inhibition of return. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16,
10
11 238-251.
12
13
14 Fox, E. (1995). Negative priming from ignored distractors in visual selection: A review.
15
16 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2(2), 145-173.
17
18
19 Fox, E. & de Fockert, J.W. (1998). Negative priming depends on prime-probe similarity.
20
21 Evidence for episodic retrieval. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 5, 107-113.
22
23
24 Francis, L., & Milliken, B. (2003). Inhibition of return for the length of a line? *Perception &*
25
26 *Psychophysics*, 65, 1208–1221.
27
28
29 Frischen, A., Loach, D. & Tipper, S.P. (2009). Seeing the world through another person's eyes:
30
31 Simulating selective attention via action observation. *Cognition*, 111, 212-218.
32
33
34 Frings, C., & Groh-Bordin, C. (2007). Electrophysiological correlates of visual identity negative
35
36 priming. *Brain Research*, 1176, 82–91.
37
38
39 Frings, C., Bermeitinger, C., & Gibbons, H. (2011). Prime retrieval of motor responses in
40
41 negative priming: Evidence from lateralized readiness potentials. *Brain Research*, 1407,
42
43 69–78.
44
45
46 Frings, C., Schneider, K. K., & Fox, E. (2015). The negative priming paradigm: An update and
47
48 implications for selective attention. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 1-21.
49
50
51 Frings, C. & Spence, C. (2011). Increased perceptual and conceptual processing difficulty
52
53 makes the immeasurable measurable: Negative priming in the absence of probe distractors.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Frings, C., & Wentura, D. (2006). Strategy effects counteract distractor inhibition: Negative
4 priming with constantly absent probe distractors. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
5
6 *Human Perception and Performance*, 32, 854-864.
7
8

9
10
11 Frings, C., Wentura, D., & Wühr, P. (2012). On the fate of distractor representations. *Journal of*
12
13 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 38(3), 570–575.
14
15

16 Frings, C., & Wühr, P. (2014). Top-down deactivation of interference from irrelevant spatial or
17
18 verbal stimulus features. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 76(8), 2360–2374.
19
20

21 Gibbons, H. (2006). An event-related potential investigation of varieties of negative priming.
22
23 *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 20(3), 170–185.
24
25

26 Gibbons, H. (2009). Functional brain-electrical correlates of negative priming in the flanker task:
27
28 Evidence for episodic retrieval. *Psychophysiology*, 46(4), 807–817.
29
30

31 Gibbons, H., Rammsayer, T. H., & Stahl, J. (2006). Multiple sources of positive-and negative-
32
33 priming effects: An event-related potential study. *Memory & cognition*, 34(1), 172-186.
34
35

36 Gibbons, H., & Stahl, J. (2008). Early activity in the lateralized readiness potential suggests
37
38 prime-response retrieval as a source of negative priming. *Experimental Psychology*, 55,
39
40 164-172.
41
42

43 Gibbons, H., & Stahl, J. (2010). Cognitive load reduces visual identity negative priming by
44
45 disabling the retrieval of task-inappropriate prime information: an ERP study. *Brain*
46
47 *Research*, 1330, 101–113.
48
49

50 Gibbons, H., Wiegand, N., & Stahl, J. (2013). Levels of visuo-spatial selection: An ERP study of
51
52 negative priming. *Brain and Cognition*, 83(2), 203–217.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Greenwald, A.G. (1972). Evidence of both perceptual filtering and response suppression for
4
5
6 rejected message in selective attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 94, 58-67.
7
- 8
9 Grison, S., Tipper, S.P. & Hewitt, O. (2005). Long-term negative priming: Support for retrieval
10
11 of prior attentional processes. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 58A(7),
12
13 1199-1224.
14
- 15
16 Groh-Bordin, C., & Frings, C. (2009). Where has all the inhibition gone? Insights from
17
18 electrophysiological measures into negative priming without probe distractors. *Brain and*
19
20 *Cognition*, 71(2), 92–98.
21
- 22
23 Hillstrom, A.P. (2000). Repetition effects in visual search. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 62, 800-
24
25
26 817.
27
- 28
29 Hinojosa, J. A., Pozo, M. A., Méndez-Bértolo, C., & Luna, D. (2009). Event-related potential
30
31 correlates of visual identity negative priming unbiased by trial-by-trial effects. *Brain and*
32
33 *Cognition*, 69(3), 531–537.
34
- 35
36 Hintzman, D.L. (1986). Schema abstraction in a multiple trace model. *Psychological Review*,
37
38
39 93, 411-428.
40
- 41
42 Hommel, B. (1998). Event files: Evidence for automatic integration of stimulus-response
43
44 episodes. *Visual Cognition*, 5, 183–216.
45
- 46
47 Hommel, B. (2004). Event files: Feature binding in and across perception and action. *Trends in*
48
49 *Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 494–500.
50
- 51
52 Hommel, B., Müsseler, J., Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (2001). The theory of event coding
53
54 (TEC): A framework for perception and action planning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*,
55
56
57 24, 849–878.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Houghton, G. & Tipper, S.P. (1994). A model of inhibitory mechanisms in selective attention.

4
5 In D. Dagenbach, D. & T.H. Carr (Eds.) Inhibitory processes in attention, memory, and
6
7 language (pp 53-112). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
8
9

10
11 Hu, F. K., & Samuel, A. G. (2011). Facilitation versus inhibition in a non-spatial attribute
12
13 discrimination tasks. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, 73 , 784-796.
14
15

16
17 Huang, L., Holcombe, A.O., & Pashler, H. (2004). Repetition priming in visual search: Episodic
18
19 retrieval. *Memory & Cognition*, 32, 12-20.
20

21
22 Jacoby, L.L. & Brooks, L.R. (1984). Nonanalytic cognition: Memory, perception and cognition.
23
24 In G.H. Bower (Ed.) *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. Academic Press:
25
26 Orlando, Florida.
27
28

29
30 Kahneman, D., Treisman, A., & Gibbs, B. J. (1992). The reviewing of object files: Object-
31
32 specific integration of information. *Cognitive psychology*, 24, 175-219.
33

34
35 Kathmann, N., Bogdahn, B., & Endrass, T. (2006). Event-related brain potential variations
36
37 during location and identity negative priming. *Neuroscience Letters*, 394(1), 53–56.
38

39
40 Kehler, S., Kraft, A., Irlbacher, K., Koch, S. P., Hagendorf, H., Kathmann, N., & Brandt, S. A.
41
42 (2009). Electrophysiological evidence for cognitive control during conflict processing in
43
44 visual spatial attention. *Psychological Research PRPF*, 73(6), 751-761.
45
46

47
48 Law, M. B., Pratt, J., & Abrams, R. A. (1995). Color-based inhibition of return. *Perception &*
49
50 *Psychophysics*, 57, 402–408.
51

52
53 Logan, G.D. (1988). Toward an instance theory of automatization. *Psychological Review*, 95,
54
55 492-527.
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

Lowe, D.G. (1979). Strategies, context, and the mechanism of response inhibition. *Memory & Cognition*, 7, 382-389.

Lupiáñez, J. (2010). Inhibition of return. In A.C. Nobre & J.T. Coull (Eds.) *Attention and Time*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

MacLeod, C.M., Chiappe, D.L., & Fox, E. (2002). The crucial roles of stimulus matching and stimulus identity in negative priming. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9, 521-528.

Marcel, A.J. (1983). Conscious and unconscious perception: An approach to the relations between phenomenal experience and perceptual processes. *Cognitive Psychology*, 15, 238-300.

May, C. P., Kane, M. J., & Hasher, L. (1995). Determinants of negative priming. *Psychological bulletin*, 118(1), 35.

Mayr, S., & Buchner, A. (2007). Negative priming as a memory phenomenon: A review of 20 years of negative priming research. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 215(1), 35.

Mayr, S., Niedeggen, M., Buchner, A., & Orgs, G. (2006). The level of reaction time determines the ERP correlates of auditory negative priming. *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 20(3), 186–194.

Mayr, S., Niedeggen, M., Buchner, A., & Pietrowsky, R. (2003). ERP correlates of auditory negative priming. *Cognition*, 90(2), B11–21.

Medin, D.L. & Schaeffer, M.M. (1978). Context theory of classification learning. *Psychological Review*, 85, 207-238.

- 1
2
3 Meyer, D.E., Schvaneveldt, R.W. & Ruddy, M.G. (1975). Loci of contextual effects on visual
4 word recognition. In P.M.A. Rabbitt & S. Dornic (Eds.), *Attention and Performance V*.
5
6 New York: Academic Press.
7
8
9
10
11 Milliken, B., Joordens, S., Merikle, P. M., & Seiffert, A. E. (1998). Selective attention: A
12
13 reevaluation of the implications of negative priming. *Psychological Review*, *105*(2), 203.
14
15
16 Milliken, B., Lupiáñez, J., Debner, J., & Abello, B. (1999). Automatic and controlled processing
17
18 in Stroop negative priming: The role of attentional set. *Journal of Experimental*
19
20
21 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *25*(6), 1384–1402.
22
23
24 Milliken, B., Thomson, D. R., Bleile, K., MacLellan, E., & Giammarco, M. (2012). Context-
25
26 specific control and the Stroop negative priming effect. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*
27
28 *Psychology*, *65*, 1430-1448.
29
30
31 Milliken, B., Tipper, S.P., Houghton, G., & Lupiáñez, J. (2000). Attending, ignoring and
32
33 repetition: On the relation between negative priming and inhibition of return. *Perception &*
34
35 *Psychophysics*, *62*, 1280-1296.
36
37
38
39 Milliken, B., Tipper, S. P., & Weaver, B. (1994). Negative priming in a spatial localization task:
40
41 Feature mismatching and distractor inhibition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
42
43 *Human Perception and Performance*, *20*(3), 624.
44
45
46
47 Moore, C. M. (1994). Negative priming depends on probe-trial conflict: Where has all the
48
49 inhibition gone?. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *56*(2), 133-147.
50
51
52
53 Morris, C. D., Bransford, J. D., & Franks, J. J. (1977). Levels of processing versus transfer
54
55 appropriate processing. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, *16*(5), 519-533.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Morton, J. (1969). Interaction of activation of word recognition. *Psychological Review*, 76,
4
5 165-178.
6
7
8
9 Neill, W.T. (1977). Inhibition and facilitation processes in selective attention. *Journal of*
10
11 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 3, 444-450.
12
13
14 Neill, W. T. (1997). Episodic retrieval in negative priming and repetition priming. *Journal of*
15
16 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, 1291-1305.
17
18
19 Neill, W. T., & Mathis, K. M. (1998). Negative Priming and Related Phenomena. *Psychology of*
20
21 *learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory*, 38, 1.
22
23
24 Neill, W. T., Terry, K. M., & Valdes, L. A. (1994). Negative priming without probe selection.
25
26 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1(1), 119–121.
27
28
29
30 Neill, W.T. & Valdes, L.A. (1992). Persistence of negative priming: Steady state or
31
32 decay? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 18,
33
34 565-576.
35
36
37
38 Neill, W.T., Valdes, L.A., Terry, K.M., & Gorfein, D.S. (1992). Persistence of negative
39
40 priming: II. Evidence for episodic trace retrieval. *Journal of Experimental*
41
42 *Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 18, 993-1000.
43
44
45
46 Ossmann, J. M., & Mulligan, N. W. (2003). Inhibition and attention deficit hyperactivity
47
48 disorder in adults. *The American journal of psychology*, 116, 35-50.
49
50
51
52 Paller, K. A., Kutas, M. & Mclsaac, H. K. (1995). Monitoring conscious recollection via the
53
54 electrical activity of the brain. *Psychological Science* 6, 107-111.
55
56
57
58 Park, J., & Kanwisher, N. (1994). Negative priming for spatial locations: Identity mismatching,
59
60

1
2
3 not distractor inhibition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
4
5
6 *Performance, 20*, 613-623.

7
8
9 Posner, M.I. & Cohen, Y. (1984). Components of visual orienting. In H. Bouma & D. G.
10
11 Bouwhuis (Eds.), *Attention and performance X* (pp. 531–556). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

12
13
14 Rothermund, K., Wentura, D., & De Houwer, J. (2005). Retrieval of incidental stimulus-
15
16 response associations as a source of negative priming. *Journal of Experimental*
17
18 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 31*, 482-495.

19
20
21 Ruge, H., & Naumann, E. (2006). Brain-electrical correlates of negative location priming under
22
23 sustained and transient attentional context conditions. *Journal of Psychophysiology, 20*(3),
24
25 160–169.

26
27
28
29 Rugg, M. D., Henson, R. N., & Robb, W. G. (2003). Neural correlates of retrieval processing in
30
31 the prefrontal cortex during recognition and exclusion tasks. *Neuropsychologia, 41*, 40–52.

32
33
34 Rugg, M. D., Mark, R. E., Walla, P., Schloerscheidt, A. M., Birch, C. S. & Allan, K. (1998)
35
36 Dissociation of the neural correlates of implicit and explicit memory. *Nature 392*, 595-598.

37
38
39 Scarborough, D.L., Cortese, C., & Scarborough, H. (1977). Frequency and repetition effects in
40
41 lexical memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception & Performance, 3*,
42
43 1-17.

44
45
46
47 Shapiro, K.L. & Loughlin C. (1993). The locus of inhibition in the priming of static objects:
48
49 Object token versus location. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*
50
51 *and Performance, 19*, 352-363.

52
53
54
55 Spadaro, A., He, C., & Milliken, B. (2012). Response to an intervening event reverses nonspatial
56
57 repetition effects in 2AFC tasks: Nonspatial IOR? *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics,*
58
59

1
2
3 74 , 331-349.
4
5

6 Spapé, M. M., & Hommel, B. (2008). He said, she said: Episodic retrieval induces conflict
7
8 adaptation in an auditory Stroop task. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 15(6), 1117-1121.
9

10
11 Stahl, J., & Gibbons, H. (2007). Event-related brain potentials support episodic-retrieval
12
13 explanations of flanker negative priming. *Experimental Brain Research*, 181(4), 595–606.
14
15

16
17 Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental*
18
19 *Psychology*, 28, 643-662.
20

21
22 Thomson, D.R. & Milliken, B. (2013). Contextual distinctiveness produces long-lasting
23
24 priming of popout. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception &*
25
26 *Performance*, 39, 202-215.
27
28

29
30 Tipper, S. P. (1985). The negative priming effect: Inhibitory priming by ignored objects. *The*
31
32 *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 37, 571-590.
33
34

35
36 Tipper, S. P. (1991). Less attentional selectivity as a result of declining inhibition in older adults.
37
38 *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 29, 45-47.
39

40
41 Tipper, S. P. (2001). Does negative priming reflect inhibitory mechanisms? A review and
42
43 integration of conflicting views. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
44
45 *Section A*, 54(2), 321-343.
46


47
48 Tipper, S.P., Brehaut, J. & Driver, J. (1990). Selection of moving and static objects for the
49
50 control of spatially directed action. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
51
52 *Perception and Performance*, 16, 492-504.
53
54

55
56 Tipper, S. P., & Cranston, M. (1985). Selective attention and priming: Inhibitory and facilitatory
57
58 effects of ignored primes. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 37, 591-611.
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
- Tipper, S.P. & Driver, J. (1988). Negative priming between pictures and words in a selective attention task: Evidence for semantic processing of ignored stimuli. *Memory & Cognition*, *16*, 64-70.
- Tipper, S.P., Grison, S., & Kessler, K. (2003). Long-term inhibition of return of attention. *Psychological Science*, *14*, 19-25.
- Tipper, S.P., Lortie, C., & Baylis, G. (1992). Selective reaching: Evidence for action-centered attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *18*, 891-905.
- Tipper, S.P. MacQueen, G.M., & Brehaut, J. (1988). Negative priming between response modalities: Evidence for the central locus of inhibition in selective attention. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *43*, 45-52.
- Tipper, S.P., Meegan, D., & Howard, L.A. (2002). Action-centred negative priming: Evidence for reactive inhibition. *Visual Cognition*, *9*, 591-614.
- Tipper, S. P., & McLaren, J. (1990). Evidence for efficient visual selectivity in children. *The development of attention: Research and theory*, In J. T. Enns, (Ed.). *The development of attention: Research and theory* (pp. 197-210). North-Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Tipper, S.P., Weaver, B., Cameron, S., Brehaut, J.C., & Bastedo, J. (1991). Inhibitory mechanisms of attention in identification and localization tasks: Time course and disruption. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, *17*,
- Tipper, S. P., Weaver, B., & Milliken, B. (1995). Spatial negative priming without mismatching: Comment on Park and Kanwisher (1994). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *21*, 1220-1229.

- 1
2
3 Verbruggen, F. & Logan, G.D. (2008). Automatic and controlled response inhibition:
4
5 Association learning in the Go/No-Go and stop signal paradigms. *Journal of Experimental*
6
7 *Psychology: General*, 137, 649-672.
8
9
- 10
11 Waszak, F., Hommel, B., & Allport, A. (2003). Task switching and long-term priming: Role of
12
13 episodic stimulus-task bindings in task switch costs. *Cognitive Psychology*, 46, 361-413.
14
15
- 16 Wesslein, A.-K., Spence, C., & Frings, C. (2015). You can't ignore what you can't separate: the
17
18 effect of visually induced target-distractor separation on tactile selection. *Psychonomic*
19
20 *Bulletin & Review*, 22(3), 728-736.
21
22
- 23
24 Wilson, D.E., Castel, A.D., & Pratt, J. (2006). Long-term inhibition of return for spatial
25
26 locations. Evidence for a memory retrieval account. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*
27
28 *Psychology*, 59, 2135-2147.
29
30
- 31
32 Wood, T. J., & Milliken, B. (1998). Negative priming without ignoring. *Psychonomic Bulletin &*
33
34 *Review*, 5(3), 470-475.
35
36
- 37
38 Wyatt, N. & Machado, L. (2013). Evidence inhibition responds reactively to the salience of
39
40 distracting information during focused attention. *PloS One*, 8(4), e62809.
41
- 42
43 Yeung, N., Botvinick, M. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2004). The neural basis of error detection: conflict
44
45 monitoring and the error-related negativity. *Psychological review*, 111(4), 931.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Panel A



Panel B

**Figure 1**

This demonstrates the experimental lay-out and presents the negative priming effects (the difference between a baseline control and a trial where the previous distractor stimulus becomes the next target). Panel A shows the situation where the participants hand started trials at the front of the board and they reached out away from the body to hit the key adjacent to the red target LED while ignoring a green distracting LED. Negative priming was much larger when the previous distractor was near the hand (32ms) than far from the hand (15ms) Panel B shows the situation where the participant starts the reach from the back of the stimulus board, reaching back towards the body. In this case greater negative priming (22ms) is observed when a previous distractor is far from the body but near the responding hand. "Subject" shows the position of the participant, which remained constant in these two kinds of reaching trials, hence maintaining retinotopic, head and body-centred frames of reference while the hand changed location.




Figure 2

The location-based (or spatial) negative priming procedure. Participants in this task are required to indicate the location of the target O in both the prime (top stimulus display) and probe (bottom three stimulus displays). In the critical ignored repetition (IR) condition, the probe target O appears in the location of the prime distractor X. In the attended repetition (AR) condition, the probe target O appears in the location of the prime target O. In the control condition, the probe target O appears in a previously unoccupied location.