Are auditory cues special? Evidence from cross-modal distractor-induced blindness

Lea Kern^{*1} and Michael Niedeggen¹

Please note: This is a preprint version of the manuscript that has not been peer-reviewed.

* Corresponding author:

Lea Kern

Freie Universität Berlin, Department of Education and Psychology, Division General
Psychology and Neuropsychology, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin, Germany.

E-mail: lea.kern@fu-berlin.de

Phone: +49 030 838 66002

Author affiliation:

¹ Freie Universität Berlin, Department of Education and Psychology, Division General
Psychology and Neuropsychology, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin, Germany

Abstract

A target that shares features with preceding distractor stimuli is less likely to be detected due to a distractor-driven activation of a negative attentional set. This transient impairment in perceiving the target (distractor-induced blindness/deafness) can be found within vision and audition. Recently, the phenomenon was observed in a cross-modal setting involving an auditory target and additional task-relevant visual information (cross-modal distractor-induced deafness). In the current study, consisting of three behavioral experiments, a visual target, indicated by an auditory cue, had to be detected despite the presence of visual distractors. Multiple distractors consistently led to reduced target detection if cue and target appeared in close temporal proximity, confirming cross-modal distractor-induced blindness. However, the effect on target detection was reduced compared to the effect of cross-modal distractor-induced deafness previously observed for reversed modalities. The physical features defining cue and target could not account for the diminished distractor effect in the current cross-modal task. Instead, this finding may be attributed to the auditory cue acting as an especially efficient release signal of the distractor-induced inhibition. Additionally, a multisensory enhancement of visual target detection by the concurrent auditory signal might have contributed to the reduced distractor effect.

Keywords: distractor-induced blindness, attention, cross-modal perception, inhibition, multisensory enhancement

Words Abstract: 193

Words manuscript: 9,956

Figures: 4

Tables: 1

1. Introduction

In our daily lives, we are constantly surrounded by a vast number of stimuli deriving from different sensory modalities. The perceptual system with its limited capacity has to filter the incoming information and efficiently select stimuli relevant to the current task, while irrelevant, distracting stimuli need to be inhibited (Feldmann-Wüstefeld & Vogel, 2019; Hasher et al., 2007; Moher et al., 2014). In addition to bottom-up stimulus properties, this selection and inhibition is assumed to be controlled top-down by *attentional sets* (Desimone & Duncan, 1995; Olivers & Meeter, 2008). While target features are stored in positive attentional sets, or target templates, which enhance processing of stimuli matching this template (Dombrowe et al., 2011; Leber & Egeth, 2006), negative attentional sets, or distractor templates, contain features that attention is directed away from (Arita et al., 2012; Olivers & Watson, 2006; Woodman & Luck, 2007; Zhang et al., 2009). The features of target and distractors are not always distinct but can overlap, leading to impaired target processing if a negative attentional set containing these shared features is activated (Boncompagni & Cosmelli, 2018; Folk et al., 2008; Lleras et al., 2008; Sahraie et al., 2001; Wu & Fu, 2017).

One experimental paradigm demonstrating the consequences of a negative attentional set comprising shared features of distractors and target on target detection is *distractor-induced blindness* (DIB). In the DIB task, participants shall detect a target (e.g., episode of coherent motion in random dot kinematogram) that is indicated by a cue (e.g., color change of fixation to red) (Sahraie et al., 2001). In the visual modality, it was observed consistently that target-like, but task irrelevant events (i.e., distractors) occurring before the cue are associated with a transient deficit in detecting the target. This “blindness” is most pronounced if cue and target are displayed simultaneously and vanishes at a cue-target stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) of 200 – 300 ms (Hesselmann et al., 2006; Sahraie et al., 2001; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018). The DIB effect has been attributed to a central inhibition of distractor (and therefore target) features, building up cumulatively with the repeated presentation of to-be-ignored distractors (Niedeggen et al., 2015; Niedeggen et al., 2012;

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Winther & Niedeggen, 2017b). Within this model, the cue is working as a release signal of the inhibition, leading to a gradual deactivation of the negative attentional set and recovering target detection rates with longer cue-target-SOAs (Michael et al., 2011). A higher selection difficulty of the cue due to lower salience is associated with a larger DIB effect (Hay et al., 2006). Previous research ruled out that DIB can be accounted for by spatial shifts of attention between the two visual streams containing cue and target (Hesselmann et al., 2009).

To date, DIB has been observed for the features motion, orientation and color (Michael et al., 2011; Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a). Some models of attentional control assume that inhibition of irrelevant stimuli works in a similar fashion for different visual features (Hasher et al., 2007; Olivers & Meeter, 2008). This assumption is supported by neuroimaging studies suggesting that working memory processes including inhibition do not seem to be organized by stimulus type (for a meta-analysis: (Wager & Smith, 2003)). Interestingly, one difference between visual features was demonstrated for DIB: color changes are apparently more effective in eliciting the inhibitory process than motion stimuli (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018). This finding might be attributed to differences between ventral and dorsal stream processing (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a), with color being predominantly processed in the ventral and motion/orientation being primarily associated with the dorsal visual system (e.g., (Kravitz et al., 2013; Valyear et al., 2006)). The distinction between ventral and dorsal processing has been proposed to not only apply to perceptual processing stages but also to working memory selection (Nee et al., 2013).

The effect of distractors on target detection is not restricted to the visual modality. Recent studies revealed a *distractor-induced deafness* (DID) (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a), which can also be observed under cross-modal stimulation (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b). In the previous cross-modal set-up (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b), the cue was presented in a rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP) sequence and the target occurred in an auditory stream. The visual sequence consisted of a circular presentation of eight greyscale bars,

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

giving the impression of a circular movement ('preloader' symbol). A small white circle with black outline could appear at the position of one of the bars, defining the cue. The target was a short rise in amplitude in a continuous tone occurring with or after the cue, while rises in amplitude before the cue were distractors that ought to be ignored. In accordance with unimodal findings, multiple distractors impaired target detection, especially if cue and target appeared concurrently. Interestingly, DID in both uni- and cross-modal setting was associated with a smaller decrease in target detection compared to the visual modality. However, the DIB effect remained to be examined for the combination of auditory cue and visual target.

The processing and detection of target stimuli in a *multisensory*, or *cross-modal*, environment is in addition to attentional selection and inhibition processes observed within modalities also influenced by interactions between the senses (Koelewijn et al., 2010; Spence et al., 2009; Stein & Stanford, 2008). If two stimuli from different modalities overlap in presentation time and/or spatial location, performance enhancements (i.e., *multisensory enhancement*) can often be observed compared to unimodal settings (Klapetek et al., 2012; Stein & Stanford, 2008; Stevenson et al., 2014; Talsma et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2016). Previous research demonstrated that an auditory stimulus temporally coinciding with a visual target can cause an enhancement of perceived visual stimulus intensity (Noesselt et al., 2008; Stein et al., 1996) and of target detection rates (Andersen & Mamassian, 2008; Frassinetti et al., 2002; Giard & Peronnet, 1999; Gleiss & Kayser, 2013; Lippert et al., 2007; Noesselt et al., 2010; Van der Burg et al., 2011). Therefore, potential influences of multisensory processing need to be considered in cross-modal settings.

The current study comprises three consecutive behavioral experiments that aimed to investigate whether the characteristics of distractor-induced blindness can be observed in a cross-modal setting. Here, the cue as signal of task relevance was defined in the auditory modality, while target and distractors were visual stimuli. More specifically, the following two characteristics should be examined: (1) are multiple target-like distractors associated with

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

impaired target detection compared to zero and one distractor conditions?, and (2) is the target detection impairment after multiple distractors most pronounced at a cue-target-SOA of 0 ms and decreases with increasing SOA? If a cross-modal DIB effect with these characteristics can be stated, this in combination with previous findings (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a, 2021b) speaks for DIB/DID occurring independent of the sensory modality cue and target are presented in. However, we also aimed to observe whether the modality cue and target appear in might have an impact on the expression of the distractor effect. Uni- and cross-modal DID showed a similar magnitude and appeared to be smaller than the visual DIB (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a, 2021b). One possible reason for this observation could be that auditory distractors generally have a weaker influence on target processing, possibly due to differences in distractor processing between visual and auditory domain. If we find a cross-modal DIB of comparable size as the unimodal visual effect – therefore being larger than DID – this speaks for a larger impact of distractors on target detection in the visual compared to the auditory modality.

2. EXPERIMENT I

The aim of Experiment I was to examine whether two basic characteristics of distractor-induced blindness - the effect of multiple distractor episodes and the recovery of this effect as a function of the cue-target-SOA - can be found in a cross-modal setting with the cue embedded in an auditory and distractor/targets occurring in a visual stream. So far, such a distractor effect (distractor-induced blindness/deafness) has been shown within the visual (Sahraie et al., 2001) and auditory modality (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a) and was recently also observed in a cross-modal task for a visual cue and an auditory target (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b). In all of these settings, the largest distractor effect occurred at a cue-target-SOA of 0 ms and decreased with increasing SOA. It remained to be examined if this effect also occurs in a cross-modal set-up containing a visual target.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

The current study aimed to close this research gap by investigating cross-modal distractor-induced blindness with the cue as signal of task relevance being defined in the auditory modality (i.e., short rise in amplitude in a continuous tone) and target and distractors being visual stimuli (i.e., brief appearance of a small white circle). We expected to observe a decrease in target detection following the presentation of multiple distractors. The target detection deficit should be most pronounced if cue and target occur concurrently and should recover with increasing cue-target-SOA. According to the DIB model, the transient “blindness” for the target is caused by the activation of a central inhibitory process by the distractors (Hesselmann et al., 2006; Niedeggen et al., 2015). Thus, one would assume that target detection should also be impaired in this cross-modal setting, irrespective of the cue being presented in another modality. To estimate the expression of the distractor-induced effect on target detection, the acquired data of Experiment I were compared to a previous behavioral experiment with visual cue and auditory distractors and target (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b). If auditory distractors have a weaker influence on target detection than visual distractors, cross-modal DIB should show a larger magnitude than cross-modal DID.

2.1 Method

The data, code and stimulus material of all three experiments, which were not pre-registered, are provided in an open repository (<https://www.doi.org/10.17632/wxmhwv7xvd.1>).

2.1.1 Participants

Sample sizes were calculated *a priori* using G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) for $\alpha = .05$ and an intended power of 80% (F-Test with repeated measurement). Based on a previous cross-modal study (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b), we expected a large effect ($f = .40$) for the within-subject factor ‘number of distractors’ (1 vs. multiple distractors). This resulted in a required sample size of $N=15$ for each of the three experiments.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Throughout Experiments I-III, participants had no history of neurologic or psychiatric conditions, normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity and self-reported normal hearing ability. Participants were recruited in the university environment, received course credit or 10€/hour for participation and gave written informed consent prior to testing. The experimental procedure (including Experiments I-III) was approved in advance by the ethics committee of Freie Universität Berlin (027/2019). A priori defined exclusion criteria based on previous studies (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b) were as follows: (1) unreliable task performance during pretest trials (< 60% correct target detection); (2) unreliable task performance during the experiment (< 25% hit rate in zero distractor condition at SOA 0 ms).

Eighteen healthy subjects participated in Experiment I (13 women; 20 – 35 years of age; $M_{age} = 25.61$, $SD = 5.25$). No participant had to be excluded based on the exclusion criteria. The data of Experiment I were compared to a previous behavioral data set (N = 20; 13 women; 18 – 39 years of age; $M_{age} = 29.20$, $SD = 5.92$), which examined cross-modal distractor-induced deafness and was published as part of Kern and Niedeggen (2021b).

2.1.2 Stimuli, procedure and design

All visual and auditory stimulus material used in Experiment I was taken from previous experiments (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a, 2021b). The resulting analogy in the set-up allowed a statistical comparison of the current data to a previous data set.

The experiment was conducted in a sound-attenuated chamber with dimmed and indirect lightning. Participants sat at 62 cm viewing distance in front of a 20" monitor (Sony Trinitron Multiscan G520) and wore in-ear headphones (Audio-Technica ATH-LS70iS) with individually fitted earpieces. Auditory stimuli were created and edited with the programs "Tone Generator" and "WavePad Editor" (NCH Software, Greenwood, USA). The experiment was run on a Windows PC using PsychoPy (Version 3.6.8 for Windows).

Participants heard two auditory sequences and monitored a dynamic visual stream concurrently. Trial duration was set to 5,000 ms. The two rapid serial auditory presentations

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

(RSAPs) were each presented to one ear. On the right ear, a continuous tone with a modulation at 5 Hz in a frequency range from 270 – 330 Hz was played (stream 1). The auditory cue was defined in this sequence as a transient rise in amplitude (+10 dB) for 100 ms. The cue was presented at a randomized temporal position between 3,100 – 4,000 ms after trial onset. On the left ear, participants heard a second sequence consisting of 50 sine-wave tones (duration: 30 ms, inter stimulus interval: 70 ms) that were each randomly selected from a set of seven tones (frequency range 1,800 – 2,200 Hz; stream 2). The amplitude of the continuous tone was reduced compared to the sine-wave tone sequence (-20 dB). Presentation time of the sine-wave tones was 30 ms with a 70 ms inter-stimulus interval (ISI) between tones. In this second RSAP stream, no task-relevant event occurred. For the aim of comparability between current and previous cross-modal findings, we kept both auditory streams in the experimental set-up since removal of one of the RSAP sequences could affect task difficulty.

Simultaneous to the two auditory sequences, a rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP) was displayed at the center of the screen. Eight bars were arranged in a circle with a total retinal size of 1.66° in diameter. The impression of a clockwise motion was created by varying the luminance of adjacent bars, in analogy to the signal indicating a loading process in software or websites ('preloader' symbol). The lightest bar was colored in white and thus appeared to be missing, while the darkest bar was colored in black. Changes in luminance appeared each 100 ms with no ISI. Target and distractors were defined within this RSVP sequence: a small white circle with black outline (0.186° in diameter) could appear for 100 ms at the position of the missing bar in the preloader symbol. The occurrence of a small white circle at the same time with or following the auditory cue was defined as target. Small circles appearing before cue onset were labeled as distractors and should be ignored. Stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) between onset of the last distractor and cue was at least 500 ms. SOAs between distractors were set between 200 to 700 ms. The experimental set-up is depicted in Figure 1.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

After giving informed consent, testing started with 32 pretest trials, during which participants were familiarized with stimuli and task. The experimenter provided verbal feedback on the correctness of responses after each trial. If participants showed a good understanding of instructions and a reliable target detection during at least 60% of trials, the main experiment started. If task performance remained unreliable during pretest, testing was aborted (see exclusion criterion 1).

The experiment consisted of 290 trials, which were presented in randomized order for each participant. After each trial, participants had to decide whether they perceived an auditory cue (question 1: "Did you hear a change in the continuous tone?") and whether they saw a target accompanying or following the cue (question 2: "Did you see a small white circle simultaneous to or after a change in the continuous tone?"). Non-speeded responses (yes/no) were given via button press on the keyboard. Participants were instructed to answer as accurately as possible. The experiment lasted approximately one hour.

Targets could appear at the same time as or shortly after the cue (within-subject factor cue-target-SOA: 0 ms vs. 100 ms vs. 300 ms). Additionally, the number of visual distractors preceding cue and target was manipulated as second within-subject factor (0 vs. 1 vs. 6-8 distractors). For each SOA condition, 80 trials containing cue and target were presented. Within each of the three SOA conditions, 40 trials included multiple distractors, 20 trials had one distractor, and 20 trials comprised no distractors. To be able to assess the reliability of response behavior in terms of false alarms (falsely reported target after correctly detected cue), trials only containing the cue were added as a control condition (15 trials with multiple distractors, 15 trials without distractor). As a second control conditions, 20 trials did not include a relevant stimulus (10 trials with multiple distractor, 10 trials without distractors).

The previous behavioral study, which examined cross-modal distractor-induced deafness and was compared to the results of Experiment I, had used the identical auditory and visual streams, task-relevant stimuli and experimental manipulations. Therefore, sensory stimulation was identical and solely the assignment of cue and target to the sensory

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

modalities was reversed (i.e., cue: appearance of small white circle; distractors/target: short rise in amplitude in continuous tone). The data of this previous experiment are accessible in an open repository (<https://doi.org/10.17632/6n7585w2jj.1>).

2.1.3 Data analysis

The hit rate (i.e., correct target detection after correctly detected cue) was computed for each experimental condition and each participant. Behavioral data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27 in a two-way repeated measures ANOVA including the within-subject factors 'SOA' between cue and target (0 ms vs. 100 ms vs. 300 ms) and 'number of distractors' (0 vs. 1 vs. 6-8). Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc comparisons were computed in case of a significant main effect or interaction. Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were applied if appropriate. If the interaction 'SOA' x 'number of distractors' reached significance, post-hoc tests were conducted for each SOA to examine an influence of the number of distractors, and the hit rates in the multiple distractor condition were compared between the three SOAs to assess the recovery of hit rates.

In a second, additional step of analysis, the data acquired in Experiment I were compared to previous cross-modal behavioral data for reversed modalities (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b) to assess a possible impact of the cross-modal setting. To this aim, an ANOVA with the repeated-measures factor 'number of distractors' (0 vs. 1 vs. 6-8) and the between-subject factor 'cross-modal setting' (auditory cue, visual target (Exp. I) vs. visual cue, auditory target) was conducted, focusing solely on the cue-target-SOA of 0 ms.

2.2 Results

Mean target detection rates for Experiments I-III are presented in Table 1. The results of Experiment I are depicted in Figure 1. Participants showed a reliable response behavior, as demonstrated by overall high hit rates and few false alarms (multiple distractors: $M = 3.48\%$, $SD = 9.27$; without distractors: $M = 2.47\%$, $SD = 8.13$). Occurrence of false alarms was not influenced by the presence of distractors, $F(1, 17) = .95$, $p = .343$, $\eta_p^2 = .053$.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Furthermore, cue detection was reliable ($M = 95.69\%$, $SD = 5.80$ for multiple distractors, SOA 0 ms), indicating a high salience of the cue.

The main effect of number of distractors reached significance, $F(1.15, 19.58) = 10.56$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .283$. Post-hoc comparisons showed that hit rates decreased with increasing number of distractor events (0 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 17) = 11.48$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .403$; 1 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 17) = 14.53$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .461$; 0 vs. 1 distractor: $F(1, 17) = 6.08$, $p = .025$, $\eta_p^2 = .263$).

The SOA between cue and target had no significant effect, $F(2, 34) = 1.28$, $p = .291$, $\eta_p^2 = .070$. Instead, the interaction between “number of distractors” and “SOA” reached significance, $F(4, 68) = 4.03$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .192$, indicating that distractors influenced hit rates differently at the three SOAs. Post-hoc tests revealed a significant effect of number of distractors on target detection at short cue-target intervals (SOA 0 ms: $F(1.24, 21.01) = 13.72$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .447$; SOA 100 ms: $F(2, 34) = 6.27$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .270$), while this influence was extinguished at SOA 300 ms ($F(2, 34) = .40$, $p = .673$, $\eta_p^2 = .023$). Additionally, post-hoc tests showed a significant recovery of target detection rates with increasing SOA for the multiple distractor condition, $F(2, 34) = 7.38$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .303$, following a linear trend, $F(1, 17) = 12.09$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .416$.

Comparison between two cross-modal data sets: does the cross-modal setting influence the distractor effect?

In a following analysis step, the data from Experiment I and a previous cross-modal experiment with identical experimental set-up but reversed modalities regarding cue and target were jointly analyzed to examine an effect of cross-modal setting. Hit rates in both experiments at SOA 0 ms are displayed in Figure 2. The analysis revealed a significant main effect of cross-modal setting, $F(1, 36) = 9.35$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .206$, driven by higher hit rates in Experiment I ($M = 91.16\%$, 95% CI [83.97, 98.35]) than in the previous experiment with visual cue and auditory target ($M = 76.22\%$, 95% CI [69.41, 83.04]). Additionally, the interaction between ‘number of distractors’ and ‘cross-modal setting’ at cue-target-SOA 0 ms

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

yielded significance, $F(2, 72) = 6.54$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .154$ (main effect number of distractors: $F(2, 72) = 26.89$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .428$). Post-hoc tests for each distractor condition showed no significant difference in hit rates if no distractors were presented, $F(1, 36) = 3.24$, $p = .080$, $\eta_p^2 = .083$, while higher hit rates were observed in Experiment I if distractors were present (1 distractor: $F(1, 36) = 4.53$, $p = .040$, $\eta_p^2 = .112$, multiple distractors: $F(1, 36) = 13.16$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .268$).

Figure 1*Task design and results of Experiment I*

Note. The left panel illustrates the task design: The cue was defined in the auditory modality, while target and distractors were presented embedded in a visual RSVP sequence. Target and distractor stimuli solely differed in the timing of their presentation: distractors appeared before cue onset, while a target could occur at the same time as or after the cue. The 'preloader' symbol at the center of the screen changed every 100 ms, creating the impression of a clockwise motion. On the left ear, participants always heard a sequence of pure tones, while on the right ear a continuous tone was presented. In Experiment I, the cue was a short rise in amplitude (+10 dB) in the continuous tone. The target event was the appearance of a small white circle within the preloader symbol for 100 ms simultaneous to or after the cue. The right panel shows the results of Experiment I: Mean hit rates (in %; y-axis) are depicted for the three SOA conditions (x-axis) and the number of distractors. Error bars depict standard errors of the mean. Multiple distractors were associated with lower target detection rates at short cue-target-SOAs.

Figure 2*Distractor effects at cue-target-SOA 0 ms in two cross-modal settings*

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Note. Hit rates acquired in Experiment I in comparison to hit rates from a previous cross-modal experiment (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b) at cue-target-SOA 0 ms. Both experiments had an identical set-up and sensory stimulation, and solely differed in the assignment of cue and target/distractors to sensory modalities. While target and distractors were visual and the cue auditory in Experiment I, auditory distractors and target and a visual cue were presented in the previous study. Overall, hit rates were higher if the cue was auditory and the target visual (Experiment I). A significant interaction between number of distractors and cross-modal setting could be observed, indicating a more pronounced drop of hit rates after the presentation of distractors if the target was auditory.

2.3 Discussion

Experiment I demonstrated that a visual target presented concurrently with or shortly after an auditory cue is less reliably detected if it is preceded by multiple target-like distractors. As hypothesized, target detection was most impaired at a cue-target-SOA of 0 ms. In line with the time course observed within the visual modality (Michael et al., 2011; Sahraie et al., 2001), the effect vanished at SOA 300, indicating the deactivation of the distractor template. Therefore, cross-modal distractor-induced blindness with the typical behavioral characteristics can be stated, providing evidence that a distractor effect cannot only be found within visual and auditory modality but also in both possible combinations between these modalities. The finding implies that target detection is reduced at SOA 0 ms in a cross-modal setting if a negative attentional set is activated by the repeated presence of multiple distractors in the auditory and visual domain. The release of this inhibition of visual features shows comparable properties for a visual and auditory cue.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

366 Additionally, and in extension of previous research, the results of Experiment I
367 demonstrate that DIB can also be elicited for the appearance of a small shape, which was
368 associated with a local change in luminance. Consequently, a fourth visual feature could be
369 established, which further strengthens the replicability of the DIB effect across different
370 feature dimensions and speaks for a similar functioning of the inhibitory process for a variety
371 of visual features.

372 While a substantial detection deficit for the visual target after multiple distractors and
373 at short SOAs could be found, the size of the effect (i.e., zero – multiple distractors at SOA 0
374 ms) was smaller than usually observed within the visual modality (Niedeggen et al., 2012;
375 Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a). Furthermore, the comparison with a cross-modal data set
376 from a previous study with a reversed assignment of modalities revealed that hit rates were
377 higher if the cue was auditory and distractors and target occurred in the visual modality than
378 vice versa. Importantly, the effect of distractors on target detection was more pronounced for
379 cross-modal DID than for cross-modal DIB (see Figure 2), indicating a greater susceptibility
380 to distractors in case the cue was visual and the target and distractors auditory. This finding
381 contradicts the assumption of a generally larger effect of visual compared to auditory
382 distractors on the detection of a target in the same modality. That the cross-modal distractor
383 effect appears to be reduced compared to the unimodal visual effect might be attributed to an
384 enhancement of visual target processing by a concurrent auditory cue, which has been
385 demonstrated for other paradigms (Frassinetti et al., 2002; Noesselt et al., 2008; Noesselt et
386 al., 2010; Van der Burg et al., 2011; Zhao et al., 2020). This multisensory enhancement
387 might counteract the distractor-induced inhibition to a certain degree. However, an alternative
388 explanation could be that the cue feature rise in amplitude - and therefore a brief increase in
389 loudness of the task relevant auditory stream - might have been especially efficient in
390 releasing the distractor-evoked inhibition and in redirecting attention to the visual target.

3. EXPERIMENT II

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Sounds with increasing intensity in terms of loudness (i.e., 'looming sounds') can enhance neural excitability of low-level visual areas (Romei et al., 2009), as well as visual orientation sensitivity (Cecere et al., 2014; Leo et al., 2011) compared to sounds of constant intensity. Additionally, looming auditory stimuli have been associated with preferential processing during multisensory integration (Cappe et al., 2012; Sutherland et al., 2014) and are claimed to be very salient since they increase phasic alertness (Bach et al., 2009) and activate a distributed brain network associated with attentional processes (Seifritz et al., 2002). If a comparable process is triggered during cross-modal DIB, one could assume that the auditory cue characteristics affect the detectability of the target. Thus, the increase in loudness as cue might have triggered a fast attentional allocation to the target stream and could have initiated a more efficient release of the negative attentional set than a tone of constant intensity.

To test if the cross-modal DIB effect observed in Experiment I is influenced by the feature defining the auditory cue, Experiment II was conducted. This subsequent experiment included the identical visual RSVP stream containing target and distractors and the same auditory stimulation, except for a different auditory feature - frequency composition - now defining the cue. We expected to replicate the cross-modal DIB effect from Experiment I. If a rise in amplitude as cue is an especially efficient release signal, the observed distractor effect at SOA 0 ms is expected to be larger in Experiment II compared to Experiment I. For visual stimuli, previous studies that experimentally manipulated cue salience indicated that a more salient cue is associated with a smaller DIB (Hay et al., 2006). To test for potential differences in cue salience, cue detection rates were assessed and compared between both experiments.

3.1 Method

3.1.1 Participants

Twenty-one new participants, who did not participate in Experiment I, were tested in Experiment II. The same requirements, exclusion criteria and a priori power analysis outlined

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

in section 2.1.1. applied for Experiment II. One participant had to be discarded due to fulfilling the second exclusion criterion. The final sample consisted of 20 participants (12 women; 18 – 35 years of age; $M_{age} = 25.59$, $SD = 4.46$).

3.1.2 Stimuli, procedure and design

Stimuli, experimental procedure and task were identical to Experiment I except for the feature defining the auditory cue. In this experiment, the cue was now embedded in stream 2 consisting of sine-wave tones. A deviant tone could appear at one point in this sequence, which consisted of an overlay of two pure tones (1,600 and 2,400 Hz; duration: 30 ms). This deviant tone served as cue. The same auditory cue has been applied in a previous study on the unimodal DID effect (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a). Importantly, the amplitude of the cue – and therefore its perceived loudness – was matched to the amplitude of all other tones in the RSAP sequence. Thus, the cue was solely defined by the frequency composition. The cue did appear again at a randomized temporal position between 3,100 – 4,000 ms after trial onset. The visual stream containing target and distractors was identical to Experiment I. The continuous tone was also presented but did not contain rises in amplitude and therefore no task relevant event. The experimental design is illustrated in Figure 3.

As in Experiment I, 290 trials were presented and cue-target-SOA (0 vs. 100 vs. 300 ms) and number of distractors (0 vs. 1 vs. 6-8) were manipulated within subjects. The assignment of trial numbers to experimental conditions remained unchanged (see section 2.2). The first analysis step mirrored the analysis procedure applied in Experiment I (see section 2.3). Additionally, to assess a potential influence of the auditory cue feature, results of Experiments I and II were analyzed in a two-way ANOVA including the between-subject factor ‘cue feature’ and the within-subject factor ‘number of distractors’, focusing on SOA 0 ms, where the effect should be most pronounced.

3.2 Results

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

The results of Experiment II are presented in Figure 3. False alarm rates were low (multiple distractors: $M = 2.67\%$, $SD = 6.35$; without distractors: $M = .89\%$, $SD = 2.75$), and not impacted by distractor presence, $F(1, 19) = 2.39$, $p = .139$, $\eta_p^2 = .112$.

The auditory cue was detected reliably ($M = 89.88\%$, $SD = 16.48$ for multiple distractors, SOA 0 ms), and cue detection rates did not differ significantly between Experiment I and II in this critical condition, $F(1, 37) = 2.02$, $p = .169$, $\eta_p^2 = .052$. Importantly, in none of the experimental conditions including a cue significant differences in cue detection rates could be stated, indicating a comparable salience of the two cues (see Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplement).

In replication of the results of Experiment I, the number of distractors significantly influenced the detection of the subsequent target, $F(2, 38) = 8.46$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .308$. Solely multiple distractors were associated with reduced hit rates (0 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 19) = 11.26$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .372$; 1 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 19) = 8.09$, $p = .010$, $\eta_p^2 = .299$; 0 vs. 1 distractor: $F(1, 19) = 3.19$, $p = .090$, $\eta_p^2 = .144$).

The factor 'SOA' had a significant influence, $F(1.48, 28.27) = 4.65$, $p = .027$, $\eta_p^2 = .197$, in the absence of an interaction between the SOA and number of distractors, $F(2.31, 43.80) = .98$, $p = .391$, $\eta_p^2 = .049$. Post-hoc tests between SOA conditions showed lower hit rates at SOA 0 compared to those at longer cue-target intervals (SOA 0 vs. 100 ms: $F(1, 19) = 8.11$, $p = .010$, $\eta_p^2 = .299$; SOA 0 vs. 300 ms: $F(1, 19) = 4.64$, $p = .044$, $\eta_p^2 = .196$). Target detection rates at SOAs 100 and 300 ms did not differ, $F(1, 19) = .29$, $p = .867$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$.

Figure 3

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

466 Task design and results of Experiment II

Experiment II

467 Note. The left panel shows the task design of Experiment II: Here, the cue was a deviant
 468 tone (i.e. overlay of two pure tones) within the stream of pure tones. Target and distractors
 469 were identical to Experiment I. The right panel shows the results of the experiment: Mean hit
 470 rates (in %; y-axis) depicted for the SOA conditions (x-axis) and the number of distractors.
 471 Error bars depict standard errors of the mean. As in Experiment I, target detection rates were
 472 reduced after multiple distractor events at short cue-target-SOAs.

473

474 **Comparison between Experiment I & II: Does the auditory cue feature influence the**
 475 **distractor effect?**

476 Combining the data from Experiments I and II, which solely differed in the feature
 477 defining the auditory cue, no main effect of the between-subject factor 'cue feature' could be
 478 stated, $F(1, 36) = .23$, $p = .868$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$. In the same way, no interaction between 'cue
 479 feature' and the within-subject factor 'number of distractors' at SOA 0 ms was observed, $F(2,$
 480 $72) = .08$, $p = .924$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$ (main effect number of distractors: $F(1.51, 54.44) = 20.32$, $p <$
 481 $.001$, $\eta_p^2 = .361$).

482 **3.3 Discussion**

483 The influence of distractors on detection of a visual target indicated by an auditory
 484 cue observed in Experiment I was replicated in Experiment II. Additionally, Experiment II
 485 showed that the cue feature rise in amplitude could not account for the high hit rates in
 486 Experiment I since an auditory cue of constant intensity was associated with a
 487 commensurate DIB effect. Importantly, cue detection was reliable and did not differ
 488 significantly between both experiments (see Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplement), speaking
 489 for a high and comparable salience of both auditory cues.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

The presence of very similar and relatively high target hit rates in both studies is not compatible with our initial assumption that the rise in amplitude led to an especially effective orientation of attention to the target and release of the inhibition. Instead, the findings indicate that dynamics in the 'loudness' of an auditory cue may not systematically influence the efficiency of visual target detection during cross-modal DIB. Based on the model proposed for DIB (Niedeggen et al., 2012), the features shared between target and distractors are crucial for the effect, while the cue feature would not be expected to have a substantial influence. The cue functions as a release signal of the distractor-induced inhibitory process (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a; Niedeggen et al., 2015) and should therefore only require a sufficient salience. The current data are in line with the assumption of the cue as a release signal.

The smaller absolute size of the cross-modal compared to the unimodal DIB was confirmed in Experiment II and could not be attributed to the auditory cue feature. However, as another alternative explanation, one could assume that the target feature local luminance change used in Experiments I and II might be a reason for the comparably weak distractor-induced effect. Maybe the local change in luminance is not associated with an efficient feature inhibition? To test this alternative explanation, in the final Experiment III, the target was now defined by a color change. This particular feature was associated with a very pronounced DIB effect within the visual modality (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018).

4. EXPERIMENT III

Cross-modal distractor-induced blindness can reliably be stated for the feature appearance of a small shape – associated with a local change in luminance –, as demonstrated by the corresponding results of Experiment I and II. Experiment III aimed to test whether the feature defining distractors and target might explain the observed high hit rates by investigating a potential influence of the visual target feature on cross-modal DIB. So far, the brief appearance of a small white circle with black outline was used as target (and

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

distractor) event, being embedded in a ‘preloader’ symbol in greyscale. This new feature should now be compared to the established feature color change, which has proven to be very efficient in eliciting feature inhibition (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018), leading to a larger DIB compared to motion stimuli. These previously observed differences, which might rely on differential processing of visual features in the cortex (i.e. ventral vs. dorsal stream) (Milner & Goodale, 2008), revealed a certain degree of feature specificity of visual DIB (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a).

A brief color change of the preloader symbol from a default color (here: green) to a target color (here: pink) served as target event in Experiment III. If a larger cross-modal DIB effect can be observed for the feature color than for a local change in luminance, the weaker cross-modal DIB effect can be attributed to target (and distractor) feature. This would confirm the previously described feature specificity.

4.1 Method

4.1.1 Participants

Nineteen participants that had not participated in one of the previous two experiments took part in Experiment III. Once again, the same inclusion and exclusion criteria and required sample size as in Experiments I and II applied (section 2.1.1). Following the exclusion of one participant due to unreliable performance during pretest (criterion 1), the final sample consisted of 18 participants (13 women; 18 – 40 years of age; $M_{age} = 27.65$, $SD = 6.74$).

4.1.2 Stimuli, procedure and design

The identical stimulus material, procedure and design as in Experiment I was used, with the exception of the configuration of the visual stream. In line with the previous experiments, the visual stream consisted of a ‘preloader’ symbol (1.66° in diameter) with a presentation rate of 10 Hz. The impression of a clockwise motion was once again elicited by

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

varying the luminance of the adjacent bars. While the visual stream contained grey scales ranging from white to black in Experiments I and II, the preloader symbol could now change its color. The preloader was usually colored in green (RGB: [0 255 0]; HSV: [120 100 100]), but could change to pink (RGB: [255 0 255]; HSV: [300 100 100]) for 100 ms. Both colors were adapted from visual DIB studies (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018). Importantly, color saturation and brightness did not differ between pink and green. The luminance of adjacent bars was graded within the respective color tone to create the impression of clockwise motion. If the color change to pink occurred with or after the auditory cue, this event was the target. Color changes to pink before the cue were considered distractor events that should be ignored. As in Experiment I, the cue was defined as a short rise in amplitude in the continuous tone. Stream 2 was presented concurrently, but did not contain any task relevant stimuli. The set-up of Experiment III is depicted in Figure 4.

290 trials were presented. Once again, cue-target-SOA (0 vs. 100 vs. 300 ms) and the number of distractors (0 vs. 1 vs. 6-8) were manipulated. Trial numbers for each experimental condition and the statistical analysis performed were identical to Experiment I and II (see section 2.2). A potential influence of the between-subject factor 'target feature' was examined in two-way ANOVA with the within-subject factor 'number of distractors' and the between-subject factor 'target feature' for the cue-target-SOA 0 ms.

Figure 4*Task design and results of Experiment III*

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Note. The task design of Experiment III is shown in the left panel: The cue was a rise in amplitude as in Experiment I. In contrast to both previous experiments, the feature defining distractors and target was now a color change of the preloader symbol from green to pink. The right panel illustrates the results: Mean hit rates (in %; y-axis) depicted for the cue-target-SOAs (x-axis) and the number of distractors. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean. Cross-modal DIB in terms of impaired target detection at short SOAs after multiple distractors could also be stated if distractors and target were defined by a brief color change.

4.2 Results

The experimental results of Experiment III are displayed in Figure 4. Response behavior was again reliable and few false alarms were produced (multiple distractors: $M = 1.93\%$, $SD = 5.32$; without distractors: $M = .56\%$, $SD = 2.36$; $F(1, 17) = 3.13$, $p = .095$, $\eta_p^2 = .155$). Cue detection rates were high ($M = 97.64\%$, $SD = 3.58$ for multiple distractors, SOA 0 ms).

In line with the previous experiments, a significant effect of the number of distractors presented before the cue could be stated, $F(1.38, 23.48) = 9.09$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .349$. Multiple color distractors impaired target detection (0 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 17) = 12.19$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .418$; 1 vs. multiple distractors: $F(1, 17) = 8.57$, $p = .009$, $\eta_p^2 = .335$; 0 vs. 1 distractor: $F(1, 17) = .33$, $p = .573$, $\eta_p^2 = .019$).

Higher hit rates were observed at larger cue-target-SOAs, $F(1.51, 25.74) = 10.21$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .375$ (SOA 0 vs. 100 ms: $F(1, 17) = 10.15$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .374$; SOA 0 vs. SOA 300 ms: $F(1, 17) = 12.77$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .429$; SOA 100 vs. 300 ms: $F(1, 17) = 3.99$, $p = .062$, $\eta_p^2 = .190$). Post-hoc tests following the significant interaction number of distractors x SOA, $F(2.50, 42.49) = 7.08$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .294$, showed a significant distractor effect at SOAs 0 and 100 ms (SOA 0 ms: $F(1.32, 22.38) = 11.22$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .398$; SOA 100 ms: $F(2, 34) = 5.11$, $p = .011$, $\eta_p^2 = .231$). At SOA 300 ms. this distractor effect had vanished ($F(2, 34) = .83$, $p = .446$, $\eta_p^2 = .046$). In the multiple distractor condition, hit rates significantly increased with increasing cue-target-SOA, $F(1.40, 23.86) = 13.39$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .441$, following a linear trend, $F(1, 17) = 16.16$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .487$.

Comparison between Experiment I & III: Does the visual target feature influence the distractor effect?

Experiment I and III only differed in the visual feature defining target and distractors and were compared to assess a possible influence of target feature on the cross-modal DIB effect. Importantly, the between-subject factor ‘target feature’ had no significant effect, $F(1, 34) = .10$, $p = .753$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$. No indications of feature specificity were obtained as demonstrated by the lack of a significant interaction between ‘target feature’ and ‘number of distractors’, $F(2, 68) = 1.09$, $p = .342$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$ (main effect number of distractors: $F(1.46, 49.54) = 22.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .400$).

4.3 Discussion

The results of Experiment III confirmed the cross-modal DIB effect with the typical behavioral characteristics for a different target feature. Importantly, a brief color change elicited a distractor effect of comparable magnitude as a change in luminance accompanying the appearance of a small white circle in Experiment I and II. The findings of Experiment III therefore contradict the notion that the overall high hit rates can be attributed to the new target feature but show that they persist for the established feature color change. In contrast to the unimodal DIB, we found no indications for a feature specificity of the cross-modal effect. Consequently, the finding of a relatively small cross-modal distractor effect elicited by a feature that was associated with a large “blindness” in the visual modality (Winther & Niedeggen, 2018) speaks for substantial differences between target detection in purely visual and cross-modal settings. These differences appear to be linked to the modality the cue is presented in: an auditory cue presumably supports visual target detection at short cue-target-SOAs more efficiently than a visual cue.

In sum, the observation of a highly significant, but comparably small decrease in target detection in the multiple distractor condition in all experiments indicates that despite the distractor-driven inhibitory process, visual target detection appears to succeed more often in cross- than in unimodal conditions.

621

622

5. General Discussion

5.1 Summary of results

624 In three behavioral experiments, a consistent effect of multiple visual distractors on
625 the detection of a visual target, which was indicated by an auditory cue, was found.
626 Confirming cross-modal distractor-induced blindness, target detection was most affected if
627 cue and target appeared simultaneously and the transient “blindness” had mostly vanished at
628 a cue-target-SOA of 300 ms. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that the appearance of a
629 small circle, associated with a local change in luminance, also elicits the inhibitory process
630 underlying DIB, establishing a new visual feature. However, the cross-modal distractor effect
631 was smaller than previously observed within the visual modality, as well as for auditory target
632 detection in unimodal and cross-modal conditions. The expression of the cross-modal DIB
633 did neither depend on the feature of the auditory cue (increase in amplitude vs. frequency
634 composition), nor on the feature of the visual target (local luminance change vs. color
635 change). Implications of the experimental results will be discussed in the following.

5.2 Implications for the inhibitory model underlying distractor-induced blindness

637 Multiple distractors, sharing the features of a target event, hinder target detection in
638 the visual (Michael et al., 2011; Sahraie et al., 2001) and auditory modality (Kern &
639 Niedeggen, 2021a), as well as in cross-modal conditions with cue and target stemming from
640 different sensory modalities (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b). The current data provide reliable
641 evidence that in line with the hypothesis, this distractor effect can also be observed if an
642 auditory cue indicates the appearance of a visual target. Consequently, for all four possible
643 combinations of cue and target within vision and audition, an effect of distractors on target
644 perception can be stated. Independent of the characteristics of cue and target, it was
645 consistently observed that (1) multiple distractors are required to decrease hit rates, while

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

one distractor is not sufficient, and (2) that the largest distractor effect occurs at a cue-target-SOA of 0 ms and decreases with increasing temporal distance between cue and target.

Experiments I and II confirmed a new visual feature, the appearance of a small circle, associated with a local change in luminance, for the DIB effect, therefore extending previous findings on distractor effects for motion, orientation and color (Michael et al., 2011; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018). That the distractor effect can be elicited by a variety of features, provided they are shared between distractors and target, indicates a large amount of feature adaptability for DIB.

In sum, these findings are in line with the assumption that DIB is caused by the cumulative activation of a negative attentional set by the repeated presentation of task-irrelevant, but target-like stimuli (Hesselmann et al., 2006; Niedeggen et al., 2012). Consequently, the same inhibitory mechanism seems to apply within visual and auditory modality, as well as in both possible combinations of these modalities.

However, the current findings also provide extensions of the DIB model. While cue salience can influence the expression of the distractor effect (Hay et al., 2006), Experiments I and II gave first evidence that the (auditory) cue feature does not seem to impact the efficiency of the distractor-induced inhibition when perceptual load and salience are kept constant. The cue appears to function as a signal for the deactivation of the distractor template, which requires a sufficient salience of the cue but apparently no specific auditory feature. This indicates in combination with previous results that the occurrence of the distractor effect is neither dependent on cue and target occurring in the same modality (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b), nor on the feature defining the cue. It remains to be examined whether comparable distractor effects for different cue features can also be observed in unimodal settings (e.g., visual), which would be expected based on the DIB model.

Another addition to the model lies in potential differences in the feature specificity of the effect between uni- and cross-modal DIB. For the visual modality, larger inhibitory effects for the target/distractor feature color than for motion stimuli were found, indicating some

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

amount of feature specificity of inhibitory processes (Ariga & Kawahara, 2004; Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a; Winther & Niedeggen, 2018). In contrast, for cross-modal DIB, the current data revealed that a color change is apparently as efficient as a local change in luminance in eliciting a target detection deficit. Whether different visual features are associated with inhibitory effects of different sizes might rely on the modality the cue is presented in. During unimodal DIB, a visual dual task, associated with high perceptual load in the visual modality, is presented. During cross-modal DIB, the dual task consists of one visual and one task-relevant auditory stream, which could be linked to a lower perceptual load and more available resources within each modality (Arrighi et al., 2011; Keitel et al., 2013). Consequently, it could be very cautiously proposed that feature specific effects regarding the inhibitory process might only be observable under high load conditions, and do therefore not occur in cross-modal tasks. Alternatively, instead of differences between unimodal and cross-modal processing, the observed lack of feature specificity for cross-modal DIB might be attributed to a similar functioning of feature inhibition for all properties that are processed in the same visual pathway. A color change and the appearance of a small circle are both features that are predominantly processed in the ventral visual stream (Kravitz et al., 2013). However, differences in inhibitory processes between predominantly 'ventral' and 'dorsal' features, as observed for visual DIB (Winther & Niedeggen, 2018), may exist, while taking into account that both pathways are interconnected (Goodale & Milner, 2010; Kravitz et al., 2013; Schenk & McIntosh, 2010). Both preliminary explanations require examination in future studies to pinpoint which account is more fitting.

5.2 Modality-specific differences in the magnitude of the distractor effect

Crucially, the current data allow a comparison of the magnitude of distractor-induced blindness and deafness in uni- and cross-modal conditions. In the visual domain, distractor effects on hit rate (here defined as: zero distractor – multiple distractor condition at cue-target-SOA 0 ms) are very pronounced (i.e. 30 % for orientation stimuli (Niedeggen et al., 2012); 46% for color stimuli (Winther & Niedeggen, 2017a); 27% for motion stimuli (Michael

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

et al., 2011)). In comparison to the visual effect, distractor-induced deafness shows a smaller magnitude. Unimodal and cross-modal DID appear to be roughly comparable in size (unimodal: 8-23% (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a); cross-modal: 13-28% (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021b)). The current findings in a cross-modal set-up with an auditory cue and a visual target suggest that under these circumstances, the distractor-induced target detection deficit is the smallest (i.e. 9-14%).

The observation of modality-specific differences in the size of the distractor effect raises the question how these differences can be accounted for. First, the high hit rates in the current study might be attributed to a response bias. This explanation can be ruled out, as in all three experiments, the number of false alarms was low (i.e., 0.6 – 3.5 %), indicating reliable response behavior. Second, it could be assumed that fundamental differences in the processing of distractors between visual and auditory modality exist (e.g., (Lavie & Tsai, 1994; Murphy et al., 2013), leading to larger distractor effects in visual compared to auditory modality. However, the data acquired with the DIB/DID paradigm are not in line with this assumption. A third possible explanation concerns the cue: the distractor effect might be more pronounced if the release signal is visual compared to auditory. Strikingly, the previous and current data provide some preliminary evidence for a possible impact of the modality the cue is presented in. The numerically smallest DIB/DID effects were observed if the cue stemmed from the auditory modality. This could indicate that an auditory cue might be an especially effective release signal, possibly due to the function of the auditory modality as ‘early warning system’ (Dalton & Lavie, 2007). However, the modality of the cue cannot provide a stand-alone explanation since unimodal DID appears to be more pronounced than cross-modal DIB, even though an auditory cue was present both times. Therefore, not only the modality the cue is presented in might have an impact but also if the task involves uni- or cross-modal stimulation.

Notably, reduced effects in cross-modal as compared to unimodal tasks have been reported for the related phenomena attentional blink (Arnell & Jenkins, 2004) and

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

inattentional blindness (Sinnott et al., 2006). Arnell and Jenkins (2004) stated that the visual attentional blink appears to be larger than the auditory effect, while cross-modal target detection deficits are usually the smallest (and are often not found at all, see (Hein et al., 2006; Soto-Faraco & Spence, 2002; Van der Burg et al., 2007)). Strikingly, Arnell and Jenkins (2004) observed that the cross-modal AB at short lags was smaller if a visual second target (T2) followed an auditory first target (T1) than vice versa. In contrast to the typical visual blink and the cross-modal effect for reversed modalities, visual T2 detection after an auditory T1 was enhanced at short compared to long T1-T2-intervals. This was interpreted as an auditory cueing effect exclusively occurring in this cross-modal condition (Arnell & Jenkins, 2004). This previous finding is in line with our current results and with the assumption that visual target detection succeeds more often, if an auditory compared to a visual cue precedes or accompanies the target. During DIB, an auditory cue seems to enable a faster and more efficient allocation of attention to the visual target and a faster release of the negative attentional set than a visual cue stemming from the same sensory modality than the target.

Multisensory research has established that a sound often enhances detection of a visual target, if they occur in temporal proximity (Chang et al., 2015; Fiebelkorn et al., 2011; Frassinetti et al., 2002; Koelewijn et al., 2010; Kusnir et al., 2011; Noesselt et al., 2010; Petersen et al., 2017; Van der Burg et al., 2008). These multisensory enhancement effects have been linked to the integration of temporally overlapping visual and auditory signals into one percept (Koelewijn et al., 2010; Senkowski et al., 2007; Wallace et al., 2020), to a cross-modal spread of attention (Talsma et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2016), and to auditory alerting (Kusnir et al., 2011). Multisensory enhancement effects could provide one suitable explanation for the relatively small cross-modal DIB effect observed here. An attentional enhancement of visual target processing caused by the auditory cue might have counteracted the distractor-driven inhibition of attentional allocation to target features to some degree. Therefore, the distractor effect might have been reduced at short cue-target-SOAs compared to unimodal settings.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Taken together, modality-specific differences in the magnitude of the distractor-induced decrease in hit rates can preliminarily be stated. These differences might be attributed to the modality the cue occurs in, with an auditory cue possibly acting as an especially effective release signal of the negative attentional set, and to particularities of cross-modal processing.

5.3 Limitations

One limitation of this study is that the present data do not enable a definite answer to the question as to why cross-modal DIB is a reliable, but smaller effect than observed in previous studies. Future research should aim to clarify whether the current findings are due to an auditory enhancement of visual processing, leading to increased hit rates at short cue-target-intervals and an especially efficient release of the negative attentional set, or if alternative explanations are more suitable. Furthermore, it remains unclear, why a visual cue did not lead to an enhancement of auditory target detection compared to unimodal DID (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a, 2021b), speaking for some specificity of multisensory enhancement regarding the modalities cue and target are presented in. It has been reported that a task-irrelevant light can improve auditory perception in contrast to the absence of a visual signal (Lovelace et al., 2003; Odgaard et al., 2004). However, our previous results indicated that a task-relevant visual cue embedded in a RSVP stream does not improve auditory detection in comparison to the unimodal setting (Kern & Niedeggen, 2021a, 2021b). Future studies should examine the modality-specific differences in DIB/DID in more detail to not only improve insight in possible differences in cue and target processing between sensory modalities but also in distinctions between cross-modal settings.

5.4 Conclusion

In sum, it was demonstrated that an inhibitory effect of visual target-like distractors on visual target detection can be stated if the signal for task relevance stems from the auditory modality. The observed cross-modal distractor-induced blindness was reduced in size compared to the cross-modal effect for reversed modalities as well as the unimodal

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

782 distractor-induced blindness but exhibited the same characteristics. Since neither cue nor
783 target feature could account for the smaller cross-modal blindness, our results indicate that
784 an auditory cue provides an especially efficient release signal of the inhibited visual features.
785 Compared to a visual signal of task relevance, an auditory cue might lead to a faster
786 attentional allocation to the target stream, especially in cross-modal conditions, where
787 multisensory enhancement effects might boost target detection.

788

789

Declarations

Acknowledgements: We thank Deborah Steininger for assistance in data collection.

Funding Information: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest: None.

Data availability: The datasets generated during the current study as well as the stimulus material and code are available in the Mendeley data repository
<https://www.doi.org/10.17632/wxmhwv7xvd.1>.

Ethics approval: This study was performed in line with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval was granted by the Ethics Committee of Freie Universität Berlin (027/2019).

Consent to participate: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Authors' contributions (Credit Author Statement):

Lea Kern: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original draft preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

Michael Niedeggen: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

References

- Andersen, T. S., & Mamassian, P. (2008). Audiovisual integration of stimulus transients. *Vision Research*, 48(25), 2537-2544. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2008.08.018>
- Ariga, A., & Kawahara, J.-I. (2004). The perceptual and cognitive distractor-previewing effect. *Journal of Vision*, 4(10), 5-5. <https://doi.org/10.1167/4.10.5>
- Arita, J. T., Carlisle, N. B., & Woodman, G. F. (2012). Templates for rejection: configuring attention to ignore task-irrelevant features. *Journal of Experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, 38(3), 580. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027885>
- Arnell, K. M., & Jenkins, R. (2004). Revisiting within-modality and cross-modality attentional blinks: Effects of target—distractor similarity. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 66(7), 1147-1161. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03196842>
- Arrighi, R., Lunardi, R., & Burr, D. (2011). Vision and audition do not share attentional resources in sustained tasks. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, 56. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00056>
- Bach, D. R., Neuhoff, J. G., Perrig, W., & Seifritz, E. (2009). Looming sounds as warning signals: The function of motion cues. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 74(1), 28-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2009.06.004>
- Boncompagni, G., & Cosmelli, D. (2018). Neural Correlates of Conscious Motion Perception. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 12(355). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00355>
- Cappe, C., Thelen, A., Romei, V., Thut, G., & Murray, M. M. (2012). Looming signals reveal synergistic principles of multisensory integration. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(4), 1171-1182. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5517-11.2012>
- Cecere, R., Romei, V., Bertini, C., & Làdavas, E. (2014). Crossmodal enhancement of visual orientation discrimination by looming sounds requires functional activation of primary visual areas: a case study. *Neuropsychologia*, 56, 350-358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.02.008>
- Chang, A. Y.-C., Kanai, R., & Seth, A. K. (2015). Cross-modal prediction changes the timing of conscious access during the motion-induced blindness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 31, 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2014.11.005>
- Dalton, P., & Lavie, N. (2007). Overriding auditory attentional capture. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 69(2), 162-171. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193739>
- Desimone, R., & Duncan, J. (1995). Neural mechanisms of selective visual attention. *Annual review of neuroscience*, 18(1), 193-222. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ne.18.030195.001205>
- Dombrowe, I., Donk, M., & Olivers, C. N. L. (2011). The costs of switching attentional sets. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 73(8), 2481-2488. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-011-0198-3>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior research methods*, 39(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Feldmann-Wüstefeld, T., & Vogel, E. K. (2019). Neural evidence for the contribution of active suppression during working memory filtering. *Cerebral Cortex*, 29(2), 529-543. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx336>
- Fiebelkorn, I. C., Foxe, J. J., Butler, J. S., & Molholm, S. (2011). Auditory facilitation of visual-target detection persists regardless of retinal eccentricity and despite wide audiovisual misalignments. *Experimental brain research*, 213(2), 167-174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2670-7>
- Folk, C. L., Leber, A. B., & Egeth, H. E. (2008). Top-down control settings and the attentional blink: Evidence for nonspatial contingent capture. *Visual Cognition*, 16(5), 616-642. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506280601134018>
- Frassinetti, F., Bolognini, N., & Làdavas, E. (2002). Enhancement of visual perception by crossmodal visuo-auditory interaction. *Experimental brain research*, 147(3), 332-343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-002-1262-y>

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

- Giard, M. H., & Peronnet, F. (1999). Auditory-visual integration during multimodal object recognition in humans: a behavioral and electrophysiological study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 11(5), 473-490. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892999563544>
- Gleiss, S., & Kayser, C. (2013). Eccentricity dependent auditory enhancement of visual stimulus detection but not discrimination. *Frontiers in integrative neuroscience*, 7, 52. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2013.00052>
- Goodale, M. A., & Milner, A. D. (2010). Two visual streams: Interconnections do not imply duplication of function. *Cognitive neuroscience*, 1(1), 65-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17588920903511635>
- Hasher, L., Lustig, C., & Zacks, R. (2007). Inhibitory mechanisms and the control of attention. In C. Jarrold (Ed.), *Variation in Working Memory* (pp. 227-249). Oxford University Press.
- Hay, J. L., Milders, M. M., Sahraie, A., & Niedeggen, M. (2006). The effect of perceptual load on attention-induced motion blindness: The efficiency of selective inhibition. *Journal of Experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, 32(4), 885-907. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.32.4.885>
- Hein, G., Parr, A., & Duncan, J. (2006). Within-modality and cross-modality attentional blinks in a simple discrimination task. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 68(1), 54-61. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193655>
- Hesselmann, G., Allan, J. L., Sahraie, A., Milders, M., & Niedeggen, M. (2009). Inhibition related impairments of coherent motion perception in the attention-induced motion blindness paradigm. *Spatial Vision*, 22(6), 493-509. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156856809789822961>
- Hesselmann, G., Niedeggen, M., Sahraie, A., & Milders, M. (2006). Specifying the distractor inhibition account of attention-induced motion blindness. *Vision Research*, 46(6-7), 1048-1056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2005.10.007>
- Keitel, C., Maess, B., Schröger, E., & Müller, M. M. (2013). Early visual and auditory processing rely on modality-specific attentional resources. *Neuroimage*, 70, 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.12.046>
- Kern, L., & Niedeggen, M. (2021a). Distractor-induced deafness: The effect of multiple auditory distractors on conscious target processing. *Cortex*, 134, 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.10.015>
- Kern, L., & Niedeggen, M. (2021b). ERP signatures of auditory awareness in cross-modal distractor-induced deafness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 96, 103241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2021.103241>
- Klapetek, A., Ngo, M. K., & Spence, C. (2012). Does crossmodal correspondence modulate the facilitatory effect of auditory cues on visual search? *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 74(6), 1154-1167. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-012-0317-9>
- Koelewijn, T., Bronkhorst, A., & Theeuwes, J. (2010). Attention and the multiple stages of multisensory integration: A review of audiovisual studies. *Acta Psychologica*, 134(3), 372-384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.03.010>
- Kravitz, D. J., Saleem, K. S., Baker, C. I., Ungerleider, L. G., & Mishkin, M. (2013). The ventral visual pathway: an expanded neural framework for the processing of object quality. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(1), 26-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.10.011>
- Kusnir, F., Chica, A. B., Mitsumasu, M. A., & Bartolomeo, P. (2011). Phasic auditory alerting improves visual conscious perception. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 20(4), 1201-1210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2011.01.012>
- Lavie, N., & Tsai, Y. (1994). Perceptual load as a major determinant of the locus of selection in visual attention [journal article]. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 56(2), 183-197. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03213897>
- Leber, A. B., & Egeth, H. E. (2006). Attention on autopilot: Past experience and attentional set. *Visual Cognition*, 14(4-8), 565-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506280500193438>
- Leo, F., Romei, V., Freeman, E., Ladavas, E., & Driver, J. (2011). Looming sounds enhance orientation sensitivity for visual stimuli on the same side as such sounds.

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

- 924 *Experimental brain research*, 213(2), 193-201. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-011-2742-8)
 925 2742-8
- 926 Lippert, M., Logothetis, N. K., & Kayser, C. (2007). Improvement of visual contrast detection
 927 by a simultaneous sound. *Brain Research*, 1173, 102-109.
 928 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2007.07.050>
- 929 Lleras, A., Kawahara, J.-I., Wan, X. I., & Ariga, A. (2008). Intertrial inhibition of focused
 930 attention in pop-out search. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 70(1), 114-131.
 931 <https://doi.org/10.3758/PP.70.1.114>
- 932 Lovelace, C. T., Stein, B. E., & Wallace, M. T. (2003). An irrelevant light enhances auditory
 933 detection in humans: a psychophysical analysis of multisensory integration in stimulus
 934 detection. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 17(2), 447-453. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(03)00160-5)
 935 6410(03)00160-5
- 936 Michael, L., Hesselmann, G., Kiefer, M., & Niedeggen, M. (2011). Distractor-induced
 937 blindness for orientation changes and coherent motion. *Vision Research*, 51(15),
 938 1781-1787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2011.06.007>
- 939 Milner, A. D., & Goodale, M. A. (2008). Two visual systems re-viewed. *Neuropsychologia*,
 940 46(3), 774-785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.10.005>
- 941 Moher, J., Lakshmanan, B. M., Egeth, H. E., & Ewen, J. B. (2014). Inhibition drives early
 942 feature-based attention. *Psychological Science*, 25(2), 315-324.
 943 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613511257>
- 944 Murphy, S., Fraenkel, N., & Dalton, P. (2013). Perceptual load does not modulate auditory
 945 distractor processing. *Cognition*, 129(2), 345-355.
 946 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.07.014>
- 947 Nee, D. E., Brown, J. W., Askren, M. K., Berman, M. G., Demiralp, E., Krawitz, A., & Jonides,
 948 J. (2013). A meta-analysis of executive components of working memory. *Cerebral*
 949 *Cortex*, 23(2), 264-282. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs007>
- 950 Niedeggen, M., Busch, N. A., & Winther, G. N. (2015). The state of a central inhibition
 951 system predicts access to visual targets: An ERP study on distractor-induced
 952 blindness (DIB). *Consciousness and Cognition*, 35, 308-318.
 953 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2015.02.002>
- 954 Niedeggen, M., Michael, L., & Hesselmann, G. (2012). Closing the gates to consciousness:
 955 distractors activate a central inhibition process. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*,
 956 24(6), 1294-1304. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00177
- 957 Noesselt, T., Bergmann, D., Hake, M., Heinze, H.-J., & Fendrich, R. (2008). Sound increases
 958 the saliency of visual events. *Brain Research*, 1220, 157-163.
 959 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2007.12.060>
- 960 Noesselt, T., Tyll, S., Boehler, C. N., Budinger, E., Heinze, H.-J., & Driver, J. (2010). Sound-
 961 induced enhancement of low-intensity vision: multisensory influences on human
 962 sensory-specific cortices and thalamic bodies relate to perceptual enhancement of
 963 visual detection sensitivity. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30(41), 13609-13623.
 964 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4524-09.2010>
- 965 Odgaard, E. C., Ariei, Y., & Marks, L. E. (2004). Brighter noise: sensory enhancement of
 966 perceived loudness by concurrent visual stimulation. *Cognitive, Affective, &*
 967 *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 4(2), 127-132. <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.4.2.127>
- 968 Olivers, C. N. L., & Meeter, M. (2008). A boost and bounce theory of temporal attention.
 969 *Psychological review*, 115(4), 836-863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013395>
- 970 Olivers, C. N. L., & Watson, D. G. (2006). Input control processes in rapid serial visual
 971 presentations: Target selection and distractor inhibition. *Journal of Experimental*
 972 *psychology: Human perception and performance*, 32(5), 1083-1094.
 973 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.32.5.1083>
- 974 Petersen, A., Petersen, A. H., Bundesen, C., Vangkilde, S., & Habekost, T. (2017). The
 975 effect of phasic auditory alerting on visual perception. *Cognition*, 165, 73-81.
 976 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2017.04.004>
- 977 Romei, V., Murray, M. M., Cappe, C., & Thut, G. (2009). Preperceptual and stimulus-
 978 selective enhancement of low-level human visual cortex excitability by sounds.
 979 *Current Biology*, 19(21), 1799-1805. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.09.027>

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

- Sahraie, A., Milders, M., & Niedeggen, M. (2001). Attention induced motion blindness. *Vision Research*, 41(13), 1613-1617. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0042-6989\(01\)00065-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0042-6989(01)00065-7)
- Schenk, T., & McIntosh, R. D. (2010). Do we have independent visual streams for perception and action? *Cognitive neuroscience*, 1(1), 52-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17588920903388950>
- Seifritz, E., Neuhoff, J. G., Bilecen, D., Scheffler, K., Mustovic, H., Schächinger, H., Elefante, R., & Di Salle, F. (2002). Neural processing of auditory looming in the human brain. *Current Biology*, 12(24), 2147-2151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822\(02\)01356-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(02)01356-8)
- Senkowski, D., Talsma, D., Grigutsch, M., Herrmann, C. S., & Woldorff, M. G. (2007). Good times for multisensory integration: effects of the precision of temporal synchrony as revealed by gamma-band oscillations. *Neuropsychologia*, 45(3), 561-571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.01.013>
- Sinnett, S., Costa, A., & Soto-Faraco, S. (2006). Manipulating inattentional blindness within and across sensory modalities. *The quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59(8), 1425-1442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210500298948>
- Soto-Faraco, S., & Spence, C. (2002). Modality-specific auditory and visual temporal processing deficits. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 55(1), 23-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724980143000136>
- Spence, C., Senkowski, D., & Röder, B. (2009). Crossmodal processing. *Experimental brain research*, 198, 107-111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-009-1973-4>
- Stein, B. E., London, N., Wilkinson, L. K., & Price, D. D. (1996). Enhancement of perceived visual intensity by auditory stimuli: a psychophysical analysis. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 8(6), 497-506. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.1996.8.6.497>
- Stein, B. E., & Stanford, T. R. (2008). Multisensory integration: current issues from the perspective of the single neuron. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9(4), 255-266. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2331>
- Stevenson, R. A., Ghose, D., Fister, J. K., Sarko, D. K., Altieri, N. A., Nidiffer, A. R., Kurela, L. R., Siemann, J. K., James, T. W., & Wallace, M. T. (2014). Identifying and quantifying multisensory integration: a tutorial review. *Brain topography*, 27(6), 707-730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-014-0365-7>
- Sutherland, C. A. M., Thut, G., & Romei, V. (2014). Hearing brighter: Changing in-depth visual perception through looming sounds. *Cognition*, 132(3), 312-323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.04.011>
- Talsma, D., Senkowski, D., Soto-Faraco, S., & Woldorff, M. G. (2010). The multifaceted interplay between attention and multisensory integration. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14(9), 400-410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.06.008>
- Tang, X., Wu, J., & Shen, Y. (2016). The interactions of multisensory integration with endogenous and exogenous attention. *Neuroscience Biobehavioral Reviews*, 61, 208-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.11.002>
- Valyear, K. F., Culham, J. C., Sharif, N., Westwood, D., & Goodale, M. A. (2006). A double dissociation between sensitivity to changes in object identity and object orientation in the ventral and dorsal visual streams: a human fMRI study. *Neuropsychologia*, 44(2), 218-228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.05.004>
- Van der Burg, E., Olivers, C. N. L., Bronkhorst, A. W., Koelewijn, T., & Theeuwes, J. (2007). The absence of an auditory-visual attentional blink is not due to echoic memory. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 69(7), 1230-1241. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193958>
- Van der Burg, E., Olivers, C. N. L., Bronkhorst, A. W., & Theeuwes, J. (2008). Pip and pop: nonspatial auditory signals improve spatial visual search. *Journal of Experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, 34(5), 1053-1065. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.34.5.1053>
- Van der Burg, E., Talsma, D., Olivers, C. N. L., Hickey, C., & Theeuwes, J. (2011). Early multisensory interactions affect the competition among multiple visual objects. *Neuroimage*, 55(3), 1208-1218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.12.068>
- Wager, T. D., & Smith, E. E. (2003). Neuroimaging studies of working memory. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 3(4), 255-274. <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.3.4.255>

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

- 1036 Wallace, M. T., Woynaroski, T. G., & Stevenson, R. A. (2020). Multisensory integration as a
 1037 window into orderly and disrupted cognition and communication. *Annual Review of*
 1038 *Psychology*, 71, 193-219. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-051112>
- 1039 Winther, G. N., & Niedeggen, M. (2017a). Adaptability and specificity of inhibition processes
 1040 in distractor-induced blindness. *Psychophysiology*, 54(12), 1882-1898.
 1041 <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12974>
- 1042 Winther, G. N., & Niedeggen, M. (2017b). Distractor-Induced Blindness: A Special Case of
 1043 Contingent Attentional Capture? *Advances in Cognitive Psychology*, 13(1), 52-63.
 1044 <https://doi.org/10.5709/acp-0206-5>
- 1045 Winther, G. N., & Niedeggen, M. (2018). Differential activation of a central inhibition system
 1046 by motion and colour distractors. *Visual Cognition*, 26(10), 802-816.
 1047 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2018.1561566>
- 1048 Woodman, G. F., & Luck, S. J. (2007). Do the contents of visual working memory
 1049 automatically influence attentional selection during visual search? *Journal of*
 1050 *Experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, 33(2), 363.
 1051 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.33.2.363>
- 1052 Wu, X., & Fu, S. (2017). The different roles of category-and feature-specific attentional
 1053 control settings on attentional enhancement and inhibition. *Attention, Perception, &*
 1054 *Psychophysics*, 79(7), 1968-1978. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-017-1363-0>
- 1055 Zhang, D., Zhou, X., & Martens, S. (2009). The impact of negative attentional set upon target
 1056 processing in RSVP: An ERP study. *Neuropsychologia*, 47(12), 2604-2614.
 1057 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2009.05.008>
- 1058 Zhao, S., Feng, C., Huang, X., Wang, Y., & Feng, W. (2020). Neural basis of semantically
 1059 dependent and independent cross-modal boosts on the attentional blink. *Cerebral*
 1060 *Cortex*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhaa362>
- 1061
- 1062 [dataset, PsychoPy code & stimulus material] Kern, L. & Niedeggen, M. (2022). Cross-modal
 1063 distractor-induced blindness. Mendeley Data, V1,
 1064 <https://www.doi.org/10.17632/wxmhwv7xvd.1>

CROSS-MODAL DISTRACTOR-INDUCED BLINDNESS

Table 1*Mean target hit rates and 95% Confidence intervals (CIs) in Experiments I-III*

Distractors	Experiment I			Experiment II			Experiment III		
	SOA 0 ms	SOA 100 ms	SOA 300 ms	SOA 0 ms	SOA 100 ms	SOA 300 ms	SOA 0 ms	SOA 100 ms	SOA 300 ms
0	$M = 95.22$	$M = 95.87$	$M = 93.38$	$M = 94.42$	$M = 96.22$	$M = 95.05$	$M = 97.60$	$M = 97.41$	$M = 95.24$
	CI [90.60, 99.83]	CI [92.42, 99.31]	CI [87.14, 99.63]	CI [88.56, 100.27]	CI [91.76, 100.67]	CI [91.53, 98.57]	CI [95.23, 99.97]	CI [93.69, 101.13]	CI [91.32, 99.17]
1	$M = 92.42$	$M = 91.36$	$M = 92.44$	$M = 91.24$	$M = 92.51$	$M = 94.87$	$M = 95.24$	$M = 96.22$	$M = 97.11$
	CI [86.23, 98.61]	CI [84.16, 98.55]	CI [87.56, 97.31]	CI [84.56, 97.91]	CI [86.89, 98.12]	CI [90.72, 99.01]	CI [91.78, 98.71]	CI [93.68, 98.75]	CI [94.43, 99.78]
6-8	$M = 85.85$	$M = 88.82$	$M = 92.00$	$M = 85.79$	$M = 90.88$	$M = 90.10$	$M = 83.87$	$M = 90.76$	$M = 96.28$
	CI [77.65, 94.05]	CI [81.94, 95.69]	CI [86.48, 97.52]	CI [78.90, 92.69]	CI [85.29, 96.46]	CI [83.34, 96.87]	CI [75.68, 92.05]	CI [85.19, 96.33]	CI [93.29, 99.26]