What the Attentional-SNARC and its (null) replications can and cannot tell us

Krzysztof Cipora^{1*} & Hans-Christoph Nuerk^{2,3}

¹ Centre for Mathematical Cognition, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK

² Department of Psychology, University of Tuebingen, Tuebingen, Germany

³ LEAD Graduate School & Research Network, University of Tuebingen, Tuebingen, Germany

* Corresponding author

Centre for Mathematical Cognition, Wavy Top Building

Loughborough University

LE11 3TU United Kingdom

Email: k.cipora@lboro.ac.uk

Abstract

In response to a recent point raised by Fischer et al. (2020), we discuss the theoretical implications of both the original Attentional SNARC (Att-SNARC) and its recent failed multi-laboratory replication. In our view, the theoretical importance of the original Att-SNARC can be summarized in two points: (1) there is a conceptual link between numbers and space, which can be observed as Spatial-Numerical Associations, and (2) Spatial-Numerical Associations are involuntary and automatic. We conclude that convergent evidence from other paradigms saves the first point from being challenged in light of the failed replication; but, on the other hand, empirical evidence for the second point no longer holds.

104 words

Keywords: Attentional SNARC, Spatial-Numerical Associations, SNA, Automaticity

In 2003 Fischer and colleagues demonstrated that in a Posner-like cuing paradigm, non-informative, centrally presented numerical cues cause spatial shifts of attention and facilitate detection of subsequently presented lateral visual targets, similarly to arrows. Small magnitude numbers lead to faster detection of left-side targets whereas large magnitude numbers lead to faster detection of right-side targets. This effect was called Attentional SNARC (Att-SNARC) and it is among the most influential studies in numerical cognition. At the time of the writing of this sentence the original paper has been cited over 760 times. Direct and conceptual replication attempts of Att-SNARC have been made (Dodd et al., 2008; Fattorini et al., 2015, 2016; Galfano et al., 2006; Pellegrino et al., 2019; Ristic & Kingstone, 2006; van Dijck et al., 2013; Zanolie & Pecher, 2014) with mixed outcomes. Importantly, most of the successful replications enforced semantic processing of numerical cues, for instance, by introducing catch trials (Cipora, He, et al., 2020 for an overview). A recent multi-laboratory replication (Colling et al., 2020) following the original protocol (i.e., the processing of numerical cues was not enforced) failed to replicate Att-SNARC. On the basis of a recently developed framework for directional Spatial-Numerical Associations (SNAs; Cipora et al., 2018), we focus on (1) why the original study gained so much interest, or what Att-SNARC seemed to tell us about number processing that other SNAs did not, and (2) what new developments (including the multi-laboratory replication) can and cannot tell us in the context of Att-SNARC. At the same time, we challenge the statement made by the authors of the original Att-SNARC paper (Fischer et al., 2020) in their commentary on the multi-laboratory replication of Colling and colleagues (2020).

The two messages of Att-SNARC

In our opinion, there are two important messages of Att-SNARC as it was originally reported:

1. There is a conceptual link (association) between numbers and space. Such a link is expressed in different SNAs (Cipora, Haman, et al., 2020). In the case of Att-SNARC this link is elicited neither by spatial location of numbers nor the location of response keys. Moreover, Att-SNARC has no functional role in the context of the task: spatial mapping of numbers does not help one to complete the task. Importantly, this link is manifested by the alterations of function of a basic cognitive process (i.e., spatial attention).

2. This SNA occurs fully automatically (i.e., it is involuntary; not related to any enforced processing).

These points are theoretically important to our understanding of the links between numbers and space, as was acknowledged by Fischer et al. (2020) in their commentary on the unsuccessful multi-laboratory replication of Colling and colleagues (2020). Fischer and colleagues point towards the purity and robustness of links between space and numbers. However, we argue that presence of the conceptual link and the automatic nature of the SNA are not the same and should not be treated as such. As we show below, the strength of empirical evidence for purity and automaticity is different. In particular, we disagree with and argue against Fischer and colleagues' claim that enforced numerical cue processing, or lack of thereof, should be treated as just one potential moderator of Att-SNARC.

[The conceptual link between numbers and space](#)

To understand the nature of the link between numbers and space it is important to establish whether such a link can be observed in the absence of perceptual and response related confounds between space and numbers (Fischer & Shaki, 2016; Shaki & Fischer, 2018). In this sense, Att-SNARC provides strong evidence that the link is not primed by making salient either stimuli presentation (numerical cues are presented centrally and do not allow for the prediction of target location), or response side (participants respond with one, centrally located response key).

The claim regarding the presence of the conceptual link is not only supported by the original Att-SNARC finding but also several other paradigms, including Att-SNARC studies that enforced numerical cue processing and thus observed the cuing effect. Similar evidence comes from studies on attentional biases in number comparison (Salvaggio et al., 2019) or mental arithmetic showing that conducting mental additions / subtractions leads to spatial biases to the right and left sides, respectively (Masson et al., 2018). Other spatial biases have been linked to response stage (e.g., Andres et al., 2020; Masson et al., 2020). Importantly, the recent failed multi-laboratory replication does not support the claim of an existence of a conceptual link; however, it does not disprove it completely at the theoretical level either, because, as pointed out by Fischer and colleagues (2020), there is convergent evidence for such a link from multiple studies and paradigms. Regarding the conceptual link between

numbers and space, the original Att-SNARC study is not qualitatively different from studies that enforced numerical cue processing or other similar paradigms.

Importantly, the claim for the conceptual (i.e., independent from specific stimuli and response setups) link between numbers and space is its bi-directionality. Not only do processing of numbers influences spatial processing. Directional actions in space affect number processing as well. Evidence from that comes from studies on random number generation while performing directional head movements (e.g., Loetscher et al., 2008; but see Moser et al., 2017 for a non-replication), or optokinetic stimulation affecting the number processing (e.g., Ranzini et al., 2015). In a similar vein, studies on patients with neglect show the impairment of number processing when spatial processing is distorted (e.g., Vuilleumier et al., 2004).

To sum up, the presence of the conceptual link between numbers and directional space seems to be quite well established, and comes from variety of paradigms. Therefore, failure to replicate the Att-SNARC does not challenge this claim considerably.

Automatic and spontaneous association

The other, in our view, equally important conclusion of the original Att-SNARC paper is that the association of numbers and space occurs spontaneously; as stated in the initial paper, the participants did not have to process the numerical cues. In fact, the cues could be ignored completely. Participants could still successfully perform the detection task even if the part of the display that presented the cues was occluded during the experiment. We know that in similar cuing paradigms both arrows and social cues such as symbolic drawings of faces gazing to the right or left cannot be ignored (Galfano et al., 2006). The finding of such an automatic effect for numbers in the original Att-SNARC report fits well into the discussion on the nature of the links between space and numbers. *The automaticity of the association is what makes a qualitative difference between the original Att-SNARC and other studies. However, over the years and across multiple replications, including the multi-laboratory replication, the claim of automaticity has not been supported* (see also Casarotti et al., 2007). The multi-laboratory replication as well as several prior studies (for a review see Pellegrino et al., 2019) clearly show that passive viewing of numbers does not cause attention to shift as was implicated in the original Att-SNARC paper.

In our view, the spontaneity of Att-SNARC, or lack of thereof, is not only a matter of one or another unknown moderator (which was not considered either in the original Att-SNARC paper or in the multi-laboratory replication) as implied by Fischer and colleagues (2020). As we mentioned above, studies that enforce number processing are actually tackling only the conceptual link, and do not tell us anything about an automatic / spontaneous nature of the effect. In other words, these studies are providing evidence for only part of the claims of the original paper. At the same time, such studies either remain neutral about automaticity, or simply show that SNAs evoked by semantic processing are not automatically elicited in absence of enforced number processing (e.g., Weis et al., 2018). A growing body of evidence shows that selective attention directed towards numbers is important or even necessary to evoke directional spatial associations in different experimental setups (Cipora, He, et al., 2020 for a review), and it seems to be true for Att-SNARC as well.

Conclusion

We think that the convergent evidence from conceptual replications and other paradigms supports only one part of the story originally presented by Fischer and colleagues (2003): that a conceptual link between numbers and space exists and it is neither elicited by spatial location of numbers nor location of response keys. Even though Att-SNARC has not been replicated in a multi-laboratory study, other paradigms provide evidence for this theoretical assumption. However, the automaticity aspect is not warranted any more, at least in the Att-SNARC paradigm, and still lacks solid empirical evidence in other paradigms. Numbers, which are not semantically processed, do not seem to automatically direct attention towards a certain direction in space. Future efforts should focus on establishing boundary conditions and factors that amplify SNAs.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Nicolas Masson and Julia Banhnmueller for their feedback to the previous version of this manuscript. We would also like to thank Zoë Kirste for language proofreading.

References

- Andres, M., Salvaggio, S., Lefèvre, N., Pesenti, M., & Masson, N. (2020). Semantic associations between arithmetic and space: Evidence from temporal order judgements. *Memory and Cognition*, 48(3), 361–369. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-019-00975-9>
- Casarotti, M., Michielin, M., Zorzi, M., & Umiltà, C. (2007). Temporal order judgment reveals how number magnitude affects visuospatial attention. *Cognition*, 102(1), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2006.09.001>
- Cipora, K., Haman, M., Domahs, F., & Nuerk, H.-C. (2020). Editorial: On the Development of Space-Number Relations: Linguistic and Cognitive Determinants, Influences, and Associations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(February), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00182>
- Cipora, K., He, Y., & Nuerk, H.-C. (2020). The Spatial Numerical Association of Response Codes effect and math skills: why related? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14355>
- Cipora, K., Schroeder, P. A., Soltanlou, M., & Nuerk, H.-C. (2018). More space, better mathematics: Is space a powerful tool or a cornerstone for understanding arithmetic? In K. S. Mix & M. T. Battista (Eds.), *Visualizing Mathematics: The Role of Spatial Reasoning in Mathematical Thought* (pp. 77–116). Springer Cham. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98767-5_4 77
- Colling, L. J., Szűcs, D., De Marco, D., Cipora, K., Ulrich, R., Nuerk, H.-C., Soltanlou, M., Bryce, D., Chen, S.-C., Schroeder, P. A., Henare, D. T., Chrystall, C. K., Corballis, P. M., Ansari, D., Goffin, C., Sokolowski, H. M., Hancock, P. J. B., Millen, A. E., Langton, S. R. H., ... McShane, B. B. (2020). Registered Replication Report on Fischer, Castel, Dodd, and Pratt (2003). *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920903079>
- Dodd, M. D., Van der Stigchel, S., Adil Leghari, M., Fung, G., & Kingstone, A. (2008). Attentional SNARC: There's something special about numbers (let us count the ways). *Cognition*, 108(3), 810–818. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.04.006>
- Fattorini, E., Pinto, M., Merola, S., D'Onofrio, M., & Doricchi, F. (2016). On the instability and

- constraints of the interaction between number representation and spatial attention in healthy humans: A concise review of the literature and new experimental evidence. *Progress in Brain Research*, 227, 223–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2016.04.023>
- Fattorini, E., Pinto, M., Rotondaro, F., & Doricchi, F. (2015). Perceiving numbers does not cause automatic shifts of spatial attention. *Cortex*, 73, 298–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.09.007>
- Fischer, M. H., Castel, A. D., Dodd, M. D., & Pratt, J. (2003). Perceiving numbers causes spatial shifts of attention. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6(6), 555–556. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1066>
- Fischer, M. H., Dodd, M. D., Castel, A. D., & Pratt, J. (2020). The Unbearable Lightness of Attentional Cuing by Symbolic Magnitude: Commentary on the Registered Replication Report by Colling et al. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920902743>
- Fischer, M. H., & Shaki, S. (2016). Measuring spatial-numerical associations: evidence for a purely conceptual link. *Psychological Research*, 80(1), 109–112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-015-0646-0>
- Galfano, G., Rusconi, E., & Umiltà, C. (2006). Number magnitude orients attention, but not against one's will. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 13(5), 869–874. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194011>
- Loetscher, T., Schwarz, U., Schubiger, M., & Brugger, P. (2008). Head turns bias the brain's internal random generator. *Current Biology*, 18(2), 60–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.11.015>
- Masson, N., Andres, M., Alsamour, M., Bollen, Z., & Pesenti, M. (2020). Spatial biases in mental arithmetic are independent of reading/writing habits: Evidence from French and Arabic speakers. *Cognition*, 200(May 2019), 104262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104262>
- Masson, N., Letesson, C., & Pesenti, M. (2018). Time course of overt attentional shifts in mental arithmetic: Evidence from gaze metrics. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology (2006)*, 71(4), 1009–1019.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2017.1318931>

- Moser, I., Vibert, D., Caversaccio, M. D., & Mast, F. W. (2017). Acute peripheral vestibular deficit increases redundancy in random number generation. *Experimental Brain Research*, 235(2), 627–637. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-016-4829-8>
- Pellegrino, M., Pinto, M., Marson, F., Lasaponara, S., Rossi-Arnaud, C., Cestari, V., & Doricchi, F. (2019). The Attentional-SNARC effect 16 years later: no automatic space–number association (taking into account finger counting style, imagery vividness, and learning style in 174 participants). *Experimental Brain Research*, 237(10), 2633–2643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-019-05617-9>
- Ranzini, M., Lisi, M., Blini, E., Pitteri, M., Treccani, B., Priftis, K., & Zorzi, M. (2015). Larger, smaller, odd or even? Task-specific effects of optokinetic stimulation on the mental number space. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 27(4), 459–470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2014.941847>
- Ristic, J., & Kingstone, A. (2006). Attention to arrows: Pointing to a new direction. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59(11), 1921–1930. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210500416367>
- Salvaggio, S., Masson, N., & Andres, M. (2019). Eye Position Reflects the Spatial Coding of Numbers During Magnitude Comparison. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, 45(10), 1910–1921. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000681>
- Shaki, S., & Fischer, M. H. (2018). Deconstructing spatial-numerical associations. *Cognition*, 175(February), 109–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.02.022>
- van Dijck, J. P., Abrahamse, E. L., Majerus, S., & Fias, W. (2013). Spatial Attention Interacts With Serial-Order Retrieval From Verbal Working Memory. *Psychological Science*, 24(9), 1854–1859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613479610>
- Vuilleumier, P., Ortigue, S., & Brugger, P. (2004). The Number Space and Neglect. *Cortex*, 40(2), 399–410. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(08\)70134-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(08)70134-5)
- Weis, T., Nuerk, H.-C., & Lachmann, T. (2018). Attention allows the SNARC effect to operate on multiple number lines. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-32174-y>

Zanolie, K., & Pecher, D. (2014). Number-induced shifts in spatial attention: A replication study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(AUG), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00987>