Explicit semantic stimulus categorization interferes with implicit emotion processing
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Previous functional magnetic resonance imaging and event-related brain potential studies revealed that performing a cognitive task may suppress the preferential processing of emotional stimuli. However, these studies utilized simple and artificial tasks (i.e. letter, shape or orientation discrimination tasks), unfamiliar to the participants. The present event-related potential study examined the emotion–attention interaction in the context of a comparably more natural scene categorization task. Deciding whether a natural scene contains an animal or not is a familiar and meaningful task to the participants and presumed to require little attentional resources. The task images were presented centrally and were overlaid on emotional or neutral background pictures. Thus, implicit emotion and explicit semantic categorization may compete for processing resources in neural regions implicated in object recognition. Additionally, participants passively viewed the same stimulus materials without the demand to categorize task images. Significant interactions between task condition and emotional picture valence were observed for the occipital negativity and late positive potential. In the passive viewing condition, emotional background images elicited an increased occipital negativity followed by an increased late positive potential. In contrast, during the animal-/non-animal-categorization task, emotional modulation effects were replaced by strong target categorization effects. These results suggest that explicit semantic categorization interferes with implicit emotion processing when both processes compete for shared resources.
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INTRODUCTION
The preferential processing of high-priority stimuli in the environment is an essential function of selective attention. Emotional stimuli may command attentional resources and priority processing due to their intrinsic stimulus significance (Lang et al., 1997; Schupp et al., 2006). Research utilizing event-related brain potentials (ERPs) determined that the processing of high-arousing pleasant and unpleasant compared with low-arousing control images is associated with a negative-going potential over temporo-occipital sensor regions around 150–300 ms poststimulus. This occipital negativity effect may reflect a transitory processing period within which emotional stimuli are selected for elaborate processing (Junghöfer et al., 2001; Schupp et al., 2003, 2007b). Subsequently, emotionally arousing as compared with neutral and non-arousing stimulus processing is associated with an enlarged late positive potential between 300 and 700 ms poststimulus. The enlarged late positive potential (LPP) is considered as a measure of the allocation of processing resources in a capacity-limited processing stage associated with stimulus representation in working memory (Schupp et al., 2006, 2007b; Herrmann et al., 2007; Sabatinelli et al., 2013). Thus, ERP components with distinct polarity, topography and timing reveal various effects of selective attention brought out by emotionally salient stimuli.

A number of studies have explored emotional stimulus processing while participants concurrently performed a primary cognitive task. Functional MRI (fMRI)- and ERP studies demonstrated that focusing visual attention on stimuli relevant to the current task goals interfered with the preferential processing of emotionally relevant stimuli, which were unrelated to the primary task at hand. For instance, participants in an fMRI-study had to discriminate the orientation of eccentrically presented bars while maintaining fixation on centrally presented emotional or neutral faces (Pessoa et al., 2002a). Under task load, as compared with control conditions, processing of emotional compared with neutral faces was not associated with increased activation in associative visual processing areas or the amygdala (Pessoa et al., 2002a; see also Erthal et al., 2005; Mitchell et al., 2007). Similar findings were seen in ERP research investigating spatial and object-based attention tasks (e.g. Holmes et al., 2003; Schupp et al., 2008; De Cesarei et al., 2009; Wiens et al., 2011, 2012): Directing attention away from emotional and neutral pictures by a concurrent task resulted in reduced emotional modulation of distinct ERP components. Theoretically, these findings are often considered from the ‘competition for processing’ perspective, according to which the processing advantage of emotional cues depends on the availability of processing resources shared with the explicit task (Pessoa et al., 2002b). Previous research examining the emotion–attention relationship commonly used discrimination tasks based on ‘synthetic’ stimuli, i.e. letter, object and shape discrimination, which were unfamiliar and meaningless to the participants (e.g. Schupp et al., 2008; De Cesarei et al., 2009; Wiens et al., 2011). However, the emotion–attention relationship in ‘competition for processing’ conditions may vary depending on the nature of the primary attention task. This issue has been explored in a series of studies (Fei-Fei et al., 2005; see also Li et al., 2002), which systematically examined the attentional requirements for a natural stimulus categorization task (i.e. detecting the presence of an animal) and discrimination tasks based on ‘synthetic’ stimuli (i.e. stimulus orientation of letters). The crucial finding of these studies was that under taxing dual task conditions, the higher-order natural scene categorization was achieved in the near absence of attention. In contrast, presumably much ‘simpler’ tasks requiring color or stimulus orientation processing consumed attentional resources. These findings raise the issue of whether previous findings of interference with emotion processing are specific to the particular class of ‘simple’, unfamiliar and meaningless tasks used in these studies. Probing the processing advantage of emotional stimuli in the context of a natural scene categorization task extends previous research regarding the ‘competition for processing’ perspective to a novel task, which is familiar and meaningful to the participants, requires little attentional resources and may consequently show little interference with obligatory emotion.
processing. Furthermore, implicit emotion and explicit task demands appear similar with respect to the processing demands in the ventral stream implicated in object recognition, in that both conditions consist of natural scenes. As a result, the issue of parallel processing in the visual stream and the obligatory detection of emotional significance can be specifically addressed as a function of high-level constraints imposed by an explicit task goal (Rousset et al., 2004).

This study examined the processing of emotional and neutral stimuli in the context of a primary natural scene categorization task. To achieve this, task-relevant natural scenes depicting centered animal and non-animal pictures were overlaid upon emotional scenes unrelated to the task images. Participants were instructed to indicate whether the natural scene contained an animal (active categorization task). To determine whether natural scene processing interferes with the preferential processing of emotional stimuli, we examined the occipital negativity and LPP component, which are the two main ERP markers of emotional attention (Schupp et al., 2006). The hypothesis that natural scene processing demands minimal processing resources predicts that emotional stimuli are preferentially processed even when participants perform a distracting natural scene categorization task (Li et al., 2002; Fei-Fei et al., 2005). Alternatively, an interference effect may be observed from the perspective that emotional background and natural scene foreground processing compete for shared processing resources. Previous research on either explicit categorization or implicit emotion processing observed very similar ERP modulations, i.e. an increased occipital negativity between 150 and 300 ms after stimulus onset followed by an increased late positive potential around 300–700 ms (Schupp et al., 2007a; Ferrari et al., 2008). Thus, interference effects may reveal competition for processing resources in higher-order visual regions implicated in object recognition, which are shared by primary task and secondary emotion processing (cf. Lavie, 2005). A passive viewing condition (counterbalanced across participants) served as a control task to assure that the identical stimuli elicit preferential emotion processing, i.e. an increased occipital negativity and late positive potential to emotional vs neutral background stimuli.

**METHODS**

**Participants**

A total of 24 (12 females) right-handed students from the University of Konstanz without reported neurological or psychiatric problems participated in the study. They received either course credits toward their research requirements or 10 €. Participants were between the ages of 18 and 24 years (M=21). All participants provided written informed consent to the protocol approved by the Review Board of the University of Konstanz.

**Stimulus materials**

Each stimulus consisted of a task-relevant target picture in the center (280 x 220 pixels) overlaid on a task-irrelevant background picture (720 x 540 pixels; see Figure 1). Task and background pictures were separated by a small white frame. The target stimuli were drawn from widely available commercial databases and comprised 150 animal images (mammals, birds, fish, arthropods and reptiles) and 150 images depicting non-animal content (outdoor and indoor scenes, tools and kitchen utensils). Emotional and neutral background pictures were drawn from the International Affective Picture System (IAPS, Lang et al., 2008) and comprised 3 x 100 pictures with pleasant (eroticca, sports, babies and food), unpleasant (mutilation, injury, grief and pollution) and neutral contents (people in everyday life situations, objects and landscapes). Normative valence ratings differed for pleasant (M=6.7, s.d.=0.76), unpleasant (M=2.5, s.d.=0.73) and neutral (M=5.4, s.d.=0.73) pictures [F(2,296)=855.2, P<0.0001; ts>12, Ps<0.001]. Similarly, categories differed regarding normative ratings of arousal [pleasant M=5.5, s.d.=0.93; neutral M=3.2, s.d.=0.67; unpleasant M=5.9, s.d.=0.85; F(2,296)=303.5, P<0.0001; ts>3.4, Ps<0.001].

To address the concern that overlaying a central picture may compromise the emotional quality of the background IAPS materials, 15 representative pictures from each category were rated at the end of the experiment on emotional dimensions of valence and arousal using the Self-Assessment-Manikin (Bradley and Lang, 1994). Using the same presentation parameters as in the main experiment, pictures were presented briefly (26.6 ms), and participants were asked to evaluate the background IAPS picture. Confirming the a priori categories of pleasant, neutral and negative images, highly significant main effects were observed for valence and arousal ratings, Fs(2,28)=26.2 and 22.2, Ps<0.0001, respectively. Pleasant pictures were evaluated more positively (M=6.5, s.d.=0.84) compared with neutral images (M=5.5, s.d.=0.67), P<0.001, and aversive pictures (M=3.8, s.d.=1.4) were judged as more unpleasant than neutral contents, P<0.01. Regarding arousal reports, pleasant and unpleasant picture categories (M=4.5 and 4.4, s.d.=0.99 and 0.95) were rated as more arousing as compared with neutral cues (M=2.6, s.d.=0.5), Ps<0.001. The pattern of emotional differentiation is somewhat reduced as compared with the normative ratings. However, this finding is consistent with previous research showing similar effects for speeded presentation times and reduced picture size (Codispoti and Cesarei 2007; Codispoti et al., 2009).

**Procedure**

The experiment consisted of two separate conditions in which participants were asked to either perform an explicit categorization task or to passively view the stimuli (see Figure 1). The order of the two conditions was counterbalanced across participants.

The explicit categorization task was similar to those used in previous research (Codispoti et al., 2006b; Ferrari et al., 2008). Specifically, participants were asked to detect pictures displaying an animal. To minimize differences across target (animal pictures) and non-target trials (non-animal pictures) with regard to motor activation, participants pressed one button with the index or middle finger to indicate the presence of an animal and another button if the picture did not contain an animal (two alternative forced-choice tasks; response assignment counterbalanced across participants). Animal and non-animal items were presented with equal probabilities of 50% in a pseudo-randomized fashion allowing for sequences of at most three pictures of each category (animal and non-animal). Order of presentation was balanced with respect to valence of the background picture so that no more than two repetitions of the same valence occurred. The
assignment of central and background pictures was randomized, separately for each participant and task condition.

The second condition was a passive viewing condition. This condition used the same stimulus materials and parameters of stimulus presentation as used in the active task condition with the critical difference that participants had no explicit task instruction. They were told to keep their eyes comfortably focused on the fixation cross in the center of the screen and to simply view the pictures.

To ensure a good signal-to-noise ratio, active and passive conditions included 1200 trials each (i.e. four repetitions of the entire stimulus set). Each trial consisted of the presentation of a picture for 26.6 ms, followed by an inter-stimulus interval varying between 750 and 1250 ms during which participants had to respond in the active task condition. Brief exposure times (~25 ms) are sufficient to elicit neural indices of explicit and implicit stimulus categorization (Thorpe et al., 1996; Ferrari et al., 2008; Peyk et al., 2009) and prevent scanning eye movements, effectively abolishing serial processing of central and peripheral visual information (Christianson et al. 1991). Using Presentation software (Neurobehavioral Systems, Inc., Albany, CA), the pictures were shown on a 22-inch CRT-monitor (75 Hz refresh rate) located approximately 75 cm in front of the participant. Picture presentation lasted for 40 min, interrupted by short breaks to allow for posture adjustments.

Analysis of behavioral responses

For animal and non-animal items, the proportion of correct responses, as well as response times, was calculated and submitted to a repeated measure ANOVA including the factors Target Category (animal vs non-animal) and Valence Category (pleasant vs neutral vs unpleasant).

ERP recordings and analysis

ERP recording

Brain and ocular scalp potential fields were measured with a 256 lead geodesic sensor net (HCGSN), on-line bandpass filtered from 0.1 to 100 Hz, and sampled at 250 Hz using Netstation acquisition hardware and EGI amplifiers (Electrical Geodesics, Inc., Eugene, OR). Electrode impedance was kept below 70 kÎ©, as recommended for this type of electroencephalogram (EEG) amplifier by EGI guidelines. Data were recorded continuously with the vertex sensor as reference electrode. A 40 Hz digital low pass filter was applied off-line to the continuous EEG record. A geodesic sensor net (HCGSN), on-line bandpass filtered from 0.1 to 100 Hz, and sampled at 250 Hz using Netstation acquisition software (Neurobehavioral Systems, Inc., Albany, CA). Electrode impedances were kept below 70 kÎ©, as recommended for this type of electroencephalogram (EEG) amplifier by EGI guidelines. Data were recorded continuously with the vertex sensor as reference electrode. A 40 Hz digital low pass filter was applied off-line to the continuous EEG record. A 40 Hz digital low pass filter was applied off-line to the continuous EEG record. A 40 Hz digital low pass filter was applied off-line to the continuous EEG record.

Statistical analyses

Data for the occipital negativity were entered into ANOVAs that included the factors Task Condition (active categorization vs passive viewing), Target Category (animal vs non-animal foreground picture) and Valence Category (pleasant vs neutral vs unpleasant background picture). Analysis of the late positive potential included the additional factor Time (300–450 vs 450–600 ms).

Initial analyses included the between-subject factors Order (passive-active vs active-passive task) and Laterality (left and right). However, there were no meaningful effects involving these two factors. Accordingly, these factors were not further considered in the reported analyses.

In addition, although the results reported are based on all trials, similar results were observed for the occipital negativity and late positive potential when separate analyses were conducted based on trials with correct and incorrect behavioral responses.

When appropriate, the Greenhouse-Geisser procedure was used to correct for violations of sphericity.

RESULTS

Categorization task

As expected, response times to target pictures (M = 425.2 ms; s.d. = 80.9) were faster as compared with non-target items (M = 443.7 ms; s.d. = 70.3), Target Category F(1,23) = 16.5,
Emotional valence of the background picture did not modulate responding to the explicit categorization task, Valence Category $F_{s} < 1$.

Accuracy did not differ significantly for target ($M = 78.1\% $; s.d. = 16.4) and non-target items ($M = 82.0\% $; s.d. = 9.3), $F(1,13) = 2.5$, ns. Again, no significant main effect or interactions involving Valence Category were observed, $F_{s} < 1$.

Event-related potentials

The main findings are summarized in Figures 2–4 displaying representative ERP waveforms (Figures 2 and 3) and ERP difference maps [emotional – neutral] and [target – non-target], respectively (Figure 4). In the passive viewing condition, emotional background images elicited an increased occipital negativity followed by an increased late positive potential. In contrast, during the animal-/non-animal-categorization task, emotional modulation effects were replaced by strong target categorization effects.

Occipital negativity (200–300 ms)

The overall ANOVA indicated significant main effects of Valence Category, $F(2,46) = 11.1, P < 0.001$ and Target Category, $F(1,23) = 12.1, P < 0.01$. Of most interest, the interaction of Task Condition by Valence Category was significant, $F(2,46) = 5.5, P < 0.05$. Accordingly, separate analyses were conducted for passive and active task conditions, respectively.

The analysis of the passive viewing condition revealed a significant main effect of Valence Category, $F(2,46) = 11.6, P < 0.0001$. Post hoc tests indicated an increased relative occipital negativity for pleasant and unpleasant as compared with neutral IAPS background pictures, $t(23) = -3.9$ and $-3.5, P_{s} < 0.005$, respectively. In contrast, there was no effect of Valence Category in the active categorization condition, $F(2,46) = 1.0$.

Results for the centrally presented natural scenes revealed an opposite pattern of effects. Although strong effects of Valence Category were observed during passive viewing, there was no difference in processing animal and non-animal pictures, Target Category $F(1,23) = 1.5$. In contrast, although no effects of Valence Category were observed during the active categorization condition, Target Category showed a significant main effect, indicating an increased occipital negativity toward animal as compared with non-animal pictures, $F(1,23) = 12.9, P < 0.005$.

There were no significant main effects or high-order interactions in the separate analyses of the passive and active task conditions.

Late positive potential (300–450 and 450–600 ms)

The significant main effect Valence Category, $F(2,46) = 4.0, P < 0.05$, was qualified by the significant interaction of Task Condition by
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Valence Category, $F(2,46) = 3.3$, $P < 0.05$. To follow-up this interaction, separate analysis of the passive viewing and active task conditions was conducted. In the passive viewing condition, a significant main effect of Valence Category was observed, $F(2,46) = 4.7$, $P < 0.05$. As in previous research, pleasant and unpleasant pictures elicited a larger LPP as compared with neutral images, $t_s(23) = 2.7$ and $2.6$, $P < 0.05$, respectively. Emotional modulation effects were not further qualified by higher-order interactions involving factors of Target Category or Time. In contrast, emotional valence of the background pictures did not modulate the LPP in the active categorization condition. The main effect of Valence Category was not significant, $F(2,46) = 0.04$, and the higher-order interaction Valence Category × Target Category × Time, $F(2,46) = 4.4$, $P < 0.05$, could not be substantiated in a separate follow-up analysis based on the factors Target Category or Time.

Significant main effects of Task Condition, $F(1,23) = 62.6$, $P < 0.0001$, Target Category, $F(1,23) = 27.8$, $P < 0.001$, and Time, $F(1,23) = 14.4$, $P < 0.01$, were qualified by the interaction of Task Condition, Target Category and Time, $F(1,23) = 10.9$, $P < 0.01$. To follow-up this interaction, separate analyses of the earlier and later time windows were conducted. In the earlier time window (300–450 ms), significant main effects of Task $F(1,23) = 52.6$, $P < 0.0001$, and Target Category $F(1,23) = 34.3$, $P < 0.0001$, were qualified by a significant interaction of Task Condition × Target Category, $F(1,23) = 15.0$, $P < 0.005$. Accordingly, both task conditions were analyzed separately. Animal pictures elicited a larger positivity than that of non-animal pictures in the active task condition, when the images were task-relevant, $F(1,23) = 39.8$, $P < 0.0001$, and although less pronounced, also in the passive viewing condition, when the images were not associated with any task, $F(1,23) = 9.1$, $P < 0.01$. As expected, a direct comparison of the difference (animal vs non-animal images) confirmed a significantly larger positive wave in the active as compared with the passive viewing condition, $t(1,23) = 3.9$, $P < 0.001$. In the later time window (450–600 ms), significant main effects of Task Condition, $F(1,23) = 66.0$, $P < 0.0001$, and Target Category, $F(1,23) = 11.2$, $P < 0.01$, were observed, whereas the interaction Task Condition × Target Category was not significant, $F(1,23) = 1.0$. However, exploratory analysis revealed that target effects were sustained in the active categorization condition, Target Category $F(1,23) = 8.5$, $P < 0.01$, whereas there was no significant effect in the passive viewing condition, Target Category $F(1,23) = 3.2$, $P = 0.09$.

**DISCUSSION**

By using a combination of a natural scene categorization task and an emotional picture- viewing paradigm, this study showed that directing visual attention toward task-relevant stimuli resulted in a loss of sensitivity toward emotional cues in the peripheral visual field. In contrast, in the absence of directed attention to task-relevant stimuli, well-established effects of selective emotion processing were found, i.e. increased occipital negativity and late positive potential toward emotionally arousing (pleasant and unpleasant) images. These results extend the ‘competition for processing’ framework for studying emotion-attention interactions. Specifically, explicit semantic categorization, a familiar and meaningful task in which participants are experts,
Interference with emotion processing

interfered with implicit emotion processing when both processes compete for shared resources.

The ‘competition for processing’ hypothesis provides a framework for the interpretation of task-interference effects on emotion processing. Specifically, it is proposed that interference effects occur when the processing demands of concurrent tasks exceed limited processing resources (Pessoa et al., 2002b). Previous studies suggest intramodal competition as a primary source for interference of emotion processing. Specifically, although primary tasks manipulating space-based and feature-based attention in the visual domain attenuated the preferential emotion processing, as indexed by occipital negativity and LPP (e.g. Holmes et al., 2003; Schupp et al., 2008; De Cesarei et al., 2009; Wiens et al., 2011, 2012), increasing the task load of an auditory task did not systematically suppress the occipital negativity elicited by emotional cues (Schupp et al., 2008). The current findings specify the notion of intramodal competition for processing resources more precisely by focusing on a meaningful and well-practiced natural scene categorization task. Natural scene categorization relies on neural representations in higher-order visual cortices, and prior research suggests that it is much less dependent on the availability of attentional resources (Li et al., 2002; Rousselet et al., 2002; Fei-Fei et al., 2005). This study, however, reveals that the categorization task interferes with preferential emotion processing for emotional background stimuli. A possible explanation for this effect may be that interference results from inter-item competition among neural maps representing foreground task stimuli and background emotion stimuli (Franconeri et al., 2013). Specifically, although spontaneous viewing supports the preferential processing of emotional information in the periphery, top-down attention processes may focus visual attention on task-relevant central stimuli, so that emotionally relevant stimuli no longer elicit the ERP signature of preferential emotion processing. Related to the ‘competition for processing’ perspective in natural scene categorization, interference effects have also been shown for the processing of multiple objects (Rousselet et al., 2004; Walker et al., 2008). Overall, and consistent with the notion for intramodal competition for processing resources, this study demonstrates interference between selective emotion processing and a well-practiced and meaningful primary categorization task. Furthermore, the present result may provide the laboratory equivalent of real-life examples such as drivers failing to notice pedestrians or other emotionally relevant stimuli when searching for directions (Simons, 2000).

The present results add to previous research on the interaction of emotion and attention in the context of a meaningful and familiar primary task. Specifically, Ferrari et al. (2008) employed a semantic categorization task to investigate emotion processing while participants had to decide whether pictures belonged to a specific higher-order stimulus category. This study demonstrated that the LPP component is sensitive to picture valence in the context of motor demands and a semantic categorization task unrelated to the emotional content of the pictures. However, despite many shared features, there are crucial differences between these studies. In the study by Ferrari et al., a single picture was presented that belonged to one out of four stimulus categories (humans, animals, landscapes and objects). Of these, the ‘humans’ category contained either pleasant, neutral or unpleasant exemplars. In separate conditions, participants were asked to categorize the images according to whether they belong to either the animal or the human category. Irrespective of whether human pictures were target or non-target stimuli, the LPP component was enhanced to emotional compared with neutral human images. Thus, when a single picture is processed, picture valence is encoded spontaneously and irrespective of target status. This study, however, used a different paradigm and observed different results: Task relevance, i.e. attentional focus on the central picture, and emotional processing of the background picture, i.e. outside the focus of attention, were separated by presenting two pictures simultaneously. Under these circumstances, sensitivity to picture valence in the peripheral field is lost and ERP
measures sensitive to the perceptual and evaluative stage of processing no longer discriminate between emotional and neutral pictures (Schupp et al., 2006).

A noteworthy aspect of the present finding concerns the timing of visual processing and preferential stimulus processing. Both, target effects in the active task condition as well as emotion effects in the passive viewing condition emerged ~200 ms after stimulus onset, providing an (upper) estimate of when information regarding stimulus category and emotional valence has been extracted. Apparently, preferential stimulus processing builds upon an initial, primarily feedforward sweep of natural scene processing (Thorpe and Fabre-Thorpe, 2001). Interestingly, intracranial recordings in the inferior occipital gyrus, fusiform gyrus and inferior temporal cortex revealed robust object-selectivity during initial processing (~200 ms), even in the presence of a second object within the image (Agam et al., 2010). Subsequent processing, however, reflected by the early posterior negativity (EPN) and LPP components, seems to be more flexibly regulated, i.e. default prioritization of emotional stimuli or task-dependent selection of target objects. Processing in these capacity-limited later processing stages, in particular the LPP, seems to be critical for long-lasting stimulus representations and conscious recognition (Chun and Potter, 1995; Sergent et al., 2005; Del Cul et al., 2007). The present results show that the default-prioritization of emotion processing is abolished when other stimulus categories are the focus of interest. Specifically, inspection of Figures 2 and 3 suggests a reciprocal relationship of the occipital negativity and late positive potential with regard to the sensitivity to emotion (passive viewing condition) and target (task condition) stimulus significance (see also Wickens et al., 1983). Overall, the ‘competition for processing’ in a particular processing stage seems to be the key variable accounting for interference effects in the emotion–attention interaction (Pessoa et al., 2002).

The current results run counter to previous findings, which suggested that natural scene categorization puts little to no demands on attentional processing resources. This interpretation was based on studies using dual-task conditions in which participants performed a central letter discrimination task while they categorized natural scenes in the peripheral field (Li et al., 2002; Fei-Fei et al., 2005). The critical issue may regard the operation of attentional control mechanisms (Baluch and Itti, 2011). In explicit dual-task conditions, attentional resources should be distributed to facilitate the performance of both task conditions. In contrast, putting implicit and explicit categorization in competition, top-down control mechanisms may maximize the allocation of attentional resources toward the task stimuli. This notion, however, would imply that preparatory attentional control mechanisms exert a strong prioritization on perceptual categorization, i.e. facilitating central processing at the expense of peripheral processing in this study.

A high processing demand of the primary task has been deemed critical for interference effects to occur (Luck et al., 2000; Pessoa et al., 2002a). The behavioral data indicate that the categorization task was somewhat more difficult (~80% accuracy) in this study as compared with previous reports (~94% accuracy; Codispoti et al., 2006b). Several methodological variables may account for these differences in performance. Compared with previous studies (Codispoti et al., 2006b), picture size of the task-relevant images was reduced, changing physical stimulus parameters. This could possibly make the processing of the stimuli more difficult (Macé et al., 2005), and indeed a reduction in performance has been similarly observed in research creating more demanding processing conditions (e.g. Li et al., 2002; Rousselet et al., 2004). Interestingly, performance of the categorization task (error rate and reaction time) was not affected by the valence of the background pictures. Different results were seen in a previous study in which participants could not rely on top-down control to focus attention toward task-relevant locations (Müller et al., 2011).

In this study, emotional stimuli were discriminated from neutral contents at the neural level and the emotional pictures interfered with task performance in the explicit task (Müller et al., 2011). Both of these studies used short presentation times, thereby preventing saccadic eye movements as a potential alternative explanation for the differing study findings. Thus, top-down attention processes may play an important role for the emotion–attention interaction and the prioritization of stimulus processing. Corroborating this notion, task instruction had profound effects on the processing of the animal pictures. Specifically, although ERP effects were limited to the task stimuli in the active task, differential LPP amplitudes were seen concurrently for animal (vs non-animal) and emotional (vs neutral) pictures in the passive viewing condition. Taken together, preparatory attentional control mechanisms seem to direct attention toward task-relevant locations at the cost of preferential emotion processing at locations outside the focus of attention.

The surprising finding concerns increased LPPs for animal compared with control stimuli in the passive viewing condition. Similar results have been reported in previous research with pictures of objects and neutral people as a contrasting category (Ferrari et al., 2008). Recent fMRI studies revealed that natural scenes elicit category-selective BOLD responses distributed across object-selective visual cortical structures irrespective of whether the stimuli were associated with an explicit task or were task-irrelevant (Peelen et al., 2009; Walther et al., 2009). In addition, animal stimuli may have a special status among the various stimulus categories of human experience, as behavioral studies show that animal pictures are detected faster and more accurately than inanimate objects, even when controlling for interest, expertise and low-level stimulus characteristics (New et al., 2007). Also, single cell recordings in humans revealed the strongest response to animal pictures in the right amygdala (Mormann et al., 2011). Thus, accumulating evidence suggests that the processing of the animal category may be biased toward prioritized processing, presumably reflecting the importance of animals in human evolution (New et al., 2007; Mormann et al., 2011). The current findings extend this notion toward the LPP component, an electrophysiological indicator of selective attention processes.

CONCLUSION

This study examined what happens to peripheral emotional processing when participants simultaneously conducted a meaningful, familiar and natural scene categorization task. Results showed that significant ERP differences between emotional and neutral background images during the passive viewing condition were abolished in the active task condition. These results speak against the notion of an ‘automatic’ allocation of attention toward emotional stimuli and suggest that emotional stimuli, though privileged, compete for limited processing resources.
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