Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition 3 (2014) 31–36

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jarmac

A shield against distraction

Niklas Halin[a,*], John E. Marsh[a,b], Anna Hellman[a,1], Ida Hellström[a,1], Patrik Sörqvist[a,c]

[a] Department of Building, Energy and Environmental Engineering, University of Gävle, Gävle, Sweden
[b] School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK
[c] Linnaeus Centre HEAD, Swedish Institute for Disability Research, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 15 October 2013
Received in revised form 17 January 2014
Accepted 20 January 2014
Available online 28 January 2014

Keywords:
Noise
Task difficulty
Memory
Distraction
Selective attention
Working memory capacity

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we apply the basic idea of a trade-off between the level of concentration and distractibility to test whether a manipulation of task difficulty can shield against distraction. Participants read, either in quiet or with a speech noise background, texts that were displayed either in an easy-to-read or a hard-to-read font. Background speech impaired prose recall, but only when the text was displayed in the easy-to-read font. Most importantly, recall was better in the background speech condition for hard-to-read than for easy-to-read texts. Moreover, individual differences in working memory capacity were related to the magnitude of disruption, but only in the easy-to-read condition. Making a task more difficult can sometimes facilitate selective attention in noisy work environments by promoting focal-task engagement.

The vigilant ability of the auditory system is exceptional for detecting events in the environment that may be valuable or potentially dangerous. In modern society, however, a continuous analysis of the auditory environment often becomes distracting rather than helpful. For instance, background speech typically impairs word processed writing (Sörqvist, Nöstl, & Halin, 2012a), reading comprehension (Oswald, Tremblay, & Jones, 2000; Sörqvist, Halin, & Hygge, 2010), proofreading (Halin, Marsh, Haga, Holmgren, & Sörqvist, 2013; Venetjoki, Kaarela-Toumaala, Keskinen, & Hongisto, 2007), prose memory (Bell, Buchner, & Mund, 2008; Sörqvist, 2010a) and other work related tasks (Banbury and Berry, 1997, 1998; Beaman, 2005; Jahncke, Hygge, Halin, Green, & Dimberg, 2011; Morris & Jones, 1991). In noisy conditions, the human mind must find a way to attenuate the undesired influence of the auditory analysis.

One way in which this can be accomplished is by increasing the amount of engagement with a focal task (in essence, concentrating harder). The view we take here is that task engagement reflects strategic cognitive control that protects against distraction, and is, in part, modulated by factors such as warnings of impeding distraction (Hughes, Hurlstone, Marsh, Vachon, & Jones, 2013; Sussman, Winkler, & Schröger, 2003), incentives to perform well (Engelmann, Damaraju, Padmala, & Pessoa, 2009) and task difficulty (Halin et al., 2013). Strategic cognitive control takes the form of a more steadfast locus-of-attention – thus overruling the call-for-attention by task-irrelevant information – and a more constrained neural processing of the task-irrelevant information at the sensory stage (Sörqvist & Rönnberg, 2014).

Laboratory studies have shown that the disruption from task-irrelevant background noise is attenuated when a participant engages with more difficult to-be-attended visual tasks (Hughes, Hurlstone, Marsh, Vachon, & Jones, 2013; Kim, Kim, & Chun, 2005; SanMiguel, Corral, & Escera, 2008). For example, the auditory-perceptual analysis of task-irrelevant background sound, as shown in auditory brainstem responses, is attenuated when the participants undertake a difficult version of the visual-verbal *n*-back task (i.e., 3-back) in comparison with an easier version (i.e., 1-back; Sörqvist, Stenfelt, & Rönnberg, 2012; see also Hairston, Letowski, & McDowell, 2013). Moreover, a deviant sound that is embedded in an otherwise repetitive sound sequence (e.g., the sound "k" in the sequence "c c c c c c k c c") impairs the ability to report back, in order, a visually presented sequence of items (i.e., serial short-term memory), because the deviant sound captures attention. If the visually presented items are masked by visual noise, however, serial short-term memory is spared, as the deviant sound loses its capacity to capture attention (Hughes et al., 2013). In a recent study, we attempted to bridge these laboratory findings to an applied context (Halin et al., 2013). More specifically, we asked participants to undertake a proofreading task (i.e., to search for

* Corresponding author at: Department of Building, Energy and Environmental Engineering, University of Gävle, SE-801 76 Gävle, Sweden. Tel.: +46 704850249.
E-mail address: niklas.halin@hig.se (N. Halin).

[1] These authors contributed equally to this paper.

2211-3681 © 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2014.01.003

semantic/contextual errors in written texts) against a background of speech or in silence. In Experiment 1, the texts were displayed in either an easy-to-read font (Times New Roman) or a hard-to-read font (Haettenschweiler); and in Experiment 2, all texts were displayed in the easy-to-read font but they were either masked by visual noise or not masked by visual noise. In both experiments, background speech impaired proofreading for semantic/contextual errors, but only when the text was easy to read, not when it was hard to read (presented in a hard-to-read font or masked by visual noise). A cross-experimental analysis showed that the two ways of manipulating task difficulty shielded from distraction in functionally similar ways. Arguably, higher task difficulty promotes focal-task engagement, reduces the neural processing of background sound (Sörqvist, Stenfelt, & Rönnberg, 2012) and potentiates the capability to block the sound's call for attention (Hughes et al., 2013).

One factor that influences distractibility is, thus, task difficulty. Another influential factor in moderating the susceptibility to distraction is working memory capacity (Engle, 2002; Sörqvist & Rönnberg, 2014). High-capacity individuals are generally less susceptible to auditory distraction than their low-capacity counterparts (Sörqvist, 2010c), both in the context of cross-modal distraction (e.g., Sörqvist et al., 2012b) and in the context of within-modal distraction (Sörqvist & Rönnberg, 2012), and across a wide variety of tasks including visual-verbal short-term memory (Beaman, 2004; Sörqvist, 2010b) and long-term memory for written prose (Sörqvist, 2010a; Sörqvist, Ljungberg, & Ljung, 2010). For example, in a study by Sörqvist et al. (2010b), participants first undertook a complex-span task called size-comparison span (SICSPAN) that was designed to measure individual differences in working memory capacity. Next, the participants read prose passages, either in silence or against a background of speech. Background speech disrupted memory for prose: Fewer questions – tapping long-term memory for the text – were subsequently answered correctly when the texts had been studied in the presence of background speech as compared to silence. This disruption of prose memory by background speech, however, was greater for participants with low working memory capacity.

In previous experiments that have tested the relation between individual differences in working memory capacity and effects of background speech on long-term memory for prose (e.g., Sörqvist, 2010a; Sörqvist, Ljungberg, et al., 2010), the text has been displayed in an easy-to-read font and there has been no manipulation of task difficulty. An interesting extension of this paradigm would be to test whether the relationship between working memory capacity and distractibility is modulated by a task difficulty manipulation (e.g., by manipulating the readability of the text by changing font type). One possibility is that low-capacity individuals, who – under 'normal' conditions – are relatively susceptible to distraction, will be aided by the increase in task difficulty (e.g., the hard-to-read font helps them achieve a steadfast locus-of-attention) and thereby become less susceptible to distraction. Conversely, the high-capacity individuals, who are relatively immune to distraction under 'normal' conditions may not experience any benefit from an increase in task difficulty, because their locus-of-attention is already steadfast. An increase in task difficulty could, therefore, reduce the gap in susceptibility to distraction that exists between low- and high-capacity individuals.

In this paper, we extend the basic idea of a trade-off between task difficult and distractibility to a task that is particularly relevant to educational settings: Memory for written prose. The participants read texts that were displayed either in an easy-to-read (Times New Roman) or a hard-to-read font (Haettenschweiler). Reading was undertaken either in a quiet environment or accompanied by a speech noise background, and the participants were required to attempt to remember as much of the text as possible for later recall. We expected to find a cross-over interaction, demonstrating disruption from the background speech, but only when the text was displayed in an easy-to-read font, not when it was displayed in a hard-to-read font. Moreover, we explored the relationship between individual differences in working memory capacity and distractibility in these two task difficulty conditions, respectively.

1. Methods

1.1. Participants

Thirty-two Swedish students participated for a small honorarium. All reported normal hearing, normal or corrected-to-normal vision and Swedish as their native language.

1.2. Materials

Sound. The background speech was comprised of a male voice that described a fictitious culture called *the Ansarians*. It was recorded in an echo-free chamber and played back through Sennheiser HD202 headphones (Leq ≈ 65 dBA).

Reading speed. We asked participants to read two shorter texts (160 words long) about the planets Mars and Neptune. All texts in the experiment were written in Swedish (font size 12 pt. and spacing between lines 1.00), in the two fonts Times New Roman (easy-to-read) and Haettenschweiler (hard-to-read), and were displayed on a computer screen with both margins evenly adjusted. The computer measured the time it took to read each text.

Memory for prose. We adopted a modified version of a test that has been used previously to measure memory for written prose (Sörqvist, 2010a) and spoken discourse (Sörqvist & Rönnberg, 2012). Four memory tests were developed. Each test had a reading phase and a test phase. In the reading phase, 5 paragraphs (approximately 85 words each) about fictitious cultures (not the same culture as the one described in the background speech) were displayed simultaneously on the computer screen. The paragraphs described, for example, the rise of the culture, advances in technology, and warfare. The paragraphs were displayed for 4 min. When the allocated time was up, the computer moved to the test phase. Prose memory was tested with 20 multiple-choice questions (5 options per question; 4 questions per paragraph) that concerned detailed information in the text (e.g., "How many regions were the land of Timad divided in?"). The questions were presented sequentially (in Arial font). The first four questions concerned the first text paragraph; the next four concerned the second paragraph, and so on. The participants were allowed to use a maximum of 15 s for each question.

Working memory capacity task. We used the size-comparison span (SICSPAN) task to tap working memory capacity (Sörqvist, Ljungberg, et al., 2010). In this task, pairs of words were presented on the computer screen and participants were required to compare them in size (e.g., "Is STRAWBERRY bigger than PINEAPPLE?"). Participants answered this question by using the 'Y' and 'N' keys on the keyboard. The participants had a maximum of 5 s to respond to each comparison. After a response, or if the time was up, the computer screen went blank for 500 ms. And thereafter, a to-be-remembered word was presented (e.g., PAPAYA) for 800 ms. This procedure was repeated two to six times before participants were asked to recall the to-be-remembered words in serial order by typing with the keyboard. The recall phase was self-paced. All presented words within a list were drawn from the same semantic category (e.g., Fruits) and each word (and category) appeared only once during the task. The total number of lists was 10 (i.e., two of each list length) and the lists were presented in a fixed ascending order (e.g., starting with the two-word lists) for all participants. Their SICSPAN score