



HAL
open science

Examination of individual differences in eye movement dynamics during mouse-and gaze-foraging

Jérôme Tagu, Árni Kristjánsson

► **To cite this version:**

Jérôme Tagu, Árni Kristjánsson. Examination of individual differences in eye movement dynamics during mouse-and gaze-foraging. 42nd European Conference on Visual Perception (ECVP), Aug 2019, Leuven, Belgium. Perception, 48 (2_suppl), pp.217, 2019, 10.1177/0301006619863862 . hal-02317109

HAL Id: hal-02317109

<https://hal.science/hal-02317109>

Submitted on 15 Oct 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

During multi-target visual foraging, most observers change their strategy when target crypticity is increased (Kristjánsson et al., 2014):



Although this behavior is observed for most individuals, some of them - so called "super foragers" - continue to frequently switch between target types during conjunction foraging.

Two modes of visual exploration can be distinguished:

Ambient mode:

Short fixation durations
Large saccade amplitudes

Focal mode:

Long fixation durations
Small saccade amplitudes


The exploration mode is assessed by calculating the K-coefficient (Krejtz et al., 2016) based on the z-scores of a given fixation duration (d_i) and of the subsequent saccade amplitude (a_{i+1}):

$$K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_n K_i \quad \text{with} \quad K_i = \frac{d_i - \mu_d}{\sigma_d} - \frac{a_{i+1} - \mu_a}{\sigma_a}$$


- Are the different foraging strategies associated with different eye movement dynamics?
- Do observers modify their strategy when foraging with eye gaze?
- Are individual differences in foraging reflected in oculomotor behavior?

METHODS AND RESULTS

"Select all the targets in the display as fast as possible, without selecting any distractor"




Target types: ● (Feature) & ● (Conjunction)
Two tasks: 🖱 Mouse foraging & 👁 Gaze foraging
80 stimuli on screen (40 targets, 40 distractors)
Selected targets disappeared. Distractor selection led to an error-message and renewal of the trial.
Stimuli equalized in size (0.5° diameter) and luminance (7 cd/m²).
Eye movement recordings during all tasks (EyeLink 1000 Plus, SR Research).




Organization of the visual exploration

All eye fixations and saccades






The 40 "critical" fixations and subsequent saccades






Number of Runs: 3 behaviors




"Normal foragers" (n=11)



"Intermediate foragers" (n=9)



"Super foragers" (n=4)



— feature foraging — conjunction foraging
⊖ 95% Confidence Intervals

— Mouse Feature — Mouse Conjunction --- Gaze Feature --- Gaze Conjunction

CONCLUSIONS

- Humans adapt their foraging to target crypticity, both when foraging with a computer mouse and with eye gaze.
- Gaze foraging seems to be more demanding than mouse foraging (e.g., higher nb of errors, higher inter-target times).

- "Super foragers" may actually be "suboptimal foragers" Within-trial analyses during foraging tasks accurately capture the foraging strategy; analysis that cannot be performed in traditional single-target visual search tasks.