

**Comparing the Response Modulation Hypothesis and the Integrated Emotions System  
Theory: The Role of Top-Down Attention in Psychopathy.**

Jaap Munneke<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sylco S. Hoppenbrouwers<sup>4</sup>, Bethany Little<sup>3</sup>, Karen Kooiman<sup>3</sup>, Erik van der Burg,<sup>3,5</sup> & Jan Theeuwes<sup>3</sup>.

1. Aysel Sabuncu Brain Research Center, Bilkent University, Ankara
2. Department of Psychology, Bilkent University, Ankara
3. Department of Experimental and Applied Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
4. Department of Clinical Psychology, Erasmus University Rotterdam
5. School of Psychology, University of Sydney

**Corresponding author:**

Jaap Munneke

Aysel Sabuncu Brain Research Center

Bilkent University

06800 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey.

Jaap.Munneke@gmail.com

## \*Highlights (for review)

- Here, two influential but opposing etiological theories of psychopathy are empirically tested.
- We test emotional versus attentional deficits in psychopathy.
- Top-down attention set influences emotion perception in psychopathy.
- Different emotional expressions are not processed equally by psychopathic individuals.

## ABSTRACT

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*Objective:* Two major etiological theories on psychopathy propose different mechanisms as to how emotional facial expressions are processed by individuals with elevated psychopathic traits. The Response Modulation Hypothesis (RMH) proposes that psychopathic individuals show emotional deficits as a consequence of attentional deployment, suggesting that emotional deficits are situation-specific. The Integrated Emotions System theory (IES) suggests that psychopathic individuals have a fundamental amygdala dysfunction which precludes adequate responsiveness to the distress of others.

*Methods:* Participants performed a visual search task in which they had to find a male target face amongst two female distractor faces. Top-down attentional set was manipulated by having participants either respond to the face's orientation, or its emotional expression.

*Results:* When emotion was task-relevant, the low-scoring psychopathy group showed attentional capture by happy and fearful distractor faces, whereas the elevated group showed capture by fearful, but not happy distractor faces.

*Conclusion:* This study provides evidence for the RMH such that top-down attention influences the way emotional faces attract attention in individuals with elevated psychopathic traits. However, the different response patterns for happy and fearful faces suggest that top-down attention may not determine the processing of all types of emotional facial expressions in psychopathy.

*Keywords:* Psychopathy, Response modulation, Attention, Emotional capture, Fear

1 Psychopathy is a well-known personality disorder, characterized by aberrant emotionality and  
2 antisocial behavior. Particularly well-known are the unemotional and callous personality  
3 traits of psychopathic individuals, often accompanied by antisocial behavior (e.g., criminal  
4 behavior and poor behavioral control; Blair & Mitchell, 2009; Hare, 1991; Hoppenbrouwers,  
5 Bulten & Brazil, 2016).  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11         Recent work has shown an increased interest in how psychopathic individuals  
12 perceive and interpret emotional facial expressions. Previous studies have revealed a diverse  
13 pattern of results concerning the ability of psychopathic individuals to recognize, process and  
14 act upon varying emotional facial expressions such as happy, fearful and angry (Fairchild,  
15 Van Goozen, Calder, Stollery & Goodyer, 2009; Fairchild, Stobbe, Van Goozen, Calder &  
16 Goodyer, 2010; but see Glass and Newman, 2006). Diverse results notwithstanding,  
17 converging evidence has suggested that the manner in which emotional expressions are  
18 processed by psychopathic individuals is qualitatively different from those processes in  
19 healthy individuals (Dawel, O’Kearney, McKone & Palermo, 2012; Marsh & Blair, 2008).  
20  
21 However, the underlying mechanisms leading to differences in processing emotional  
22 expressions in psychopathic individuals are poorly understood. While deficits in affective  
23 functioning have been hypothesized to reflect the core of psychopathy, aberrations in  
24 cognitive factors such as attention have also been put forth as important etiological factors  
25 (Baskin-Sommers, Curtin & Newman, 2011; Newman and Baskin-Sommers, 2012). These  
26 opposing views are reflected in two theories that aim to describe the mechanisms underlying  
27 psychopathy.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51         First, the Response Modulation Hypothesis (RMH) proposes a malfunction in  
52 information-processing abilities as an important contributor to psychopathic behavior.  
53 Specifically, psychopathic behavioral traits are suggested to originate from deficits in the  
54 ability to rapidly switch from goal-directed behavior to attending task-irrelevant information  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 when processing this irrelevant information could lead to beneficial behavior or improved  
2 social interaction (Gorenstein & Newman, 1980; Newman & Wallace, 1993; Patterson &  
3 Newman, 1993). According to Newman and Wallace (1993) psychopathic individuals are  
4 deficient in detecting and redirecting top-down attention towards important or informative,  
5 yet task-irrelevant stimuli, resulting in the non-adaptive perseverance of behavioral patterns  
6 solely aimed at ongoing goals. Indeed, evidence for the RMH is observed in a host of studies  
7 emphasizing the presence of attentional abnormalities in psychopathy (e.g. Newman, Curtin,  
8 Bertsch & Baskin-Sommers, 2010; Baskin-Sommers et al. 2011; Hoppenbrouwers, Van der  
9 Stigchel, Slotboom, Dalmeijer & Theeuwes, 2015; Hoppenbrouwers, Van der Stigchel,  
10 Sergiou & Theeuwes, 2016). In short, the RMH states that psychopathic individuals have a  
11 rigid, inflexible mechanism of top-down attentional control, resulting in diminished  
12 attentional resources being allocated to information not fitting the psychopathic individual's  
13 top-down set.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 A second theory on the etiological factors of psychopathy is the Integrated Emotions  
32 System theory (IES; Blair, 2005) which focuses on deficits in the processing of emotional  
33 and affective stimuli. At the focus of the IES lies a dysfunction in the amygdala (Blair,  
34 Mitchell, Peschardt, Colledge, Leonard, Shine, et al., 2004), which may prevent the allocation  
35 of attention towards emotional expressions. Amygdala deficits are hypothesized to cause an  
36 impairment in the formation of aversive stimulus-reinforcement associations in psychopathic  
37 individuals, with aversive stimuli extending to emotional expressions such as fear and anger  
38 (Blair, 2005). As a consequence, emotions that signal distress in others are not processed  
39 effectively by psychopathic individuals, resulting in diminished social behavior.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
The RMH and IES lead to a number of opposing hypotheses concerning how  
emotional facial expressions may influence attentional selection. First, the RMH's focus on  
attentional processes as the source of psychopathic behavior predicts that aberrant behavior

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

by psychopathic individuals is situation specific rather than pan-situational: Only when threat-signaling stimuli or emotional expressions do not match the top-down goals of the psychopathic individual will these stimuli go unnoticed and unattended. In short, it is the relevance of a stimulus that matters. On the contrary, the IES makes no claims about the relevance of stimuli and predicts that psychopathic individuals are generally unresponsive to aversive emotional stimuli due to disrupted amygdala functioning. A consequence of the lack of emotional responsiveness to aversive stimuli is that attention may not be automatically drawn to such emotional stimuli and as such this emotional information is not, or to a lesser extent processed. Second, according to the RMH, the deficiency in processing non-relevant information does not only pertain to threat-signaling or emotional stimuli, but to any type of stimulus that does not match the psychopathic individual's goals and as such remains unattended. Alternatively, the IES does not make such a broad claim by stating that attentional selection in psychopathic individuals is predominantly determined by the absence of a stimulus-reinforcement relation between an aversive stimulus and a behavioral response towards that stimulus. The IES therefore makes specific predictions that tailor to aversive stimuli such as facial expressions signaling distress, but does not make any claims regarding the relevance of such information. Regarding attention, the IES predicts differences between aversive emotional expressions such as fearful faces, as compared to neutral or positive expressions, regardless of whether processing these emotions is part of the psychopathic individual's top-down set.

To investigate how attention to emotional expressions is altered in psychopathy and to distinguish between the RMH and the IES, we employed a paradigm used by Hodsoll, Lavie and Viding (2014). Hodsoll and colleagues investigated how emotional facial expressions affected the allocation of attention in children with high versus low callous-unemotional traits (CU-traits; a precursor for psychopathy: Viding & McCrory, 2012) and healthy controls (for

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

more information on the influence of emotion on attentional processes see Byrne & Eysenck, 1995; Yiend, 2010). In their paradigm, participants searched for a male target face among two female distractor faces and indicated whether the male face was tilted to the left or the right. On a subset of trials, one of the faces contained an emotional expression, either presented on the male target face or on one of the two female distractor faces. This manipulation allowed for testing the difference in attentional allocation to emotional facial expressions in a high CU group, a low CU group and healthy controls using both emotional distractor faces and emotional target faces. Results showed that children with increased callous-unemotional traits showed reduced attentional capture by irrelevant emotional faces; a finding in support of the IES.

In the current study, we added a critical condition in which participants had to judge the emotion of a male target face, rather than its orientation. Using both positive and negative emotional expressions under different task demands was done for multiple reasons: First, the IES predicts that individuals with elevated psychopathic traits will show an abnormality in the detection of a fearful facial expression, irrespective of the task set (i.e., whether the participant is responding to the emotion or the orientation). As such, it is expected that individuals with elevated psychopathic traits are slower than controls when the target face displays a fearful facial expression. However, when a distractor displays a fearful facial expression, the IES predicts that individuals with elevated psychopathic traits show better performance than controls because they are not influenced by the fearful expression on the distractor. Second, contrary to the IES, the RMH predicts that emotional differences between individuals with low versus elevated psychopathic traits arise as a function of task-relevance, independent of the emotion's valence. Therefore, during the emotion task, the RMH predicts no difference between healthy controls and psychopathic individuals as emotion is always part of an individual's top-down set. On the contrary, during the orientation task, emotion is

1 task irrelevant. Emotional expressions may still automatically capture attention in healthy  
2 controls, but not in psychopathic individuals as their top-down set is focused on orientation,  
3 rather than the emotion of the presented stimuli. By manipulating top-down attentional set  
4 and using different emotional facial expressions we directly compare the RMH and the IES  
5 with the aim of reconciling earlier contrasting findings.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 **1. METHODS**

### 12 *1.1. Participants*

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 We tested a mixed community sample ( $N=100$ ) consisting of 80 undergraduate students and  
18 20 non-students recruited from the community (36 males, mean age = 24.4, SD = 5.7; one  
19 participant did not provide age information). All participants had normal or corrected-to-  
20 normal vision and did not report any history of mental illness. All participants provided  
21 informed consent and course credits or a monetary reward was provided as compensation.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

### 1.2. *Materials and Design*

#### 1.2.1. *Psychopathy Questionnaire*

Participants started the experiment by completing the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI), a self-report questionnaire of 187 items that assesses psychopathic traits (Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). The overall PPI score can be split into two specific factors associated with psychopathy: PPI-I has been labelled ‘Fearless Dominance’ and represents social potency, fearlessness and stress immunity, whereas PPI-II is called ‘Impulsive Antisociality’ and refers to impulsivity, egocentricity and aggressiveness among the most dominant traits. These



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

factors have been found to be highly valid, demonstrating relations with psychopathic traits (Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen & Krueger, 2003; Benning, Patrick, Blonigen, Hicks & Iacono, 2005).

### 1.2.2. Emotional Capture Task

Following the questionnaire, participants conducted the Emotional Capture Task. Stimulus presentation and response collection were managed by a PC with a 22" monitor, using Matlab 2014b with the Psychophysics Toolbox extension (Brainard, 1997; Pelli, 1997). Stimuli were presented at a viewing distance of 75 cm, maintained with a chin-rest. The stimuli were the same as those used by Hodsoll et al. (2014), consisting of a subset of faces selected from the NimStim Face Stimulus Set (Tottenham et al., 2009). These faces consisted of twelve different identities: Six male and six female faces, each identity having a happy, neutral and fearful face. The face images were used in two separate tasks: The orientation task and the emotion task.

The orientation task was similar to the task used by Hodsoll et al. (2014). Participants were shown three images of different faces, presented around a central fixation dot (visual angle =  $0.3^\circ$ ). All images subtended a visual angle of  $4.19^\circ \times 2.82^\circ$  (h x w), and were presented  $2.67^\circ$  away from fixation (inner edge). All faces could be presented perfectly upright ( $0^\circ$  angle) or presented at a  $15^\circ$  angle to the left or right. Two faces were always presented above fixation and one face was presented below fixation (see Figure 1). One of the presented faces would always have a male identity which served as the target stimulus. Of the three presented faces, two faces would display neutral facial expressions, whereas the remaining face could display one of the three emotional expressions: Happy, fearful or neutral. The experiment was designed such that two-thirds of the trials contained an emotional expression at the male target face (happy or fearful). Of the remaining trials, when

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

the target face displayed a neutral expression, two thirds of those trials contained a female distractor face displaying a happy or fearful facial expression. Therefore, one ninth of the trials contained only faces with neutral facial expressions. All experimental factors were counterbalanced and randomized within blocks. In the orientation task, participants were instructed to indicate as fast as possible whether the male face was tilted to the left or right or presented upright, by pressing one of three keys on a standard keyboard ('v', 'b' and 'n' for left tilted, upright and right tilted). The emotion task was similar to the orientation task: Participants were instructed to search for the male target face and respond as fast as possible to whether this face displayed a neutral, happy or fearful emotional expression by pressing the 'v', 'b' and 'n' keys, respectively.

Participants were tested in a darkened room, and performed both tasks (orientation and emotion) in one session. The emotion and orientation task were presented in a blocked fashion, their order counterbalanced. For each trial, a central fixation dot appeared for 0.5 seconds, which was then followed by the search display which remained on the screen until a response was made. For either task, participants completed a practice block of 24 trials, then proceeded to complete four experimental blocks of 81 trials each (324 experimental trials in total).

-----  
Figure 1 here  
-----

### *1.2.3. Data Analysis*

Separate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) on the reaction time data were conducted on trials in which the emotion was presented on the target face versus trials on which the emotion was presented on the distractor face. As the RMH clearly states that emotion processing deficits

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

arise when important environmental stimuli are irrelevant to goal-directed behavior, a difference between target and distractor emotions was expected.

One-ninth of all trials consisted of only neutral faces. These trials were not entered into the ANOVA, due to being physically identical when the neutral emotion was presented at the target or a distractor face. Therefore, initial analyses were only conducted on trials containing either a happy or a fearful emotion on one of the faces. Subsequently, post-hoc comparisons were conducted against the appropriate neutral condition for baseline comparisons (i.e. the average reaction time for all neutral trials independently for each task).

To summarize, we conducted a series of mixed model ANOVAs on the reaction time data, with task (orientation, emotion) and emotion (happy, fearful) as within-subjects factors and the level of psychopathy as a between-subjects factor. Because psychopathy is a dimensional construct (Edens, Marcus, Lillienfeld & Poythress, 2006), two groups were created based on a median split of the factorial PPI scores. While a loss of power is unavoidable, this ensures that the different groups have significantly different psychopathy scores. In addition, it is the only option available to split out an interaction between task, emotion and psychopathy. The results below focus only on interactions between the experimental factors and psychopathy scores. For overall task performance, independent of psychopathy, see supplementary Figure S1.

## 2. RESULTS

Data from one participant was removed due to poor behavioral performance on the orientation task. For the reaction times analyses, all trials with incorrect responses were removed from the data set (6.56%). Subsequently, the data was trimmed towards a normal distribution by removing all trials in which the participant responded slower than 3000 ms or faster than 200 ms (0.81%). Additionally, all trials were removed with reaction times 2.5 SD

above the average of the trimmed data, separately for each participant and task (2.71%).

Table 1 describes the properties of the psychopathy questionnaire.

-----  
Table 1 here  
-----

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

2.1 *Psychopathy Analyses*

2.1.1 *Emotion at Target*

The mixed model ANOVA on the reaction times from trials in which the male target face displayed an emotional expression did not show any interactions between psychopathy and the experimental factors (smallest  $p$ 's: PPI-I = .135; PPI-II = .296; See Table 2 for all reaction times).

-----  
 Table 2 here  
 -----

2.1.2 *Emotion at Distractor*

Using PPI-I as a between-subjects factor did not yield a task x emotion x PPI-I interaction ( $F < 1$ ), whereas this three-way interaction was highly significant when using PPI-II as a between-subjects factor ( $F(1,97)=7.895, p=.006, \eta_p^2=.075$ ). Post-hoc ANOVAs with emotion as a within-subjects factor and PPI-II as a between-subjects factor, conducted separately per task, failed to produce a significant emotion x PPI-II interaction in the orientation task ( $F(1,97)=1.153, p=.286, \eta_p^2=.012$ ), but did result in a significant interaction between emotion x PPI-II in the emotion task ( $F(1,97)=6.792, p=.011, \eta_p^2=.065$ ). Post-hoc t-tests showed that the difference in reaction times between trials with happy and fearful distractor facial expressions was small and non-significant for the low-scoring psychopathy group ( $\Delta 1$  ms,  $t(47)=.086, p=.932$ ), whereas this difference was large and significant for the elevated psychopathy group ( $\Delta 44$  ms,  $t(50)=3.811, p<.001$ ). Participants in the elevated psychopathy group responded slowest to the male target face when one of the female distractor faces

1 displayed a fearful emotional expression (Figure 2). As the only statistically significant  
2 interactions between psychopathy and the experimental factors arose from using PPI-II as a  
3 between-subjects factor, we will be using this factor for the remaining analyses.  
4  
5

6  
7 -----  
8 Figure 2 here  
9 -----  
10

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 *2.1.3. Post-hoc comparisons with neutral trials*  
16

17  
18 To disentangle the differences between the low and elevated psychopathy groups with  
19 regards to emotional attentional capture by distracting emotional faces, we compared the  
20 reaction times from trials with happy or fearful distractor faces to trials consisting of only  
21 neutral faces. As previous analyses showed that the level of psychopathy only interacted with  
22 emotion in the emotion task, we conducted these post-hoc analyses for this task alone and  
23 solely for trials in which the distractor face displayed an emotional expression.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Figure 2 shows the average reaction times for the happy, fearful and neutral distractor  
34 trials during the emotion task. Post-hoc tests showed that reaction times to neutral trials in the  
35 emotion task were significantly faster than reaction times to distractors displaying a happy  
36 ( $\Delta 40$  ms;  $p=.004$ ) or a fearful ( $\Delta 41$  ms;  $p=.001$ ) expression in the low psychopathy group.  
37  
38 Contrary to these findings, post-hoc analyses on the reaction times in the emotion task  
39 indicated that the elevated group showed faster response times only to trials with distractor  
40 faces displaying fearful emotional expressions ( $\Delta 66$  ms;  $p<.001$ ), but this test did not reach  
41 significance for happy emotional expressions ( $\Delta 22$  ms;  $p=.094$ ). Importantly, the amount of  
42 emotional attentional capture for the elevated psychopathy group appeared to be much  
43 stronger for fearful facial expressions as compared to happy facial expressions, as indicated  
44 by a significant difference between the two emotions ( $p<.001$ ). For the low scoring  
45 psychopathy group, no such difference was observed ( $p=.932$ ).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

No effects of emotional attentional capture were observed in the accuracy data. Neither the low scoring psychopathy group, nor the elevated psychopathy group showed a difference in accuracy between neutral, happy and fearful trials in the emotion task when presented on a distractor face (low scoring group: smallest  $p=.224$ ; elevated group: smallest  $p=.194$ ).

### 3. Discussion

To better understand the interplay between emotional and cognitive factors in psychopathy, we compared two theories on the relation between psychopathy and attentional allocation to emotional facial expressions. Here, participants conducted two tasks in which they either indicated the orientation or the emotion of a target face.

The current study focused on 1) investigating to what extent top-down attentional set influenced emotional attentional capture in elevated compared to low scoring participants and 2) investigating how different emotional expressions may lead to different patterns of emotional attentional capture between elevated and low scoring psychopathic individuals. The first main finding is that no differences between the two groups were observed when the target face displayed an emotional expression. The second main finding is that top-down set influenced the degree to which an emotional facial expression attracted attention between the low versus elevated psychopathy group. That is, when emotion was task-relevant, the elevated psychopathy group showed no emotional attentional capture by happy distractor faces whereas this was the case in the low psychopathy group. When emotion was task-relevant, both groups showed similar responses to a fearful distractor. So, where the IES would predict abnormalities in the detection of fearful faces (be it as a target or distractor), no such pattern was observed here. Therefore, these findings suggest that top-down set has an influence on attentional allocation toward important emotional stimuli, which aligns with the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

RMH. However, some deviations were observed here: The RMH postulates that all stimuli not fitting a psychopathic individual's active top-down set will not be attended as they are irrelevant to their ongoing goals. Yet, when emotion was part of the top-down set individuals with elevated psychopathic traits were captured by fearful, but not happy distractor faces. This difference between groups was not observed when emotion was task-irrelevant. As such, these findings further suggest that cognitive factors (i.e., attention, top-down set) may not fully explain all emotion processing abnormalities in psychopathy (see supplementary section S2 for an alternative explanation). The concept of top-down attention as an underlying factor in psychopathy may therefore benefit from further refinement.

The observation that different emotions lead to different patterns of attentional capture, provides a tentative indication as to how the RMH can be refined. Deficits in attentional deployment to emotional faces, may potentially interact with the nature of the task being conducted even when these tasks rely on a similar top-down set. The current study investigated emotional attentional capture in a rapid visual search task, leading to differential responses for happy and fearful faces. In previous work, Baskin-Sommers and Newman (2014) used an attentional task in which the behavioral response was more intimately linked with the categorization of emotional expressions. In their study, no effect of the type of emotion was observed on attentional guidance. Therefore, it may be the case that both top-down attentional set as well as task-type determine to what extent psychopathic individuals are captured by emotional expressions.

A crucial observation is that all observed effects of psychopathy rely on PPI-II scores. PPI-II reflects behavioral traits that are labeled as 'Impulsive Antisociality', referring to impulsivity, egocentricity and aggressiveness. No effects of psychopathy were observed for PPI-I scores. The observation that cognitive factors play a major role in psychopathy as defined by PPI-II is in line with a recent meta-analysis that showed that structural and



1 functional deficits in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) of antisocial, psychopathic  
2 individuals correlated with poorer attentional control (Yang and Raine, 2016). In line with  
3 this finding, Sadeh and Verona (2008) showed reduced processing of irrelevant distractors for  
4 psychopathic individuals with primary psychopathic traits (e.g. callousness & social  
5 dominance). This is in line with the current observation that participants with elevated  
6 psychopathic traits were less distracted by happy emotional distractor faces. However, in the  
7 current study mainly PPI-II interacted with attention to influence the processing of emotional  
8 distractor faces, preventing the formulation of a clear conclusion as to which specific  
9 psychopathic traits interact with attention and emotion.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22         Despite a carefully constructed experimental design, some limitations should be  
23 addressed. First, the factor structure (i.e. PPI-I and PPI-II) of a questionnaire may vary when  
24 administered in different populations. However, given the current sample size it is not  
25 possible to conduct confirmatory factor analyses which leaves open the possibility that the  
26 factor structure in this sample is not similar to that reported in prior publications.  
27 Nonetheless, Cronbach's alpha was observed to be high for both factors, providing evidence  
28 that the test items making up the factors consistently measured the questionnaire's latent  
29 underlying variables. A second limitation comes from using a small sample. Although the  
30 sample size is sufficient for simple psychophysical measurements, the inclusion of a between  
31 subjects-factor related to highly-variant personality properties resulted in a sample that may  
32 not be large enough to expose all effects present in the data. However, the current study does  
33 provide an excellent starting point for future studies in larger, well-powered samples.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- 1  
2 Baskin-Sommers, A. R., Curtin, J. J., & Newman, J. P. (2011). Specifying the Attentional  
3  
4 Selection That Moderates the Fearlessness of Psychopathic Offenders. *Psychological Science*  
5  
6 22, <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610396227>  
7  
8  
9 Baskin-Sommers, Arielle R., and Joseph P. Newman. "Psychopathic and Externalizing Offenders  
10  
11 Display Dissociable Dysfunctions When Responding to Facial Affect." *Personality Disorders*  
12  
13 5, no. 4 (October 2014): 369–79. doi:10.1037/per0000077.  
14  
15  
16 Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Blonigen, D. M., Hicks, B. M., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Estimating  
17  
18 facets of psychopathy from normal personality traits: a step toward community  
19  
20 epidemiological investigations. *Assessment*, 12, 3–18.  
21  
22 <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191104271223>  
23  
24  
25 Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. F. (2003). Factor  
26  
27 Structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and Implications for Clinical  
28  
29 Assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 15, 340–350. <http://doi.org/10.1037/1040->  
30  
31 3590.15.3.340  
32  
33  
34 Blair, R. J. R. (2005). Applying a cognitive neuroscience perspective to the disorder of  
35  
36 psychopathy. *Development and Psychopathology*, 17, 865–891.  
37  
38 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579405050418>  
39  
40  
41 Blair, R. J. R., & Mitchell, D. G. V. (2009). Psychopathy, attention and emotion. *Psychological*  
42  
43 *Medicine*, 39, 543–555. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003991>  
44  
45  
46 Blair, R. J. R., Mitchell, D. G. V., Peschardt, K. S., Colledge, E., Leonard, R. A., Shine, J. H., ...  
47  
48 Perrett, D. I. (2004). Reduced sensitivity to others' fearful expressions in psychopathic  
49  
50 individuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1111–1122.  
51  
52 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.008>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, *10*, 433–436.

2 <http://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00357>

3  
4 Byrne, A., & Eysenck, M. W. (1995). Trait anxiety, anxious mood, and threat detection. *Cognition*  
5 *and Emotion*, *9*, 549–562. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02699939508408982>

6  
7 Dawel, A., O’Kearney, R., McKone, E., & Palermo, R. (2012). Not just fear and sadness: Meta-  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
analytic evidence of pervasive emotion recognition deficits for facial and vocal expressions in  
psychopathy. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *36*, 2288–2304.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.08.006>

Edens, J. F., Marcus, D. K., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Poythress, N. G. (2006). Psychopathic, not  
psychopath: taxometric evidence for the dimensional structure of psychopathy. *Journal of*  
*Abnormal Psychology*, *115*, 131–144. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.115.1.131>

Fairchild, G., Stobbe, Y., van Goozen, S. H. M., Calder, A. J., & Goodyer, I. M. (2010). Facial  
Expression Recognition, Fear Conditioning, and Startle Modulation in Female Subjects with  
Conduct Disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, *68*, 272–279.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2010.02.019>

Fairchild, G., Van Goozen, S. H. M., Calder, A. J., Stollery, S. J., & Goodyer, I. M. (2009).  
Deficits in facial expression recognition in male adolescents with early-onset or adolescence-  
onset conduct disorder. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *50*, 627–636.

<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02020.x>

Glass, S. J., & Newman, J. P. (2006). Recognition of facial affect in psychopathic offenders.

*Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *115*, 815–820. [http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-](http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.115.4.815)

[843X.115.4.815](http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.115.4.815)

Gorenstein, E. E., & Newman, J. P. (1980). Disinhibitory psychopathology: A new perspective  
and a model for research. *Psychological Review*, *87*, 301–315. [http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-](http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.3.301)

[295X.87.3.301](http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.3.301)

1 Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare psychopathy checklist-revised: Manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health  
2 Systems, Incorporated.

3  
4  
5 Hodsoll, Sara, Nilli Lavie, and Essi Viding. "Emotional Attentional Capture in Children with  
6  
7 Conduct Problems: The Role of Callous-Unemotional Traits." *Frontiers in Human*  
8  
9 *Neuroscience* 8 (August 26, 2014). doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00570.

10  
11  
12 Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Bulten, B. H., & Brazil, I. A. (2016). Parsing Fear: A Reassessment of the  
13  
14 Evidence for Fear Deficits in Psychopathy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(6), 573–600.  
15  
16 doi:10.1037/bul0000040.

17  
18  
19 Hoppenbrouwers, S. S., Van der Stigchel, S., Sergiou, C. S., & Theeuwes, J. (2016). Top-down  
20  
21 attention and selection history in psychopathy: Evidence from a community sample. *Journal*  
22  
23 *of Abnormal Psychology*, 125, 435–441. <http://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000133>

24  
25  
26 Hoppenbrouwers, S., van der Stigchel, S., Slotboom, J., Dalmeijer, E., & Theeuwes, J. (2015).  
27  
28 Disentangling attentional deficits in psychopathy using visual search: Failures in the use of  
29  
30 contextual information. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 132–138.  
31  
32 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.06.009>

33  
34  
35  
36 Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and Preliminary Validation of a Self-  
37  
38 Report Measure of Psychopathic Personality Traits in Noncriminal Population. *Journal of*  
39  
40 *Personality Assessment*, 66, 488–524. [http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603\\_3](http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6603_3)

41  
42  
43 Marsh, A. A., & Blair, R. J. R. (2008). Deficits in facial affect recognition among antisocial  
44  
45 populations: A meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 32, 454–465.  
46  
47 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2007.08.003>

48  
49  
50  
51 Newman, J. P., & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. (2012). Early selective attention abnormalities in  
52  
53 psychopathy. *Cognitive neuroscience of attention*, 421-440.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Newman, J. P., Curtin, J. J., Bertsch, J. D., & Baskin-Sommers, A. R. (2010). Attention Moderates  
2 the Fearlessness of Psychopathic Offenders. *Biological Psychiatry*, *67*, 66–70.  
3  
4 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.07.035>  
5  
6  
7 Newman, J. P., & Wallace, J. F. (1993). Diverse pathways to deficient self-regulation:  
8  
9 Implications for disinhibitory psychopathology in children. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *13*,  
10  
11 699–720. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(05\)80002-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(05)80002-9)  
12  
13  
14 Patterson, Mark C., C., & Newman, J. P. (1993). Reflectivity and learning from aversive events:  
15  
16 Toward a psychological mechanism for the syndromes of disinhibition. *Psychological*  
17  
18 *Review*, *100*, 716–736. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.4.716>  
19  
20  
21 Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: transforming numbers  
22  
23 into movies. *Spatial Vision*, *10*, 437–442. <http://doi.org/10.1163/156856897X00366>  
24  
25  
26 Sadeh, N., & Verona, E. (2008). Psychopathic personality traits associated with abnormal selective  
27  
28 attention and impaired cognitive control. *Neuropsychology*, *22*, 669–680.  
29  
30 <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0012692>  
31  
32  
33 Tottenham, N., Tanaka, J. W., Leon, A. C., McCarry, T., Nurse, M., Hare, T. A., ... Nelson, C.  
34  
35 (2009). The NimStim set of facial expressions: Judgments from untrained research  
36  
37 participants. *Psychiatry Research*, *168*, 242–249.  
38  
39 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2008.05.006>  
40  
41  
42  
43 Viding, E., & McCrory, E. J. (2012). Genetic and neurocognitive contributions to the development  
44  
45 of psychopathy. *Development and Psychopathology*, *24*, 969–983.  
46  
47 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S095457941200048X>  
48  
49  
50  
51 Yang, Y., & Raine, A. (2009). Prefrontal structural and functional brain imaging findings in  
52  
53 antisocial, violent, and psychopathic individuals: A meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research:*  
54  
55 *Neuroimaging*, *174*, 81–88. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychresns.2009.03.012>  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Yiend, J. (2010). The effects of emotion on attention: A review of attentional processing of  
emotional information. *Cognition and Emotion*, 24, 3–47.

<http://doi.org/10.1080/02699930903205698>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table Captions**

**Table 1.** Mean, standard deviation and range per group for both levels of the PPI questionnaire. In addition, Cronbach's alpha is included as a measure of internal consistency for factors PPI-I and PPI-II.

**Table 2.** Reaction Times and Accuracy for each condition, separately for the low scoring and the elevated group for the two different PPI factors (PPI-I and PPI-II).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure Captions**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Figure 1.** Examples of a typical stimulus screen. **A)** All neutral stimuli. **B)** The male target face displays an emotional expression. **C)** The female distractor face displays an emotional expression.

**Figure 2.** The two levels of psychopathy display a different pattern of emotional attentional capture for happy and fearful emotional expressions when emotion is task relevant and displayed on a distractor face. Error bars reflect the standard error of the mean.

Table 1

	Cronbach's alpha	<i>Low Psychopathy Group</i>			<i>Elevated Psychopathy Group</i>		
		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
PPI-I	0.899	119.43	13.35	81-135	151.12	11.48	146-191
PPI-II	0.898	157.10	12.81	119-173	198.39	16.70	174-235


Table 2

	<i>LOW SCORING GROUP</i>				<i>ELEVATED GROUP</i>			
	<i>Happy</i>		<i>Fearful</i>		<i>Happy</i>		<i>Fearful</i>	
	<i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>
<b><i>PPI - I</i></b>								
<b><i>Emotion Task</i></b>								
Target	958 (24)	92.6 (0.9)	1036 (30)	92.7 (1.1)	967 (19)	95.0 (0.5)	1076 (24)	92.4 (0.8)
Distractor	1089 (29)	91.0 (1.4)	1110 (30)	89.1 (1.5)	1118 (31)	92.7 (1.0)	1143 (27)	92.3 (1.0)
<b><i>Orientation Task</i></b>								
Target	751 (19)	94.1 (0.8)	760 (19)	93.9 (0.8)	742 (12)	95.2 (0.6)	753 (13)	94.7 (0.7)
Distractor	785 (22)	94.1 (0.8)	803 (22)	92.4 (1.0)	784 (15)	94.5 (0.8)	799 (15)	94.2 (1.0)
<b><i>PPI - II</i></b>								
<b><i>Emotion Task</i></b>								
Target	961 (24)	94.5 (0.6)	1047 (28)	93.3 (0.8)	964 (20)	93.2 (0.8)	1066 (26)	91.8 (1.1)
Distractor	1112 (34)	91.8 (1.0)	1113 (29)	90.8 (1.1)	1096 (26)	91.8 (1.4)	1140 (28)	90.6 (1.5)
<b><i>Orientation Task</i></b>								
Target	741 (14)	95.2 (0.5)	753 (15)	95.3 (0.6)	751 (18)	94.1 (0.8)	759 (17)	93.5 (0.8)
Distractor	779 (18)	94.5 (0.6)	801 (16)	94.3 (0.8)	791 (19)	94.1 (0.8)	801 (21)	92.4 (1.1)

Figure 1



Figure 2



### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Stefan van der Stigchel for his helpful comments and suggestions.

### **Funding**

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Preparation of this manuscript was supported by an ERC advanced grant [ERC-2012-AdG – 323413 Jan Theeuwes] and a TUBITAK-BIDEB visiting scientist grant [2221 – J. Munneke].

## Supplementary Figure S1

	<i>Emotion Task</i>				<i>Orientation Task</i>			
	<i>Happy</i> <i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>Fearful</i> <i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>Happy</i> <i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>	<i>Fearful</i> <i>RT (ms)</i>	<i>Acc (%)</i>
Emotion on Target	962 (15)	93.8 (0.5)	1057 (19)	92.5 (0.7)	746 (11)	94.6 (0.5)	756 (12)	94.3 (0.5)
Emotion on Distractor	1104 (21)	91.8 (0.9)	1127 (20)	90.7 (0.9)	785 (13)	94.3 (0.5)	801 (13)	93.3 (0.7)

	<i>Target Emotion</i>				<i>Distractor Emotion</i>			
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta_p^2$	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta_p^3$
<b>Reaction Times</b>								
<i>Factor</i>								
Task	(1,98)	475.432	< .01	0.829	(1,98)	517.136	< .01	0.841
Emotion	(1,98)	93.617	< .01	0.489	(1,98)	14.681	< .01	0.13
Task x Emotion	(1,98)	72.501	< .01	0.425	(1,98)	0.536	0.466	0.005

	<i>Target Emotion</i>				<i>Distractor Emotion</i>			
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta_p^2$	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta_p^3$
<b>Accuracy</b>								
<i>Factor</i>								
Task	(1,98)	10.666	0.002	0.098	(1,98)	14.651	< .01	0.13
Emotion	(1,98)	5.100	0.026	0.049	(1,98)	4.433	0.038	0.043
Task x Emotion	(1,98)	1.861	0.176	0.019	(1,98)	0.031	0.86	0


Supplementary Figure S1 shows an overview of all mean reaction times and accuracy scores for each task, emotion and location (target or distractor; top-panel), independent of level of psychopathy. Furthermore, Figure S2 (middle-panel) presents the reaction-time based statistical tests (Repeated Measures ANOVA) conducted for all main and interaction effects, independent of level of psychopathy, separately for trials in which the target face displayed an emotion and

trials in which the distractor face displayed an emotion. Finally, the bottom-panel presents the results of a similar ANOVA conducted on the accuracy scores.

To summarize, the general task effects show that top-down attentional set influences the extent to which emotional faces attract attention as well as an influence of emotional expression on attentional guidance. Finally, stimulus-relevance (target or distractor) appears to influence the manner in which attention is guided towards emotional faces. Therefore, the current task is highly suitable to study the relationship top-down attention, emotional expression and psychopathic traits.



## Supplementary Figure S2



Due to the fact that the male target face contained an emotion on 67% of the trials, participants may have been searching for the presence of an ‘emotion’ rather than a male target face as it indicated the target face with an above chance probability. Although adopting a top-down set for emotion could partially explain the current results, additional analyses indicate that it is unlikely that the participants adopted this top-down set.

To rule out the option that participants used emotion as a search template, we looked at the effects of the presence or absence of emotions on reaction times over a period of time during which participants could potentially learn to use emotion as an attentional guide. As participants were not informed of the probability of the presence of emotion at the target location, using this strategy needs to be learned; an effect which should take place over time and trials. We calculated to what extent reaction times to an emotional expression at the target face decreased compared to trials on which the target face displayed a neutral expression (distractors could still

display an emotion). If participants learned to use emotion as a guide for finding the target, we expected no difference between the RTs for happy and fearful emotions compared to neutral emotions early on in the experiment when learning had not taken place yet. However, after a subset of trials participants would have learned to guide attention towards the target's emotional expression when present, leading to fast response times for happy and fearful target faces compared to all neutral trials and trials on which participants mistakenly selected a distractor emotion. Alternatively, if attentional capture by emotion is fully automatic, we expect no difference over time for the influence of emotion on attention. Already at the start of the experiment, the difference between the presence of a happy or fearful target expression should be faster compared to neutral trials.

In order to address this issue, we calculated the average reaction time based on a rolling average for each type of emotion based on the contents of constructed bins of 26 sequential trials. That is, the first bin consisted of trials 1- 26, the second bin of trials 2 – 27 and so on. This moving average provides a good measure of how participants may have learned to use emotion as a guide for finding the target. Each bin contained a subset of trials in which one of the three possible emotions (including neutral) was presented at the target location. Therefore, each bin yielded an average reaction time per emotion. This way, changes in reaction times over time could be studied for each task and emotion (orientation and emotion) separately. As most changes are expected to occur in the beginning of the experiment when learning would potentially take place, we aimed our analysis on the first 30 bins of data (See Figure S2). Crucially, we used trials from the task (emotion or orientation) that participants conducted first in the experimental session as the learning effect is expected to take place there. An ANOVA with emotion (happy, fearful and neutral) and Bin (1-30) yielded a significant effect of emotion

and bin in both tasks (all tests Huynh-Feldt corrected): Emotion task: emotion:  $F(2,96) = 31.030$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.393$ ; bin:  $F(29,1392) = 18.932$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.283$ ; orientation Task: emotion:  $F(2,98) = 4.829$ ,  $p = .010$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .090$ ; bin:  $F(29,1450) = 12.416$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .202$ ). Crucially, no interaction between emotion and bin was observed in either task (Emotion task:  $F(58,2784) = 1.266$ ,  $p = .265$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .02$ ; Orientation task:  $F < 1$ ) suggesting that participants did not learn to use emotion as an attentional guide, but rather were captured by emotion equally throughout the experiment. To obtain further support for this observation, we compared the effects of the first 30 bins with the last 30 bins of each task. If learning to use the emotion as an attentional guide takes place over time, a three-way interaction can be expected between emotion x bin x bin location (first 30 bins or last 30 bins; a graphical representation of these effects can be seen in Figure S2). Crucially, neither task showed this three-way interaction (both  $F$ s  $< 1$ ), providing clear evidence that participants were automatically captured by emotion.