RESEARCH ARTICLE | *Control of Movement*

Impaired visuomotor generalization by inconsistent attentional contexts

Tony S. L. Wang[1] and Joo-Hyun Song[1,2]

[1]*Department of Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Science, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island; and* [2]*Brown Institute for Brain Sciences, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island*

Wang TS, Song JH. Impaired visuomotor generalization by inconsistent attentional contexts. *J Neurophysiol* 118: 1709–1719, 2017. First published June 28, 2017; doi:10.1152/jn.00089.2017.—In daily life, people are constantly presented with situations in which they have to learn and acquire new motor skills in complex environments, where attention is often distracted by other events. Being able to generalize and perform the acquired motor action in different environments is a crucial part of visuomotor learning. The current study examined whether attentional distraction impairs generalization of visuomotor adaptation or whether consistent distraction can operate as an internal cue to facilitate generalization. Using a dual-task paradigm combining visuomotor rotational adaptation and an attention-demanding secondary task, we showed that switching the attentional context from training (dual-task) to generalization (single-task) reduced the range of transfer of visuomotor adaptation to untrained directions. However, when consistent distraction was present throughout training and generalization, visuomotor generalization was equivalent to without distractions at all. Furthermore, this attentional context-dependent generalization was evident even when sensory modality of distractions differed between training and generalization. Therefore, the general nature of the dual tasks, rather than the specific stimuli, is associated with visuomotor memory and serves as a critical cue for generalization. Taken together, we demonstrated that attention plays a critical role during sensorimotor adaptation in selecting and associating multisensory signals with motor memory. This finding provides insight into developing learning programs that are generalizable in complex daily environments.

NEW & NOTEWORTHY Learning novel motor actions in complex environments with attentional distraction is a critical function. Successful motor learning involves the ability to transfer the acquired skill from the trained to novel environments. Here, we demonstrate attentional distraction does not impair visuomotor adaptation. Rather, consistency in the attentional context from training to generalization modulates the degree of transfer to untrained locations. The role of attention and memory must, therefore, be incorporated into existing models of visuomotor learning.

motor learning; motor control; visual attention

THE ABILITY TO LEARN and perform motor skills, such as driving a car, is a fundamental aspect of human behavior and is often critical for daily function. The example of driving under different traffic conditions illustrates how motor skills must be performed in different environmental conditions. The ability to transfer and extrapolate motor skills to novel and different contexts is an important function of motor learning, which possibly reveals the underlying representational changes in motor memory (Poggio and Bizzi 2004; Taylor et al. 2013; Thoroughman and Shadmehr 2000; Thoroughman and Taylor 2005). For instance, people can extend and generalize acquired motor behaviors to other directions (Krakauer et al. 2000), hand positions (Shadmehr and Moussavi 2000), and even movements of the other arm (Criscimagna-Hemminger et al. 2003; Wang and Sainburg 2004, 2006).

Learning is often localized such that the transfer of motor learning to untrained spatial regions is limited (Krakauer et al. 2000). For instance, generalization of the visuomotor adaptation to untrained directions generally decreases as a function of increased angular distance from the trained direction, and it is often confined to target directions within 45° of either side of the trained direction (Ghahramani et al. 1996; Krakauer et al. 2000; Taylor and Ivry 2013a). A neural network model readily accounts for these findings (Donchin et al. 2003; Tanaka et al. 2009, 2012; Thoroughman and Taylor 2005) by assuming that adaptation updates neural populations, with each neuron being represented by a tuning function corresponding to separate spatial directions. Adaptation training to one spatial direction tunes neurons to preferably respond to that movement. Importantly, the width of the tuning function determines the range with which this movement generalizes to untrained directions.

Transfer of motor actions can be also affected by changes in the environmental cue (Lee and Schweighofer 2009; Shea and Morgan 1979). Learning under certain contexts also constrains the transfer of motor behavior to novel contexts (Ayala et al. 2015; Dionne and Henriques 2008; Hommel 1993; Ivry et al. 2004; Mechsner et al. 2001). In a sequential motor learning paradigm, for example, Ruitenberg et al. (2012) trained participants to make one of four key presses on the keyboard that corresponded to one of four positions on the computer screen. They learned two six-key sequences and each sequence was associated with either a blue or yellow training cue. For one group, the mapping between training cue color and key sequence was reversed between training and test. It resulted in longer mean reaction times compared with a group that retained the original cue-sequence mapping. Therefore, the ability to reproduce the learned sequence was dependent on the color of training cue.

Similar external constraints on generalization of visuomotor adaptation have also been observed. For instance, Criscimagna-Hemminger et al. (2003; see also Wang and Sainburg 2004, 2006) showed that participants could transfer visuomotor adaptation learned by one arm to the other. Recently, Taylor

Address for reprint requests and other correspondence: T. S. L. Wang, Dept. of Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences, Brown Univ., 190 Thayer St., Providence, RI 02912 (e-mail: tony_wang@brown.edu).

and Ivry (2013a) argued that the width of the generalization function is also influenced by the training environment. They examined whether an external contextual cue, created by a circular or rectangular target arrangement, affected the transfer of adaptation to untrained directions. Participants were trained either with a translational shift perturbation in the rectangular workspace or with a visuomotor rotation in the circular workspace. They found that switching the target arrangement in the visuomotor rotation condition from circular to rectangular broadened the generalization function. Conversely, switching the target arrangement from rectangular to circular in the translational shift condition narrowed the generalization function. Therefore, the external environment modulated the width of the generalization function.

Beyond these external factors, Bédard and Song (2013) recently examined how concurrent cognitive processes affect the generalization of visuomotor adaptation. They observed that performing visuomotor training with a concurrent, attention-demanding discrimination task, such as a rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP) task, reduced the gain and narrowed the tuning of the generalization function. They suggested that divided attention narrowly restricts an internal model, reducing the range and magnitude of transfer by modulating a selective subpopulation of neurons in motor areas. This suggestion is consistent with a traditional notion that attention is a necessary resource that facilitates learning and, therefore, dividing attentional resources across tasks can impair learning (Curran and Keele 1993; Nissen and Bullemer 1987; Pashler 1998; Taylor and Thoroughman 2007, 2008).

Yet, we noticed that this effect of divided attention on generalization (Bédard and Song 2013) was only studied under inconsistent task context between the training (dual-task) and the generalization phase (single task). On the basis of a series of subsequent studies, we formulated an alternative hypothesis that the reduced generalization led by divided attention could be caused by inconsistency between task contexts. Using a similar dual-task paradigm as in Bédard and Song (2013), Song and colleagues (Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015) examined how various attentional demands of a secondary task modulate immediate motor performance and how consistency in task context between learning and recall affects memory formation and retrieval. Surprisingly, they found that performing the distraction task did not impair the rate of initial visuomotor learning. However, recall of visuomotor adaptation, learned with the distractor present, required that the distractor also be present during the recall phase. In the absence of a distractor task in the recall phase, there was no benefit of prior learning for motor performance in recall (i.e., savings of learning). Importantly, this savings-of-learning effect was not task specific. Song and Bédard (2015) showed that the type of stimuli in the secondary task does not provide the context to facilitate recall; rather, it is the consistent state of attentional distraction generated by completing the secondary task. Participants demonstrated superior recall of visuomotor adaptation, even if they completed two different secondary tasks in training (RSVP task) and recall (sound discrimination task). This paradoxical result suggests that performing the dual-task induces an attentional state (divided vs. undivided) that acts as a "vital context" for encoding and retrieval of motor memories (Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015). Extending beyond this result, Im et al. (2016) showed that this

newfound paradoxical benefit of consistent dual-task context lasts for more than one day as visuomotor memory retrieval is enhanced under conditions in which it is more difficult to engage in attentional selection of the motor task.

The current study compared two alternative hypotheses: *1)* whether divided attention impairs generalization or *2)* whether consistent divided attention can operate as an internal contextual cue for visuomotor generalization. In short, we applied the dual-task paradigm (e.g., Bédard and Song 2013) to visuomotor generalization. Participants first completed the visuomotor adaptation task with and without a secondary task to one direction. Then, participants generalized visuomotor adaptation with and without the secondary task to untrained directions. If attention operates as a resource for processing, visuomotor generalization would be impeded whenever the secondary task is performed regardless of context consistency between the training and generalization phases. Conversely, if the consistent attentional context necessitates visuomotor adaptation generalization beyond the trained direction, those who consistently divide their attention to a secondary task across training and generalization phases would fully generalize their performance equivalent to those who consistently perform a single task.

Following Song and Bédard (2015) and Im et al. (2016), we introduced an additional group to determine whether the key to successful visuomotor generalization depends on the repetition of specific secondary task across training and generalization. In this group, participants completed two different secondary tasks within different sensory modalities in training and generalization (i.e., RSVP and sound discrimination). We hypothesize that attentional context is generated by the general nature of consistent attentional distraction and not the specific task. The transfer of adaptation in this group is expected to be analogous to generalization in the other consistent groups. Such a result would imply that context modulation of generalization and recall of visuomotor adaptation (i.e., Song and Bédard 2015) share a common learning system.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Participants

Fifty-two right-handed participants with normal color vision and normal or corrected-to-normal vision participated in the experiment in exchange for course credit. All participants were naïve to the goal of the experiment. The number of participants per group ($n = 13$) was determined on the basis of prior studies that utilized a similar dual-task paradigm and experimental design (Bédard and Song 2013; Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015). Reliable effect sizes were observed in these studies ($\eta^2 > 0.26$).[1] The sample size is also within the range of sample sizes from previous visuomotor adaptation studies (e.g., Krakauer et al. 2000; Thoroughman and Taylor 2005). The experimental protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Brown University.

Apparatus and Materials

In a dimly illuminated room, participants sat in a chair ~57 cm from an Apple iMac computer with a 21-inch screen with refresh rate 60 Hz and native resolution of 1920 × 1080 pixels. Participants used a stylus pen to perform a goal-directed reaching task with their right hand.

---

[1] According to Cohen (1988) effect sizes of 0.02, 0.13, and 0.26 are considered small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively.

Movement of the stylus controlled a corresponding cursor on the screen (diameter 0.5 cm). The tips of the stylus rested on a touch screen (Magic Touch; Keytec, Garland TX) that lay flat on a table and aligned with each participant's midline and the center of the computer screen. Stimulus presentation and recording of cursor displacement was controlled by custom software written in MATLAB (version 2008b; MathWorks, Natick, MA) and functions from Psychtoolbox (version 3) (Brainard 1997; Pelli 1997).

Design and Procedure

Visuomotor task. Figure 1*A* outlines the visuomotor adaptation task. Participants were tasked to move a cursor from a starting position (annulus with a diameter of 1°, corresponding to 1 cm) in the center of the screen toward a reach target (solid white dot, 1 cm in diameter) located 5.5 cm from the starting position. Participants were specifically instructed to make fast and linear movements toward the target and then to return to the starting position immediately after reaching the target. Seven possible target directions were assigned to each participant: one training target (randomly selected from 3, 6, 9, or 12 o'clock directions from the starting position) and six other target directions located at ±22.5°, ±45°, and ±90° relative to the training target. The target remained visible for the entire duration of the trial (1,500 ms). A trial started when the cursor was positioned in the starting position, and this triggered the appearance of the reach target in the visuomotor task, as well as the visual or auditory stream in the secondary task. There were two types of experimental trials. In the no-rotation trials, the cursor followed the stylus movement. In the


Fig. 1. Task schematics. *A*: reaching task: The solid circle indicates a reach target location, and the open circle indicates the starting position. Reach targets appeared one at a time and remained visible for the entire trial (1,500 ms). In no-rotation trials, the cursor (dotted line) followed stylus motion (solid line) normally, whereas in rotation trials, the cursor direction was rotated by 45°CCW or CW from the reach trajectory. *B*: secondary rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP) task: Five upright or inverted Ts of various colors were each presented sequentially for 150 ms, with 150-ms gaps between stimuli (total of 1,500 ms). Participants had to report at the end of each trial how many relevant targets (1, 2, or 3) were presented in that trial. Targets were defined as inverted green and upright red Ts. *C*: secondary sound discrimination task. Five tones at three different frequencies (200 Hz, 300 Hz, and 450 Hz) appeared again with the same timing as the RSVP task. Participants had to report the total number of high- and low-frequency tones. *D*: experimental phases. The solid circles indicate locations of seven reach targets. Reach targets appeared one at a time. Participants performed four consecutive experimental phases. In the familiarization phase (no-rotation), participants made reaching movements to seven target directions with cursor feedback. The baseline phase (no-rotation) is the same as the familiarization phase, except cursor feedback was only visible to the trained direction. In the training phase (rotation), participants reached only toward the trained direction with rotated cursor feedback. In the generalization phase (rotation), participants reached toward seven target directions. Cursor feedback was provided only for the trained direction.

rotation trials, the cursor direction was rotated 45° counterclockwise (CCW) or 45° clockwise (CW). The direction of rotation was counterbalanced between participants. The rotation was applied for the entire duration of the trial (i.e., 1,500 ms from trial onset), including both the outward and inward movements. Outside the trial, the unrotated cursor was visible to guide participants back to the starting position.

Secondary RSVP task. Figure 1*B* illustrates schematic outline of the RSVP tasks. A sequence of five Ts shapes (0.5° × 1°) was generated from pseudorandom permutations of letter orientation (inverted or upright) and color (red, white, green, blue, or yellow). The sequence was presented above the starting position and each T in the sequence appeared every 300 ms, remaining visible for only 150 ms (for a total of 1,500 ms). Participants were required to detect conjunction targets (red upright Ts and green inverted Ts) and report the total number of targets detected at the end of teach trial by pressing a keyboard key with their left hand. The number of target Ts for each trial varied with a uniform distribution between one and three, and thus, 33% represents chance performance. To control for the effect of divided attention on reaching, a control task was devised in which participants received instructions to ignore the Ts and simply press the key corresponding to the visual written cue such as "Press button 1" at the end of each trial with their left hand. The RSVP stream appeared on every trial of all experimental phases except during the sound discrimination task. This ensured that visual stimuli remained consistent for all groups.

In our previous studies (i.e., Song and Bédard 2013, 2015) that have used a similar dual-task paradigm, we have repeatedly demonstrated that eye movements do not affect performance in the dual-task paradigm. Specifically, allowing participants to either make free eye movements or maintain central gaze fixation does not affect accuracy in the RSVP task or reach error in visuomotor adaptation. As a consequence, we did not constrain each participant's eye movements throughout the experiment.

Secondary sound discrimination task. Figure 1*C* illustrates the schematic outline of the sound discrimination task. Five tones at three different frequencies (200 Hz, 300 Hz, and 450 Hz) appeared with the same timing as the RSVP task, and participants were asked to count the number of low- and high-frequency tones within each sequence. The total number of relevant low- and high-frequency tones varied randomly between one and three with equal probability.

Experimental design. Figure 1*D* outlines the four phases within each experimental session: *1*) familiarization (70 no-rotation trials with seven target directions), *2*) baseline (70 no-rotation trials with seven target directions), *3*) training (70 rotation trials with one target direction), and *4*) generalization (70 rotation trials with seven target directions). The familiarization phase provided participants with the opportunity to practice reaching toward each target direction with continuous cursor feedback to all seven directions. The baseline phase was designed to measure for inherent bias in the reach movement toward each direction. The cursor remained visible for only the training target (i.e., 0°) but disappeared once the cursor left the starting position for the six remaining directions. The position of the training target was counterbalanced between participants, and it appeared at the 3, 6, 9, or 12 o'clock position. In the training phase, visuomotor adaptation was trained with the single training target. Participants received continuous feedback to the training target, and their reach trajectory was rotated by either 45° clockwise (CW) or counterclockwise (CCW). The degree to which visuomotor adaptation transferred to untrained directions (±22.5°, ±45°, and ±90° relative to the training target) was measured in the generalization phase. Cursor feedback was rotated to the same direction as the training phase (i.e., either 45° CW or CCW), and continuous feedback was presented for the trained target but not for the untrained targets (Krakauer et al. 2000).

Experimental groups. Four experimental groups were created on the basis of whether participants completed a concurrent secondary task during the training and/or generalization phases. For naming convention (see Song and Bédard 2015), "RSVP" refers to participants completing the RSVP task with reaching (i.e., high distraction of attention), "sound" refers to participants completing the sound discrimination task, and "none" refers to participants completing the button press (control) task with reaching (i.e., no distraction of attention). In the RSVP-RSVP group, for example, participants completed the RSVP task during both the training and generalization phases of the experiment. Participants in the none-none group completed the button press task during both the training and generalization phases. In the RSVP-sound group, participants completed the RSVP task in training and completed the sound discrimination task in generalization. Finally, in the RSVP-none group, participants completed the RSVP task in training and completed the button press task in generalization.

Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures generally followed those used in our previous studies (Bédard and Song 2013; Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015). For the visuomotor task, we filtered the *x* and *y* coordinates of the cursor displacements with a low-pass Butterworth filter using an 10-Hz cutoff and then calculated the cursor trajectory by taking the square root of the sum of squared *x* and *y* coordinates at each time point. We differentiated the position of the cursor to yield tangential velocity and determined the onset and end of movement when the cursor reaches 5% of peak velocity. We measured reaction time (RT) as the time elapsed from target appearance to movement onset and the movement time (MT) as the time elapsed between movement onset and movement end. We measured reach error by calculating the angle between the line that joined the starting position to the target with the line that joined the position of the cursor at movement onset to the position of the cursor at peak velocity. To conduct the statistical analysis, individual participant's training and generalization data for each dependent variable (i.e., reach error, RT, and MT) were averaged across seven successive trials to create 10 blocks of seven trials.

Following previous studies (Bédard and Song 2013; Krakauer et al. 2000), we calculated an adaptation index (*Eq. 1*) for each target direction to quantify the generalization function.

$$\text{Adaptation Index} = 1 - \frac{E_{Gen} - E_{Base}}{45°} \tag{1}$$

where E_{Gen} and E_{Base} represented the reach error during the generalization and baseline phases, respectively. An adaptation index of 0 or 1 represents no or full adaptation, respectively. To determine whether divided attention would alter the gain, shift, or width of the generalization function, we fitted a Gaussian function to the rotation adaptation index of each individual participant as a function of angular distance from the trained direction:

$$f(x) = ae^{\frac{-x^2}{2s^2}} + c \tag{2}$$

where parameter *a* is the gain, *c* is the constant shift, and *s* is the width of the Gaussian function, and *x* is the angular distance from the training target. We used MATLAB (2014b, MathWorks) and SPSS (version 22, IBM) for data and statistical analyses.

RESULTS

Training Phase: No Disruption of Motor Performance by Attentional Distraction

Performance accuracy in the RSVP task was first analyzed to confirm that participants effectively allocated their attention to the secondary task in training. Mean accuracy in the RSVP-

none, $51\% \pm 0.02$, $t_{12} = 10.47$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 2.94$, RSVP-RSVP, $55\% \pm 0.03$, $t_{12} = 6.31$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 1.78$, and RSVP-sound $50\% \pm 0.02$, $t_{12} = 7.49$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 2.08$, groups were all above chance performance (~33%). Mean accuracy was also not different between groups ($F_{2,36} = 1.35$, $P = 0.27$).

Figure 2A shows that attentional load did not affect reach error performance. In all four groups (none-none, RSVP-none, RSVP-RSVP, and RSVP-sound), reach error was reduced across trial blocks, and each group achieved a similar level of performance in the final block. We conducted a two-way group (none-none, RSVP-none, RSVP-RSVP, and RSVP-sound) × trial block (1st–4th, and 10th blocks) ANOVA of reach error using data from the first four training blocks, as well as the final training block. The first four blocks were chosen because this range was most representative of learning. Reduction in reach error was greatest over this period, and reach error approached asymptotic performance in the fourth block. The final block was included to indicate asymptotic performance. A Mauchly's test of sphericity showed that the assumption of sphericity was violated for the factor of trial block. Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were applied to subsequent ANOVAs involving this factor to reduce the chance of Type I error. This analysis revealed there was a significant main effect of trial block, $F_{2.29,109.80} = 117.52$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.70$, mean squared error (MSE) = 44.66, indicating visuomotor adaptation. Importantly, adaptation was not affected by attentional distraction, as the main effect of group was not significant, $F_{3,48} = 1.13$, $P = 0.35$. The trial block × group interaction was not significant ($F < 1$). Therefore, performing the RSVP task does not impair visuomotor learning. This is consistent with previous studies that have used a similar procedure (Bédard and Song 2013; Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015).

RT and MT were analyzed to determine whether participants used a compensatory strategy in the dual-task procedure. For instance, participants may allocate extra cognitive resources to the RSVP task, allowing for longer initiations of movement (RT) or slower movements (MT). In such cases, RT and/or MT would be longer in the dual-task conditions. Figure 2B, left shows the mean RT for the four groups. As per the analysis of reach error, we analyzed RT and MT data from the first four and final trial blocks. Analysis of RT revealed a main effect of trial block, $F_{3.39,162} = 22.83$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.29$, MSE = 0.006, and group, $F_{3,48} = 6.41$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.29$, MSE = 0.03. The two-way interaction was also significant, $F_{10.13,162} = 2.3$, $P = 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.1$, MSE = 0.006, and this implies that group difference was largest in the early blocks but reduced in the final block. We conducted a post hoc contrast analysis to compare RT of the single-task group against the three dual-task groups. This analysis showed that RT in the three dual-task groups was not different to RT in the single task group, $F_{1,48} = 2.77$, $P = 0.1$. Instead, the main effect of group appears to be driven by some individual differences between the three dual-task groups. Such differences are unlikely to be interesting since each dual-task group followed an identical experiment procedure.

Figure 2C, left shows that participants took less time to complete each movement with repeated trials as mean MT decreases across trial blocks. The group × trial block ANOVA confirms the main effects of trial blocks, $F_{3.14,150.77} = 7.74$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.13$, MSE = 0.006, as well as group, $F_{3,48} = 4.1$, $P = 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.20$, MSE = 0.05. The two-way interaction was not significant, $F_{9.42,123.91} = 1.21$, $P = 0.39$. We again conducted a post hoc contrast analysis of MT from the single task group and compared it to MT from the three


Fig. 2. Mean performance during the training and generalization phases for the none-none (blue), RSVP-none (orange), RSVP-RSVP (green), and RSVP-sound groups (purple). Each trial block represents the mean performance from every two trials in the training phase and seven trials in the generalization phase. A: reach error during the training phase. We measured reach error by calculating the angle between the line that joined the starting base to the target with the line that joined the position of the cursor at movement onset to the position of the cursor at peak velocity. B: reaction time (RT) during training (left) and generalization (right). RT was defined as the time elapsed from target appearance to movement onset. C: movement time (MT) during training (left) and generalization (right). MT was defined as the time elapsed between movement onset and movement. Error bars represent means ± SE.

dual-task groups. This analysis showed that MT was not affected by the presence of attentional distraction, $F_{1,48} = 1.02$, $P = 0.32$. The analysis of both RT and MT suggest that completing the RSVP task did not interfere with visuomotor learning. Participants did not appear to devise a cognitive or movement strategy to compensate for completing the RSVP task. This finding is consistent with studies that have used a similar dual-task paradigm (Bédard and Song 2013; Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015).

Generalization Phase: Inconsistent Attentional Context Impairs Visuomotor Generalization

The critical question is how consistency of attentional context affects visuomotor generalization. We compared generalization performance of the three consistent context groups, RSVP-RSVP (consistent divided attention), none-none (consistent undivided attention), and RSVP-sound (consistent divided attention across two secondary tasks), to generalization performance in the inconsistent group, RSVP-none (inconsistent divided-undivided attention). The RSVP-sound group is designed to show that attentional context is generated by the nature of consistent attentional distraction and not the specific task. Consequently, we expect the transfer of adaptation to be similar between the RSVP-RSVP and RSVP-sound groups.

Performance accuracy was analyzed to show that participants maintained their attention to the secondary task in the generalization phase. In the RSVP-RSVP group, participants performed above chance accuracy, 56% ± 0.04, $t_{12} = 6.10$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 1.72$, and their performance was not different from training, $t_{12} = -1.24$, $P = 0.24$, $d = 0.34$. Similarly, sound discrimination performance in the RSVP-sound group was above chance accuracy, 61% ± 0.03, $t_{12} = 8.14$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 2.26$, but these participants showed better sound discrimination accuracy than their RSVP accuracy in training, $t_{12} = -2.99$, $P = 0.01$, $d = 0.83$. Comparison of accuracy on the secondary tasks between the RSVP-RSVP and RSVP-sound groups yielded no difference ($t < 1$).

Dividing attentional resources during the training phase did not impair the degree of visuomotor adaptation for the trained target. Mean reach error to the trained target were not different between the none-none, RSVP-none, RSVP-RSVP, and RSVP-sound groups, 19.38° ± 12.23°, 19.03° ± 9.21°, 18.61° ± 7.04°, and 18.84° ± 7.66° respectively ($F < 1$).

We again analyzed RT and MT data to ensure that participants did not use a strategy to compensate for the secondary task in the generalization phase. Recall that only the RSVP-RSVP and RSVP-sound groups completed a secondary task in generalization. Figure 2B, right shows longer mean RT in the none-none group than the other three groups. The trial block × group ANOVA confirmed that both the main effects of group, $F_{3,48} = 3.76$, $P = 0.02$, $\eta^2 = 0.19$, MSE = 0.05, and trial block, $F_{6.99,335.45} = 2.89$, $P = 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$, MSE = 0.004, were significant. The two-way interaction was not significant, $F_{20.33,325.22} = 1.1$, $P = 0.35$. Participants did not appear to compensate for the RSVP task by devising a strategy, since RT was not higher in either the RSVP-RSVP or RSVP-sound groups. This was confirmed by a post hoc contrast analysis of the single-task and dual-task groups ($F < 1$). Figure 2C, right shows the mean MT for each group in the generalization phase. From the figure, it is clear that there is no difference in mean

MT between groups, $F_{3,48} = 1.15$, $P = 0.34$, but MT appears to decrease with increased trial blocks, $F_{6.23,300}) = 2.25$, $P = 0.04$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$, MSE = 0.003. The two-way interaction was not significant, $F_{18.69,300} = 1.45$, $P = 0.08$.

Our primary interest is whether consistency of the attentional state (i.e., divided vs. undivided) between training and generalization affects visuomotor adaptation to untrained directions. To recap, we hypothesized that performing the RSVP task concurrently with the visuomotor adaptation task did not impair immediate motor performance during training, but it may lead to impaired consolidation of learning. This leads to weaker transfer of visuomotor adaptation to the untrained directions in all three RSVP groups (RSVP-none, RSVP-RSVP, and RSVP-sound). In contrast, the consistency of attentional contexts (undivided vs. divided attention) between the training and generalization phases could modulate the transfer of adaptation. In this case, generalization should be weakest for the RSVP-none group.

Figure 3 shows the adaptation index (*Eq. 1*; markers) as a function of angular distance between the trained target directions and other untrained target directions. An adaptation index of 0 indicates no adaptation and 1 indicates full adaptation. Consistent with previous visuomotor generalization studies, the peak responses for all the groups are at the trained direction with decay to untrained directions, suggesting that adaptation is localized to the trained direction (e.g., Krakauer et al. 2000; Taylor et al. 2013). To further examine how diverting attention to the secondary task affects the width, the gain, or constant shift of the generalization, we fit Gaussian functions (*Eq. 2*; lines) to individual data. An increase in gain represents increase of adaptation transfer to the trained direction. The width represents the angular range of visuomotor adaptation transfer to untrained directions, and thus, increased width results in greater adaptation indices to untrained directions. The constant


Fig. 3. Adaptation index of the generalization and Gaussian fits for the none-none (blue), RSVP-none (orange), RSVP-RSVP (green), and RSVP-sound groups (purple). The markers represent the mean adaptation index at each target direction. The solid lines represent the mean predictions of the best fitting Gaussian function for each participant. The error bars represent means ± SE.

shift parameter represents a global generalization component that may be applied to each target direction by the participant (Brayanov et al. 2011). For each participant, we fit their data by minimizing the negative log-likelihood of the Gaussian function, using the optimization method developed by Hookes and Jeeves (1961).

Figure 3 shows the mean model predictions generated from the best-fitting parameters of each individual data. A summary of the best-fitting parameters for each group is presented in Table 1. The model predictions accurately capture the overall pattern of the generalization function for each group. In particular, the predicted generalization functions of the three context-consistent groups, none-none (blue line), RSVP-RSVP (green line), and RSVP-sound (purple line), are similar to each other. Conversely, the generalization function of the RSVP-none group (orange line) appears to be narrower and shorter than the three other groups. We conducted a one-way ANOVA on the best-fitting parameters to verify these observations. The statistical analysis reveals that there is a main effect of group for width, $F_{3,48} = 5.52$, $P < 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.26$, MSE = 168.6, but there is no effect of group for either gain, $F_{3,48} = 1.61$, $P = 0.2$, or constant shift ($F < 1$). To further investigate the main effect of width, we conducted three pairwise t-tests between the inconsistent group and the three consistent groups (Bonferroni corrected, $k = 3$, $\alpha_{\text{Bonferroni}} = 0.017$). This analysis revealed that the width was narrower in the RSVP-none group compared with the none-none group, $t_{24} = 3.43$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 0.70$, RSVP-RSVP, $t_{24} = 3.58$, $P < 0.01$, $d = 0.74$, and RSVP-sound groups, $t_{24} = 2.61$, $P = 0.015$, $d = 0.53$. In summary, a broader generalization function was observed in the three context-consistent groups than in the RSVP-none group.

The none-none and RSVP-none groups are replications of the no-load and attention-load groups reported by Bédard and Song (2013). Like us, they reported that inconsistent attentional context between training and generalization reduced the width of the generalization function. According to their Gaussian fit, Bédard and Song reported that gain was also reduced in their attention-load group, whereas we reported no such difference in our RSVP-none group. However, comparison of the two models in which either the gain or width parameter was allowed to vary between groups showed that the width model provided a better fit of the generalization function than the gain model in the attention-load group ($R^2 = 0.86$ vs. 0.84). Therefore, the width-only model provides the simplest and best explanation for the Bédard and Song data, and this is consistent with the current observation.

Table 1. *Mean best fitting parameters*

| | Parameter Values | | |
	Gain (SE)	Width (SE)	Shift (SE)
None-None	0.41 (0.04)	45.08 (3.59)	0.15 (0.04)
RSVP-None	0.39 (0.02)	28.59 (3.25)	0.14 (0.02)
RSVP-RSVP	0.43 (0.03)	43.67 (3.53)	0.15 (0.04)
RSVP-Sound	0.46 (0.02)	40.82 (3.74)	0.10 (0.03)

RSVP, rapid serial visual presentation.

DISCUSSION

In the current study, we demonstrated that a change in the attentional state from training to generalization phases (e.g., from divided to undivided) restricted the range of transfer of visuomotor adaptation to untrained targets. Importantly, the presence of a secondary task during training itself did not impair visuomotor adaptation as long as a secondary task was consistently performed during generalization. Importantly, the ability for attentional context to modulate visuomotor generalization is not task specific. The width of the generalization function was similar for the groups that completed either the same (RSVP-RSVP) or different (RSVP-sound) secondary tasks in the training and generalization phases. The critical requirement is that a similar level of attentional discrimination is maintained across training and generalization.

The findings are inconsistent with Bédard and Song's (2013) suggestion that divided attention during visuomotor adaptation restricts learning by the internal model. Previous studies have shown that consistent attentional distraction can enhance motor memory recall in trained directions (Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015). The current findings show this is extended to the transfer of adaptation to untrained directions. The consistency of the attentional state, generated by external distraction, appears to modulate adaptation to both trained and untrained directions. In the following sections, we discuss how the current findings fit within existing computational, neurophysiological, and cognitive frameworks of visuomotor adaptation.

Contextual Modulation of Visuomotor Adaptation

Existing computational models of visuomotor adaptation provide clear explanatory frameworks for both the time course of visuomotor adaptation, as well as generalization of adaptation to untrained directions. For instance, a prediction error model in which the error between motor output and visuomotor feedback is minimized through training adequately accounts for the time course of visuomotor adaptation (i.e., Smith et al. 2006). To explain generalization, training may be assumed to update learning in both the trained direction, as well as surrounding directions. The angular distance between the trained and untrained directions determines the amount of adaptation updated to surrounding directions. Specifically, a Gaussian tuning function has been used to model this process (see Tanaka et al. 2009, 2012). A wider tuning function implies that more untrained directions are updated during adaptation, and this leads to greater transfer of adaptation (Bock and Schmitz 2011; Ghahramani and Wolpert 1997).

The aforementioned framework, however, is unable to explain adaptation with different external context cues. For instance, participants can adapt to several different visuomotor rotations associated with separate cues, such as color cues or separate target locations (Imamizu et al. 2007; Lee and Schweighofer 2009). Lee and Schweighofer (see also Smith et al. 2006) suggest that visuomotor learning is mediated by two learning systems, a fast process that learns rapidly but retains information poorly, and a slow process that learns more gradually but has excellent retention. To explain the role of contextual cues, Lee and Schweighofer proposed that a number of parallel states within the slow process that corresponds to the number of contextual cues in training. This account adequately

explains a host of adaptation phenomena, including savings, anterograde interference, and dual adaptation (Franklin and Wolpert 2011; Wolpert et al. 2011). The outstanding question is how attentional contexts interact with the fast and/or slow process to modulate visuomotor generalization.

We propose that attention plays a critical role during visuomotor adaptation in selecting and associating multisensory signals with motor memory, which operates as an internal contextual cue for motor learning (Im et al. 2015; Song and Bédard 2015). Extending Lee and Schweighofer's (2009) model, we conjectured that the state of divided and undivided attention to the secondary task could be represented as separate contexts in the slow process. As a consequence, switching the attentional context from divided to full attention rendered weaker generalization to the untrained direction in the RSVP-none group since the slow process associated with the divided attentional context during training discontinues when the slow process is associated with the undivided attentional context during generalization. Greater generalization in the RSVP-sound group than in the RSVP-none also implies that the contextual cue is generated from the state of the attentional distraction and not from the specific task. The current findings, however, do not allow us to specify the exact architecture of this model. For instance, an alternative model with parallel fast processes and a single slow process can account for our findings. This problem can only be solved by developing a formal computational model and further empirical investigation.

Neurophysiological Basis for Visuomotor Adaptation

A strength of the aforementioned computational models is that they provide biologically plausible explanations for generalization of motor adaptation (Poggio and Bizzi 2004; Pouget and Snyder 2000). For instance, Paz et al. (2003) recorded single-unit activity in motor cortex (M1) in nonhuman primates before, during, and after visuomotor adaptation. Increases in the spiking rates of the neuron were observed in neurons whose preferred direction closely matched the trained direction. The spiking rates do not change for neurons whose preferred directions that were away from the trained direction. This shows that a selective subpopulation of neurons in M1, whose preferred tuning direction is similar to the trained direction, is active during visuomotor adaptation.

Recent data from neurophysiological studies during visuomotor adaptation show that multiple brain regions, such as the M1, posterior parietal cortex (PPC), ventral premotor cortex, and cerebellum, are involved in adaptation (Della-Maggiore and McIntosh 2005; Diedrichsen et al. 2005; Gandolfo et al. 2000; Krakauer et al. 2004; Orban de Xivry et al. 2011; Paz et al. 2003; Wise et al. 1998, Tseng et al. 2007). Activation of multiple regions may suggest that multiple learning systems are engaged during visuomotor learning and that each region may serve a different function during learning. For instance, Graydon et al. (2005) showed that PPC learning-related activation decreases during the later stages of visuomotor adaptation, but cerebellum learning-related activation increases during this period. Importantly, both these regions have been shown to process motor error during visuomotor adaptation (Bédard and Sanes 2014; Della-Maggiore and McIntosh 2005; Diedrichsen et al. 2005), but studies have also identified

functional differences between these regions. This dissociation corresponds to the notion that multiple learning systems, with separate time scales, concurrently operate during visuomotor learning (e.g., Lee and Schweighofer 2009). Neuroimaging studies have also demonstrated that the cerebellum is involved in the organization of multiple internal models, where each model corresponds to a different motor action (Imamizu et al. 2003, 2004; Imamizu and Kawato 2008).

Cognitive Factors Involved Visuomotor Learning

Multiple motor learning models have been studied extensively. For instance, an error-based model can make predictions about the sensory consequences of a selected action to improve motor control (Herzfeld et al. 2014; Krakauer et al. 2005; Smith et al. 2006). Further, a reinforcement learning model can account for processes such as movement aiming direction when the goal is to maximize the rate of reward (Shmuelof et al. 2012; Pekny et al. 2015). These models have focused on sensorimotor aspects of immediate performance but have often overlooked how higher-order cognitive functions, such as attention and memory, operate to facilitate motor learning process and cope with interferences arising from a complex daily environment.

Recently, Taylor et al. (2014; see also Taylor and Ivry 2012, 2013b) demonstrated that during abrupt visuomotor adaptation, participants developed an aiming strategy toward a reach target to counteract for the rotational perturbation. For example, participants aimed at the 45°CCW location when the 45°CW rotation was introduced. By asking participants in advance to report which location they aimed at before reach movement, Taylor et al. (2014) could partition the contribution of improved aiming strategy from visuomotor adaptation performance. They suggested that visuomotor adaptation is the summation of explicit strategy and implicit learning driven by a sensory-prediction error signal, which also closely mapped onto the fast and slow learning processes, respectively (McDougle et al. 2015; McDougle et al. 2016).

It remains unclear as to how explicit and implicit processes are distinctively affected by internal attentional contexts and generalized to untrained directions. Perhaps attentional distraction has a greater and immediate effect on explicit strategy since the latter is highly susceptible to an external cue and instruction (Taylor and Ivry 2013b). In contrast, the implicit learning process might globally carry long-term memory of internal attentional contexts. Our previous work (Im et al. 2016) has shown that attentional context can modulate motor memory retrieval 1 day after initial training, indicating its long-term association.

The question remains as to how the cognitive and implicit learning systems are organized. For example, the dichotomy proposed by Taylor and colleagues (McDougle et al. 2015, 2016) maps closely to the notion of model-based and model-free reinforcement learning (Dayan and Niv 2008). Model-based learning emphasizes the construction of an internal model that is used to support goal-directed action. Conversely, model-free learning uses reward prediction errors (i.e., Rescorla and Wagner 1972; Sutton and Barto 1998) to augment behavior without the construction of an internal model.

In addition to explicit strategy, other cognitive influences on motor learning have been reported. For example, visual-spatial

working memory has been shown to positively correlate with the learning rates in both motor sequence learning and visuomotor adaptation tasks (Bo et al. 2011; Seidler et al. 2012). Moreover, the brain areas associated with visual-spatial working memory, such as the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and bilateral inferior parietal lobules, are active during the early, but not late, stages of learning in these tasks (Seidler et al. 2012). Overall, it suggests that any motor learning model solely based on error-based learning needs to be updated to account for cognitive effects such as robust attention-context modulation on motor learning. This integration will provide a deeper, more principled understanding of training, retention, and generalization of motor skills.

Attentional Distraction as an Internal Context for Visuomotor Memory

The success of episodic memory retrieval has been shown to depend on whether the environmental context is matched at the times of encoding and recall (e.g., Godden and Baddeley 1975; Smith and Vela 2001). This effect has also been observed in studies of motor learning (e.g., Krakauer et al. 2006; Ruitenberg et al. 2012; Taylor and Ivry 2013a), such as the recall of a motor sequence is faster when the context of recall is matched with that of learning. The current experiment extended this notion by showing that consistency in the attentional or internal context, as generated by the secondary task, affects retrieval of visuomotor adaptation.

Prior studies on episodic memory (e.g., Eich 1980) showed that consistent external contextual cues took priority over consistent internal states for memory retrieval. By contrast, we showed that consistent task demands generate an internal cue that overrides the same external environment (i.e., the RSVP stream was displayed throughout the experiment). In addition, the attentional state generated by the secondary task is not task specific. Song and Bédard (2015) showed that using two different attention-demanding tasks in adaptation training (i.e., RSVP task) and in recall (i.e., sound discrimination task) facilitates recall equally well as having the same attention-demanding task in both phases. This effect persisted when recall was tested one day after initial training (Im et al. 2016). The current experiment extends this finding by showing that attentional distraction, generated by two different secondary tasks, modulates the transfer of adaptation. Evidence for context modulation of both visuomotor generalization and recall indicate that they share a common learning process. Completing a secondary task generates an internal cue related to the cognitive state, and this serves as a contextual cue for encoding and retrieval.

This notion is consistent with studies that demonstrate internal physiological states induced by various drugs—such as alcohol, morphine, and cigarettes—affect memory recall in both human and nonhuman animals (e.g., Blasi et al. 2002; DeCarli et al. 1992; Goodwin et al. 1969; Nishimura et al. 1990; Peters and McGee 1982). As a consequence, the current findings support previous studies (Im et al. 2015, 2016; Song and Bédard 2015), which show attentional state modulates the retrieval of visuomotor memory in a manner analogous to the modulation of external contexts on memory retrieval.

Conclusion

The current study shows that inconsistency in attentional context between training and generalization phases narrows the width of the generalization function. As a consequence, we propose that attentional contexts serve as an internal cue that allows for the encoding and retrieval of different motor representations. Recent behavioral and neurophysiological data suggest that multiple learning systems are responsible for visuomotor adaptation. Further investigation is required to identify which system is responsible for context modulation of adaptation. In summary, the current study provides insight into how cognitive processes affect internal representation of the visuomotor memory.

DISCLOSURES

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the authors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

T.S.W. and J.-H.S. conceived and designed research; T.S.W. performed experiments; T.S.W. analyzed data; T.S.W. and J.-H.S. interpreted results of experiments; T.S.W. prepared figures; T.S.W. drafted manuscript; T.S.W. and J.-H.S. edited and revised manuscript; T.S.W. and J.-H.S. approved final version of manuscript.

REFERENCES

Ayala MN, 't Hart BM, Henriques DY. Concurrent adaptation to opposing visuomotor rotations by varying hand and body postures. *Exp Brain Res* 233: 3433–3445, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00221-015-4411-9.

Bédard P, Sanes JN. Brain representations for acquiring and recalling visual-motor adaptations. *Neuroimage* 101: 225–235, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.07.009.

Bédard P, Song JH. Attention modulates generalization of visuomotor adaptation. *J Vis* 13: 12, 2013. doi:10.1167/13.12.12.

Blasi V, Young AC, Tansy AP, Petersen SE, Snyder AZ, Corbetta M. Word retrieval learning modulates right frontal cortex in patients with left frontal damage. *Neuron* 36: 159–170, 2002. doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00936-4.

Bo J, Jennett S, Seidler RD. Working memory capacity correlates with implicit serial reaction time task performance. *Exp Brain Res* 214: 73–81, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00221-011-2807-8.

Bock O, Schmitz G. Adaptation to rotated visual feedback depends on the number and spread of target directions. *Exp Brain Res* 209: 409–413, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00221-011-2564-8.

Brainard DH. The psychophysics toolbox. *Spat Vis* 10: 433–436, 1997. doi:10.1163/156856897X00357.

Brayanov J, Petreska B, Smith MA. Generalization patterns reveal that visuomotor adaptation is composed of two distinct components. Paper presented at the Translational and Computational Motor Control, Washington, DC, 2011.

Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1988.

Criscimagna-Hemminger SE, Donchin O, Gazzaniga MS, Shadmehr R. Learned dynamics of reaching movements generalize from dominant to nondominant arm. *J Neurophysiol* 89: 168–176, 2003. doi:10.1152/jn.00622.2002.

Curran T, Keele SW. Attentional and nonattentional forms of sequence learning. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn* 19: 189–202, 1993. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.19.1.189.

Dayan P, Niv Y. Reinforcement learning: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 18: 185–196, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2008.08.003.

DeCarli C, Haxby JV, Gillette JA, Teichberg D, Rapoport SI, Schapiro MB. Longitudinal changes in lateral ventricular volume in patients with

dementia of the Alzheimer type. *Neurology* 42: 2029–2036, 1992. doi:10.1212/WNL.42.10.2029.

Della-Maggiore V, McIntosh AR. Time course of changes in brain activity and functional connectivity associated with long-term adaptation to a rotational transformation. *J Neurophysiol* 93: 2254–2262, 2005. doi:10.1152/jn.00984.2004.

Diedrichsen J, Hashambhoy Y, Rane T, Shadmehr R. Neural correlates of reach errors. *J Neurosci* 25: 9919–9931, 2005. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1874-05.2005.

Dionne JK, Henriques DY. Interpreting ambiguous visual information in motor learning. *J Vis* 8: 1–10, 2008. doi:10.1167/8.15.2.

Donchin O, Francis JT, Shadmehr R. Quantifying generalization from trial-by-trial behavior of adaptive systems that learn with basis functions: theory and experiments in human motor control. *J Neurosci* 23: 9032–9045, 2003.

Eich JE. The cue-dependent nature of state-dependent retrieval. *Mem Cognit* 8: 157–173, 1980. doi:10.3758/BF03213419.

Franklin DW, Wolpert DM. Computational mechanisms of sensorimotor control. *Neuron* 72: 425–442, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2011.10.006.

Gandolfo F, Li C, Benda BJ, Schioppa CP, Bizzi E. Cortical correlates of learning in monkeys adapting to a new dynamical environment. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 97: 2259–2263, 2000. doi:10.1073/pnas.040567097.

Ghahramani Z, Wolpert DM. Modular decomposition in visuomotor learning. *Nature* 386: 392–395, 1997. doi:10.1038/386392a0.

Ghahramani Z, Wolpert DM, Jordan MI. Generalization to local remappings of the visuomotor coordinate transformation. *J Neurosci* 16: 7085–7096, 1996.

Godden DR, Baddeley AD. Context-dependent memory in two natural environments: on land and underwater. *Br J Psychol* 66: 325–331, 1975. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1975.tb01468.x.

Goodwin DW, Powell B, Bremer D, Hoine H, Stern J. Alcohol and recall: state-dependent effects in man. *Science* 163: 1358–1360, 1969. doi:10.1126/science.163.3873.1358.

Graydon FX, Friston KJ, Thomas CG, Brooks VB, Menon RS. Learning-related fMRI activation associated with a rotational visuo-motor transformation. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 22: 373–383, 2005. doi:10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2004.09.007.

Herzfeld DJ, Pastor D, Haith AM, Rossetti Y, Shadmehr R, O'Shea J. Contributions of the cerebellum and the motor cortex to acquisition and retention of motor memories. *Neuroimage* 98: 147–158, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.04.076.

Hommel B. The role of attention for the Simon effect. *Psychol Res* 55: 208–222, 1993. doi:10.1007/BF00419608.

Hooke R, Jeeves TA. "Direct search" solution of numerical and statistical problems. *J Assoc Comput Mach* 8: 212–229, 1961. doi:10.1145/321062.321069.

Im HY, Bédard P, Song JH. Encoding attentional states during visuomotor adaptation. *J Vis* 15: 20, 2015. doi:10.1167/15.8.20.

Im HY, Bédard P, Song JH. Long lasting attentional-context dependent visuomotor memory. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 42: 1269–1274, 2016. doi:10.1037/xhp0000271.

Imamizu H, Kawato M. Neural correlates of predictive and postdictive switching mechanisms for internal models. *J Neurosci* 28: 10751–10765, 2008. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1106-08.2008.

Imamizu H, Kuroda T, Miyauchi S, Yoshioka T, Kawato M. Modular organization of internal models of tools in the human cerebellum. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 100: 5461–5466, 2003. doi:10.1073/pnas.0835746100.

Imamizu H, Kuroda T, Yoshioka T, Kawato M. Functional magnetic resonance imaging examination of two modular architectures for switching multiple internal models. *J Neurosci* 24: 1173–1181, 2004. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4011-03.2004.

Imamizu H, Sugimoto N, Osu R, Tsutsui K, Sugiyama K, Wada Y, Kawato M. Explicit contextual information selectively contributes to predictive switching of internal models. *Exp Brain Res* 181: 395–408, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00221-007-0940-1.

Ivry RB, Diedrichsen J, Spencer RCM, Hazeltine E, Semjen A. A cognitive neuroscience perspective on bimanual coordination. In: *Neuro-behavioral Determinants of Interlimb Coordination*, edited by Swinnen S, Duysens J. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic, 2004, p. 259–295. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-9056-3_10.

Krakauer JW, Ghez C, Ghilardi MF. Adaptation to visuomotor transformations: consolidation, interference, and forgetting. *J Neurosci* 25: 473–478, 2005. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4218-04.2005.

Krakauer JW, Ghilardi MF, Mentis M, Barnes A, Veytsman M, Eidelberg D, Ghez C. Differential cortical and subcortical activations in learning rotations and gains for reaching: a PET study. *J Neurophysiol* 91: 924–933, 2004. doi:10.1152/jn.00675.2003.

Krakauer JW, Mazzoni P, Ghazizadeh A, Ravindran R, Shadmehr R. Generalization of motor learning depends on the history of prior action. *PLoS Biol* 4: e316, 2006. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040316.

Krakauer JW, Pine ZM, Ghilardi MF, Ghez C. Learning of visuomotor transformations for vectorial planning of reaching trajectories. *J Neurosci* 20: 8916–8924, 2000.

Lee JY, Schweighofer N. Dual adaptation supports a parallel architecture of motor memory. *J Neurosci* 29: 10396–10404, 2009. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1294-09.2009.

McDougle SD, Bond KM, Taylor JA. Explicit and implicit processes constitute the fast and slow processes of sensorimotor learning. *J Neurosci* 35: 9568–9579, 2015. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5061-14.2015.

McDougle SD, Ivry RB, Taylor JA. Taking aim at the cognitive side of learning in sensorimotor adaptation tasks. *Trends Cogn Sci* 20: 535–544, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2016.05.002.

Mechsner F, Kerzel D, Knoblich G, Prinz W. Perceptual basis of bimanual coordination. *Nature* 414: 69–73, 2001. doi:10.1038/35102060.

Nishimura M, Shiigi Y, Kaneto H. State dependent and/or direct memory retrieval by morphine in mice. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 100: 27–30, 1990. doi:10.1007/BF02245784.

Nissen MJ, Bullemer P. Attentional requirements of learning—evidence from performance-measures. *Cognit Psychol* 19: 1–32, 1987. doi:10.1016/0010-0285(87)90002-8.

Orban de Xivry JJ, Marko MK, Pekny SE, Pastor D, Izawa J, Celnik P, Shadmehr R. Stimulation of the human motor cortex alters generalization patterns of motor learning. *J Neurosci* 31: 7102–7110, 2011. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0273-11.2011.

Pashler HE. *The Psychology of Attention.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Paz R, Boraud T, Natan C, Bergman H, Vaadia E. Preparatory activity in motor cortex reflects learning of local visuomotor skills. *Nat Neurosci* 6: 882–890, 2003. doi:10.1038/nn1097.

Pekny SE, Izawa J, Shadmehr R. Reward-dependent modulation of movement variability. *J Neurosci* 35: 4015–4024, 2015. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3244-14.2015.

Pelli DG. The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: transforming numbers into movies. *Spat Vis* 10: 437–442, 1997. doi:10.1163/156856897X00366.

Peters R, McGee R. Cigarette smoking and state-dependent memory. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 76: 232–235, 1982. doi:10.1007/BF00432551.

Poggio T, Bizzi E. Generalization in vision and motor control. *Nature* 431: 768–774, 2004. doi:10.1038/nature03014.

Pouget A, Snyder LH. Computational approaches to sensorimotor transformations. *Nat Neurosci* 3, *Suppl*: 1192–1198, 2000. doi:10.1038/81469.

Rescorla RA, Wagner AR. A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: variations in the effectiveness of reinforcement and nonreinforcement. In: *Classical Conditioning II: Current Research and Theory*, edited by Black AH, Prokasy WF. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972, p. 64–99.

Ruitenberg MF, Abrahamse EL, De Kleine E, Verwey WB. Context-dependent motor skill: perceptual processing in memory-based sequence production. *Exp Brain Res* 222: 31–40, 2012. doi:10.1007/s00221-012-3193-6.

Seidler RD, Bo J, Anguera JA. Neurocognitive contributions to motor skill learning: the role of working memory. *J Mot Behav* 44: 445–453, 2012. doi:10.1080/00222895.2012.672348.

Shadmehr R, Moussavi ZM. Spatial generalization from learning dynamics of reaching movements. *J Neurosci* 20: 7807–7815, 2000.

Shea JB, Morgan RL. Contextual interference effects on the acquisition, retention, and transfer of a motor skill. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 5: 179–187, 1979. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.5.2.179.

Shmuelof L, Krakauer JW, Mazzoni P. How is a motor skill learned? Change and invariance at the levels of task success and trajectory control. *J Neurophysiol* 108: 578–594, 2012. doi:10.1152/jn.00856.2011.

Smith MA, Ghazizadeh A, Shadmehr R. Interacting adaptive processes with different timescales underlie short-term motor learning. *PLoS Biol* 4: e179, 2006. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040179.

Smith SM, Vela E. Environmental context-dependent memory: a review and meta-analysis. *Psychon Bull Rev* 8: 203–220, 2001. doi:10.3758/BF03196157.

Song JH, Bédard P. Allocation of attention for dissociated visual and motor goals. *Exp Brain Res* 226: 209–219, 2013. doi:10.1007/s00221-013-3426-3.

Song JH, Bédard P. Paradoxical benefits of dual-task contexts for visuomotor memory. *Psychol Sci* 26: 148–158, 2015. doi:10.1177/0956797614557868.

Sutton RS, Barto AG. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998.

Tanaka H, Krakauer JW, Sejnowski TJ. Generalization and multirate models of motor adaptation. *Neural Comput* 24: 939–966, 2012. doi:10.1162/NECO_a_00262.

Tanaka H, Sejnowski TJ, Krakauer JW. Adaptation to visuomotor rotation through interaction between posterior parietal and motor cortical areas. *J Neurophysiol* 102: 2921–2932, 2009. doi:10.1152/jn.90834.2008.

Taylor JA, Hieber LL, Ivry RB. Feedback-dependent generalization. *J Neurophysiol* 109: 202–215, 2013. doi:10.1152/jn.00247.2012.

Taylor JA, Ivry RB. The role of strategies in motor learning. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1251: 1–12, 2012. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06430.x.

Taylor JA, Ivry RB. Context-dependent generalization. *Front Hum Neurosci* 7: 171, 2013a. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00171.

Taylor JA, Ivry RB. Implicit and explicit processes in motor learning. In: *Action Science: Foundations of an Emerging Discipline,* edited by Prinz W, Beisert M, Herwig A. Boston, MA: MIT Press, 2013b, p. 63–88. doi:10.7551/mitpress/9780262018555.003.0003.

Taylor JA, Krakauer JW, Ivry RB. Explicit and implicit contributions to learning in a sensorimotor adaptation task. *J Neurosci* 34: 3032, 2014. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3619-13.2014.

Taylor JA, Thoroughman KA. Divided attention impairs human motor adaptation but not feedback control. *J Neurophysiol* 98: 317–326, 2007. doi:10.1152/jn.01070.2006.

Taylor JA, Thoroughman KA. Motor adaptation scaled by the difficulty of a secondary cognitive task. *PLoS One* 3: e2485, 2008. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0002485.

Thoroughman KA, Shadmehr R. Learning of action through adaptive combination of motor primitives. *Nature* 407: 742–747, 2000. doi:10.1038/35037588.

Thoroughman KA, Taylor JA. Rapid reshaping of human motor generalization. *J Neurosci* 25: 8948–8953, 2005. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1771-05.2005.

Tseng YW, Diedrichsen J, Krakauer JW, Shadmehr R, Bastian AJ. Sensory prediction errors drive cerebellum-dependent adaptation of reaching. *J Neurophysiol* 98: 54–62, 2007. doi:10.1152/jn.00266.2007.

Wang J, Sainburg RL. Limitations in interlimb transfer of visuomotor rotations. *Exp Brain Res* 155: 1–8, 2004. doi:10.1007/s00221-003-1691-2.

Wang J, Sainburg RL. Interlimb transfer of visuomotor rotations depends on handedness. *Exp Brain Res* 175: 223–230, 2006. doi:10.1007/s00221-006-0543-2.

Wise SP, Moody SL, Blomstrom KJ, Mitz AR. Changes in motor cortical activity during visuomotor adaptation. *Exp Brain Res* 121: 285–299, 1998. doi:10.1007/s002210050462.

Wolpert DM, Diedrichsen J, Flanagan JR. Principles of sensorimotor learning. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 12: 739–751, 2011. doi:10.1038/nrn3112.