SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Comparisons between Two divided-attended locations:

For the divided-attended condition, we ran several comparisons between the data from the two divided-attended locations in each attentional cue group to confirm the two sets of data were comparable. The results of t-tests confirmed that for the early period of data there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in either accuracy (exogenous: \( p=0.543 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.912 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.857 \)) or RT (exogenous: \( p=0.375 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.260 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.576 \)). For the accuracy data during training, the results of a slope homogeneity analysis confirmed that there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in any of the attentional cue groups (exogenous: \( p=0.643 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.719 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.837 \)). Also for the RT data during training, there was no significant difference between the divided-attended locations in any of the attentional cue groups (exogenous: \( p=0.247 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.739 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.619 \)). For the contrast thresholds, a two-way (two locations x pre- vs. post-training sessions) ANOVA revealed that there were no significant main effect of location (exogenous: \( p=0.718 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.985 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.639 \)) or interaction effect between location and session (exogenous: \( p=0.976 \); endogenous/arrow: \( p=0.447 \); endogenous/color: \( p=0.783 \)). The results indicate that the performance and changes in it at the two divided-attended locations were quantitatively comparable.
Supplementary Figure 1. Changes in reaction time at the unattended location during training for the endogenous attention cue groups. Arrow: Endogenous/Arrow cue group, Color: Endogenous/Color cue group, Incorrect: incorrect trials, Correct: correct trials. Reaction time data for the correct trials are the same as the data shown in Figure 5.