

Individual differences in spatial working memory strategies differentially reflected in the engagement of control and default brain networks

Nina Purg Suljić^{a*}, Aleksij Kraljić^a, Masih Rahmati^b, Youngsun T. Cho^b, Anka Slana Ozimič^a, John D. Murray^{b,c,d}, Alan Anticevic^{b,c,+}, and Grega Repovš^{a+}

^aDepartment of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

^bDepartment of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

^cDepartment of Psychology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

^dDepartment of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

*Corresponding author

+Co-senior authors

1 **Spatial locations can be encoded and maintained in working** 40
2 **memory using different representations and strategies. Fine-** 41
3 **grained representations provide detailed stimulus information,** 42
4 **but are cognitively demanding and prone to inexactness. The** 43
5 **uncertainty in fine-grained representations can be compensated** 44
6 **by the use of coarse, but robust categorical representations.** 45
7 **In this study, we employed an individual differences approach** 46
8 **to identify brain activity correlates of the use of fine-grained** 47
9 **and categorical representations in spatial working memory. We** 48
10 **combined data from six fMRI studies, resulting in a sample of** 49
11 **155 (77 women, 25 ± 5 years) healthy participants performing a** 50
12 **spatial working memory task. Our results showed that individual** 51
13 **differences in the use of spatial representations in working** 52
14 **memory were associated with distinct patterns of brain activ-** 53
15 **ity. Higher precision of fine-grained representations was related** 54
16 **to greater engagement of attentional and control brain systems** 55
17 **throughout the task trial, and the stronger deactivation of the** 56
18 **default network at the time of stimulus encoding. In contrast,** 57
19 **the use of categorical representations was associated with lower** 58
20 **default network activity during encoding and higher frontopari-** 59
21 **etal network activation during maintenance. These results may** 60
22 **indicate a greater need for attentional resources and protection** 61
23 **against interference for fine-grained compared to categorical** 62
24 **representations.** 63

25 **spatial cognition, working memory, fMRI, fine-grained representation,** 64
26 **categorical representation** 65

27 **Correspondence: nina.purg@ff.uni-lj.si** 66

28 Introduction

29 Research on working memory has shown that individuals use 68
30 a variety of different representations and strategies to encode 69
31 and maintain information over short periods of time in sup- 70
32 port of an ongoing task (e.g., Curtis, 2004; Oblak et al., 2024, 71
33 2022; Purg et al., 2022; Slana Ozimič et al., 2023; Starc et al., 72
34 2017). While mental representations describe the content of 73
35 information encoded in working memory, cognitive strate- 74
36 gies refer to the selection of mental representations and pro- 75
37 cesses that are either explicitly or implicitly used by an in- 76
38 dividual to perform a working memory task (Miller et al., 77
39 2012; Oblak et al., 2024, 2022; Slana Ozimič et al., 2023). 78

The specific representations and strategies used in working memory depend on several factors, such as the type of information to be retained (Oblak et al., 2022; Slana Ozimič et al., 2023), the type and predictability of a response to be generated (Curtis, 2004; Purg et al., 2022), the availability of attentional resources (Adam et al., 2015; Starc et al., 2017), and behavioral relevance (Klyszejko et al., 2014; Yoo et al., 2022). Increasingly, research also shows that even when faced with the same task requirements, individuals may use different representations and strategies to perform the task (Oblak et al., 2024, 2022; Slana Ozimič et al., 2023; Starc et al., 2017). Here, we investigate the neural correlates of individual differences in the use of working memory strategies in a multi-study, multi-site dataset of spatial working memory performance during functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI).

Spatial working memory enables the short-term storage of spatial information, such as the location of a stimulus. Extensive research has shown that memory for a stimulus location is affected by systematic distortions (e.g., Crawford et al., 2016; Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991). In particular, it has been observed that when individuals are asked to reproduce a stimulus location stored in working memory within an empty circle, they exhibit systematic shifts in their responses towards the diagonals of the four quadrants, formed by dividing the circle using the horizontal and vertical axes of symmetry (Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991). These systematic biases in spatial working memory performance have been suggested to reveal a hierarchical organization of spatial representations (Huttenlocher et al., 1991).

According to the category adjustment model (Huttenlocher et al., 1991, 2000), a stimulus location is encoded and maintained at two levels of representation – first, as a precise, fine-grained representation that stores the information of the actual location in memory, and second, as a categorical representation that assigns the stimulus location to one of a limited number of spatial categories (e.g., quadrants). The model predicts that the estimation of a stimulus location results from the combination of information at both levels, with

79 the use of a categorical representation helping to compensate 136
80 for the loss of precision in a fine-grained representation. Even 137
81 though this process introduces a systematic bias in individual 138
82 responses away from the correct position toward the proto- 139
83 typical location of the spatial category, it is assumed to in- 140
84 crease the overall response accuracy by decreasing the vari- 141
85 ability of responses. At the neural level, the dynamic field 142
86 theory (Schutte et al., 2003; Simmering et al., 2006) suggests 143
87 that spatial boundaries, such as perceivable edges or sponta- 144
88 neously imposed axes of symmetry in task space, have a de- 145
89 flecting effect on memory-guided behavioral responses due 146
90 to their lateral inhibitory effects, causing the activation pro- 147
91 duced by the target stimulus stored in working memory to 148
92 drift in the opposite direction. 149

93 The degree of reliance on fine-grained and categorical 150
94 coding of spatial locations has been related to variability 151
95 in cognitive resources. In our previous work (Starc et al., 152
96 2017), we separately estimated the use of fine-grained and 153
97 categorical representations during the performance of a spa- 154
98 tial working memory task, while measuring pupil responses. 155
99 We assumed that increased pupil dilation would reflect in- 156
100 creased cognitive effort exerted toward the formation and 157
101 maintenance of either fine-grained or categorical representa- 158
102 tions. Our results were consistent with a compensatory use of 159
103 fine-grained and categorical representations within individu- 160
104 als, where a drop in attentional resources directed towards 161
105 the formation of fine-grained representations during stimulus 162
106 encoding resulted in increased reliance on categorical repre- 163
107 sentations during late maintenance and response phases of 164
108 the task. Additionally, we observed that individuals who 165
109 showed on average worse fine-grained precision also exhib- 166
110 ited greater overall use of categorical representations, sug- 167
111 gesting stable individual differences in the use of specific re- 168
112 presentations and strategies. 169

113 Similarly, Crawford et al. (2016) found individual dif- 170
114 ferences in fine-grained and categorical spatial coding that 171
115 were correlated with individual spatial working memory ca- 172
116 pacity. Specifically, individuals with better spatial working 173
117 memory capacity showed higher fine-grained memory preci- 174
118 sion and lower reliance on categorical representations. Since 175
119 working memory capacity describes the limited cognitive re- 176
120 sources that can be directed towards storage of information 177
121 in working memory, either at the level of attentional alloca- 178
122 tion or representational capacities (Slana Ozimič and Repovš, 179
123 2020), these results suggest that individual differences in the 180
124 use of fine-grained and categorical representations might be 181
125 explained by the availability of cognitive resources with fine- 182
126 grained representations requiring more resources than cate- 183
127 gorical representations. 184

128 Despite the extensive behavioral and computational char- 185
129 acterization of fine-grained and categorical spatial coding, 186
130 not much is known about the underlying neurobiological 187
131 mechanisms. Spatial working memory is consistently charac- 188
132 terized by sustained activation in frontal and parietal brain ar- 189
133 eas as measured with electrophysiological recordings in non- 190
134 human primates (e.g., Chafee and Goldman-Rakic, 1998; Fu- 191
135 nahashi et al., 1989; Fuster, 1973; Fuster and Alexander, 192

1971; Kubota and Niki, 1971) and fMRI in humans (e.g.,
Brown et al., 2004; Courtney et al., 1998; Curtis, 2004; Sri-
mal and Curtis, 2008; Zarahn et al., 1999). This activity is
thought to reflect active engagement of these areas in work-
ing memory processes, however, the specific function of this
activity has been more difficult to identify. Relating brain ac-
tivity with behavioral performance of working memory tasks
during fMRI has shown that brain activity varies with the
level of response precision (Curtis, 2004; Hallenbeck et al.,
2021), specific strategy use (Curtis, 2004; Purg et al., 2022),
general memory load (Adam et al., 2018; Glahn et al., 2002;
Leung et al., 2004; Linden et al., 2003; Proskovec et al.,
2019) and behavioral prioritization (Klyszejko et al., 2014;
Yoo et al., 2022).

In a previous fMRI study (Anticevic et al., 2010), we in-
vestigated the relationship between response accuracy in a
visual working memory task and brain activity during the
task. Our results showed that stronger deactivation in the
temporo-parietal junction (TPJ) and the default network dur-
ing stimulus encoding predicted higher accuracy of work-
ing memory performance. Since TPJ and the default net-
work have been associated with stronger deactivation dur-
ing increased cognitive effort and inhibition of distractors
(Raichle, 2015a; Shulman et al., 2003; Todd et al., 2005),
these results suggest that their suppression may be related
to increased cognitive effort that is required to ensure good
memory accuracy and protection from interference. How-
ever, the study used non-spatial visual stimuli and match-to-
sample responses that do not allow the estimation of separate
contribution of fine-grained and categorical representations
to behavioral responses. Therefore, the brain systems and
related mechanisms underlying fine-grained and categorical
spatial coding have yet to be determined.

In the present study, we were interested in brain activity
correlates of individual differences in the use of fine-grained
and categorical representations in spatial working memory.
Due to the hypothesized relationship between the use of
these working memory representations and the level of cog-
nitive resources required, we focused on brain systems that
have been previously associated with general engagement
of attention and cognitive control, specifically the cingulo-
opercular, dorsal-attention, and frontoparietal networks (e.g.,
Barch et al., 2013; Cole et al., 2014; Ji et al., 2019; Raichle,
2015a; Smith et al., 2009). In addition, we investigated the
role of the default network in the use of fine-grained and
categorical representations, which has been associated with
stronger inhibition during high attentional demands and the
function of providing protection from distractors in working
memory tasks (e.g., Barch et al., 2013; Cole et al., 2014; Ji
et al., 2019; Raichle, 2015a; Smith et al., 2009). We hypothe-
sized that a greater reliance on precise, fine-grained represen-
tations would be supported by increased activation of atten-
tional and control brain systems, and a stronger inhibition of
the default network. On the other hand, we assumed that un-
certainty in fine-grained representations, such as due to a loss
of precision or task interference, would be accompanied by
a greater reliance on categorical representations that require

fewer attentional and control resources. To test these hypotheses, we investigated brain activity measured with fMRI during the performance of a spatial working memory task. A methodological challenge in the investigation of individual differences in brain-behavior relationships are low effect sizes that require large sample sizes to be detected (Elliott et al., 2020; Grady et al., 2021; Marek et al., 2022). To overcome this challenge, we combined six fMRI studies conducted at two different recording sites. Together, we used data from 155 (77 women, 25 ± 5 years) healthy individuals, which largely exceeded the average sample sizes of similar studies (e.g., around 25 participants, Marek et al., 2022). Based on behavioral performance on the task, we estimated the overall reliance on fine-grained and categorical representations of each participant by decomposing their contributions to task response errors. Individual use of fine-grained and categorical representations was then related to differences in levels of brain activity. Our results revealed individual differences in the use of spatial representations in working memory that were related to distinct patterns of brain activity. Ongoing engagement of attentional and control brain networks throughout the entire task trial, and stronger deactivation of the default network at the time of encoding a stimulus location were found to predict higher fine-grained precision in spatial working memory performance. In contrast, the use of a categorical representation was associated with lower default network activity in the encoding period and higher frontoparietal network activation in the delay period. These results suggest that the formation, maintenance and recall of fine-grained representations is supported by an increased allocation of attentional resources provided by attentional and control brain networks, whereas the categorical representations do not seem to impose such attentional demands and may be associated with an inability to protect the fine-grained representation from interference, resulting in higher reliance on the categorical representation when providing the response.

Materials and Methods

Participants

We combined data from six studies (Figure 1A). Three studies (Studies I-III; Table S1) were conducted at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, and three studies (Studies IV-VI; Table S1) at Yale University, USA. Between 11 and 37 participants took part in each study, for a total of 166 participants. All participants were healthy adults with no current or previous neurological, psychiatric, or substance-use disorders. Exclusion criteria also included contraindications to MR, such as the presence of metal implants or any other metal particles in the body, history of epileptic seizures, tremor or other motor disorders, and pregnancy. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Several participants were excluded from further data analysis due to incomplete data collection ($N = 5$), failure to follow instructions ($N = 1$), poor data quality, or excessive movement during data collection ($N = 2$). We also excluded participants who deviated greatly from the group mean age (i.e., greater than $3 \times SD$)

to ensure a more homogeneous sample ($N = 2$). Furthermore, we excluded an outlier in neuroimaging data ($N = 1$), as explained in detail in the section *fMRI acquisition, preprocessing and analysis*. Data from the remaining 155 (77 women, 25 ± 5 years) participants were used for further analysis. Most participants were right-handed (90.9%), while the rest of the participants were left-handed (11 participants, 7.14%) or ambidextrous (3 participants, 1.95%). All participants performed the behavioral task with their dominant hand. Detailed demographic information of the participants included in the data analysis are presented in Table S1. The studies carried out at the University of Ljubljana were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, and the National Medical Ethics Committee, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Slovenia. The studies conducted at Yale University were approved by the Yale Institutional Review Board. Participants gave written informed consent before participating in the study. In all studies, participants had to perform a spatial working memory task while their brain activity was measured with fMRI.

Spatial working memory task

Individual studies were primarily conducted to address different research questions related to spatial working memory. Some of the studies are described elsewhere (Moujaes et al., 2024; Purg et al., 2022), while others are yet unpublished. The studies also differed slightly in the exact details of the spatial working memory task, which included different task conditions in each study. For the purposes of this paper, we only analyzed the task conditions that were most comparable across the studies. In particular, we focused our investigation on the task condition in which participants were asked to remember the position of a briefly presented target stimulus and, after a short delay period, to move a probe using a joystick to the position of the remembered target (Figure 1B). Despite minor differences in task design across studies, the goal of the task was always the same – a single stimulus location had to be remembered, maintained, and then recreated with a joystick on each trial. The task was displayed on an MR-compatible screen that was visible to participants from the MR scanner via a head mirror. The specific screen sizes and resolutions varied depending on the recording site and study as described in detail in Table S2. The tasks were prepared using custom scripts and run in PsychoPy (Studies I-III; Table S2; Peirce et al., 2019) or E-Prime 2.0 (Studies IV-VI; Table S2; Schneider et al., 2012). Participants responded with an MR-compatible joystick (Hybridmojo LLC, Washington, USA).

The spatial working memory task differed in the time course of task events and the exact range of target locations across studies (for details see Table S2). In three studies (Studies I-III; Table S2), the trial started with the presentation of a fixation point (2.5 s) in the center of the screen, followed by a brief presentation of a target disk stimulus. In the remaining three studies (Studies IV-VI; Table S2), the trial started immediately with the presentation of a target disk stimulus. Target stimulus presentation lasted between 0.1 s

and 2 s, depending on the study. The target stimuli were presented at variable locations that were pseudorandomly selected from 20 to 36 different possible locations, depending on the study. Target locations were chosen such that the target amplitude (i.e., radial distance) from the center of the screen was constant for each participant, whereas target angles from the center of the screen varied between trials for the same participant (see Table S2 for details on the exact target amplitudes and angles for each study). The target stimuli were never presented on the cardinal axes to prevent verbalization of precise locations (Srimal and Curtis, 2008). Participants were instructed to memorize the exact position of the target stimulus. In one study (Study I; Table S2), the presentation of the target stimulus was followed by a masking pattern (0.05 s) with the aim of disrupting iconic visual memory (Curtis, 2004). In all studies, the target presentation was followed by a delay period (8 s to 10.4 s, depending on the study) during which a fixation point was presented in the center of the screen to which participants were asked to direct their gaze. In three studies (Studies IV-VI; Table S2), gaze fixation was additionally enforced by instructing participants to press a button upon a change of color of the fixation cross, which occurred randomly in 50% of trials. After the delay, a probe (i.e., a disk stimulus of the same size as the target stimulus, but a different color) appeared in the center of the screen, and participants were instructed to move the probe using a joystick to the location of the previously presented target stimulus, as precisely as possible. The time of their response was limited due to the concurrent fMRI recording between 2.3 s and 3 s, depending on the study. Individual trials were separated by an inter-trial interval (ITI) that was either fixed in duration (Studies IV-VI; Table S2) or randomly varied to allow for better task-related fMRI signal decomposition (Studies I-III; Table S2). Participants performed between 20 and 80 trials of the task, divided into 1 to 4 blocks, depending on the study.

Behavioral data analysis

In behavioral data analysis, we first converted all behavioral data from pixel-based measurements into degrees of visual angle ($^{\circ}$ va) to provide standardization across different screen resolutions and viewing distances. At the level of individual participants, we calculated trial-to-trial response errors as the difference between the final location of the response in relation to the target location, which are thought to reflect the precision of spatial working memory. Since the findings of single-neuron recordings suggest that spatial representations are encoded at the neural level in terms of angle and amplitude in the polar coordinate system (e.g., Chafee and Goldman-Rakic, 1998; Funahashi et al., 1989; Rainer et al., 1998), we decomposed the response error on each trial into angular and amplitude differences between target and response locations measured from the center of the screen. Next, we excluded all invalid or outlier responses to ensure that the results reflected the engagement of spatial working memory and not any technical errors or inattention to the task. We defined outliers as any response that was located

more than 45° away from the target location in either direction or whose amplitude was not between 0.5 and $1.75 \times$ the target amplitude. We also excluded responses that fell outside the quadrant of the target location, defined by the horizontal and vertical axes crossing the center of the screen, to prevent the effect of misclassifying the stimulus location to the incorrect quadrant. In total, we excluded on average 2.45% of trials per participant.

During the performance of the task, only the stimulus angle was varied, while the stimulus amplitude remained constant for each participant. Thus, we assumed that memory processes would be more strongly reflected in angular response errors than in amplitude response errors, and focused our further analyses on angular response errors only. To delineate the individual effects of fine-grained and categorical representations on response errors we relied on the assumptions of the category adjustment model (Crawford et al., 2016; Duffy et al., 2010; Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991, 2000). The model proposes that the estimation of stimulus location retained in working memory results from the combined use of fine-grained and categorical representations, each prone to decay and associated inexactness. Additionally, studies (Haun et al., 2005; Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991; Purg et al., 2022; Starc et al., 2017) have shown that when participants are asked to recall the position of a stimulus in a blank space, such as in the case of our study, they use four quadrants, delineated by the horizontal and vertical axes, as spatial categories, with the central value located at their corresponding diagonals, acting as the category prototype. Hence, behavioral responses collected during the spatial working memory task are assumed to be composed of a systematic shift toward the categorical center (i.e., the prototype) with the associated inexactness of this information, in addition to variability around the shifted representation due to a loss of fine-grained precision.

Computationally, we used a Bayesian model (Figure 1C), previously explained in detail in several publications (Crawford et al., 2016; Duffy et al., 2010; Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991, 2000), where the response (R) was modeled as a weighted sum of the fine-grained memory location (M) and the location of the categorical prototype (P), while the contribution of each component was defined by λ :


$$R = \lambda M + (1 - \lambda)P$$

The memory location (M) was defined as the true target location (i.e., the target angle from the center of the screen; μ) with the associated standard deviation (σ_M) reflecting memory inexactness. Similarly, the prototype location (P) was centered on the diagonal of the quadrant in which the target stimulus was presented (i.e., the angle of the corresponding diagonal; ρ), its inexactness reflected by the standard deviation around the prototype location (σ_P). λ reflected confidence in the memory representation, while $1 - \lambda$ defined the degree of bias toward the use of prototype information. Mathematically, λ was defined as the ratio between the inexactness of the prototype compared to the combined inexactness of the prototype and memory representations (Crawford

A. Multi-site and multi-study fMRI dataset

Site:	University of Ljubljana			Yale University		
Study:	Study I	Study II	Study III	Study IV	Study V	Study VI
Participants:	$n = 27$	$n = 26$	$n = 30$	$n = 37$	$n = 25$	$n = 10$
Total:	$n = 155$					

B. Spatial working memory task



C. Estimation of behavioral measures




Fig. 1. Overview of the dataset structure and behavioral methods. **A.** The dataset included six fMRI studies of spatial working memory, conducted at two different sites. In total, 155 participants were included in the data analysis. **B.** Common elements of a spatial working memory task across all studies. Each task trial consisted of a brief presentation of a target stimulus at different angles and a constant amplitude from the center of the screen, followed by a hand response to the target location using a joystick after a short delay. ITI refers to the inter-trial interval. **C.** An illustration of how the memory inexactness (σ_M) and the prototype bias ($1 - \lambda$) were calculated based on angular response errors as measures of the use of fine-grained and categorical representations, respectively.

416 et al., 2016; Duffy et al., 2010; Huttenlocher et al., 1991):

$$\lambda = \frac{\sigma_P^2}{\sigma_P^2 + \sigma_M^2}$$

417 In this way, we modeled the assumption that the more 435
 418 inexact the memory representation is compared to the proto- 436
 419 type, the lower the reliance on the fine-grained memory of the 437
 420 target and the higher the contribution of the prototype when 438
 421 estimating stimulus location. 439

422 The parameters of the Bayesian model were estimated 440
 423 using the probabilistic programming language Stan (Team, 441
 424 2022b) in R (Team, 2022a). We estimated the posterior prob- 442
 425 abilities of λ , σ_M and σ_P for each participant using a two- 443
 426 level linear model by fitting the Student's t-distribution to 444
 427 the data. Estimates were obtained based on multiple task 445
 428 trials per each participant, thus participants were used as a 446
 429 grouping variable at the first level to model varying intercepts 447
 430 across participants. The model was run separately for each 448

431 study to prevent the potential influence of different study de-
 432 signs and protocols on behavioral performance. Weakly infor-
 433 mative prior distributions were used for all model param-
 434 eters, ensuring that the standard deviation of the prior dis-
 435 tribution was at least 10 times larger than that of the pos-
 436 terior distribution. Specifically, we used normal prior dis-
 437 tribution for regression parameters and half-normal distribu-
 438 tions for standard deviations. The prior distributions were
 439 centered at mean values of the posterior parameter estimates
 440 computed with a preliminary one-level regression model to
 441 ensure stable sampling convergence. The prior distribution
 442 for the degrees of freedom parameter was set to $\Gamma(2, 0.1)$
 443 as recommended by Juárez and Steel (2010). The stability
 444 of the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) sampling algorithm
 445 was analyzed by verifying that all estimated parameters had
 446 estimated effective sample sizes in the bulk of the distribu-
 447 tions and in the tails of the distributions larger than 400 sam-
 448 ples (Vehtari et al., 2021), and that the potential scale reduc-

tion statistics (\hat{R}) did not deviate from 1.0. To ensure stable convergence of our models, we visually inspected the trace plots of the posterior parameters and performed prior and posterior predictive checks. We verified that the maximum tree depth was not saturated. Strong degeneracies inherent to multilevel models were addressed by reparameterizing the models to a non-centered parameterization (Betancourt and Girolami, 2013).

The resulting mean estimate of σ_M for each participant was used as a measure of memory inexactness, since it reflected the variability around the true target location thought to result from the loss of precision in a fine-grained representation. To estimate the degree of reliance on a categorical representation, we used the measure of prototype bias defined as $1 - \lambda$, which reflected the relative contribution of the prototypical location to behavioral responses, while mean λ was computed from posterior probabilities for individual participants.

fMRI acquisition, preprocessing and analysis

fMRI data were collected with Philips Achieva 3TX (Studies I-III; Table S3), Siemens Tim Trio (Study IV; Table S3), and Prisma (Studies IV-VI; Table S3) scanners. We acquired T1- and T2-weighted structural images and several BOLD images using T2*-weighted echo-planar imaging sequences. We also collected pairs of spin-echo images with opposite phase encoding to estimate field maps for the purpose of distortion correction during data preprocessing. Acquisition parameters for specific images varied between different studies, as described in Table S3.

The preprocessing and analysis of the MRI data was performed with the Quantitative Neuroimaging Environment and Toolbox (QuNex; Ji et al., 2023). Several steps of analysis and visualizations were prepared using R (Team, 2022a), Matlab (R2021a, Natick, Massachusetts, USA), and Connectome Workbench (Human Connectome Project, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, USA).

MR images were preprocessed using Human Connectome Project (HCP) minimal preprocessing pipeline (Glasser et al., 2013). Specifically, structural images were corrected for magnetic field distortions and registered to the MNI atlas, brain tissue was segmented into white and gray matter, and the cortical surface was reconstructed. Functional BOLD images were sliced-time aligned, corrected for spatial distortions, motion-corrected, registered to the MNI atlas, and the BOLD signal was mapped to the joint surface volume representation (CIFTI) and spatially smoothed ($\sigma = 4$ mm). Further analyses were performed on "dense" whole-brain data (i.e., each grayordinate independently). To observe general patterns across functional brain systems and to increase statistical power, we also performed analyses on parcellated whole-brain data. Parcellated data were obtained by extracting the mean signal of 360 cortical brain regions identified based on the HCP-MMP1.0 parcellation (Glasser et al., 2016) and, additionally, for 358 subcortical regions and 12 brain networks based on the Cole-Anticevic Network Partition (Ji et al., 2019). Although the exploratory analyses were

performed for all brain areas and networks, we were primarily interested in the cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, frontoparietal, and default networks as defined in the Cole-Anticevic Network Partition (Ji et al., 2019).

We performed the activation analysis using a general linear modeling (GLM) approach in which event regressors were convolved with the assumed double-gamma haemodynamic response function (HRF; Friston et al., 1998). For each participant, we modeled each phase of a task trial separately. Specifically, we estimated the β coefficients for the encoding, delay, and response phases (Figure S1). For three studies (Studies IV-VI; Table S2), we also separately modeled the attention cue in the middle of the delay period when present (Figure S1). Trials with outlier responses based on the behavioral data analysis were modeled as separate events using unassumed modeling and excluded from the group-level statistical analyses of the fMRI data. We additionally modeled motion parameters, their first derivatives, and squared motion parameters to account for any signal artifacts due to movement. To identify outlier participants based on brain activity, we computed Pearson correlation coefficients between the β maps for encoding, delay and response activity of each participant with a corresponding group average β map. We identified one participant who deviated more than $3 \times SD$ from the group average β map and excluded this participant from further analysis.

To identify significant activation and deactivation during the task, we next analyzed the β estimates at the group level using permutation analysis (500 permutations, tail acceleration) in PALM (Winkler et al., 2014). To test the significance of the β estimates based on the "dense" grayordinate data, we conducted two-tailed one-sample t-tests with TFCE ($H = 2$, $E = 0.5$, $C = 26$) FWE correction. To test the significance of the β estimates based on the parcellated data, we conducted two-tailed one-sample t-tests with FDR correction. The resulting corrected p -value maps were thresholded at the whole-brain corrected significance level of $\alpha < 0.05$.

The estimation of brain-behavior relationship

To estimate the relationship between brain activity in specific networks and behavioral measures, we performed Bayesian two-level linear modeling with factors memory inexactness and prototype bias. The models were numerically estimated using the probabilistic programming language Stan (Team, 2022b) in R (Team, 2022a). To obtain standardized β coefficients and provide easier comparison of results across both behavioral factors, brain activity estimates, memory inexactness, and prototype bias were standardized to $\mu = 0$, $\sigma = 1$, across all participants. We used study as the grouping variable at the first level to model varying intercepts across studies and Student's t-distribution to describe the data. Weakly informative prior distributions were used for all model parameters, ensuring that the standard deviation of the prior distribution was at least 10 times larger than that of the posterior distribution. Specifically, we used normal prior distributions ($\mu = 0$, $\sigma = 10$) for regression parameters and half-Cauchy prior distributions ($\mu = 0$, $\lambda = 2.5$) for standard deviations,

561 as recommended by Gelman (2006). The prior distribution 616
562 for the degree of freedom parameter was set to $\Gamma(2, 0.1)$ as 617
563 recommended by Juárez and Steel (2010). The stability of 618
564 the HMC sampling algorithm was analyzed by verifying that 619
565 all estimated parameters had estimated effective sample sizes
566 in the bulk of the distributions and in the tails of the distri- 620
567 butions larger than 400 samples (Vehtari et al., 2021), and 621
568 that the potential scale reduction statistics (\hat{R}) did not deviate
569 from 1.0. To ensure a stable convergence of our models, we
570 visually inspected the trace plots of the posterior parameters
571 and performed prior and posterior predictive checks. We ver- 622
572 ified that the maximum tree depth was not saturated. Strong 623
573 degeneracies inherent to multilevel models were addressed 624
574 by reparametrizing the models to a non-centered parameteri- 625
575 zation (Betancourt and Girolami, 2013). 626

576 To examine the effect of sample size on the detection of 629
577 brain-behavior relationships, we conducted Bayesian linear 630
578 modeling for sample sizes ranging from 15 to 155 partici- 631
579 pants. At each sample size, 1000 samples were created by 632
580 sampling with replacement from the set of all participants. 633
581 We then performed Bayesian two-level normal linear model 634
582 with factors memory inexactness and prototype bias with 635
583 study as a random effect for each separate sample. The mod- 636
584 els were computed in the same manner as described in the 637
585 previous paragraph. 638

586 Results 641

587 Individual differences in the use of spatial coding 642 588 strategies 643 644

589 We first examined the pattern of response errors at different 645
590 target angles in order to identify any behavioral indicators of 646
591 the use of categorical representations during spatial working 647
592 memory performance. We observed that participants system- 648
593 atically shifted their responses toward the nearest diagonals, 649
594 with a greater bias occurring at target angles further away 650
595 from the diagonals (Figures 2A-B and S2A). This finding 651
596 indicates the use of categorical representations, where par- 652
597 ticipants formed spatial categories defined by the four quad- 653
598 rants of the screen, delineated by the vertical and horizon- 654
599 tal axes, each best represented by its diagonal (Huttenlocher 655
600 et al., 2004, 1991; Starc et al., 2017). 656

601 To separately measure the contribution of fine-grained 657
602 and categorical representations in spatial working memory, 658
603 we next derived two behavioral measures based on the mod- 659
604 eling of the responses – memory inexactness and prototype 660
605 bias. We used memory inexactness as a measure of the preci- 661
606 sion of fine-grained representations, and prototype bias as a 662
607 measure of the extent to which participants relied on categor- 663
608 ical representations. For each behavioral measure, we calcu- 664
609 lated a mean estimate for each participant, reflecting their use 665
610 of fine-grained and categorical representations (for distribu- 666
611 tions across participants see Figure 2C and for study differ- 667
612 ences in both measures see Figures S2B-C). We then com- 668
613 puted the Pearson correlation coefficient to examine the re- 669
614 lationship between both measures across studies. Our results 670
615 revealed a positive correlation, $r = 0.660$, $p < 0.001$, between 671

memory inexactness and prototype bias (Figure 2D), suggest-
ing that participants who relied more heavily on categorical
representations showed poorer precision of fine-grained rep-
resentations and vice versa.


Task-related brain activity across different levels of parcellation

In the analysis of the fMRI data, we first examined the ar-
eas of the brain that were activated or deactivated during
different phases of a task trial, namely the encoding, delay,
and response phases (Figure S3A). During all phases of the
trial, significant activation (i.e., $p < 0.05$ corrected for multi-
ple comparisons) was observed in a number of brain regions,
spanning the frontal, parietal, and occipital cortices. Subcor-
tical activation was consistently observed in the cerebellum,
thalamus, putamen, caudate, and brainstem. Phase-specific
activations differed mainly in the early and ventral stream
visual areas, where extensive activation was observed only
during the encoding and response phases. Significant deacti-
vation was observed in all phases of the trial in the posterior
cingulate cortex, and in areas of the medial prefrontal cor-
tex, and inferior frontal cortex. Additional deactivation was
observed in the lateral temporal cortex for the delay and re-
sponse, and in the inferior parietal cortex, early and ventral
stream visual areas for the delay phase only. Subcortical de-
activation was mainly observed during the delay and response
phases in the cerebellum, hippocampus, and amygdala.


To investigate the integration of activity within functional
brain regions and networks, and their average responses to
the task, we also performed the activation analysis of the
fMRI data averaged within cortical regions of the HCP-
MMP1.0 parcellation (Glasser et al., 2016), and within sub-
cortical regions and networks based on the Cole-Anticevic
Network Partition (Ji et al., 2019). The results based on par-
cellated data showed additional significant task-related acti-
vations and deactivations (Figures 3A, S3B, and S3C). When
looking at more general networks, increased activity was ob-
served during encoding in the primary and secondary visual
networks, somatomotor, cingulo-opercular, dorsal attention,
frontoparietal, and language networks, in addition to the pos-
terior and ventral multimodal networks. Deactivation was ob-
served only in the default network. The delay phase showed
significant activation in the secondary visual, somatomotor,
cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, and posterior multimodal
networks. In contrast, decreased activity was observed in
the default, ventral multimodal, and orbito-affective networks
during the delay. Finally, the response phase was charac-
terized by activation in the primary and secondary visual
networks, somatomotor, cingulo-opercular, dorsal attention,
frontoparietal, auditory, posterior multimodal, and ventral
multimodal networks. Significant deactivation was again ob-
served only in the default network.

Lastly, we examined whether the analysis on parcellated
fMRI data improved effect sizes or, alternatively, diluted ef-
fects due to inhomogeneous activity within individual brain
regions and networks. Similar to the analysis described in
Glasser et al. (2016) and Ji et al. (2019), we compared the


A. Example pattern of angular errors



B. Average angular error at different target angles



C. Distributions of behavioral measures across individuals



D. Correlation between measures




Fig. 2. Systematic biases and individual differences in spatial working memory performance. **A.** An example pattern of the systematic bias in spatial working memory performance computed as average angular response errors at different target angles across participants in Studies IV, V and VI, which used the same stimulus angles in relation to the center of the screen. The start of the arrow denotes the target position, while the head of the arrow points to the average response position. **B.** Angular response errors at different target angles across all participants. Red lines represent diagonals of each quadrant, delineated by the horizontal and vertical axes shown as gray lines. **C.** The distribution of memory inexactness and prototype bias across participants. The points present the mean of each measure, with the range indicating the standard deviation of the measure. **D.** Relationship between memory inexactness and prototype bias across all participants estimated using Pearson correlation coefficient.

672 unthresholded Z-values for delay-related activity between the 691
 673 "dense" grayordinate data and brain regions, and additionally 692
 674 between the brain regions and network data (Figure S3D). 693
 675 Our results showed that although the Z-values of individual 694
 676 grayordinates exceeded the Z-values obtained for the brain 695
 677 regions and networks to which they belonged, the analysis of 696
 678 the parcellated data resulted in higher overall effect size es- 697
 679 timates than the analysis of the grayordinate data. Similarly, 698
 680 analysis of network average data resulted in higher effect size 699
 681 estimates than analysis of the brain regions. Although work- 700
 682 ing with grayordinate data provides better spatial precision of 701
 683 results and is preferable when precise localization is of inter- 702
 684 est, these results suggest that working with parcellated data 703
 685 is preferable when testing hypotheses related to functional 704
 686 regions or networks, as was the case in our study. 705

687 Individual differences in spatial coding strategies re- 706 688 flected in brain activity 707

689 Next, we were interested in whether individual differences in 709
 690 the use of fine-grained and categorical representations are re- 710

reflected in brain activity. To this end, we used Bayesian linear modeling to predict the activity of brain networks of interest based on measures of memory inexactness and prototype bias (Figure 3B). Specifically, we used hierarchical linear modeling with behavioral measures as fixed factors and study as a random effect. We focused on the average activity within networks (i) to identify the engagement of broad brain systems during the use of different spatial coding strategies and (ii) to increase the effect sizes and statistical power of the analysis. Specifically, we examined brain-behavior relationships for the cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, frontoparietal, and default networks, separately for different task phases (Figure 3C).

During the encoding phase of the task, our results revealed 98.2% and 100% posterior probabilities for a negative relationship between memory inexactness and activity in the cingulo-opercular and dorsal-attention networks, respectively. These results suggest that increased encoding-related activity in the cingulo-opercular and dorsal-attention networks was related to decreased memory inexactness, or

711 in other words, increased memory precision. We also ob- 768
712 served a 96.2% posterior probability of a positive relation- 769
713 ship between memory inexactness and activity in the default 770
714 network, indicating that decreased activity in the default net- 771
715 work was associated with increased memory precision. Re- 772
716 lating encoding-related activity with prototype bias revealed 773
717 a negative relationship between prototype bias and the de- 774
718 fault network activity with a posterior probability of 98.5%, 775
719 showing that decreased activity in the default network was 776
720 associated with increased prototype bias. 777

721 For the delay phase, the results indicated 98.8%, 99.9%, 778
722 and 95.1% posterior probabilities for a negative relationship 779
723 between memory inexactness and activity in the cingulo- 780
724 opercular, dorsal-attention, and frontoparietal networks, re- 781
725 spectively. This result again suggests that increased memory 782
726 precision was related to increased activity in these networks 783
727 during spatial working memory performance. On the other 784
728 hand, the results showed 96.4% and 90.9% posterior proba- 785
729 bilities of a positive relationship between prototype bias and 786
730 activity in the frontoparietal and default networks, respec- 787
731 tively. These relationships suggest that both increased fron- 788
732 toparietal activation and weaker deactivation of the default 789
733 network are associated with increased prototype bias during 790
734 the spatial working memory task. 791

735 Relating response-related activity with memory inexact- 792
736 ness revealed a negative relationship between memory inex- 793
737 actness and activity in the cingulo-opercular and dorsal at- 794
738 tention networks with posterior probabilities of 98.5% and 795
739 98.8%, respectively. The results also showed a 92.6% poste- 796
740 rior probability of a positive relationship between prototype 797
741 bias and activity in the cingulo-opercular network. These re- 798
742 sults suggest that increased response-related activity in these 799
743 networks was related with increased memory precision, as 800
744 well as increased prototype bias. We also observed a negative 801
745 relationship between prototype bias and the default network 802
746 activity with a posterior probability of 92.7%, suggesting that 803
747 decreased activity in this network was associated with in- 804
748 creased prototype bias.

749 The general whole-brain patterns of the relationship be- 805
750 tween brain activity and behavioral measures of memory in- 806
751 exactness and prototype bias for brain regions and networks 807
752 can be observed in Figures S4-5. These analyses revealed 808
753 several additional relationships with both behavioral mea- 809
754 sures and activity in other brain networks. For memory in- 810
755 exactness, a negative relationship with activity in the primary 811
756 visual, secondary visual, and posterior-multimodal networks 812
757 during the encoding was found with posterior probabilities of 813
758 98.9%, 100%, and 99.0%, respectively (Figure S5). We also 814
759 observed a negative relationship between memory inexact- 815
760 ness and response-related activity in the primary visual, sec- 816
761 ondary visual, somatomotor, and posterior-multimodal net- 817
762 works with posterior probabilities of 96.1%, 99.2%, 97.5%, 818
763 and 98.7%, respectively (Figure S5). For the prototype bias, a 819
764 positive relationship with activity in the language and orbito- 820
765 affective networks during the delay was observed with poste- 821
766 rior probabilities of 97.7%, and 98.8%, respectively (Figure 820
767 S5). 821

The effect of sample size on the detection of brain-behavior relationships

A comparatively large multi-study sample provided us with an increased power to detect brain-behavior relationships with relatively small effect sizes. To further validate the stability of the results and assess statistical power in evaluating brain-behavior relationships, we conducted a comprehensive resampling analysis. Specifically, for each sample size from 15 to 155, we randomly selected a set of participants from our original sample with replacement 1000 times and repeated the Bayesian hierarchical linear regression for the four networks of interest, i.e. the cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, frontoparietal, and default networks, for the delay period for each sample. This allowed us to evaluate the effects of sample size on model estimates, their confidence intervals, and statistical power.

While mean β coefficients estimated in the linear model were generally stable across different sample sizes (Figure S6), our results indicated that the variability of β estimates within each sample size changed significantly with sample size. Zero was robustly excluded from the 95% confidence interval computed across 1000 resamplings for the relationships between memory inexactness and activity in the cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, and frontoparietal networks only after sample sizes of 93, 73, and 151, respectively. Zero was also consistently excluded from the 95% confidence interval across 1000 resamplings for the relationship between prototype bias and the frontoparietal network activity after a sample size of 149. Statistical power, computed as the proportion of samples in which 95% of posterior distribution was above or below 0, linearly increased with increasing sample size and reached 61.3%, 87.8%, and 26.0% for the relationships between memory inexactness and activity in the cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, and frontoparietal networks, respectively, and 31.2% for the relationship between prototype bias and the frontoparietal network activity (Figure S6).


Discussion

A spatial location can be encoded and maintained in working memory using different representations and strategies. Fine-grained representations provide detailed stimulus information, but are cognitively demanding and prone to inexactness. On the other hand, categorical representations may provide a more robust and less demanding strategy, but at the cost of loss of fine-grained precision. In our study, we were interested in the extent to which individuals rely on fine-grained and categorical representations to encode and maintain spatial information in working memory, and how these individual differences in spatial working memory strategies are reflected in brain activity.


Individual differences in spatial coding strategies

The investigation of behavioral performance in the spatial working memory task revealed the presence of a systematic bias in behavioral responses. Specifically, we observed that

A. Network brain activity during different task phases



B. Estimation of brain-behavior relationships



C. Brain-behavior relationship for different brain networks and task phases




Fig. 3. Average network activity in relation to individual spatial working memory performance. **A.** The average activity in the cingulo-opercular, frontoparietal, dorsal-attention, and default networks during different task phases. **B.** Steps in the analysis of the relationship between brain activity in specific networks and behavioral measures of memory inexactness and prototype bias. For each participant, we computed average brain activity within networks of interest defined by Cole-Anticevic Network Partition (Ji et al., 2019), and individual measures of memory inexactness and prototype bias. Next, we ran a Bayesian hierarchical linear model across participants predicting brain network activity with memory inexactness and prototype bias, and controlling for study as a random effect. **C.** Posterior distributions of the relationship between the activity of specific networks and behavioral measures of memory inexactness (red) and prototype bias (blue). Points indicate mean β -estimates, and lines 95% confidence intervals.

822 participants tended to shift their responses closer to the near- 879
823 est diagonals of the four quadrants, formed by dividing the 880
824 screen at the vertical and horizontal axes of symmetry. Sev- 881
825 eral previous studies (Haun et al., 2005; Huttenlocher et al., 882
826 2004, 1991; Purg et al., 2022; Starc et al., 2017) have sug- 883
827 gested that such a bias reflects the use of categorical repre- 884
828 sentations, where participants spontaneously impose spatial 885
829 categories in coding stimulus position. Huttenlocher et al. 886
830 (2004) have shown that this bias is replicated even when dif- 887
831 ferent spatial categories are imposed by the task by clustering 888
832 stimuli around the horizontal and vertical axes, as well as en- 889
833 couraging participants to use categories centered on the car- 890
834 dinal axes and bounded by the diagonals. This suggests that 891
835 the horizontal and vertical axes represent the most robust cat- 892
836 egory boundaries, resulting in the lowest misclassification of 893
837 spatial information (Huttenlocher et al., 2004). Nevertheless, 894
838 the use of different reference points (Holyoak and Mah, 1982; 895
839 Sadalla et al., 1980) or spatial borders (Nelson and Chaiklin, 896
840 1980; Newcombe and Liben, 1982), and specific instructions 897
841 on the context of the space (Tversky and Schiano, 1989) have 898
842 been shown to affect the type of categories constructed in spa- 899
843 tial estimation tasks, suggesting that the categories formed 900
844 are, at least to some extent, context-dependent (Huttenlocher 901
845 et al., 1991). 902

846 Our results are in line with the category adjustment model 903
847 Huttenlocher et al. (1991, 2000), which proposes that a spa- 904
848 tial location in working memory is simultaneously repre- 905
849 sented as a fine-grained and categorical representation. The 906
850 model predicts that the uncertainty in remembered fine- 907
851 grained information is compensated for by using information 908
852 of a broader stimulus category, which introduces a system- 909
853 atic bias in responses towards a prototypical value, but in- 910
854 creases an overall response accuracy by decreasing response 911
855 variability. We used the assumptions of the category adjust- 912
856 ment model to mathematically describe behavioral responses 913
857 during spatial working memory performance and to identify 914
858 individual contributions of fine-grained and categorical rep- 915
859 resentations to response errors. Specifically, we estimated the 916
860 inexactness in fine-grained memory as a spread of responses 917
861 around the true target value, while the effect of a categorical 918
862 representation on the estimation of stimulus location was de- 919
863 scribed in terms of a degree of systematic bias towards the 920
864 prototype. We were particularly interested in the relation- 921
865 ship between the use of both representations across individ- 922
866 uals. Our results replicated previous observation of a posi- 923
867 tive correlation between a loss of fine-grained memory preci- 924
868 sion and the use of a categorical representation (Starc et al., 925
869 2017). Specifically, our results suggest that there are individ- 926
870 ual differences in the balance between the use of fine-grained 927
871 and categorical spatial coding – individuals with higher fine- 928
872 grained precision of spatial representations relied less on cat- 929
873 egorical information, whereas individuals who showed lower 930
874 precision in fine-grained representations seemed to rely more 931
875 strongly on categorical representations. 932

876 At the interindividual level, the degree of reliance on cate- 933
877 gorical versus fine-grained representations has been related to 934
878 individual working memory capacity (Crawford et al., 2016; 935

Stukken et al., 2016). Studies on working memory capaci-
ty have traditionally focused on estimating the number of
items a participant can maintain over short periods of time by
comparing task performance under different working mem-
ory loads (for a review see Luck and Vogel, 2013). However,
recent studies (Bays and Husain, 2008; Spencer and Hund,
2002; Zhang and Luck, 2008) suggest that increasing the de-
tail or precision of these objects requires additional work-
ing memory resources at the cost of reducing the number
of objects that can be remembered simultaneously. There-
fore, the formation of high-precision representations might
be easier for individuals with a high working memory ca-
pacity, whereas a low working memory capacity would re-
quire a reduction in stimulus complexity, such as by using
coarse categorical coding. Crawford et al. (2016) estimated
the relationship between spatial working memory capacity
and the use of fine-grained or categorical representations dur-
ing spatial working memory performance based on a sample
of 778 adults. Their results showed a correlation between
spatial working memory capacity and different spatial cod-
ing strategies, with higher capacity predicting higher spatial
precision and lower categorical bias. Moreover, consistent
with these results is also the observation that introducing dis-
tractor stimuli that need to be retained during spatial work-
ing memory performance or an interference task which put
additional strain on working memory resources results in an
increased use of categorical representations Crawford et al.
(2016); Huttenlocher et al. (1991). To sum, the use of differ-
ent spatial coding strategies might be related to the availabil-
ity of cognitive resources, which could explain interindivid-
ual differences in the preference for a specific strategy.

It is important to note that due to the complex hierarchical
structure of our model of the effect of fine-grained and cate-
gorical representations on behavioral responses, the assump-
tions of the model were to some extent simplified, which
could potentially affect our estimates. For example, in our
model we assumed the same prototype location for all partic-
ipants, which we centered on the diagonal of each quadrant.
Some studies have shown that the prototype might not be lo-
cated exactly on the diagonal, and might even differ between
different quadrants of the task display or between participants
(Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991). This variability in the pro-
totype location was captured to an extent by the measure of
prototype inexactness in our model, although larger inconsis-
tencies in the assumed and actual prototype location could
increase the estimation of prototype inexactness and, in turn,
underestimate the degree of reliance on categorical represen-
tations in spatial working memory performance.

Furthermore, our model did not account for the poten-
tial influence of inexact boundaries in the estimation of stim-
ulus locations near boundaries. In the case of our study,
participants gave their responses on a blank screen, which
meant that no spatial boundary was explicitly presented, but
participants spontaneously imposed boundaries in the form
of horizontal and vertical symmetry axes. Their estima-
tion of boundaries could therefore be uncertain or inexact,
which could lead to misclassification of stimuli near bound-

aries. For instance, responses within the boundary inexactness could fall into any of the two categories delineated by the boundary and adjusted towards its center. When averaged, these responses with opposing directions of prototype bias would cancel each other out, resulting in an overall decreased effect of prototype bias around the inexact boundary (Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991). Our results showed that average response errors increased with target angle further from the diagonal, with a slight decrease near the boundaries, especially in the study in which the stimuli were presented the closest to the cardinal axes. For this reason, we excluded all misclassified stimuli from our data analysis to prevent dilution of the effects of categorical representations. We identified only 1.86% of misclassified stimuli per participant, with all misclassification occurring up to the target angle 15° from any boundary. The dynamic field theory (Schutte et al., 2003; Simmering et al., 2006) assumes that boundaries, perceived or spontaneously imposed, have a deflecting effect on behavioral responses during the estimation of a stimulus location in working memory due to their lateral inhibitory effects at the neural level, which results in a drift of the activation produced by the remembered target stimulus away from the boundary. Despite the overall decreased response errors near boundaries in our study, our results might still be in line with the assumptions of the dynamic field theory when looking at individual responses – i.e. the boundary might still have a deflecting effect, but in different directions for the correctly and incorrectly classified stimuli.

Different coding strategies related to the engagement of separable brain systems

The assumed advantage of categorical spatial coding is that it is less demanding on cognitive resources without compromising the overall accuracy of responses. In contrast, encoding fine-grained information yields precise responses, but requires greater engagement of attention and cognitive control. Therefore, we hypothesized that the use of specific spatial representations would be related to the level of engagement of the attentional and control brain systems. Specifically, we expected that a stronger reliance on precise, fine-grained representations would be supported by increased activation of attentional and control brain systems, and stronger inhibition of the default network. On the other hand, we assumed that uncertainty in fine-grained representations, such as due to a loss of precision or task interference, would be related to an increased use of categorical representations that would require fewer attentional and control resources.

In the investigation of the relationship between brain activity with behavioral measures of the precision of fine-grained representations and the use of categorical representations, we observed a strong positive relationship between fine-grained memory precision and activity in the cingulo-opercular and dorsal-attention networks during all phases of the task, the encoding, delay, and response. We also observed a slightly weaker positive relationship between memory precision and the frontoparietal network activity during the delay. These results suggest that increased memory pre-

cision is indeed accompanied by an increased engagement of these networks. The cingulo-opercular, dorsal-attention, and frontoparietal networks are consistently activated during different working memory tasks and have been widely recognized to play an important role in active maintenance of information in working memory (Brown et al., 2004; Curtis, 2006, 2004; D’Esposito and Postle, 2015; Eriksson et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2017; Purg et al., 2022; Zarahn et al., 1999). In addition, increases in the level of activity and functional connectivity within these networks have been found to scale with increased attentional demands, working memory load, and memory accuracy (e.g., Assem et al., 2020; Barch et al., 2013; Bray et al., 2015; Cole et al., 2014; Fox et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2017, 2018; Magnuson et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2009). Therefore, our findings support the notion that the formation and active maintenance of fine-grained representations presents a cognitive load and engages attentional and cognitive control systems.

Our results also revealed a negative relationship between fine-grained memory precision and the default network activity during encoding only, showing that decreased activity in this network was related to increased memory precision. Traditionally, fMRI studies investigating functional connectivity at rest have identified the role of the default network in spontaneous intrinsic activity in the absence of cognitive load (e.g., Cole et al., 2014; Damoiseaux et al., 2006; Fox et al., 2005; Greicius et al., 2003; Moussa et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2009). Moreover, the default network shows robust deactivation during the performance of various cognitive tasks, including during working memory performance, which becomes stronger with increasing cognitive load (e.g., Anticevic et al., 2010; Cole et al., 2014; Fox et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2018; Raichle, 2015a,b; Smith et al., 2009). Such decreases in the activity of the default network are thought to reflect the allocation of cognitive resources to task-relevant information and protection from distraction (Liu et al., 2017). For example, Anticevic et al. (2010) showed that stronger suppression of the default network during the encoding of target stimuli, prior to the presentation of distractors, predicted higher response accuracy in a working memory task. These results are consistent with our observations, although the study included non-spatial visual stimuli and match-to-sample responses that do not allow the uncoupling of separate contributions of fine-grained and categorical representations to response accuracy, which makes it difficult to directly relate the two studies. In summary, our results suggest that stronger inhibition of the default network is required to ensure good fine-grained memory precision, likely as a result of allocating attentional and control resources toward task-relevant stimuli and protection from interference.

Conversely, the relationship between the use of categorical representations and brain activity was somewhat less clear. Our results revealed opposing relationships with the default network activity and the prototype bias during the encoding and response phases of the task compared to the delay period. Specifically, we observed that increased use of prototype bias was related to stronger deactivation during

1049 the encoding and response, and weaker deactivation during¹¹⁰⁶
1050 the delay phase of the task. These results suggest temporal¹¹⁰⁷
1051 differences in the engagement of the default network in re-¹¹⁰⁸
1052 lation to the use of categorical representations. Stronger de-¹¹⁰⁹
1053 activation during the encoding and response might reflect in-¹¹¹⁰
1054 creased attentional engagement and inhibition of distractors¹¹¹¹
1055 directed toward the formation and recall of categorical repre-¹¹¹²
1056 sentations, respectively. On the other hand, weaker deactiva-¹¹¹³
1057 tion during the delay might suggest decreased attentional and¹¹¹⁴
1058 control demands when individuals rely on categorical repre-¹¹¹⁵
1059 sentations, supporting the hypothesis that categorical coding¹¹¹⁶
1060 of spatial positions provides a less demanding spatial work-¹¹¹⁷
1061 ing memory strategy. ¹¹¹⁸

1062 The investigation of the relationship between the use of¹¹¹⁹
1063 categorical representations and the activity in attentional and¹¹²⁰
1064 control brain networks revealed a positive relationship be-¹¹²¹
1065 tween the prototype bias and activity in the frontoparietal¹¹²²
1066 network during the delay, as well as a slightly weaker posi-¹¹²³
1067 tive relationship between the prototype bias and the activ-¹¹²⁴
1068 ity in the cingulo-opercular network during the response. In¹¹²⁵
1069 other words, increased engagement in these networks pre-¹¹²⁶
1070 dicted a higher use of categorical representations. While the¹¹²⁷
1071 formation, maintenance and recall of fine-grained representa-¹¹²⁸
1072 tions required constant engagement of attentional and control¹¹²⁹
1073 systems, the results on the use of categorical representations¹¹³⁰
1074 suggest that these brain systems were engaged only later in¹¹³¹
1075 a task trial during stimulus maintenance and recall. Simi-¹¹³²
1076 larly, [Starc et al. \(2017\)](#) reported a compensatory use of fine-¹¹³³
1077 grained and categorical representations during an individual¹¹³⁴
1078 task trial, where the failure to encode fine-grained informa-¹¹³⁵
1079 tion with high precision at the time of encoding of spatial in-¹¹³⁶
1080 formation could then be compensated for by the reconstruction¹¹³⁷
1081 of target location based on categorical information in the¹¹³⁸
1082 late delay and response periods of the trial. These results are¹¹³⁹
1083 somewhat inconsistent with the hypothesis of reduced cog-¹¹⁴⁰
1084 nitive load and reliance on cognitive resources when using¹¹⁴¹
1085 categorical representations, but may indicate a need for at-¹¹⁴²
1086 tentional and cognitive control during the recall of categorical¹¹⁴³
1087 representations just before the response has to be given. ¹¹⁴⁴

1088 However, our assumption that the observed relationship¹¹⁴⁵
1089 with the delay-related frontoparietal activity reflects the use¹¹⁴⁶
1090 of a categorical representation may be wrong. The category¹¹⁴⁷
1091 adjustment model ([Huttenlocher et al., 1991, 2000](#)) proposes¹¹⁴⁸
1092 that participants resort to the use of a categorical represen-¹¹⁴⁹
1093 tation when their confidence in a memory representation is¹¹⁵⁰
1094 low, which would arguably be assessed just before or at the¹¹⁵¹
1095 time of the response. Taking this into account, we can hy-¹¹⁵²
1096 pothesize that the increased frontoparietal activity does not¹¹⁵³
1097 reflect the cognitive processes engaged in the maintenance¹¹⁵⁴
1098 of a categorical representation, but rather the processes that¹¹⁵⁵
1099 predict a loss of confidence in the fine-grained memory rep-¹¹⁵⁶
1100 resentation and subsequent increased reliance on the cate-¹¹⁵⁷
1101 gorical representation. Even though the frontoparietal net-¹¹⁵⁸
1102 work has been strongly implicated in allocation of attention¹¹⁵⁹
1103 and active maintenance of task-relevant information in work-¹¹⁶⁰
1104 ing memory, studies have also shown its role in protection¹¹⁶¹
1105 from task-irrelevant information (e.g., [Jerde and Curtis, 2013](#);¹¹⁶²

[Ptak, 2012](#); [Zhang et al., 2017](#)). The increase in frontoparietal activity may reflect an increased effort in protecting the memory from task interference and suppression of distractors due to lower ability or confidence in the precision of the fine-grained memory representation, leading to larger reliance on categorical representation when providing the response. This is consistent with the finding that introducing an interference during the delay of spatial estimation tasks increased the reliance on categorical information ([Huttenlocher et al., 2004, 1991](#)). When assessing the role of the frontoparietal network, it is also prudent to consider the functional heterogeneity of the network. Specifically, our results of task-related activity based on voxel-wise fMRI data showed activation in some, and deactivation in other areas within the frontoparietal network, suggesting that the role of the frontoparietal network in spatial working memory processes might be more complex than initially thought, and the averaging of the activity within the network might mask diverging functions within the network.

Together, the observed patterns of associations between brain and behavior reflect important relationships between the two strategies of encoding, maintenance and recall of spatial information. While the negative relationship between fine-grained memory precision and the use of categorical representations suggests a complementary use of categorical and fine-grained representations with the goal to increase the overall response accuracy, the two strategies relate to the engagement of separable brain systems. In particular, the precision of fine-grained representations is related to the level of attentional engagement, which is reflected in the activation of the attentional and control brain networks. Additionally, greater deactivation of the default network during the formation of fine-grained representations appears to predict higher memory precision, perhaps by providing suppression of distractors and the allocation of resources toward task-relevant information. In contrast, the extent of reliance on categorical representations does not seem to impose such attentional demands. Compared with the ongoing engagement of attentional and control systems necessary to ensure high precision of fine-grained representations, some evidence was found for the activation of these systems in relation to the use of categorical representations later in the task trial during maintenance and response. Interestingly, the relationship between categorical representations and the activity in the default network appears to change over the course of the trial, where stronger inhibition of the default network is required during stimulus encoding and recall, whereas decreased inhibition is observed during the maintenance of spatial information. Since the use of a categorical representation is predicted by the uncertainty or loss of confidence in a fine-grained representation the increased deactivation of the default network during the stimulus presentation and response may reflect an increased effort in protecting the memory from task interference and suppression of distractors. On the other hand, the relaxation of the default network during the delay possibly reflects a decrease in cognitive demands in the maintenance of categorical representations.

1163 By exploring the relationship between the use of fine-grained or categorical representations with the activity of other brain networks, we identified several relationships that suggest that the use of two strategies is related to different modalities. The precision of fine-grained memory was associated with the activity in primary visual, secondary visual, and posterior multimodal networks during the encoding and response, with increased activity in these networks predicting higher memory precision. Additionally, higher memory precision was also associated with increased somatomotor network activity during the response. These results suggest that fine-grained representations might be encoded as a visual information which is reactivated during the response, when it is converted into a motor plan used to execute the task response (Purg et al., 2022). In contrast, we observed that the use of categorical representations was predicted by the delay-related activity in the language network, with an increased categorical bias related to increased activity in this network. The engagement of the language network in the maintenance of categorical representations might indicate the transformation of spatial information into verbal codes during spatial working memory. For example, spatial categories defined as the four quadrants of the screen, delineated by the horizontal and vertical axes, could be remembered in terms of verbal codes "up-right", "up-left", "down-left", and "down-right". Similarly, studies that collected subjective reports on the strategies used during the performance of visuospatial working memory tasks have found that both, visualization and verbalization, are common strategies used to encode and maintain information in working memory (Brown and Wesley, 2013; Oblak et al., 2024, 2022; Sanfratello et al., 2014; Slana Ozimić et al., 2023). In addition, several studies have related individual differences in the use of these strategies to distinct patterns of brain activity (Kirchhoff and Buckner, 2006; Miller et al., 2012; Sanfratello et al., 2014).

1198 In this study, we focused on general behavioral and neural strategies used in spatial working memory rather than specific mechanisms. Our results provide insight into the level of general cognitive demand involved in the use of fine-grained versus categorical representations. However, they do not indicate the specific brain regions in which the different types of information are represented. fMRI studies that used multivariate pattern analysis (MVPA) have shown that fine-grained stimulus-specific information can be decoded from early sensory areas that initially processed the stimulus (Harrison and Tong, 2009; Serences et al., 2009). In contrast, other studies have shown that the prefrontal and parietal areas can store more abstract representations, such as goals, task rules, and categories (Christophel et al., 2017; D'Esposito and Postle, 2015; Meyers et al., 2008; Riggall and Postle, 2012). Additionally, single-neuron recordings in the prefrontal cortex of monkeys during the performance of a spatial working memory task have shown that neurons, exhibiting directional selectivity for presented target angles, differed in the width of their tuning curves, suggesting that certain neurons respond to more specific directions and others to a broader range of directions (Funahashi et al., 1989). Based on these findings,

it has been proposed that brain areas in the posterior-anterior axis respond to different levels of abstraction, with low-level posterior areas responding to fine-grained information and high-level anterior areas to more abstract information and regulatory signals (Christophel et al., 2017; D'Esposito and Postle, 2015; Rahmati et al., 2018). However, further studies are needed to identify areas of the brain that are involved in the storage of fine-grained and categorical representations used in spatial working memory.

The ability to detect significant brain-behavior relationships

Several recent studies (Elliott et al., 2020; Grady et al., 2021; Marek et al., 2022; Poldrack et al., 2017) have discussed the problem of highly variable brain-behavior relationships that require large sample sizes to obtain stable and reliable results. For example, Marek et al. (2022) have shown that brain-wide association studies with typical sample sizes (i.e., around 25 participants) resulted in low statistical power, inflated effect sizes, and a failure to replicate results. We addressed this challenge by using a multi-site and multi-study fMRI dataset, which afforded us with a relatively large sample size ($n = 155$) compared to other task-related fMRI studies (Elliott et al., 2020; Marek et al., 2022). To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest fMRI dataset on spatial working memory to date. An additional advantage of a larger sample size was that it allowed us to explore the effect of the sample size on the findings of interest.

The investigation of the effect of sample size on β estimates as a measure of brain-behavior relationships revealed that β estimates can vary substantially from sample to sample when employing relatively small sample sizes. As indicated by the confidence intervals, the variability of the estimates decreased steeply at first and then slowly approached the population mean. These results are consistent with the observation that the sampling variability is large for small sample sizes and stabilizes at larger sample sizes (Marek et al., 2022). In the case of our study, brain-behavior associations appeared to stabilize roughly between 73 and 151 observations, consistent with the result obtained by Grady et al. (2021) and Schönbrodt and Perugini (2013). Moreover, similar to other fMRI studies on brain-behavior associations (Marek et al., 2022; Poldrack et al., 2017), statistical power, i.e. the ability to detect a significant effect, increased monotonically with increasing sample size, and remained fairly low even at larger sample sizes. The maximum statistical power we observed was 88.4% at $n = 153$ for the relationship between memory inexactness and activity in the dorsal-attention network.

In order to maximize sample size and statistical power, we combined data from multiple sites and studies, which presented additional challenges and limitations. Notably, there were minor differences in task designs and data collection protocols between studies, potentially contributing to the observed variability across participants. We addressed this issue using a multilevel approach. First, we analyzed the task condition that was directly comparable across studies and always

1276 had the same goal, i.e. to remember a single random target¹³³²
1277 location for a few seconds on any individual trial. However,¹³³³
1278 even though the task was essentially the same across stud-¹³³⁴
1279 ies, there could potentially be some differences in task dif-¹³³⁵
1280 ficulty, as a result of a different number of possible target¹³³⁶
1281 locations, different duration of target stimulus presentation,¹³³⁷
1282 or different length of the delay period. While we observed
1283 some differences in behavioral performance across studies,¹³³⁸
1284 any differences in task difficulty were hard to delineate from
1285 the effects of different strategies on responses. Second, we¹³³⁹
1286 used a hierarchical model with study as a random effect to¹³⁴⁰
1287 account for any variability due to systematic differences be-¹³⁴¹
1288 tween studies. Nevertheless, the final sample size was still¹³⁴²
1289 relatively small compared to the recommendation of recent¹³⁴³
1290 studies (Elliott et al., 2020; Marek et al., 2022) indicating that¹³⁴⁴
1291 thousands of participants are required to prevent the inflation¹³⁴⁵
1292 of effect sizes and replication failure in brain-behavior asso-¹³⁴⁶
1293 ciation analyses. In addition, the hierarchical structure of our
1294 data increased the complexity of the linear model used and¹³⁴⁷
1295 might require even larger sample sizes to obtain reliable esti-¹³⁴⁸
1296 mates (Kerkhoff and Nussbeck, 2019; Maas and Hox, 2004,¹³⁴⁹
1297 2005). To further increase statistical power we performed¹³⁵⁰
1298 analyses on brain networks rather than grayordinates with
1299 should provide a better signal-to-noise ratio due to averag-
1300 ing data and ensure fewer statistical comparisons. We also¹³⁵¹
1301 used Bayesian statistical methods which have been found to¹³⁵²
1302 give more robust results even at low sample sizes (e.g., Van¹³⁵³
1303 De Schoot et al., 2021). Additionally, we have provided de-¹³⁵⁴
1304 tailed power analysis to allow better insight into the stability¹³⁵⁵
1305 of brain-behavior relationships in our study. However, more¹³⁵⁶
1306 data or replication on an independent dataset would be wel-¹³⁵⁷
1307 come to further ensure the validity and generalizability of the¹³⁵⁸
1308 relationships observed in our analyses. ¹³⁵⁹
¹³⁶⁰
¹³⁶¹

1309 Conclusion

1310 In this multi-site, multi-study analysis, we found that indi-¹³⁶²
1311 viduals differ in the extent to which they rely on fine-grained¹³⁶³
1312 versus categorical representations to encode and maintain a¹³⁶⁴
1313 spatial location in working memory, and that these differ-¹³⁶⁵
1314 ences correlate with the engagement of brain networks dur-¹³⁶⁶
1315 ing the encoding, delay, and response phases of the task trial.¹³⁶⁷
1316 Behaviorally, individuals with lower fine-grained precision¹³⁶⁸
1317 relied more on categorical representations, which led to a
1318 higher categorical bias. Increased activation of attentional,¹³⁶⁹
1319 and control brain networks throughout the entire task trial,
1320 and stronger deactivation of the default network in the en-¹³⁷⁰
1321 coding period were found to predict higher precision in spa-
1322 tial working memory performance, possibly reflecting the
1323 importance of attentional resources for successful encoding¹³⁷¹
1324 and maintenance of the fine-grained representation. In con-¹³⁷²
1325 trast, the use of a categorical representation was associated,¹³⁷³
1326 with lower default network activity in the encoding period,¹³⁷⁴
1327 and higher frontoparietal network engagement in the delay
1328 period, the latter possibly reflecting an inability to protect the
1329 fine-grained representation from interference, which led to¹³⁷⁵
1330 higher reliance on the categorical representation when pro-¹³⁷⁶
1331 viding the response. The results stress the need to consider¹³⁷⁷
¹³⁷⁸

individual differences in the use of specific representations
and strategies when studying complex cognitive functions,
such as working memory. They also illustrate the insights
that the individual differences approach can provide in the
study of brain-behavior relationships when a sufficient num-
ber of participants is ensured.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: N.P.S., J.D.M., A.A., and G.R.; Project
administration: N.P.S.; Data curation: N.P.S., Y.T.C., and
A.S.O.; Methodology: N.P.S., A.K., M.R., J.D.M., A.A., and
G.R.; Formal analysis: N.P.S., A.K., and G.R.; Visualization:
N.P.S.; Writing – original draft: N.P.S.; Writing – review &
editing: N.P.S., A.K., M.R., Y.T.C., A.S.O., J.D.M., A.A.,
and G.R.; Supervision: J.D.M., A.A., and G.R.; Funding ac-
quisition: A.A. and G.R.; Resources: A.A. and G.R.

Conflict of Interest

J.D.M., A.A., and G.R. consult for and hold equity in
Neumora Therapeutics and Manifest Technologies. Other au-
thors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

This work was supported by the Slovenian Research and
Innovation Agency (Z5-50177 to N.P.S., J7-5553 and J3-
9264 to G.R., P3-0338 to A.S.O., and G.R., P5-0110 to
A.K.), the National Institutes of Health (DP5OD012109-01,
1U01MH121766, 5R01MH112189, and 5R01MH108590 to
A.A.), the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Al-
coholism (2P50AA012870-11 to A.A.), the Brain and Be-
havior Research Foundation Young Investigator Award (to
A.A.), and Simons Foundation Autism Research Initiative Pi-
lot Award (to A.A.).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank colleagues and students who
helped with data collection, as well as all participants in the
studies for their time and cooperation. We also thank the re-
viewers and editors for their constructive comments and sug-
gestions.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary tables and figures are available at [the link to
the supplementary material].

Data Availability

Data and analysis scripts for this paper can be found in
the Open Science Framework (OSF) repository available at
<https://osf.io/k8mrv/>.

References

Adam KCS, Mance I, Fukuda K, Vogel EK. The Contribution of Attentional Lapses to Individual
Differences in Visual Working Memory Capacity. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 2015.
27:1601–1616. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00811.

- 1379 Adam KCS, Robison MK, Vogel EK. Contralateral Delay Activity Tracks Fluctuations in Working1465
1380 Memory Performance. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 2018. 30:1229–1240. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01233. 1466
- 1381 Anticevic A, Repovs G, Shulman GL, Barch DM. When less is more: TPJ and default network1468
1382 deactivation during encoding predicts working memory performance. *NeuroImage*. 2010.1469
1383 49:2638–2648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.11.008>. 1470
- 1384 Assem M, Blank IA, Mineroff Z, Ademoğlu A, Fedorenko E. Activity in the fronto-parietal multiple-1471
1385 demand network is robustly associated with individual differences in working memory and1472
1386 fluid intelligence. *Cortex*. 2020. 131:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.06.013>. 1473
1387 2020.06.013. 1474
- 1388 Barch DM, Burgess GC, Harms MP, Petersen SE, Schlaggar BL, Corbetta M, Glasser MF, Curtiss1475
1389 S, Dixit S, Feldt C, Nolan D, Bryant E, Hartley T, Footer O, Bjork JM, Poldrack R, Smith S,1476
1390 Johansen-Berg H, Snyder AZ, Van Essen DC. Function in the human connectome: Task-1477
1391 fMRI and individual differences in behavior. *NeuroImage*. 2013. 80:169–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.05.033>. 1479
- 1392 Bays PM, Husain M. Dynamic Shifts of Limited Working Memory Resources in Human Vision.1480
1393 *Science*. 2008. 321:851–854. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1158023>. 1481
- 1394 Betancourt MJ, Girolami M. Hamiltonian Monte Carlo for Hierarchical Models. 2013. Number:1482
1395 arXiv:1312.0906 arXiv:1312.0906 [stat]. 1483
- 1396 Bray S, Almas R, Arnold AEGF, Iaria G, MacQueen G. Intraparietal Sulcus Activity and Func-1484
1397 tional Connectivity Supporting Spatial Working Memory Manipulation. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2015.1485
1398 25:1252–1264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bbt320>. 1486
- 1400 Brown LA, Wesley RW. Visual working memory is enhanced by mixed strategy use and seman-1487
1401 tic coding. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*. 2013. 25:328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/108020445911.2013.773004>. 1489
- 1402 Brown M, DeSouza J, Goltz HC, Ford K, Menon RS, Goodale MA, Everling S. Comparison of1490
1403 Memory- and Visually Guided Saccades Using Event-Related fMRI. *Journal of Neurophysiol-1491*
1404 ogy. 2004. 91:873–889. <https://doi.org/10/d4rkqw>. 1492
- 1405 Chafee MV, Goldman-Rakic PS. Matching Patterns of Activity in Primate Prefrontal Area 8a and1493
1406 Parietal Area 7ip Neurons During a Spatial Working Memory Task. *Journal of Neurophysiol-1494*
1407 ogy. 1998. 79:2919–2940. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1998.79.6.2919>. 1495
- 1408 Christophel TB, Klink PC, Spitzer B, Roelfsema PR, Haynes JD. The Distributed Nature of Work-1496
1409 ing Memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2017. 21:111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.12.007>. 1498
- 1410 Cole M, Bassett D, Power J, Braver T, Petersen S. Intrinsic and Task-Evoked Network Architec-1499
1411 tures of the Human Brain. *Neuron*. 2014. 83:238–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.05.014>. 1501
- 1412 Courtney SM, Petit L, Maisog JM, Ungerleider LG, Haxby JV. An Area Specialized for Spatial1502
1413 Working Memory in Human Frontal Cortex. *Science*. 1998. 279:1347–1351. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.279.5355.1347>. 1504
- 1414 Crawford LE, Landy D, Salthouse TA. Spatial working memory capacity predicts bias in estimate1505
1415 s of location. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*. 2016.1506
1416 42:1434–1447. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000228>. 1507
- 1417 Curtis C. Prefrontal and parietal contributions to spatial working memory. *Neuroscience*. 2006.1508
1418 139:173–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2005.04.070>. 1509
- 1419 Curtis CE. Maintenance of Spatial and Motor Codes during Oculomotor Delayed Response Tasks.1510
1420 *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2004. 24:3944–3952. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1510-04.2004>. 1511
- 1421 Damoiseaux JS, Rombouts SARB, Barkhof F, Scheltens P, Stam CJ, Smith SM, Beckmann1512
1422 CF. Consistent resting-state networks across healthy subjects. *Proceedings of the National1513*
1423 Academy of Sciences. 2006. 103:13848–13853. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514>
1424 0601417103. 1515
- 1425 D'Esposito M, Postle BR. The Cognitive Neuroscience of Working Memory. *Annu-1516*
1426 al Review of Psychology. 2015. 66:115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015031>. 1518
- 1427 Duffy S, Huttenlocher J, Hedges LV, Crawford LE. Category effects on stimulus estimation: Shift-1519
1428 ing and skewed frequency distributions. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 2010. 17:224–230.1520
1429 <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.17.2.224>. 1521
- 1430 Elliott ML, Knodt AR, Ireland D, Morris ML, Poulton R, Ramrakha S, Sison ML, Moffitt TE, Caspi1522
1431 AR. What Is the Test-Retest Reliability of Common Task-Functional MRI Measures?1523
1432 New Empirical Evidence and a Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Science*. 2020. 31:792–806.1524
1433 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620916786>. 1525
- 1434 Eriksson J, Vogel E, Lansner A, Bergström F, Nyberg L. Neurocognitive Architecture of Working1526
1435 Memory. *Neuron*. 2015. 88:33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.020>. 1528
- 1436 Fox MD, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Corbetta M, Van Essen DC, Raichle ME. The human brain is1529
1437 intrinsically organized into dynamic, anticorrelated functional networks. *Proceedings of the1530*
1438 National Academy of Sciences. 2005. 102:9673–9678. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0504136102>. 1532
- 1439 Friston K, Fletcher P, Josephs O, Holmes A, Rugg M, Turner R. Event-Related fMRI: Characteriz-1533
1440 ing Differential Responses. *NeuroImage*. 1998. 7:30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1997.0306>. 1534
- 1441 Funahashi S, Bruce CJ, Goldman-Rakic PS. Mnemonic coding of visual space in the monkey's1536
1442 dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 1989. 61:331–349. <https://doi.org/10/ggocg98>. 1538
- 1443 Fuster JM. Unit activity in prefrontal cortex during delayed-response performance: neuronal1539
1444 correlates of transient memory. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 1973. 36:61–78. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1973.36.1.61>. 1541
- 1445 Fuster JM, Alexander GE. Neuron Activity Related to Short-Term Memory. *Science*. 1971.1542
1446 173:652–654. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.173.3997.652>. 1543
- 1447 Gelman A. Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models (comment on arti-1544
1448 cle by Browne and Draper). *Bayesian Analysis*. 2006. 1. [https://doi.org/10.1214/1545](https://doi.org/10.1214/154506-ba117a)
1449 06-ba117a. 1546
- 1450 Glahn D, Kim J, Cohen M, Poutanen VP, Therman S, Bava S, Van Erp T, Manninen M, Huttunen1547
1451 M, Lönnqvist J. Maintenance and Manipulation in Spatial Working Memory: Dissociations in1548
1452 the Prefrontal Cortex. *NeuroImage*. 2002. 17:201–213. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2002.1161>. 1550
- 1453 Glasser MF, Coalson TS, Robinson EC, Hacker CD, Harwell J, Yacoub E, Ugurbil K, Anders-1551
1454 son J, Beckmann CF, Jenkinson M, Smith SM, Van Essen DC. A multi-modal parcellation1552
1455 of human cerebral cortex. *Nature*. 2016. 536:171–178. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18933>. 1553
- 1456 Glasser MF, Sotiropoulos SN, Wilson JA, Coalson TS, Fischl B, Andersson JL, Xu J, Jbabdi S,1554
1457 Webster M, Polimeni JR, Van Essen DC, Jenkinson M. The minimal preprocessing pipelines1555
1458 for the Human Connectome Project. *NeuroImage*. 2013. 80:105–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.127>. 1556
- 1459 Grady CL, Rieck JR, Nichol D, Rodrigue KM, Kennedy KM. Influence of sample size and analytic1557
1460 approach on stability and interpretation of brain-behavior correlations in task-related fMRI1558
1461 data. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2021. 42:204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25217>. 1559
- 1462 Greicius MD, Krasnow B, Reiss AL, Menon V. Functional connectivity in the resting brain: A1560
1463 network analysis of the default mode hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of1561*
1464 Sciences. 2003. 100:253–258. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0135058100>. 1562
- 1465 Hallenbeck GE, Sprague TC, Rahmati M, Sreenivasan KK, Curtis CE. Working memory represen-1563
1466 tations in visual cortex mediate distraction effects. *Nature Communications*. 2021. 12:4714.1564
1467 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24973-1>. 1565
- 1468 Harrison SA, Tong F. Decoding reveals the contents of visual working memory in early visual1566
1469 areas. *Nature*. 2009. 458:632–635. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07832>. 1567
- 1470 Haun DB, Allen GL, Wedell DH. Bias in spatial memory: a categorical endorsement. *Acta Psycho-1568*
1471 logica. 2005. 118:149–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2004.10.011>. 1569
- 1472 Holyoak KJ, Mah WA. Cognitive reference points in judgments of symbolic magnitude. *Cognitive1570*
1473 Psychology. 1982. 14:328–352. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(82\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(82)90013-5)
1474 90013-5. 1571
- 1475 Huttenlocher J, Hedges LV, Corrigan B, Crawford L. Spatial categories and the estimation of loca-1572
1476 tion. *Cognition*. 2004. 93:75–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2003.10.006>. 1573
- 1477 Huttenlocher J, Hedges LV, Duncan S. Categories and Particulars: Prototype Effects in Estimat-1574
1478 ing Spatial Location. *Psychological Review*. 1991. 98:352–376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.3.352>. 1575
- 1479 Huttenlocher J, Hedges LV, Vevea JL. Why Do Categories Affect Stimulus Judgment? *Journal of1576*
1480 Experimental Psychology: General. 2000. 129:220–241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.129.2.220>. 1577
- 1481 Jerde TA, Curtis CE. Maps of space in human frontoparietal cortex. *Journal of Physiology-Paris*.1578
1482 2013. 107:510–516. <https://doi.org/10/ggrf96>. 1579
- 1483 Ji JL, Demšar J, Fonteneau C, Tamayo Z, Pan L, Kraljić A, Matković A, Purg N, Helmer M, War-1580
1484 rington S, Winkler A, Zerbi V, Coalson TS, Glasser MF, Harms MP, Sotiropoulos SN, Murray1581
1485 JD, Anticevic A, Repovš G, QuNex—An integrative platform for reproducible neuroimaging1582
1486 analytics. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*. 2023. 17:1104508. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2023.1104508>. 1583
- 1487 Ji JL, Spronk M, Kulkarni K, Repovš G, Anticevic A, Cole MW. Mapping the human brain's cortical-1584
1488 subcortical functional network organization. *NeuroImage*. 2019. 185:35–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.10.006>. 1585
- 1489 Juárez MA, Steel MFJ. Model-Based Clustering of Non-Gaussian Panel Data Based on Skew-1586
1490 Distributions. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*. 2010. 28:52–66. <https://doi.org/10.1198/jbes.2009.07145>. 1587
- 1491 Kerkhoff D, Nussbeck FW. The Influence of Sample Size on Parameter Estimates in Three-Level1588
1492 Random-Effects Models. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2019. 10:1067. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01067>. 1589
- 1493 Kirchoff BA, Buckner RL. Functional-Anatomic Correlates of Individual Differences in Memory.1590
1494 *Neuron*. 2006. 51:263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2006.06.006>. 1591
- 1495 Klyszek J, Rahmati M, Curtis CE. Attentional priority determines working memory precision.1592
1496 *Vision Research*. 2014. 105:70–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2014.09.002>. 1593
- 1497 Kubota K, Niki H. Prefrontal cortical unit activity and delayed alternation performance in mon-1594
1498 keys. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 1971. 34:337–347. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.1971.34.3.337>. 1595
- 1499 Leung HC, Seelig D, Gore JC. The effect of memory load on cortical activity in the spatial working1596
1500 memory circuit. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*. 2004. 4:553–563. <https://doi.org/10.3758/CABN.4.4.553>. 1597
- 1501 Linden DE, Bittner RA, Muckli L, Waltz JA, Kriegeskorte N, Goebel R, Singer W, Munk MH.1598
1502 Cortical capacity constraints for visual working memory: dissociation of fMRI load effects1599
1503 in a fronto-parietal network. *NeuroImage*. 2003. 20:1518–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.07.021>. 1600
- 1504 Liu J, Xia M, Dai Z, Wang X, Liao X, Bi Y, He Y. Intrinsic Brain Hub Connectivity Underlies1601
1505 Individual Differences in Spatial Working Memory. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2017. 27:5496–5508.1602
1506 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhw317>. 1603
- 1507 Liu S, Poh JH, Koh HL, Ng KK, Loke YM, Lim JKW, Chong JSX, Zhou J. Carrying the past1604
1508 to the future: Distinct brain networks underlie individual differences in human spatial work-1605
1509 ing memory capacity. *NeuroImage*. 2018. 176:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.04.014>. 1606
- 1510 Luck SJ, Vogel EK. Visual working memory capacity: from psychophysics and neurobiology to1607
1511 individual differences. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2013. 17:391–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.06.006>. 1608
- 1512 Maas CJM, Hox JJ. Robustness issues in multilevel regression analysis. *Statistica Neerlandica*.1609
1513 2004. 58:127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0039-0402.2003.00252.x>. 1610
- 1514 Maas CJM, Hox JJ. Sufficient Sample Sizes for Multilevel Modeling. *Methodology*. 2005. 1:86–92.1611
1515 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241.1.3.86>. 1612
- 1516 Magnuson ME, Thompson GJ, Schwarb H, Pan WJ, McKinley A, Schumacher EH, Keilholz SD.1613
1517 Errors on interrupter tasks presented during spatial and verbal working memory performance1614
1518 are linearly linked to large-scale functional network connectivity in high temporal resolution1615
1519 resting state fMRI. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*. 2015. 9:854–867. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-014-9347-3>. 1616
- 1520 Marek S, Tervo-Clemmens B, Calabro FJ, Montez DF, Kay BP, Hatoum AS, Donohue MR, Foran1617
1521 W, Miller RL, Hendrickson TJ, Malone SM, Kandala S, Feczko E, Miranda-Dominguez O, Gra-

- ham AM, Earl EA, Perrone AJ, Cordova M, Doyle O, Moore LA, Conan GM, Uriarte J, Snideri637
K, Lynch BJ, Wilgenbusch JC, Pengo T, Tam A, Chen J, Newbold DJ, Zheng A, Seider NA,1638
Van AN, Metoki A, Chauvin RJ, Laumann TO, Greene DJ, Petersen SE, Garavan H, Thomp-1639
son WK, Nichols TE, Yeo BTT, Barch DM, Luna B, Fair DA, Dosenbach NUF. Reproducible1640
brain-wide association studies require thousands of individuals. *Nature*. 2022. 603:654–660.1641
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04492-9>. 1642
- Meyers EM, Freedman DJ, Kreiman G, Miller EK, Poggio T. Dynamic Population Coding of Cat-1643
egory Information in Inferior Temporal and Prefrontal Cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology*.1644
2008. 100:1407–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.90248.2008>. 1645
- Miller MB, Donovan CL, Bennett CM, Aminoff EM, Mayer RE. Individual differences in cognitive1646
style and strategy predict similarities in the patterns of brain activity between individuals.1647
NeuroImage. 2012. 59:83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.1648>
05.060. 1649
- Moujaes F, Ji JL, Rahmati M, Burt JB, Schleifer C, Adkinson BD, Savic A, Santamauro N, Tamayor1650
Z, Diehl C, Kolobaric A, Flynn M, Rieser N, Fonteneau C, Camarro T, Xu J, Cho Y, Repovš1651
G, Fineberg SK, Morgan PT, Seifritz E, Vollenweider FX, Krystal JH, Murray JD, Preller KH,1652
Anticevic A. Ketamine induces multiple individually distinct whole-brain functional connectivity1653
signatures. *eLife*. 2024. 13:e84173. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.84173>. 1654
- Moussa MN, Steen MR, Laurienti PJ, Hayasaka S. Consistency of Network Modules in Resting-1655
State fMRI Connectome Data. *PLoS ONE*. 2012. 7:e44428. <https://doi.org/10.1656>
1371/journal.pone.0044428. 1657
- Nelson TO, Chaiklin S. Immediate memory for spatial location. *Journal of Experimental Psychol*-1658
ogy: Human Learning and Memory. 1980. 6:529–545. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1659>
0278-7393.6.5.529. 1660
- Newcombe N, Liben LS. Barrier effects in the cognitive maps of children and adults. *Jour*-1661
nal of Experimental Child Psychology. 1982. 34:46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/1662>
0022-0965(82)90030-3. 1663
- Oblak A, Dragan O, Slana Ozimić A, Kordeš U, Purg N, Bon J, Repovš G. What is it like to do a1664
visuo-spatial working memory task: A qualitative phenomenological study of the visual span1665
task. *Consciousness and Cognition*. 2024. 118:103628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/1666>
j.concog.2023.103628. 1667
- Oblak A, Slana Ozimić A, Repovš G, Kordeš U. What Individuals Experience During Visuo-Spatial1668
Working Memory Task Performance: An Exploratory Phenomenological Study. *Frontiers in*1669
Psychology. 2022. 13:811712. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.811712>. 1670
- Peirce J, Gray JR, Simpson S, MacAskill M, Höchenberger R, Sogo H, Kastman E, Lindeløv1671
JK. PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2019.1672
51:195–203. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y>. 1673
- Poldrack RA, Baker CI, Durnez J, Gorgolewski KJ, Matthews PM, Munafò MR, Nichols TE, Poline1674
JB, Vul E, Yarkoni T. Scanning the horizon: towards transparent and reproducible neuroimag-1675
ing research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2017. 18:115–126. <https://doi.org/10.1676>
1038/nrn.2016.167. 1677
- Proskovec AL, Wiesman AI, Heinrichs-Graham E, Wilson TW. Load effects on spatial working1678
memory performance are linked to distributed alpha and beta oscillations. *Human Brain Map*-1679
ping. 2019. 40:3682–3689. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24625>. 1680
- Ptak R. The Frontoparietal Attention Network of the Human Brain: Action, Saliency, and a Priority1681
Map of the Environment. *The Neuroscientist*. 2012. 18:502–515. <https://doi.org/10.1682>
1177/1073858411409051. 1683
- Purg N, Starc M, Slana Ozimić A, Kraljić A, Matković A, Repovš G. Neural Evidence for Different1684
Types of Position Coding Strategies in Spatial Working Memory. *Frontiers in Human Neuro*-1685
science. 2022. 16:821545. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.821545>. 1686
- Rahmati M, Saber GT, Curtis CE. Population Dynamics of Early Visual Cortex during Working1687
Memory. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 2018. 30:219–233. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01196. 1688
- Raichle ME. The Brain's Default Mode Network. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. 2015a. 38:433–1689
447. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-071013-014030>. 1690
- Raichle ME. The restless brain: how intrinsic activity organizes brain function. *Philosophical*1691
Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2015b. 370:20140172. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0172>. 1692
- Rainer G, Asaad WF, Miller EK. Selective representation of relevant information by neurons in the1693
primate prefrontal cortex. *Nature*. 1998. 393:577–579. <https://doi.org/10/df47cn>. 1694
- Riggall AC, Postle BR. The Relationship between Working Memory Storage and Elevated Activity1695
as Measured with Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2012.
32:12990–12998. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1892-12.2012>. 1696
- Sadalla EK, Burroughs WJ, Staplin LJ. Reference points in spatial cognition. *Journal of Experi*-1697
mental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory. 1980. 6:516–528. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.6.5.516>. 1698
- Sanfratello L, Caprihan A, Stephen JM, Knoefel JE, Adair JC, Qualls C, Lundy SL, Aine CJ. Same1699
task, different strategies: How brain networks can be influenced by memory strategy. *Human*1700
Brain Mapping. 2014. 35:5127–5140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22538>. 1701
- Schneider W, Eschman A, Zuccolotto A. E-Prime Reference Guide. 2012. 1702
- Schutte AR, Spencer JR, Schöner G. Testing the Dynamic Field Theory: Working Memory for1703
Locations Becomes More Spatially Precise Over Development. *Child Development*. 2003.
74:1393–1417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00614>. 1704
- Schönbrodt FD, Perugini M. At what sample size do correlations stabilize? *Journal of Research in*1705
Personality. 2013. 47:609–612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.05.009>. 1706
- Serences JT, Ester EF, Vogel EK, Awh E. Stimulus-Specific Delay Activity in Human Primary1707
Visual Cortex. *Psychological Science*. 2009. 20:207–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02276.x>. 1708
- Shulman GL, McAvoy MP, Cowan MC, Astafiev SV, Tansy AP, d'Avossa G, Corbetta M. Quantita-1709
tive Analysis of Attention and Detection Signals During Visual Search. *Journal of Neurophys*-1710
iology. 2003. 90:3384–3397. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00343.2003>. 1711
- Simmering VR, Spencer JP, Schöner G. Reference-related inhibition produces enhanced position1712
discrimination and fast repulsion near axes of symmetry. *Perception & Psychophysics*. 2006.
68:1027–1046. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193363>. 1713
- Slana Ozimić A, Oblak A, Kordeš U, Purg N, Bon J, Repovš G. The diversity of strategies used1714
in working memory for colors, orientations, and positions: A quantitative approach to a first-1715
person inquiry. *BioRxiv*. 2023. 1716
- Slana Ozimić A, Repovš G. Visual working memory capacity is limited by two systems that change1717
across lifespan. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 2020. 112:104090. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2020.104090>. 1718
- Smith SM, Fox PT, Miller KL, Glahn DC, Fox PM, Mackay CE, Filippini N, Watkins KE, Toro R, Laird1719
AR, Beckmann CF. Correspondence of the brain's functional architecture during activation and
rest. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2009. 106:13040–13045. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0905267106>. 1720
- Spencer JP, Hund AM. Prototypes and particulars: Geometric and experience-dependent spatial1721
categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 2002. 131:16–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.131.1.16>. 1722
- Srimal R, Curtis CE. Persistent neural activity during the maintenance of spatial position in1723
working memory. *NeuroImage*. 2008. 39:455–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.08.040>. 1724
- Starc M, Anticevic A, Repovš G. Fine-grained versus categorical: Pupil size differentiates between1725
strategies for spatial working memory performance: Pupil size predicts working memory
strategies. *Psychophysiology*. 2017. 54:724–735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12828>. 1726
- Stukken L, Van Rensbergen B, Vanpaemel W, Storms G. Understanding individual differences in1727
representational abstraction: The role of working memory capacity. *Acta Psychologica*. 2016.
170:94–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2016.06.002>. 1728
- Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 2022a. 1729
- Team SD. Stan Modeling Language Users Guide and Reference Manual. 2022b. 1730
- Todd JJ, Fougnie D, Marois R. Visual Short-Term Memory Load Suppresses Temporo-Parietal1731
Junction Activity and Induces Inattentive Blindness. *Psychological Science*. 2005. 16:965–
972. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01645.x>. 1732
- Tversky B, Shchiano DJ. Perceptual and conceptual factors in distortions in memory for graphs
and maps. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 1989. 118:387–398. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.118.4.387>. 1733
- Van De Schoot R, Depaoli S, King R, Kramer B, Märtens K, Tadesse MG, Vannucci M, Gelman
A, Veen D, Willemsen J, You C. Bayesian statistics and modelling. *Nature Reviews Methods*
Primers. 2021. 1:1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-020-00001-2>. 1734
- Vehtari A, Gelman A, Simpson D, Carpenter B, Bürkner PC. Rank-normalization, folding, and
localization: An improved \widehat{R} for assessing convergence of MCMC. *Bayesian*
Analysis. 2021. 16. <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-BA1221>. ArXiv:1903.08008 [stat]. 1735
- Winkler AM, Ridgway GR, Webster MA, Smith SM, Nichols TE. Permutation inference for the
general linear model. *NeuroImage*. 2014. 92:381–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.01.060>. 1736
- Yoo AH, Bolaños A, Hallenbeck GE, Rahmati M, Sprague TC, Curtis CE. Behavioral Prioritiza-1737
tion Enhances Working Memory Precision and Neural Population Gain. *Journal of Cognitive*
Neuroscience. 2022. 34:365–379. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01804. 1738
- Zarahn E, Aguirre GK, D'Esposito M. Temporal isolation of the neural correlates of spatial
mnemonic processing with fMRI. *Cognitive Brain Research*. 1999. 7:255–268. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410\(98\)00029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(98)00029-9). 1739
- Zhang R, Geng X, Lee TMC. Large-scale functional neural network correlates of response
inhibition: an fMRI meta-analysis. *Brain Structure and Function*. 2017. 222:3973–3990.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-017-1443-x>. 1740
- Zhang W, Luck SJ. Discrete fixed-resolution representations in visual working memory. *Nature*.
2008. 453:233–235. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06860>. 1741