Electrophysiological properties of the concise language paradigm (CLaP)

Natascha M. Roos[1], Julia Chauvet[2] & Vitória Piai[1,3]

[1] Donders Institute for Brain Cognition and Behaviour, Donders Center for Cognition, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands; [2] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands;
[3] Radboud university medical center, Donders Institute for Brain Cognition and Behaviour, Department of Medical Psychology, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

INTRODUCTION

- Lack of studies investigating language comprehension and production together
- Concise Language Paradigm (CLaP): combination of language comprehension and production, tapping into processes of both within each trial by having conext-driven picture naming with menaingful auditory sentences[1-7], auditory time-reversed sentences[8] and scrambled pictures[9]
- Identical trial structure across conditions: presenting an auditory stimulus (constrained, unconstrained, or reversed sentences) followed by a visual stimulus to be named (normal or scrambled objects)
- Reduced task-related confounds between conditions

METHODS

PARTICIPANTS & MATERIALS

- 21 right-handed, healthy speakers of Dutch, 18-28 years (15 females)
- Visual stimuli: 156 normal pictures, 30 scrambled pictures[9]
- Auditory stimuli: constrained and unconstrained sentences[10] (78 each), time-reversed speech sentences[8] (78)

ANALYSIS

- Auditroy responses locked to sentence onset (78 trials): ERPs and TFRs
- Context effect during pre-picture interval (48 trials): TFRs
- Visual responses locked to picture onset (30 trials): ERPs
- statistical comparison with non-parametric cluster-based permutation tests[11]

DESIGN



Schematic overview of example trials for sentence (constrained, unconstrained, reversed) and picture (normal, scrambled) conditions. Note the different time-lockings to sentence or picture. Sentence time varies per trial.

RESULTS

NAMING TIMES



SENTENCE

AUDITORY EVOKED POTENTIALS



TIME-FREQUENCY REPRESENTATIONS



PRE-PICTURE

TIME-FREQUENCY REPRESENTATIONS



SIGNIFICANT T-VALUES



PICTURE

EVENT-RELATED POTENTIALS



VISUAL EVOKED POTENITALS



P1: 100-160ms | N1: 160-200ms | P2: 200-300ms

DISCUSSION

- Bare and unconstrained picture naming are equally slow, fastest naming following constrained sentences
- Auditory responses differ between meaningful and reversed speech, peaking around 240-400ms (in ERPs and TFRs)
- Context effect due to power decreases in constrained trials (rather than increase in unconstrained trials), also present in constrained over reversed trials
- Visual responses following constrained sentences have lowest amplitude (similar to repetition priming[12-15]), scrambled pictures evoke highest amplitude[14] (especially P2 component), unconstrained and bare have similar amplitude
- Findings provide benchmarking for future studies in different populations

QR scan to download

[1]Piai, V., et al. (2014). Neuropsy, 53, 146–156. | [2]Piai, V., et al. (2015). HBM, 36(7), 2767–2780. | [3]Piai, V., et al. (2017). HBM, 38(6), 3151–3162. | [4]Piai, V., et al. (2018). EJN, 48(7), 2622–2629. | [5]Piai, V., et al. (2020). J Neuroling, 55, 100905. | [6]Roos, N. M., & Piai, V. (2020). EJN, 52(5), 3457–3469. | [7]Klaus, J., et al. (2020). HBM, 41(4), 1061–1071. | [8]Stoppelman, N., et al. (2013). BB, 3(3), 211–222. | [9]Stojanoski, B., & Cusack, R. (2014). J Vision, 14(12), 6–6. | [10]Chupina, I., et al. (2022). EJN, 56(8), 5235–5259. | [11]Maris, E., & Oostenveld, R. (2007). JNM, 164(1), 177–190. | [12]Gruber, T., et al. (2004). EJN, 19(4), 1073–1082. | [13]Gruber, T., & Müller, M. M. (2002). CBR, 13(3), 377–392. | [14]Gruber, T., & Müller, M. M. (2005). CC, 15(1), 109–116. | [15]Rugg, M. D., et al. (1995). CBR, 3(1), 17–24.

Natascha Roos | natascha.roos@donders.ru.nl