

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/84341/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Gerson, Sarah A. , Bekkering, Harold and Hunnius, Sabine 2015. Short-term motor training, but not observational training, alters neurocognitive mechanisms of action processing in infancy. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 27 (6) , pp. 1207-1214. 10.1162/jocn_a_00774

Publishers page: http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00774

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



**Short-term motor training, but not observational training,
alters neurocognitive mechanisms of action processing in
infancy**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</i>
Manuscript ID:	JOCN-2014-0376.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Gerson, Sarah; Radboud University Nijmegen, Donders Institute Bekkering, Harold Hunnius, Sabine; Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University, Donders Center for Cognition
Keywords:	EEG, Learning, Motor control, Social Cognition

Running head: UNIQUE MOTOR ACTIVITY FOR ACTIVE LEARNING

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Short-term motor training, but not observational training, alters neurocognitive
19 mechanisms of action processing in infancy
20
21
22
23
24

25 Gerson, S. A.,¹ Bekkering, H.,¹ & Hunnius, S.¹
26

27 Radboud University Nijmegen, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition, and Behaviour
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Corresponding author:**
44

45 Sarah Gerson
46

47 Montessorilaan 3
48

49 6522CC Nijmegen
50

51 The Netherlands
52

53 +31 (06) 29 77 81 35
54

55 s.gerson@donders.ru.nl
56
57
58
59
60

Research Highlights

- We examined the effect of active versus observational experience on the neural correlates of action perception in 10-month-olds
- We found more motor activity to the effects of actively learned actions than to actions only observed
- We can conclude that active experience is critical to action perception on a neural level
- The findings shed light on the developmental origins of shared neural representations

For Review Only

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

Abstract:

The role of motor experience in the processing of perceived actions is hotly debated on both behavioral (e.g., action understanding) and neural (e.g., activation of the motor system) levels of interpretation. Whereas some researchers focus on the role of motor experience in the understanding of and motor activity associated with perceived actions, others emphasize the role of visual experience with the perceived actions. The question of whether prior firsthand motor experience is critical to motor system activation during perception of actions performed by others is best addressed through studies with infants who have a limited repertoire of motor actions. In this way, infants can receive motor or visual training with novel actions that are not mere recombinations of previously acquired actions. In this study, 10-month-old infants received active training with a motorically unfamiliar action that resulted in a distinct sound effect. They received observational experience with a second, similarly unfamiliar action. Following training, we assessed infants' neural motor activity via electroencephalography (EEG) while they listened to the sounds associated with the actions relative to a novel sound. We found a greater decrease in mu power to sounds associated with the motorically learned action than to those associated with the observed action that the infants had never produced. This effect was directly related to individual differences in the degree of motor learning via motor training. These findings indicate a unique effect of active experience on neural correlates of action perception.

Keywords: action production; action perception; cognitive development; infancy; learning

Short-term motor training, but not observational training, alters neurocognitive mechanisms of action processing

Links between action and perception have been established across several species, throughout development, and via a variety of measures. Across these findings, the general notion is that action and perception of goal-directed actions are connected via shared neural representations and that this connection allows us to use our action experience to recognize and predict the goals of others' actions (Prinz, 1997). The identifying feature of these shared representations, the so-called *mirror system*, is that similar brain regions or neurons (as measured via fMRI, EEG, single cell recording, or other neuroimaging measures) are active when performing an action and perceiving the same action (or the sound or effect of that action; Kohler et al., 2002).

The Controversial Role of Expertise in Mirror System Activation

To understand the intricate relation between perception and action and differentiate the roles of motoric and visual experience, researchers are investigating the links between motor expertise, action perception, and activation of the motor system. One avenue of investigation that aims to parse out unique effects of motor experience, exemplified by Casile and Giese (2006), is to directly examine the role of motor experience on action perception, independent of any visual experience. In this experiment, participants were trained to perform a novel movement while blindfolded. Their accuracy in identifying this movement via visually presented point light displays improved after motor training despite a lack of visual information during training. Interestingly, individual differences in visual recognition performance strongly correlated with participants' accurate performance of the newly learned action during blindfolded training.

1
2
3 Similar effects of experience on brain activation over motor regions further
4 corroborate the behavioral effects of motor training. For example, Calvo-Merino and
5 colleagues (2006) measured brain activation during the observation of dance moves
6 professional dancers had previously performed relative to moves with which they had
7 visual familiarity but no motor experience (i.e., moves produced by a dance partner of
8 the opposite gender). They found increased premotor, parietal, and cerebellar activity
9 for those actions within the dancers' own motor repertoires relative to the visually, but
10 not motorically, familiar actions. Cross and colleagues (2006) further showed that
11 training dancers to perform novel dance moves increased premotor activity when
12 viewing the trained, but not untrained, actions. Similar effects of expertise on motor
13 activation and activation of larger mentalizing brain networks have been found for
14 chopstick use (Järveläinen, Schuermann, & Hari, 2004), handwriting (Quandt,
15 Marshall, Bouquet, Young, & Shipley, 2011), sports (Aglioti, Cesari, Romani, &
16 Urgesi, 2008; Kim et al., 2011), and music (Bangert et al., 2006).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 In contrast to the evidenced differences between motor experts and non-
35 experts in motor activation across domains, other research indicates comparable or
36 increased motor activity to motorically unfamiliar actions. For example, in a follow-up
37 to the Cross et al. study (2006), the researchers compared physical and
38 observational learning of dance moves and found increased activity in premotor and
39 parietal regions for both types of actions (relative to actions not performed/watched,
40 Cross et al., 2006; see also Cross et al., 2009, 2012). Thus, the current state of the
41 adult literature on experience is inconclusive. Development provides a unique
42 window in which to look at effects of experience on neural activation of the motor
43 system because infants have a more limited repertoire of experience on which to
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

draw. Further, intervening in early development allows one to manipulate the timing of naturally emerging motor actions and study the direct effects of this manipulation.

A Developmental Perspective on Active Experience

Both behavioral and neuroimaging studies have been conducted with infants in the first two years of life to examine the role of active experience on action perception. In intervention studies, infants are trained to perform novel actions and their recognition of the goal of these actions is then assessed. For instance, three-month-old infants who were trained to perform reaching actions (using Velcro mittens), but not untrained infants, recognized the goal of a reaching action (Sommerville, Woodward, & Needham, 2005). Importantly, several studies have now contrasted active with observational experience. When three-month-old infants were given active versus observational training with reaching actions, only those who received active experience benefited from training (Gerson & Woodward, 2014a, b). Similarly, 10-month-old infants benefited from active, but not observational, training with cane-pulling actions (similar to cloth-pulling; Sommerville, Hildebrand, & Crane, 2008). Investigating the role of motor, relative to visual, experience is crucial for understanding the role that the motor system plays in action perception.

Other researchers have focused on neural measures to assess effects of active experience on the motor regions of the infant brain. The most common assessment of motor activity in the infant brain is the measure of the so-called “mu rhythm,” measured via electroencephalography (EEG). In both infants and adults, reduced power (relative to a baseline condition) in the alpha frequency bands (approximately 8-12 Hz in adults and 6-9 Hz in infants; Marshall, Bar-Haim, & Fox, 2002) has been found over motor regions of the brain (central and frontocentral electrodes) both when individuals perform and observe goal-directed actions

1
2
3 (Cuevas, Cannon, Yoo, & Fox, 2014; Marshall & Meltzoff, 2012, 2014; Vanderwert,
4
5 Fox, & Ferrari, 2013). Using this measure, some studies reveal striking parallels to
6
7 the neuroimaging research on expertise in adults and the behavioral evidence in
8
9 infancy. For example, Paulus and colleagues (2012) found motor activity in 8-month-
10
11 olds during perception of sounds associated with previously learned actions but not
12
13 sounds associated with objects on which infants did not act during a training phase
14
15 (see also Lloyd-Fox, Wu, Richards, Elwell, & Johnson, 2013; van Elk, van Schie,
16
17 Hunnius, Vesper, & Bekkering, 2008). This research, however, examined actions with
18
19 which infants already had previous experience and did not assess whether newly
20
21 acquired actions led to similar effects in the motor system.
22
23

24
25 Further, as with adults, data concerning the role of experience in infancy are
26
27 not all consistent. In a recent study by Southgate and Begus (2013), there was no
28
29 difference between motor activation during the observation of executable and non-
30
31 executable actions (e.g., movement of objects by a claw) in 9-month-olds. In a follow-
32
33 up to the Paulus study (Paulus, Hunnius, & Bekkering, 2013), infants saw their
34
35 parents shake a rattle that made a novel sound. These infants later showed motor
36
37 activity to the sounds associated with the observed action. In this study, however, the
38
39 observed action was one that infants were capable of producing prior to the training
40
41 study. Thus, it is still unknown whether such mapping via observation would occur
42
43 with motorically unfamiliar actions.
44
45

46
47 In sum, the question of whether active experience is crucial to processes
48
49 underlying action perception is still open. In this experiment, we examine the
50
51 possibility that a close link between action production and perception early in
52
53 development can be built upon with greater experience. According to this proposal,
54
55 given that rattle shaking in the Paulus et al. (2013) study was within the motor
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 repertoire of these infants, the subsequent motor activation to the sound associated
4
5 with the observed shaking could be a function of the infant mirroring the shaking
6
7 action during training. Rather than relying on assumptions of previous action
8
9 experience, we created new experiences with a novel action and assessed the
10
11 effects of this experience on neural responses to action perception. To do so, we
12
13 manipulated young infants' experience with unfamiliar actions and measured the
14
15 effects of motor versus observational learning of novel actions on the motor system.
16
17 This training manipulation closely matches those used in behavioral research with
18
19 infants that have found unique effects of active, above and beyond, observational
20
21 experience (Gerson & Woodward, 2014a, b; Sommerville et al., 2008). Incorporating
22
23 an interventional training design with neural measures allows us, for the first time, to
24
25 examine causal claims about the effects of active versus observational experience on
26
27 action-perception links on a neural level and test the assumption that active
28
29 experience is critical to motor activity during action perception early in development.
30
31 We expected more motor activity to sounds associated with actively learned actions
32
33 than observed actions that the infants had never produced (Elsner & Hommel, 2001;
34
35 Hunnius & Bekkering, 2014; Woodward & Gerson, 2014). Further, we hypothesized
36
37 that those infants who were better able to perform the learned action at the end of
38
39 training would have a more precise motor representation of the action and thus show
40
41 greater motor activity to the sound associated with the learned action.
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Methods**

48
49 **Participants:** Twenty-six infants were scheduled based on previous research
50
51 and seventeen infants were included in the final sample for this study. Nine infants
52
53 began the study but were not included in final analyses due to not returning for the
54
55 EEG session after training (n = 1) or not sitting through at least nine trials of each
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition prior to movement and artifact rejection ($n = 8$). No infants were excluded
4
5 from final analyses due to outlying data points. As suggested in recent reviews
6
7 (Cuevas et al., 2014), we also examined whether data was similar when we removed
8
9 outliers from analyses. After calculating the Event Related Desynchronization (ERD:
10
11 the relative decrease in power to the event versus baseline, as described in the
12
13 Results section below), any infant who had an ERD greater than three standard
14
15 deviations above the mean at any site and in any condition. This excluded four
16
17 infants and we saw the same pattern of results (active ERD lower than observational
18
19 ERD). The final dataset of infants ranged in age from 9 months, 16 days to 10
20
21 months, 16 days at the pre-training session (mean age = 10 months, 0 days).
22
23 Research was approved by the local ethics board.
24
25

26
27 **Materials and Procedure:** Infants' participation in this study consisted of three
28
29 phases: a pre-training behavioral session, behavioral training sessions at home, and
30
31 a post-training EEG session. In each of these sessions, the same two toys were used
32
33 during the behavioral portion (see Figure 1). Both toys afforded means-end actions
34
35 that resulted in a unique sound effect (a series of tones that lasted approximately two
36
37 seconds). One toy had a wooden puppet atop a rectangular box (10.5 X 10.5 X 17
38
39 cm). When the box was hit with a staff-like tool (approximately 34 cm long), the
40
41 puppet spun around and a sound was played. The second toy was a rectangular box
42
43 (31 X 25 X 11.5 cm) with an indentation at the front. When a cane-like tool
44
45 (approximately 40 cm) was used to pull a toy duck into the indentation, a sound was
46
47 played. The particular sound associated with each toy was counterbalanced across
48
49 infants. The toy on which the infant performed versus observed an action was also
50
51 counterbalanced.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Pre-Training Session:** In the first session, infants observed the experimenter
4 perform the appropriate means-end action on one of the two above-described toys
5 (and heard the associated sound). After the experimenter performed the action, she
6 asked the parent to perform the action and made sure the parent was demonstrating
7 the action in a similar fashion (e.g., drawing the infant's attention to the toy during the
8 action and during the playing of the sound, if necessary). The infant was then taught
9 to perform the action on the other toy. The action was demonstrated for the infant
10 and the infant was encouraged to attempt the action his or herself. If the infant did
11 not act, the experimenter encouraged the parent to help move the child's hand
12 toward the tool and coach them through the action in scaffolded steps. After training
13 the child and the parent on each of the two actions, the experimenter gave the parent
14 a schedule for training throughout the following week. The experimenter also helped
15 the parent learn how to use the camera that they would take home to record home
16 training sessions.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Training Sessions:** Parents were asked to have their child perform the
35 trained action every alternate day for approximately five minutes each day between
36 the pre- and post-training sessions. On the alternate days, the parent demonstrated
37 the other action for the child. As during the pre-training session, parents were told to
38 draw their infant's attention to the action when observing and to help their child if
39 necessary when performing. Parents were asked to record all sessions so that
40 coding of activity could be assessed offline via digital video. Coding of these videos
41 indicated that parents typically practiced each action approximately three times
42 between the pre-training and post-training session (range: 3-5). The average length
43 of each training session was longer ($p = .02$) for the active training sessions (5:21
44 minutes) than for the observational training sessions (4:15 minutes). Despite the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 difference in length, infants viewed, on average, more successful actions per session
4
5 ($p < .001$) during the observational training sessions ($M = 16.18$) than the active
6
7 training sessions ($M = 9.64$).
8

9
10 **Post-Training Session:** Post-training sessions occurred between six and
11
12 eleven days (mean intersession length was 7.41 days) following the pre-training
13
14 session. Infants were first familiarized with the room and the experimenters and then
15
16 fitted with a 32 active electrode infant-sized EEG cap (Brain Products, Munich).
17
18 Infants then sat on their parent's lap in a shielded room in front of a monitor that
19
20 displayed abstract pictures that were randomly changed every 1600 to 5000ms
21
22 (jittered timing between picture presentation). Pictures were an attempt to maintain
23
24 infants' attention and were unrelated to the test stimuli. Audio stimuli were played
25
26 from a central speaker every 2600 to 5000ms (jittered presentation time and
27
28 unrelated to of the presentation of the pictures). Each audio stimulus lasted 2000ms
29
30 and consisted of three different sounds: the sound associated with the performed
31
32 action during training (which differed between infants due to counterbalancing), the
33
34 sound associated with the observed action, and a novel sound. The order of sound
35
36 presentation was pseudorandomized, with the constraint that each sound was always
37
38 repeated two times (and never more than two times in a row). Each sound was
39
40 presented twenty times throughout the session. Following the picture and sound
41
42 presentation, infants had the opportunity to perform each of the two actions (while
43
44 EEG was recorded). Infants first performed the action they had practiced at home
45
46 and then the action they had only previously observed.
47
48
49
50

51 52 **Coding and Analysis:**

53
54 **Coding and Exclusion of Movement:** Each video was coded offline for infant
55
56 movement. No sound was played during coding so that the coder was blind to the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition of trials that were identified as consisting of movement. All movements
4
5 were coded and identified as gross movement (e.g., turning toward the parent), fine
6
7 movement (e.g., moving one finger), or movement that resembled grasping. For final
8
9 analyses, all trials with movement were removed. On average, 37 out of the 60
10
11 possible trials were removed per infant due to movement ($SD = 8.53$, range: 22-50).

12
13
14 **Coding of Actions:** At the end of the EEG session, all infants had the chance
15
16 to perform each of the two actions. EEG collection was continuous throughout this
17
18 portion. Five randomly selected segments of the EEG data collected during infants'
19
20 action performance (for each infant) was used to identify the frequency bands used in
21
22 our analyses (see below). We presented them with the object on which they had
23
24 received active training first and then presented them with the object they had
25
26 previously only observed. A trained coder then assessed, for each infant, his or her
27
28 actions on each object. The videos were clipped and presented in random order so
29
30 the coder was blind to the infant's experience with each object. The coder counted
31
32 the number of times each action was successfully produced and whether the child
33
34 produced the action successfully on his or her own or did so with the help of the
35
36 parent or experimenter. Infants were assigned a score based on their actions on
37
38 each object: Never Performed Alone (if they only ever performed the action with help
39
40 or never performed the action at all) or Performed Alone (if they ever performed the
41
42 action without help from the parent or experimenter). The scores were ordinal such
43
44 that any infant who both performed the action with a parent and on their own was
45
46 scored as Performed Alone. For actions on the actively learned object, nine infants
47
48 were in the Never Performed Alone group and eight infants were in the Performed
49
50 Alone group. For actions on the observed object, eleven infants were in the Never
51
52 Performed Alone group and six were in the Performed Alone group.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **EEG Analysis:** Thirty-two active electrodes were arranged in the 10-20
4
5 system and referenced online to FCz. The signal was amplified using a 32-channel
6
7 BrainAmp DC EEG amplifier, band-pass filtered (.1-125 Hz), and digitized at 500 Hz.
8
9 We kept impedances below 60 k Ω . We analyzed the data using FieldTrip, an open
10
11 source Matlab (version 7.0, TheMathWorks, Inc.) toolbox developed at the Donders
12
13 Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour (<http://www.ru.nl/neuroimaging/fieldtrip>).
14
15 Trials were identified by the onset of the each sound and lasted for the length of the
16
17 sound (i.e. about two seconds). Trials during which infant movement was coded were
18
19 excluded from further analyses. We then visually inspected the remaining trials to
20
21 exclude EEG artifacts such as noisy channels. On average, approximately nine trials
22
23 (range 3-20) remained for each condition for each subject after movement and
24
25 artifact rejection. The number of trials analyzed did not differ between conditions.
26
27 When including only those infants who had 6 or more trials per condition
28
29 (approximately 100/170 data points), results remained consistent (i.e., a significant
30
31 effect of condition remained, $p = .05$). A bandpass filter was used with a frequency
32
33 range of 1 to 30 Hz. A fast Fourier transform was then conducted using a multitaper
34
35 method with a Hanning taper and a 2 Hz smoothing box to determine spectral power
36
37 estimates for each condition from 1 to 30 Hz.
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Results**

44
45 In order to verify that the mu rhythm was in the 6-9 Hz range for our sample
46
47 (as suggested by previous research; Cuevas et al., 2014; Marshall & Meltzoff, 2011),
48
49 we compared power values across the 3-30 Hz range during periods of infant
50
51 movement (i.e., when infants performed the actions at the end of the EEG session)
52
53 relative to periods that were free of movement (i.e., collapsing across conditions to
54
55 include all trials of sound presentation that were not removed due to movement). Mu
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rhythm has been defined as the frequency bands that are suppressed during
4
5 movement relative to non-movement over motor regions. In order to account for
6
7 variability in power ranges across infants, a proportional score was used to calculate
8
9 relative power per band from 2-30 Hz: (power in each 1 Hz band)/(average power
10
11 across 2-30 Hz bands). As expected, a decrease in power for the movement, relative
12
13 to the still, phases of the experiment in the 6-9 Hz range confirmed our choice of
14
15 frequency bands for analyses (see Figure 2).
16
17

18
19 Event-related desynchronization (ERD) was defined as (event-related power –
20
21 baseline power)/(baseline power) with power during presentation of the novel sound
22
23 serving as baseline (Pfurtscheller, 2003; Vanderwert et al., 2013). Based on previous
24
25 research (Marshall & Meltzoff, 2012), mu power was calculated as power in the 6-9
26
27 Hz frequency range over frontocentral sites (C3, C4, Cz, FC1, and FC2). ERD was
28
29 calculated separately for time-locked to sounds associated with performed actions
30
31 and sounds associated with observed actions. A generalized linear model (GLM) with
32
33 ERD as the dependent variable and Condition (performed or observed), Region (C or
34
35 FC), and Site (1/3 [i.e., FC1 or C3], 2/4 [i.e., FC2 or C4], z [i.e., Cz]) as within
36
37 subjects factors revealed a main effect of condition, $F(1,152) = 6.20$, $p = .014$, $\eta_p^2 =$
38
39 $.039$, and no other main effects or interactions. The difference between conditions
40
41 was a function of a lower ERD in the performed than the observed condition.
42
43
44

45
46 Identical GLM analyses that replaced frontal, parietal, and occipital regions
47
48 with the central and frontocentral regions in the above-described GLM (e.g., ERD as
49
50 the dependent variable, Condition [performed or observed] and Site [3, 4, z] as within
51
52 subjects factors for Frontal sites) revealed no significant differences between
53
54 conditions, $ps > .30$; $\eta_p^2 \leq .01$, indicating that the effect was localized to frontocentral
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sites (see Figure 3; *note: when outliers were excluded for these other regions, the*
4
5 *results remained the same*).
6

7
8 In an additional GLM (with Site and Region as within subjects factors), raw
9
10 power data (i.e., not ERD corrected for baseline, so that activation to the novel
11
12 sound, previously baseline, could be compared directly with activation to the other
13
14 sounds) was compared between the sound associated with the performed and
15
16 observed action versus the novel sound. A significant decrease in power was found
17
18 in response to the sound associated with the actively trained action, $F(1,152) = 4.29$,
19
20 $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .027$ (see Figure 4). There was no difference in power between the
21
22 observed versus novel sound, $p = .84$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$.
23
24

25
26 In order to examine individual differences in training effectiveness, a final set
27
28 of GLMs were conducted with condition as a fixed factor and region and site as
29
30 within-subjects factors, ERD to the active sound as dependent variable, and ability to
31
32 perform the learned action in the last session (Performed Alone or Never Performed
33
34 Alone) as a between-subjects factor. This revealed a significant interaction between
35
36 condition and performance ability, $F(1,142) = 3.24$, $p = .034$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$ (see Figure 5),
37
38 such that infants who had performed the action alone showed a significant difference
39
40 in ERD to the sounds associated with the actively learned versus observed actions
41
42 (mean difference = .64 [SEM = .19], $p = .001$), whereas infants who never performed
43
44 the action alone did not (mean difference = .08 [SEM = .18], $p = .68$). Because, at
45
46 the end of the final session, infants also had the chance to perform the action they
47
48 had previously only observed, we also measured differences in infants' ability to
49
50 perform this action at the end of training (though they only received observational
51
52 training with this action). When the ability to perform the observed action was added
53
54 as a covariate to the above GLM, no such interaction emerged, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This suggests that variability in learning the actively experienced action, but not
4
5 variability in learning a similarly difficult (but only previously observed) action, drove
6
7 these effects.
8

9 10 **Discussion**

11 The results of the current study can be summarized in two points: First, motor
12
13 experience with novel actions uniquely activates the neural motor system in response
14
15 to perceiving the effect of this action, whereas observational experience does not.
16
17 Second, this effect is directly related to individual differences in the degree of motor
18
19 learning during active training. These findings suggest that active experience is
20
21 critical to modulating motor activity during action perception early in development.
22
23 These findings provide crucial information for the theoretical debates concerning the
24
25 role of experience in action perception and motor activation. The effects of short-term
26
27 training of novel motor actions on neural responses to the sensory consequences of
28
29 those actions have never before been studied in infants. The training paradigm
30
31 demonstrates a direct, causal effect of active experience on the neural correlates of
32
33 action perception. Further, the fact that neural responses were related to infants'
34
35 ability to produce the actively learned, but not observationally learned, action
36
37 demonstrates specific effects on neural functioning of learning particular actions. This
38
39 is the first study to teach infants novel motor actions and find a relation between each
40
41 infant's ability to produce that action at the end of training and activation of their
42
43 neural motor system when presented with the sensory consequence of that particular
44
45 action. Finally, the measure of motor activation to audio presentation of action effects
46
47 ruled out any possible effects of visual processing of the action, thus ensuring that
48
49 the activation was not a function of visual processing.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The discrepancy between our findings and those that suggest benefits from
4
5 observational experience raise an important question: How can we move beyond
6
7 initial motor experience to learn more broadly about actions and their effects in the
8
9 environment? Infancy provides a unique window through which to look at the
10
11 differential roles of motor and observational experience because of infants' limited
12
13 repertoire of motor actions. Behaviorally, we saw no difference in the number of
14
15 infants who could perform the actively versus observationally learned actions at the
16
17 end of training. Importantly, there were no demonstrable benefits of learning from
18
19 observation either on a group level or when infants were split based on whether they
20
21 could perform the observationally learned action. Because action performance was
22
23 measured at the end of the EEG session, it is an open question whether infants who
24
25 could perform the observationally learned action would have shown a similar
26
27 response to the sounds associated with that action (as those associated with the
28
29 actively learned action) if they had had the chance to perform the action prior to the
30
31 post-training EEG session. The precise nature of the motor representation created for
32
33 each of these actions through training and how this relates to motor activity in the
34
35 brain should be examined further in future research.
36
37
38
39

40 In this study, infants had a week's worth of active and observational training
41
42 with new, two-step actions. In natural contexts, longer-term learning of motor actions
43
44 likely serves as a base for and contributes to infants' subsequent observational
45
46 learning (Gerson, 2014; Woodward & Gerson, 2014). In this way, later in
47
48 development, similar motor activity is likely to be seen for observed actions within
49
50 and outside one's motor repertoire, as long as the person can achieve the goal of the
51
52 action (in some way) using movements already within his or her motor system (see
53
54 Aziz-Zadeh, Sheng, Liew, & Damsio, 2012; Woodward & Gerson, 2014).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Southgate has presented a similar hypothesis to reconcile controversial
4 evidence of motor activation for actions within and outside infants' motor repertoire
5 (Southgate, 2013). In the Begus and Southgate (2013) experiment, the authors found
6 no indication of a difference in infants' motor activation in response to observing claw
7 actions and hand actions on an object. Similar activation for claw and hand actions
8 would be expected if infants were able to recognize the path of the claw and relate
9 this to an action they could use to achieve this goal (reaching with a hand). Reaching
10 with the hand is an action that is repeatedly practiced by 9-month-olds in their
11 everyday life and would thus easily be brought forward as an alternative action. It is
12 possible that increased experience with a variety of simple actions leads to motor
13 activation to the observation of a broader range of actions that can achieve similar
14 goals through the combination or substitution of the simple actions (Buccino & Riggio,
15 2006). After having gained motor experience with a particular action (e.g., shaking),
16 an infant can potentially map this motor representation, as in Paulus et al., to novel
17 effects and goals (e.g., a new sound) that become associated with the motor action
18 through observational, rather than active, experience (Paulus et al., 2013; cf. de
19 Klerk, Johnson, Heyes, & Southgate, 2014).

20
21 Whether the observed effect was a function of a *causal* link between the motor
22 action and the sound is an open question. That is, it is unknown whether the motor
23 action necessarily needed to result in the sound in order for the association between
24 the sound and the motor system to be formed. For example, if infants were to
25 activate their own motor systems via play with another object while they viewed their
26 parents perform the (motorically unfamiliar) action that resulted in the sound, their
27 motor system might then later respond to the sound via association with the action
28 the infant had produced (that was unrelated to the sound except in "coincidental"
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 timing). This possibility would be consistent with the theoretical proposal put forth by
4
5 Paulus and colleagues (2008) and is a question for future research. The current
6
7 findings are consistent with the unique behavioral effects of active relative to
8
9 observational experience early in development (Gerson & Woodward, 2014a;
10
11 Hunnius & Bekkering, 2014; Sommerville et al., 2008). Whether and how this change
12
13 in motor activity is related to the change in perception of the goal of the observed
14
15 action is an open question. To date, as far as we are aware, no studies have
16
17 simultaneously measured individual differences in motor activation and perception of
18
19 the effect of an action. Instead, similar relations between expertise and behavioral
20
21 measures and expertise and motor activation have been hypothesized to support
22
23 links between the behavioral and neural measures (e.g., Marshall & Meltzoff, 2014;
24
25 Woodward & Gerson, 2014). Examining this relation more directly is important for
26
27 uncovering the true nature of the link between motor activity and action
28
29 understanding.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Aglioti, S.M., Cesari, P., Romani, M., & Urgesi, C. (2008). Action anticipation and
6
7 motor resonance in elite basketball players. *Nature neuroscience*, *11*, 1109-1116.
8
9 doi: 10.1038/nn.2182
10
- 11 Aziz-Zadeh, L., Sheng, T., Liew, S.L., & Damsio, H. (2012). Understanding
12
13 otherness: The neural bases of action comprehension and pain empathy in a
14
15 congenital amputee. *Cereb. Cortex*, *22*, 811-819. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhr139
16
17
- 18 Bangert, M., Peschel, T., Schlaug, G., Rotte, M., Drescher, D., Hinrichs, H., Heinze,
19
20 H.J., & Altenmüller, E. (2006) Shared networks for auditory and motor processing in
21
22 professional pianists: Evidence from fMRI conjunction. *Neuroimage*, *30*, 917-926.
23
24 doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.10.044
25
26
- 27 Buccino, G., Riggio, L. (2006). The role of the mirror neuron system in motor
28
29 learning. *Kinesiology*, *38*, 5-15.
30
31
- 32 Calvo-Merino, B., Grèzes, J., Glaser, D.E., Passingham, R.E., & Haggard, P. (2006).
33
34 Seeing or doing? Influence of visual and motor familiarity in action
35
36 observation. *Current Biology*, *16*, 1905-1910. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2006.07.065
37
38
- 39 Cannon, E.N., Woodward, A.L., Gredebäck, G., von Hofsten, C., & Turek, C. (2012)
40
41 Action production influences 12-month-old infants' attention to others'
42
43 actions. *Developmental Science*, *15*, 35-42. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2011.01095.x
44
45
- 46 Casile, A., & Giese, M.A. (2006). Nonvisual motor training influences biological
47
48 motion perception. *Current Biology*, *16*, 69-74. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2005.10.071
49
50
- 51 Cross, E.S., Hamilton, A.F.C., & Grafton, S.T. (2006). Building a motor simulation de
52
53 novo: observation of dance by dancers. *Neuroimage*, *31*, 1257-1267. doi:
54
55 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.033
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cross, E.S., Kraemer, D.J.M., Hamilton, A.F.C., Kelley, W.M., & Grafton, S.T. (2009).
4
5 Sensitivity of the action observation network to physical and observational learning.
6
7 *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 315-326. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhn083
8
9
10 Cross, E.S., Liepelt, R., Hamilton, A.F., Parkinson, J., Ramsey, R., Stadler, W., Prinz,
11
12 W. (2012) Robotic movement preferentially engages the action observation
13
14 network. *Human Brain Mapping*, 33, 2238-2254. doi: 10.1002/hbm.21361
15
16 Cuevas, K., Cannon, E.N., Yoo, K., Fox, N.A. (2014). The infant EEG mu rhythm:
17
18 Methodological considerations and best practices. *Developmental Review*, 34, 26–
19
20 43. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2013.12.001
21
22
23 de Klerk, C.C.J.M., Johnson, M.H., Heyes, C.M., & Southgate, V. (2014). Baby steps:
24
25 Investigating the development of perceptual-motor couplings in infancy.
26
27 *Developmental Science* (early access), 1-11. doi: 10.1111/desc.12226
28
29
30 Elsner, B., & Hommel, B. (2001). Effect anticipation and action control. *Journal of*
31
32 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 27, 229-240. doi:
33
34 10.1037/0096-1523.27.1.229
35
36
37 Gerson, S.A. (2014). Sharing and comparing: How comparing shared goals broadens
38
39 goal understanding in development. *Child Development Perspectives*, 8, 24–29.
40
41 doi: 10.1111/cdep.12056
42
43
44 Gerson, S.A., Woodward, A.L. (2014a) Learning from their own actions: The unique
45
46 effect of producing actions on infants' action understanding. *Child Development*, 85,
47
48 264-277. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12115
49
50
51 Gerson, S.A., Woodward, A.L. (2014b) The joint role of trained, untrained, and
52
53 observed actions at the origins of goal recognition. *Infant Behavior and*
54
55 *Development*, 37, 94-104. doi: 10.1016/j.infbeh.2013.12.013
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hunnius, S., & Bekkering, H. (2014). Review article: What are you doing? How active
4 and observational experience shape infants' action understanding. *Phil. Trans. R.*
5 *Soc. B.* Advance Access published April 28, 2014: doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0490
6
7
8
9
10 Järveläinen, J., Schuermann, M., & Hari, R. (2004). Activation of the human primary
11 motor cortex during observation of tool use. *Neuroimage*, 23, 187-192. doi:
12 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.06.010
13
14
15
16 Kim, Y., Seo, J.H., Song, H.J., Yoo, D.S., Lee, H.J., Lee, J., Lee, G., Kwon, E., Kim,
17 J.G., Chang, Y. (2011) Neural correlates related to action observation in expert
18 archers. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 223, 342-347. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2011.04.053
19
20
21
22
23 Kohler, E., Keysers, C., Umiltà, M.A., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., & Rizzolatti, G. (2002).
24 Hearing sounds, understanding actions: Action representation in mirror
25 neurons. *Science*, 297, 846-848. doi: 10.1126/science.1070311
26
27
28
29
30 Lloyd-Fox, S., Wu, R., Richards, J.E., Elwell, C.E., & Johnson, M.H. (2013). Cortical
31 activation to action perception is associated with action production abilities in young
32 infants. *Cerebral Cortex* Advance Access published August 23, 2013:
33 doi: 10.1093/cercor/bht207.
34
35
36
37
38 Marshall, P. J., Bar-Haim, Y., & Fox, N. A. (2002). Development of the EEG from 5
39 months to 4 years of age. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 113, 1199-1208.
40
41
42
43 Marshall, P.J., & Meltzoff, A.N. (2011). Neural mirroring systems: Exploring the EEG
44 mu rhythm in human infancy. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 1, 110-123.
45 doi: 10.1016/j.dcn.2010.09.001
46
47
48
49 Marshall, P.J., & Meltzoff, A.N. (2014). Neural mirroring mechanisms and imitation in
50 human infants. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B.* Advance Access published April 28, 2014:
51 doi: 10.1098/rstb.2013.0620
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Paulus, M., Hunnius, S., & Bekkering, H. (2013). Neurocognitive mechanisms
4 underlying social learning in infancy: Infants' neural processing of the effects of
5 others' actions. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 8, 774-779. doi:
6 10.1093/scan/nss065
7
8
9
10
11 Paulus, M., Hunnius, S., van Elk, M., & Bekkering, H. (2012). How learning to shake
12 a rattle affects 8-month-old infants' perception of the rattle's sound:
13 Electrophysiological evidence for action-effect binding in infancy. *Developmental*
14 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 2, 90-96. doi: 10.1016/j.dcn.2011.05.006
15
16
17
18
19
20 Pfurtscheller, G. (2003). Induced oscillations in the alpha band: functional meaning.
21 *Epilepsia*, 44, 2-8. doi: 10.1111/j.0013-9580.2003.12001.x
22
23
24
25 Prinz, W. (1997). Perception and action planning. *European Journal of Cognitive*
26 *Psychology*, 9, 129-154. doi: 10.1080/713752551
27
28
29
30 Quandt, L.C., Marshall, P.J., Bouquet, C.A., Young, T., & Shipley, T.F. (2011).
31 Experience with novel actions modulates frontal alpha EEG
32 desynchronization. *Neuroscience Letters*, 499, 37-41. doi:
33 10.1016/j.neulet.2011.05.028
34
35
36
37
38
39 Sommerville, J.A., Hildebrand, E.A., & Crane, C.C. (2008). Experience matters: The
40 impact of doing versus watching on infants' subsequent perception of tool-use
41 events. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 1249-1256. doi: 10.1037/a0012296
42
43
44
45 Sommerville, J.A., Woodward, A.L., & Needham, A. (2005). Action experience alters
46 3-month-old infants' perception of others' actions. *Cognition*, 96, B1-B11. doi:
47 10.1016/j.cognition.2004.07.004
48
49
50
51
52 Southgate, V. (2013). Does infant behaviour provide support for the mirror neuron
53 theory of action understanding? *Consciousness and Cognition*, 22, 1114-1121. doi:
54 10.1016/j.concog.2013.04.008
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Southgate, V., & Begus, K. (2013). Motor activation during the prediction of
4 nonexecutable actions in infants. *Psychological Science*, 24, 828-835. doi:
5 10.1177/0956797612459766
6
7
8
9
10 Vanderwert, R.E., Fox, N.A., & Ferrari, P.F. (2013). The mirror mechanism and mu
11 rhythm in social development. *Neuroscience Letters*, 540, 15-20. doi:
12 10.1016/j.neulet.2012.10.006
13
14
15
16 van Elk, M., van Schie, H.T., Hunnius, S., Vesper, C., & Bekkering, H. (2008). You'll
17 never crawl alone: Neurophysiological evidence for experience-dependent motor
18 resonance in infancy. *Neuroimage*, 43, 808-814. doi:
19 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.07.057
20
21
22
23
24
25 Woodward, A.L., & Gerson, S.A. (2014). Review article: Mirroring and the
26 development of action understanding. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B. Advance Access*
27 published April 28, 2014: doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0181
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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




Fig. 1.
(A) An infant learning to perform a new action at home: hitting a toy with a stick and (B) an infant observing her dad perform a new action at home: pulling a duck with a cane
163x87mm (150 x 150 DPI)

view Only

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




Fig. 2.
Relative power values as a function of frequency (Hz) depicted for still periods (collapsed across conditions) and execution of actions. The yellow shaded area illustrates the Alpha-frequency range.
208x143mm (120 x 120 DPI)

View Only




Fig. 3.

ERD (in frontocentral electrodes) to active and observational sounds was not significantly different in frontal, parietal, or occipital regions. ERD is defined as $(\text{event-related power} - \text{baseline power}) / (\text{baseline power})$ with power (6-9 Hz) during presentation of the novel sound serving as baseline. (outliers excluded; error bars represent standard errors)

220x107mm (120 x 120 DPI)




Fig. 4.
Raw power to active and observational sounds collapsed across all subjects (A) and split by infants' ability to perform the actively learned actions (B). (error bars represent standard errors, * $p < .05$)
236x148mm (150 x 120 DPI)




Fig. 5.

ERD (in frontocentral electrodes) plotted per subject, split as a function of infants' ability to produce the actively learned action at the end of training. Means across subjects within each group are plotted as lines and the shaded area represents the standard error. ERD is defined as (event-related power - baseline power)/(baseline power) with power (6-9 Hz) during presentation of the novel sound serving as baseline.
 254x168mm (150 x 150 DPI)