



HAL
open science

Priming words with pictures: Neural correlates of semantic associations in a cross-modal priming task using fMRI

Tilo Kircher, Katharina Sass, Olga Sachs, Sören Krach

► **To cite this version:**

Tilo Kircher, Katharina Sass, Olga Sachs, Sören Krach. Priming words with pictures: Neural correlates of semantic associations in a cross-modal priming task using fMRI. *Human Brain Mapping*, 2009, 30 (12), pp.4116-n/a. 10.1002/hbm.20833 . hal-00492061

HAL Id: hal-00492061

<https://hal.science/hal-00492061>

Submitted on 15 Jun 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Priming words with pictures: Neural correlates of semantic associations in a cross-modal priming task using fMRI

Journal:	<i>Human Brain Mapping</i>
Manuscript ID:	HBM-08-0285.R3
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-May-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Kircher, Tilo; Philipps-University Marburg, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Sass, Katharina; RWTH Aachen University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Sachs, Olga; RWTH Aachen University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Krach, Sören; Philipps-University Marburg, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Section of Neuroimaging
Keywords:	semantic priming, lexical decision, semantic processing, fMRI, language



1
2
3
4
5
6 **Priming words with pictures: Neural correlates of semantic associations in**
7
8
9 **a cross-modal priming task using fMRI**
10
11

12
13
14 **Short Title: Semantic associations and cross-modal priming**
15

16
17
18 Authors: Tilo Kircher^{1*}, Katharina Sass^{2*}, Olga Sachs², Sören Krach^{1,3}
19
20

21
22
23 1 Department of Psychiatry und Psychotherapy, Philipps-University Marburg, Rudolf-
24
25 Bultmann-Straße 8, D-35039 Marburg, Germany
26

27
28 2 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, RWTH Aachen University, Pauwelsstr.
29
30 30, D-52074 Aachen, Germany
31

32 3 Department of Psychiatry und Psychotherapy, Section of Neuroimaging, Philipps-
33
34 University Marburg, Rudolf-Bultmann-Straße 8, D-35039 Marburg, Germany
35
36

37
38
39
40 * Equal Contribution
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Correspondence:

Tilo Kircher, Department of Psychiatry und Psychotherapy, Philipps-University Marburg,
Rudolf-Bultmann-Straße 8, D-35039 Marburg, Germany,

E-mail: kircher@med.uni-marburg.de, tel: ++49-6421-58-65200,

fax: ++49-6421-58-68939

Keywords: semantic priming, lexical decision, semantic processing, language, fMRI

ABSTRACT

In our everyday life we process information from different modalities simultaneously with great ease. With the current study we had the following goals: To detect the neural correlates of (1) automatic semantic processing of associates and (2) to investigate the influence of different visual modalities on semantic processing.

Stimuli were presented with a short SOA (350 ms) as subjects performed a lexical decision task. To minimize the variance and increase homogeneity within our sample, only male subjects were measured. Three experimental conditions were compared while brain activation was measured with a 3 T fMRI scanner: related word-pairs (e.g., *frame – picture*), unrelated word-pairs (e.g., *frame – car*) as well as word-nonword pairs (e.g., *frame – fubber*). They were presented uni- (word –word) and cross-modally (picture – word).

Behavioral data revealed a priming effect for cross-modal and unimodal word-pairs. On a neural level, the unimodal condition revealed response suppression in bilateral fronto-parietal regions. Cross-modal priming led to response suppression within the right inferior frontal gyrus. Common areas of deactivation for both modalities were found in bilateral fronto-tempo-parietal regions.

These results suggest that the processing of semantic associations presented in different modalities lead to modality-specific activation caused by early access routes. However, common activation for both modalities refers to a common neural network for semantic processing suggesting amodal processing.

INTRODUCTION

In our everyday life we process information from different modalities simultaneously (e.g., auditory, visual). For proper comprehension the sensory input is converted into concepts linked to the distributed semantic associations that encode their meaning (Mesulam 1998). Comprehension is a very fast, automatic process, which holds true for single items as well as the linkage of two or more concepts, as semantic priming studies have shown. Within the last years, the neural correlates of unimodal (visual words) semantic priming processes have been elucidated. Whether cross-modal integration (visual objects vs. visual word forms) of meaning activates common or distinct neural networks, remains yet debated.

The storage and access of conceptual representations of information presented cross-modally is summarized in two general classes of models. The first model postulates multiple semantic systems (e.g., Paivio 1991; Shallice 1988; Warrington and Shallice 1984). Distinct conceptual representations for verbal (words) and visual (pictures) input modalities are assumed, i.e. verbal and visual input modalities have separate conceptual representations (Paivio 1991). Both systems have their own organization and processing parameters. The second general model suggests a single amodal semantic system which is incorporated in the Organized Unitary Conceptual Hypothesis (OUCH; Caramazza et al. 1990). Here, all processing routes converge to a single set of conceptual representations common for different modalities. The model assumes a common semantic representation of visual objects and their verbal descriptions, but different access routes from the two modalities.

A number of functional imaging studies have addressed the question of a modality independent semantic system, usually applying simple naming tasks which leave a long time for processing. For example, Moore and Price (1999) found activation of the left fusiform and the right inferior frontal gyrus as well as right anterior cingulate for the processing of meaningful over non-meaningful stimuli, irrespective of input modality (pictures and words). Imaging studies investigating cross-modal semantic processing found mainly left-lateralized

Kircher et al., Semantic associations and cross-modal priming

1
2
3 activations common for both input modalities. For example, auditory-to-visual semantic tasks
4
5 revealed common activation in left inferior prefrontal and anterior temporal regions
6
7 (Marinkovic, et al. 2003; Heim, et al. 2007). It was assumed that there is a modality specific
8
9 memory system but that supramodal semantic stores can be accessed from any modality.
10
11 Common areas of activation for semantic processing of pictures and words were found within
12
13 the left fusiform, parahippocampal and superior temporal, as well as left inferior frontal gyrus
14
15 (Bright, et al. 2004). Modality specific activations were found in the temporal pole for words
16
17 and occipitotemporal regions for pictures. Furthermore, in an imaging study of Vandenberghe
18
19 et al. (1996) semantic processing of pictures and words led to largely overlapping activation
20
21 in the left hemisphere including the temporo-parietal junction, fusiform gyrus, middle
22
23 temporal and inferior frontal gyri. Modality specific activations were present in the left
24
25 fusiform and right occipital gyrus for pictures and in the left inferior parietal and inferior
26
27 frontal gyri for words. Altogether, these results seem to support an amodal semantic system
28
29 that is distributed across the brain and shared by both input modalities. Nevertheless, beside
30
31 common areas of activation in mainly left frontal and temporal regions all studies revealed
32
33 modality specific activations. However, the tasks which have been used to investigate cross-
34
35 modal processing so far have been limited to simple word or picture naming (e.g., DeLeon, et
36
37 al. 2007; Moore and Price 1999), categorization or semantic judgment tasks (e.g.,
38
39 Vandenberghe, et al. 1996; Marinkovic, et al. 2003; Booth, et al. 2002; Bright, et al. 2004)
40
41 and simple lexical decisions (e.g., Heim, et al. 2007; Xiao, et al. 2005). Only a few studies
42
43 investigated cross-modal processing with the technique of semantic priming whereas the
44
45 studies often used auditory-to-visual stimuli, i.e. did not ask for the cross-modal integration
46
47 of visual information (e.g., Giesbrecht, et al. 2004; Carlesimo, et al. 2003; Bergerbest, et al.
48
49 2004; Badgaiyan, et al. 2001) or used long stimulus presentations times, i.e. they investigated
50
51 controlled rather than automatic processing of modalities (Koivisto and Revonsuo 2000;
52
53 Kahlaoui, et al. 2007).

1
2
3 In behavioral studies of semantic processing, a widely applied technique is automatic
4 semantic priming using short SOAs. A task commonly used is the lexical decision task.
5
6 Generally, a prime word (e.g., *frame*) is presented on a computer screen, followed by a string
7
8 of letters (target) which can be a real word (e.g., *picture*) or nonword (e.g., *fubber*). The
9
10 subject has to decide if the target is a real word or not. The main outcome is the priming
11
12 effect, i.e. subjects respond faster to the target if it was preceded by a related prime word
13
14 (e.g., *frame – picture*), compared to when it is preceded by an unrelated word (e.g., *frame –*
15
16 *stone*). The priming effect is explained by an automatic “spread of activation” between
17
18 related word representations within the semantic network that occurs at short stimulus onset
19
20 asynchrony (SOA < 400 ms; see Neely 1991 for a review). Thus, if a prime is presented, its
21
22 concept is activated and the activation will automatically spread through associative
23
24 pathways to the corresponding concept.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 The neural correlates underlying this spread of activation have been examined by
33
34 functional imaging studies (for example Wible, et al. 2006; Raposo, et al. 2006; Kotz, et al.
35
36 2002; Sachs, et al. 2008). In summary, related word-pairs led to reduced (response
37
38 suppression) or enhanced activity (response enhancement) in comparison to unrelated word-
39
40 pairs within lateral temporal, inferior or middle frontal regions (Wible, et al. 2006; Rissman,
41
42 et al. 2003) and temporo-parietal regions (Kotz, et al. 2002; Raposo, et al. 2006). Response
43
44 suppression is thought to reflect the attenuation of hemodynamic activity as consequence of
45
46 priming, i.e. it reflects faster or “more efficient” processing of primed stimuli (Henson 2003).
47
48 Response enhancement is thought to be a correlate of cognitive processes that index the
49
50 spread of activation itself (Marinkovic, et al. 2003; Henson 2003). Thus, response
51
52 suppression is a special form of BOLD response “deactivation”, response enhancement a
53
54 special form of BOLD “activation in the context of semantic priming experiments in an fMRI
55
56 setting.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The aim of the current study was to investigate between- (picture-word) and within-
4 modality (word-word) neural processing using semantic priming. In order to avoid strategic
5 influence or expectancy which can affect priming-specific patterns of activation (Grossman,
6 et al. 2006), we wanted to use fast, automatic, implicit processing, i.e. semantic priming with
7 an short stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA). According to Neely (1991) automatic processing
8 occurs if the SOA is under 400 ms. Therefore, we used an SOA of 350 ms. The novelty of
9 our design compared to the existing studies lies in the combination of short SOA addressing
10 automatic lexico-semantic processing of associatively related concepts and different
11 modalities. Associations were defined as “external or complementary relations among
12 objects” (Lin and Murphy 2001) that shared functional (e.g., *chalk – blackboard*) or part-
13 whole links (e.g., *ladder – rung*).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 We predict that if cross-modal and unimodal stimuli are processed in an amodal
30 system, comparable activation clusters should be found in areas specific for semantic
31 processing such as lateral prefrontal and temporal cortices (e.g., Kotz, et al. 2002; Raposo, et
32 al. 2006; Rissman, et al. 2003; Wible, et al. 2006). If, alternatively, cross-modal and
33 unimodal stimuli are processed in multiple semantic systems we predict that differential
34 activation clusters should be revealed. Due to the processing of perceptual features visual
35 picture-word processing is then hypothesized to activate occipital (Kohler, et al. 2000), and
36 verbal word-word priming to left-temporal regions. In addition, due to possible gender effects
37 in neural processing, we only included male subjects (for example Bermeitinger, et al. 2008;
38 Baxter, et al. 2003; Laws 1999; Lloyd-Jones and Humphreys 1997).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Sixteen healthy male subjects with an average age of 26.0 years ($S.D.$ = 3.4) were recruited from the staff of the RWTH University Hospital Aachen and were paid a fee for participation. All subjects were native German speakers, had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and were right-handed according to the Edinburgh Inventory of Handedness (Oldfield 1971). Subjects were excluded if they had been diagnosed with a past or present psychiatric, neurological, or medical disorder. None of the subjects was taking psycho-pharmacologically active medication at time of study or within the last two months. The study was approved by the local ethics committee and all subjects gave informed consent to participate in the study.

Stimuli and design

In the semantic priming task, a prime was presented to the subjects (e.g., *frame*). Depending on the session, the prime stimulus was either a picture or a written word. A visually presented string of letters (target) followed the prime. Subjects had to decide whether the target was a real word (e.g., *picture*) or not (e.g., *fubber*) by pressing one of two buttons.

Three experimental conditions were used: (1) related word-pairs, e.g. *frame* – *picture*, (2) unrelated word-pairs, e.g. *frame* – *car*, (3) word-nonword pairs, e.g. *frame* – *fubber*. The different modalities (unimodal word-word and cross-modal picture-word) were presented in different sessions with different stimuli. The idea behind this is that (a) we wanted to avoid confusing instructions, i.e. before a new session started, the subject was informed that there will be pictures and words or words and words and (b) the experiment should be rather short to not compromise the attention of the subjects, i.e. using two different sessions for both modalities led to a shorter duration of the experiment because the subjects had to be instructed only twice. To avoid session-specific effects we modeled the session effect in the

1
2
3 fMRI data analysis. Altogether, two sessions per modality were presented leading to 30
4 related trials per condition.
5
6

7
8 The related word-pairs consisted of a prime and an associatively related target. The
9 associative relation was defined by a functional or a part-whole relationship between prime
10 and target. To ensure that the word-pairs had a strong relationship a pre-test was conducted.
11
12 Twelve volunteers not participating in the actual fMRI study were asked to rate word-pair
13 relations on a scale from 1 (= unrelated) to 7 (= highly-related). The volunteers were
14 instructed to rate the target words regarding their contextual relatedness and their interaction
15 in time and space. Words selected had to be values of 5 or higher in the pre-test. The selected
16 words for pictures and written words did not differ in their average rating ($M_{pic} = 6.58$, $S.D._{pic}$
17 $= 0.46$; $M_{word} = 6.43$; $S.D._{word} = 0.53$; $p = 0.24$). The unrelated targets had to be scored 2 or
18 less in the same test. Nonwords were all pronounceable German words that were constructed
19 by changing one or two consonants in real target words. The selected stimuli had to belong to
20 the same overall conceptual domain (all words depicted only objects), were concrete and
21 imaginable. Different stimuli were used for the modalities, but they were repeated within one
22 session (i.e. the prime words were presented in the related, the unrelated and the nonword
23 condition, the target words were presented twice in the related and unrelated condition). The
24 stimuli (i.e. primes, targets and prime-target pairs) were matched within and between
25 modalities (i.e. sessions). Prime and target were also matched within modality. The criteria
26 for all matches were lexical frequency (CELEX database; Baayen, et al. 1993), word length,
27 and relationship (part-whole vs. functional; see Table 1 for stimuli used in the experiment).
28
29 The results revealed no differences between stimuli and modalities ($p > .25$; see Table 2 for
30 results of the matching). In an additional test, all prime-target pairs were rated on a 10-point
31 scale regarding their extent of visual similarity (Kalenine and Bonthoux 2008). The results
32 demonstrate that thematic relations were not similar ($M_{sim_unimodal} = 2.8$; $S.D._{sim_unimodal} = 1.6$;
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 $M_{sim_cross-modal} = 2.6$; $S.D._{sim_cross-modal} = 1.3$; $p = .37$) and that the similarity did not differ
4
5
6 between modalities.

7
8
9
10 -----
11
12 Insert Table 1 about here
13
14 -----
15
16
17
18 -----
19
20
21 Insert Table 2 about here
22
23 -----
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The pictures for the cross-modal condition were taken from the International Picture
31 Naming Project (IPNP; <http://crl.ucsd.edu/~aszekely/ipnp/index.html>). The pictures were
32
33 normed across seven languages (for details see Bates, et al. 2003). In addition, we conducted
34
35 a pre-test with 12 volunteers not participating in the fMRI study. The volunteers were asked
36
37 to name the pictures. Only pictures that were recognized by every volunteer were selected.
38
39 The final selection of the pictures was made according the already selected and matched
40
41 word-pair list whereas the prime words were replaced with pictures. These pictures consisted
42
43 of concrete black line drawings on a white background that represent simplex words, i.e.
44
45
46
47
48 objects.

50 51 52 53 **Design and Procedure**

54
55 A rapid event-related fMRI (erfMRI) design was used to present (unimodally and
56
57 cross-modally) related, unrelated and word-nonword trials (Amaro and Barker 2006; Gold, et
58
59 al. 2006; Sass, et al. 2009a; Sass, et al. 2009c). Within these blocks, the inter-stimulus
60
interval (ISI) was shorter than the duration of the hemodynamic response function (HRF)

1
2
3 generated from previous trials. The idea behind was that the presentation of trials from the
4 same condition in a sequence leads to a better sampling of the HRF curve and hence to a
5 better signal. Per 'word' condition, there were three blocks with two trials and six blocks with
6 three trials (i.e. within one block the same condition occurred two- or three-times). The
7 remaining stimuli (six per conditions and all nonwords) were pseudo-randomly distributed.
8 The ISI between the small blocks and between the remaining stimuli was longer so that the
9 overlapping HRFs are deconvolved. The modalities (cross-modal picture-word and unimodal
10 word-word) were presented in different sessions. Subjects obtained no information about the
11 construction and arrangement of stimuli and conditions. Four pseudo randomized versions of
12 the experiment were counterbalanced across subjects to avoid a systematic effect of
13 conditions on each other. The presentation of the stimuli was controlled using a
14 preprogrammed Presentation script file (version 11.0 software package Neurobehavioral
15 Systems, <http://www.neurobs.com/>) projected through MR-compatible video goggles
16 (VisuaStim XGA, Resonance Technology, Inc., <http://www.mri-video.com/>).

17
18 Each trial began with an attention cue "+" (500ms), followed by the presentation of
19 the prime (350ms; either word or picture) and then by the target that was shown for 1000 ms.
20 After the target, a hash sign (#) appeared for a jittered duration of 1.5 to 2.5 seconds (small
21 jitter within the small blocks; $M_{ISI\text{small}} = 2$ seconds) or 3 to 5 seconds (long jitter between
22 small blocks and remaining stimuli; $M_{ISI\text{long}} = 4$ seconds). Subjects had to press one of two
23 buttons as fast and correct as possible depending on the kind of the target word (real word –
24 right button or nonword – left button). Pressing was done with the index or middle finger of
25 the left hand to avoid motor-related activation in the left hemisphere.

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

Data acquisition

The Scanning was performed on a 3T scanner (Gyrosan Achieva, Philips Medical Systems, Best, The Netherlands) using standard gradients and a circular polarized phase array

1
2
3 head coil. Subjects lay in a supine position, while head movement was limited by foam
4 padding within the head coil. In order to ensure optimal visual acuity, subjects were offered
5 fMRI-compatible glasses that could be fixed to the video goggles. For each subject and each
6 run, a series of 216 EPI-scans, lasting about seven minutes, was acquired. Stimuli were
7 presented in an erfMRI design fashion, with 30 stimuli per condition and a trial length of
8 approximately five seconds.
9

10 Scans covered the whole brain, including five initial dummy scans parallel to the
11 AC/PC line with the following parameters: number of slices (NS), 31; slice thickness (ST),
12 3.5 mm; interslice gap (IG), 0.35 mm; matrix size (MS), 64 x 64; field of view (FOV),
13 240x240mm; echo time (TE), 30 ms; repetition time (TR), 2 s. For anatomical localization,
14 we acquired high resolution images with a T1-weighted 3D FFE sequence (TR = 25 ms; TE =
15 2.04 ms; NS = 160 (sagittal); ST = 2 mm; IG = 1 mm; FOV = 256 x 256 mm; voxel size = 1
16 x 1 x 2 mm).
17

18 **Behavioral data analysis**

19 Reaction time was measured from the moment the target was presented until the
20 subject made a correct response. Raw reaction time data were trimmed by eliminating
21 responses exceeding the mean of every condition by more than two standard deviations to
22 reduce skew (3.9%; Ratcliff 1993). Trimmed data were entered into a repeated measure
23 ANOVA with modality (cross-modal and unimodal) and relation (related and unrelated) as
24 independent variables.
25

26 **fMRI data analysis**

27 Image processing and statistical analyses were performed using statistical parametric
28 mapping software (SPM5, www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk) implemented in MATLAB 7.0 (Mathworks
29
30

1
2
3 Inc., Sherborn, MA). The first five volumes were discarded to minimize T1-saturation
4
5 effects, i.e. they were discarded because of the non-equilibrium state of magnetization.
6
7

8 Each subject's fMRI images were realigned to the first functional image in order to
9
10 correct for head movement. The resliced volumes were normalized to the standard stereotaxic
11
12 anatomical MNI-space by using the transformation matrix calculated from the first EPI-scan
13
14 of each subject and the EPI-template. For the normalization the default SPM5 settings with
15
16 16 nonlinear iterations and the standard EPI-template of SPM5 were used. Each normalized
17
18 image was then smoothed using an 8-mm Gaussian kernel to accommodate differences in
19
20 anatomy between subjects. The time series data were high-pass filtered with a high-pass cut-
21
22 off 1/128 Hz. The first-order autocorrelations of the data were estimated and corrected for.
23
24
25

26
27 Following pre-processing, statistical analyses for each individual subject were
28
29 conducted. The hemodynamic response triggered by the target word in each condition was
30
31 modeled with a canonical HRF. The model parameters were estimated using restricted
32
33 maximum likelihood (ReML). Parameter estimates of the HRF regressor for each of the
34
35 different conditions were calculated from the least mean squares fit of the model to the time
36
37 series. Additionally, because the two modalities were presented in different sessions, the
38
39 session effect was modeled. At the second level, a SPM5 random effects group analyses was
40
41 performed by entering the parameter estimates for all conditions into a within-subject one-
42
43 way ANOVA to create a statistical parametric map (SPM). Because we assume that the
44
45 differences between the processing of both modalities might be small, we chose to employ
46
47 Monte-Carlo simulation of the brain volume to establish an appropriate voxel contiguity
48
49 threshold (Slotnick, et al. 2003). This correction has the advantage of higher sensitivity to
50
51 smaller effect sizes, while still correcting for multiple comparisons across the whole brain
52
53 volume. The result of the Monte-Carlo simulations was based on the 4 x 4 x 4 mm
54
55 interpolated voxels. Further information used for the cluster-size calculations were the 8-mm
56
57 smoothing kernel, the field of view (64 x 64) and the number of slices (31). Assuming an
58
59
60

1
2
3 individual voxel type I error of $p < .00005$, a cluster extent of 4 contiguous resampled voxels
4
5 was indicated as necessary to correct for multiple voxel comparisons at $p < .05$. The extent
6
7 threshold was set at $k = 20$ voxels.
8
9

10 Firstly, we examined the semantic priming effect concerning response suppression
11 (RS) and response enhancement (RE). To investigate RS, the related condition was subtracted
12 from the unrelated condition (unrelated > related). The opposite contrast was calculated to
13 obtain RE. To ensure, that the activations (RS) and deactivation (RE) were a result of the
14 differences between the related and unrelated conditions, both contrasts were exclusively
15 masked with the word-nonword conditions (cross-modal picture-nonword and unimodal
16 word-nonword). The mask was thresholded at $p < .05$ uncorrected. Secondly, to investigate
17 the modality-specific effects and interactions we subtracted the unimodal condition from the
18 cross-modal condition (i.e. [cross-modal related > unrelated] > [unimodal related >
19 unrelated]) and vice versa. The results were inclusively masked with the corresponding
20 contrasts (related > unrelated) to assess those voxels that fall within the area determined by
21 the mask (Bright, et al. 2004; Devlin, et al. 2002). The mask was thresholded at $p < .05$
22 uncorrected. Finally, modality-independent regions were identified by subtracting (a) both
23 unrelated conditions from the related conditions ([unimodal related + cross-modal related] >
24 [unimodal unrelated + cross-modal unrelated]) to assess activation of both related conditions
25 and (b) deactivation of both related conditions were calculated by subtracting both related
26 conditions from the unrelated conditions ([unimodal unrelated + cross-modal unrelated] >
27 [unimodal related + cross-modal related]). In addition, the results were inclusively masked
28 (thresholded at $p < .05$) with the individual contrasts: (a) [unimodal related > unrelated],
29 [cross-modal related > unrelated]; (b) [unimodal unrelated > related], [cross-modal unrelated
30 > related]. With this procedure the contrasts show only voxels that fall within the areas
31 determined by the mask and the regions of activation overlap can be identified (Bright, et al.
32 2004; Devlin, et al. 2002). The reported voxel coordinates of activation peaks were from the
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

Kircher et al., Semantic associations and cross-modal priming

MNI space (ICBM standard). For the anatomical localization the functional data were referenced to probabilistic cytoarchitectonic maps (Eickhoff, et al. 2005).

For Peer Review

RESULTS

Behavioral data

Accuracy: The percentage of errors was entered into a repeated measure ANOVA with modality and relation as independent variables. Results revealed that there was no effect of modality ($F(1, 15) = .05, p = .83$) and relation ($F(1, 15) = 1.05, p = .32$) and no interaction between modality and relation ($F(1, 15) = 1.15, p = .30$). Incorrect responses were excluded from further analysis.

Reaction time: The results of the ANOVA indicated that there was no main effect of modality ($F(1, 15) = .06, p = .81$), but that subjects were faster in the related compared to the unrelated condition ($F(1, 15) = 14.73, p < .005$). There was no interaction between modality and relation ($F(1, 15) = .20, p = .66$). The difference between the related and the unrelated condition of the two modalities was used to calculate the priming effects of the modalities. In both modalities, subjects were faster in the related compared to the unrelated condition (cross-modal condition: $t(15) = 2.92, p < .01$; unimodal condition: $t(15) = 2.66, p < .05$). A further t-test of priming effect sizes in cross-modal and unimodal conditions revealed that the picture-word priming effect did not differ from the word-word priming effect ($t(15) = -.45, p = .66$; see Table 3 for mean reaction times, standard deviations and size of the priming effects).

Insert Table 3 about here

Imaging data

Priming effects in the unimodal word-word condition

Subtraction of the unimodal related from the unimodal unrelated trials (unrelated > related; excl. masked with unimodal word-nonword) revealed bilateral fronto-parietal clusters of activation, i.e. bilateral inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), left inferior parietal lobule (IPL), right middle frontal gyrus (MFG), right superior frontal gyrus (SFG) and right precentral gyrus. Furthermore, a significant cluster in the right precuneus was found. For the opposite contrast (related > unrelated) no activation reached significance (see Table 4, Figure 1A).

Priming effects in the cross-modal picture-word condition

The contrast cross-modal unrelated > cross-modal related (excl. masked with cross-modal picture-nonword) revealed activation in the right IFG. For the opposite contrast (related > unrelated) no significant activation cluster was found (see Table 4, Figure 1B).

Insert Figure 1 about here

Modality specific semantic effects and interactions

For the subtraction of the unimodal condition from the cross-modal condition ([cross-modal related > unrelated] > [unimodal related > unrelated]; incl. masked with [(unimodal/cross-modal) related > unrelated]) and vice versa ([unimodal related > unrelated] > [cross-modal related > unrelated]; incl. masked with [(unimodal/ cross-modal) related > (unimodal/cross-modal) unrelated]) no cluster reached significance.

Regions of common semantic effects for both modalities

To identify regions of overlapping activation, both unrelated conditions were subtracted from the related conditions ([unimodal related + cross-modal related] > [unimodal unrelated + cross-modal unrelated]; incl. masked with [(unimodal/cross-modal) related > (unimodal/cross-modal) unrelated]). No cluster reached significance. For the opposite contrast ([unimodal unrelated + cross-modal unrelated] > [unimodal related + cross-modal related]; incl. masked with [(unimodal/cross-modal) unrelated > (unimodal/cross-modal) related]), bilateral fronto-tempo-parietal activation clusters were found: right IFG, MFG, fusiform gyrus, middle temporal gyrus (MTG) and left medial frontal gyrus, IPL, superior temporal gyrus (STG) and left caudate nucleus. Since the activations that were found in this contrast are relatively small but complex, we examined them more thoroughly by plotting parameter estimates for each of the conditions to rule out that the overlapping activations occur in both modalities. Analyzing the parameter estimates, we established that there was a decrease of the related in comparison of the unrelated condition of both modalities for all main clusters (see Table 4 and Figure 2).

Insert Table 4 and Figure 2 about here

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the neural correlates of uni- and cross-modal priming using fMRI with a word-word and picture-word semantic priming task. The results indicated that the processing of different modalities leads to common semantic priming effects behaviorally. On a neural level, unimodal priming led to bilateral fronto-parietal activations whereas cross-modal priming revealed activation of the right IFG. The comparison of both modalities revealed no differences between them but rather modality-independent signal changes in bilateral fronto-tempo-parietal regions.

In the unimodal (word-word) condition we found a deactivation of frontal and parietal areas for related compared to unrelated stimuli, corresponding to a significant behavioral priming effect. The bilateral frontal deactivation confirms earlier priming studies that related the prefrontal regions with the selection and retrieval of semantic information (Rossell, et al. 2003; Cabeza and Nyberg 2000). Hence, the response suppression is caused by reduced demands for the semantic memory retrieval or is the result of selection caused by the automatic spread of activation (Matsumoto, et al. 2005; Tivarus, et al. 2006). For example, Kuperberg et al. (2007) found deactivation of the bilateral prefrontal regions in response to directly related word-pairs. They assumed that this reflects a relative ease of accessing target words that has been predicted from their directly related primes. Furthermore, they propose that the deactivation of the right prefrontal cortex might reflect the more general involvement of inhibitory processes, “possibly inhibiting predictions that did not match related targets”. In addition, the reduced activity of the right MFG could be caused by the extensive search within the semantic network for unrelated word-pairs leading to a higher retrieval effort and reduced decision certainty (Kotz, et al. 2002; Rissman, et al. 2003). This result is supported by the deactivation of the left IPL, a region that is associated with semantic memory processing and retrieval especially for semantic associations (Assaf, et al. 2006). In addition, the activation of the right precuneus is particularly interesting. It is assumed that the

1
2
3 precuneus plays a role in mental imagery, episodic memory, contextual associations and self-
4
5 processing (Cavanna and Trimble 2006, Kircher, et al. 2000). We assume that the activity of
6
7 the precuneus in our study reflects the involvement of episodic and more hypothetically self
8
9 relevant (semantic autobiographic) memory retrieval in semantic priming.
10
11

12
13 In the cross-modal (picture-word) condition the behavioral priming effect was related
14
15 to neural response suppression in the right IFG. Again, these signal decreases might be
16
17 related to the more general involvement of right prefrontal regions in inhibition processes
18
19 (Kuperberg, et al. 2007).
20
21

22
23 The comparison of both modalities revealed no differences between uni- and cross-
24
25 modal semantic priming. In contrast, common regions of deactivation were found within
26
27 bilateral fronto-tempo-parietal regions. The extensive involvement of the right-lateralized
28
29 fronto-temporal clusters during semantic processing has been demonstrated in some studies.
30
31 One hypothesis suggests, that the right frontal and temporal lobe maintains weak, diffuse
32
33 semantic activations within a broader semantic field (Jung-Beeman 2005; Beeman and
34
35 Chiarello 1998; Raposo, et al. 2006; Rossell, et al. 2001). For example, activation was found
36
37 for distant semantic relations of words (Beeman, et al. 1994), extraction of overall meaning
38
39 from sentences (Kircher, et al. 2001) and for related words that do not share many semantic
40
41 features (Chiarello 1998). In addition, activation of the MTG bilaterally were found for
42
43 semantic category judgments, i.e. the temporal lobe plays a critical role during semantic
44
45 processing (Pugh, et al. 1996). For our results, we assume that the deactivation of the right
46
47 fronto-temporal regions for related pairs reflects the ease of semantic processing for
48
49 associatively related concepts that is independent of modality. Support comes from several
50
51 studies investigating semantic priming in the left and right hemisphere (Raposo, et al. 2006;
52
53 Rossell, et al. 2001; Bright, et al. 2004). They propose that “both hemispheres are capable of
54
55 activating a large set if that information is associated” (Richards and Chiarello 1995). We
56
57 would therefore interpret our results along this line and assume that deactivations of the right
58
59
60

1
2
3 lateral temporal and frontal lobe reflect semantic processing of associations and the higher
4
5 retrieval effort and extensive search within the semantic network for unrelated word-pairs.
6
7 This assumption is supported by the signal decreases within left fronto-temporal regions that
8
9 were found during amodal, implicit priming (Henson 2003) and were related to greater
10
11 processing resources required for words that are semantically unrelated compared to related
12
13 (Cabeza and Nyberg 2000; Rissman, et al. 2003; Ruff, et al. 2008).
14
15
16

17 **In the current study, we used only artifacts to investigate the influence of**
18 **different visual modalities on the processing of semantic associations. Nevertheless,**
19 **associative relationships exist not only between artifacts, but also between other**
20 **concepts, for example, living/natural objects (e.g., lion – mane, tiger – stripes). Using**
21 **natural objects, different areas of activation would be expected in comparison to**
22 **artifacts (e.g., Perani, et al. 1999; Thompson-Schill, et al. 1999). For example, Perani et**
23 **al. (1999) have found that the left fusiform gyrus was involved in the processing of**
24 **pictures and words of living entities and the left middle temporal gyrus was involved in**
25 **the processing of words and pictures of tools. Furthermore, Kalenine et al. (2009)**
26 **showed that the domain (natural vs. artifact objects) had an influence on the neural**
27 **correlates of semantic relations. According to our study, we would therefore expect**
28 **different areas of activation for natural objects (e.g., within bilateral visual areas;**
29 **Kalenine, et al. 2009) but these activations should be independent of presentation**
30 **modality. Furthermore, the current literature revealed that an associative relationship**
31 **between object concepts and action semantics (Beauchamp and Martin 2007; Tyler, et**
32 **al. 2003) is mainly processed within the left temporal cortex – independent of**
33 **presentation modality (words or pictures; Perani, et al. 1999). A further distinction can**
34 **be made regarding manipulable (e.g., cherry – basket) and non-manipulable objects**
35 **(e.g., bed – person asleep). Kalenine et al. (2009) found that manipulable associative**
36 **relations led to enhanced activation within left inferior parietal and middle temporal**
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 **regions in comparison to non-manipulable relations whereas artifacts elicited greater**
4 **activation within right temporo-parietal regions in comparison to natural objects.**
5
6
7 **Overall, using different associatively related object concepts, we would expect category-**
8 **specific differences between man-made and natural objects (Martin, et al. 1996) within**
9 **distinct neural networks. This differentiation might be based on perceptual/ visual**
10 **attributes (natural kinds) and functional/ motor features (artifacts), i.e. object**
11 **knowledge is organized around sensory and functional features as suggested by the**
12 **sensory-motor hypothesis (Warrington and Shallice 1984). However, according to the**
13 **results of the current study and results of earlier studies (e.g, Kahlaoui, et al. 2007; Sass,**
14 **et al. 2009b) these differences between distinct objects domains (living, non-living) and**
15 **categories (animals, tools) should be independent of presentation modality.**
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Limitations

32
33
34 We restricted our sample to male subjects due to the ongoing debate about gender specific
35 effects for almost all types of cognitive demands, including language processing and
36 lateralization (Baxter, et al. 2003; Bermeitinger, et al. 2008; Laws 1999; Lloyd-Jones and
37 Humphreys 1997).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Summary

46
47
48 Our results indicate that cross-modal and unimodal processing share a common neural
49 network within the bilateral fronto-temporal cortex. Thus, our data support an amodal
50 semantic system based on the hypothesis of Caramazza et al. (1990) rather than the
51 hypothesis of multiple semantic systems (e.g., Paivio, 1991). First of all, similar to other
52 studies we found no difference between cross-modal and unimodal priming on a behavioral
53 or neural level (Caramazza, et al. 1990; Vandenberghe, et al. 1996). Secondly, both priming
54 types elicited common deactivations in the bilateral fronto-temporal regions. These areas may
55
56
57
58
59
60

Kircher et al., Semantic associations and cross-modal priming

1
2
3 reflect semantic processing and retrieval of associatively related concepts irrespective of
4
5 modality. Conceivably, the processing of different modalities leads to modality specific
6
7 activation reflecting the processing routes that converge to a single set of conceptual
8
9 representations common for different modalities (Caramazza, et al. 1990; Carlesimo, et al.
10
11 2003), i.e. semantic processing itself is independent of modality.
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

For Peer Review

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project is supported by a grant from the Interdisciplinary Center for Clinical Research “BIOMAT” within the Faculty of Medicine at the RWTH Aachen University (IZKF VV N68). We thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on this manuscript.

For Peer Review

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Amaro E, Jr., Barker GJ. (2006): Study design in fMRI: basic principles. *Brain Cogn*
7
8 60(3):220-32.
9
- 10 Assaf M, Calhoun VD, Kuzu CH, Kraut MA, Rivkin PR, Hart J, Jr., Pearlson GD. (2006):
11
12 Neural correlates of the object-recall process in semantic memory. *Psychiatry Res*
13
14 147(2-3):115-26.
15
16
- 17 Baayen RH, Piepenbrock R, Rijn Hv. 1993. The CELEX Lexical Database [CD-ROM].
18
19 Version Release 1. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium, University of
20
21 Pennsylvania.
22
23
- 24 Badgaiyan RD, Schacter DL, Alpert NM. (2001): Priming within and across modalities:
25
26 exploring the nature of rCBF increases and decreases. *Neuroimage* 13(2):272-82.
27
28
- 29 Bates E, D'Amico S, Jacobsen T, Szekely A, Andonova E, Devescovi A, Herron D, Lu CC,
30
31 Pechmann T, Pleh C and others. (2003): Timed picture naming in seven languages.
32
33 *Psychon Bull Rev* 10(2):344-80.
34
35
- 36 Baxter LC, Saykin AJ, Flashman LA, Johnson SC, Guerin SJ, Babcock DR, Wishart HA.
37
38 (2003): Sex differences in semantic language processing: a functional MRI study.
39
40 *Brain Lang* 84(2):264-72.
41
42
- 43 Beauchamp MS, Martin A. (2007): Grounding object concepts in perception and action:
44
45 evidence from fMRI studies of tools. *Cortex* 43(3):461-8.
46
47
- 48 Beeman MJ, Chiarello C. (1998): Complementary right and left hemisphere language
49
50 comprehension. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 7:2-8.
51
52
- 53 Beeman MJ, Friedman RB, Grafman J, Perez E, Diamond S, Lindsay MB. (1994):
54
55 Summation priming and coarse semantic encoding in the right hemisphere. *Journal of*
56
57 *Cognitive Neuroscience* 6:26-45.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bergerbest D, Ghahremani DG, Gabrieli JD. (2004): Neural correlates of auditory repetition
4
5 priming: reduced fMRI activation in the auditory cortex. *J Cogn Neurosci* 16(6):966-
6
7 77.
8
9
- 10 Bermeitinger C, Wentura D, Frings C. (2008): Nature and facts about natural and artificial
11
12 categories: Sex differences in the semantic priming paradigm. *Brain Lang* 106(2):153-
13
14 63.
15
16
- 17 Booth JR, Burman DD, Meyer JR, Gitelman DR, Parrish TB, Mesulam MM. (2002):
18
19 Modality independence of word comprehension. *Hum Brain Mapp* 16(4):251-61.
20
21
- 22 Bright P, Moss H, Tyler LK. (2004): Unitary vs multiple semantics: PET studies of word and
23
24 picture processing. *Brain Lang* 89(3):417-32.
25
26
- 27 Cabeza R, Nyberg L. (2000): Imaging cognition II: An empirical review of 275 PET and
28
29 fMRI studies. *J Cogn Neurosci* 12(1):1-47.
30
31
- 32 Caramazza A, Hillis AE, Rapp BC, Romani C. (1990): The multiple semantics hypothesis:
33
34 Multiple confusions? *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 7(3):161-189.
35
36
- 37 Carlesimo GA, Turriziani P, Paulesu E, Gorini A, Caltagirone C, Fazio F, Perani D. (2003):
38
39 Brain activity during intra- and cross-modal priming: New empirical data and review
40
41 of literature. *Neuropsychologia* 42:14-24.
42
43
- 44 Cavanna AE, Trimble MR. (2006): The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and
45
46 behavioural correlates. *Brain* 129(Pt 3):564-83.
47
48
- 49 Chiarello C. 1998. On codes of meaning and the meaning of codes: Semantic access and
50
51 retrieval within and between hemispheres. In: Beeman M, Chiarello C, editors. *Right*
52
53 *hemisphere language comprehension: Perspectives from cognitive neuroscience.*
54
55 Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. p 141-160.
56
57
- 58 DeLeon J, Gottesman RF, Kleinman JT, Newhart M, Davis C, Heidler-Gary J, Lee A, Hillis
59
60 AE. (2007): Neural regions essential for distinct cognitive processes underlying
picture naming. *Brain* 130(Pt 5):1408-22.

- 1
2
3 Devlin JT, Russell RP, Davis MH, Price CJ, Moss HE, Fadili MJ, Tyler LK. (2002): Is there
4
5 an anatomical basis for category-specificity? Semantic memory studies in PET and
6
7 fMRI. *Neuropsychologia* 40(1):54-75.
8
9
- 10 Eickhoff SB, Stephan KE, Mohlberg H, Grefkes C, Fink GR, Amunts K, Zilles K. (2005): A
11
12 new SPM toolbox for combining probabilistic cytoarchitectonic maps and functional
13
14 imaging data. *NeuroImage* 25(4):1325-1335.
15
16
- 17 Giesbrecht B, Camblin CC, Swaab TY. (2004): Separable effects of semantic priming and
18
19 imageability on word processing in human cortex. *Cereb Cortex* 14(5):521-9.
20
21
- 22 Gold BT, Balota DA, Jones SJ, Powell DK, Smith CD, Andersen AH. (2006): Dissociation of
23
24 automatic and strategic lexical-semantics: functional magnetic resonance imaging
25
26 evidence for differing roles of multiple frontotemporal regions. *J Neurosci*
27
28 26(24):6523-32.
29
30
- 31 Grossman M, Koenig P, Kounios J, McMillan C, Work M, Moore P. (2006): Category-
32
33 specific effects in semantic memory: category-task interactions suggested by fMRI.
34
35 *Neuroimage* 30(3):1003-9.
36
37
- 38 Heim S, Eickhoff SB, Ischebeck AK, Supp G, Amunts K. (2007): Modality-independent
39
40 involvement of the left BA 44 during lexical decision making. *Brain Struct Funct*
41
42 212(1):95-106.
43
44
- 45 Henson R. (2003): Neuroimaging studies of priming. *Prog Neurobiol* 70(1):53-81.
46
47
- 48 Jung-Beeman M. (2005): Bilateral brain processes for comprehending natural language.
49
50 *Trends Cogn Sci* 9(11):512-8.
51
52
- 53 Kahlaoui K, Baccino T, Joannette Y, Magnié M-N. (2007): Pictures and Words: Priming and
54
55 Category Effects in Object Processing. *Current Psychology Letters* 23(3).
56
57
- 58 Kalenine S, Bonthoux F. (2008): Object manipulability affects children's and adults'
59
60 conceptual processing. *Psychon Bull Rev* 15(3):667-72.

- 1
2
3 Kalenine S, Peyrin C, Pichat C, Segebarth C, Bonthoux F, Baciú M. (2009): The sensory-
4
5 motor specificity of taxonomic and thematic conceptual relations: a behavioral and
6
7 fMRI study. *Neuroimage* 44(3):1152-62.
8
9
10 Kircher TT, Brammer M, Tous Andreu N, Williams SC, McGuire PK. (2001): Engagement
11
12 of right temporal cortex during processing of linguistic context. *Neuropsychologia*
13
14 39(8):798-809.
15
16
17 Kircher TT, Senior C, Phillips ML, Benson PJ, Bullmore ET, Brammer M, Simmons A,
18
19 Williams SC, Bartels M, David AS. (2000): Towards a functional neuroanatomy of
20
21 self processing: effects of faces and words. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 10(1-2):133-
22
23 44.
24
25
26
27 Kohler S, Moscovitch M, Winocur G, McIntosh AR. (2000): Episodic encoding and
28
29 recognition of pictures and words: role of the human medial temporal lobes. *Acta*
30
31 *Psychol (Amst)* 105(2-3):159-79.
32
33
34 Koivisto M, Revonsuo A. (2000): Semantic priming by pictures and words in the cerebral
35
36 hemispheres. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 10(1-2):91-8.
37
38
39 Kotz SA, Cappa SF, von Cramon DY, Friederici AD. (2002): Modulation of the lexical-
40
41 semantic network by auditory semantic priming: an event-related functional MRI
42
43 study. *Neuroimage* 17(4):1761-72.
44
45
46 Kuperberg GR, Lakshmanan BM, Greve DN, West WC. (2007): Task and semantic
47
48 relationship influence both the polarity and localization of hemodynamic modulation
49
50 during lexico-semantic processing. *Hum Brain Mapp*.
51
52
53 Laws KR. (1999): Gender affects naming latencies for living and nonliving things:
54
55 implications for familiarity. *Cortex* 35(5):729-33.
56
57
58 Lin EL, Murphy GL. (2001): Thematic relations in adults' concepts. *J Exp Psychol Gen*
59
60 130(1):3-28.

- 1
2
3 Lloyd-Jones TJ, Humphreys GW. (1997): Perceptual differentiation as a source of category
4
5 effects in object processing: evidence from naming and object decision. *Mem Cognit*
6
7 25(1):18-35.
8
9
- 10 Marinkovic K, Dhond RP, Dale AM, Glessner M, Carr V, Halgren E. (2003): Spatiotemporal
11
12 dynamics of modality-specific and supramodal word processing. *Neuron* 38(3):487-
13
14 97.
15
16
- 17 Martin A, Wiggs CL, Ungerleider LG, Haxby JV. (1996): Neural correlates of category-
18
19 specific knowledge. *Nature* 379(6566):649-52.
20
21
- 22 Matsumoto A, Iidaka T, Haneda K, Okada T, Sadato N. (2005): Linking semantic priming
23
24 effect in functional MRI and event-related potentials. *Neuroimage* 24(3):624-34.
25
26
- 27 Mesulam MM. (1998): From sensation to cognition. *Brain* 121 (Pt 6):1013-52.
28
- 29 Moore CJ, Price CJ. (1999): Three distinct ventral occipitotemporal regions for reading and
30
31 object naming. *Neuroimage* 10(2):181-92.
32
33
- 34 Neely JH. 1991. Semantic priming effects in visual word recognition: a selective review of
35
36 current findings and theories. In: Besner D, Humphreys GW, editors. *Basic processes*
37
38 *in reading: visual word recognition*. Hillsdale (NJ, US): Lawrence Erlbaum. p 264-
39
40 336.
41
42
- 43 Oldfield RC. (1971): The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
44
45 *Neuropsychologia* 9(1):97-113.
46
47
- 48 Paivio A. (1991): Dual Coding Theory: Retrospect and Current Status. *Canadian Journal of*
49
50 *Psychology* 45(3):255-287.
51
52
- 53 Perani D, Schnur T, Tettamanti M, Gorno-Tempini M, Cappa SF, Fazio F. (1999): Word and
54
55 picture matching: a PET study of semantic category effects. *Neuropsychologia*
56
57 37(3):293-306.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Pugh KR, Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Constable RT, Skudlarski P, Fulbright RK, Bronen
4
5 RA, Shankweiler DP, Katz L, Fletcher JM and others. (1996): Cerebral organization
6
7 of component processes in reading. *Brain* 119 (Pt 4):1221-38.
8
9
- 10 Raposo A, Moss HE, Stamatakis EA, Tyler LK. (2006): Repetition suppression and semantic
11
12 enhancement: an investigation of the neural correlates of priming. *Neuropsychologia*
13
14 44(12):2284-95.
15
16
- 17 Ratcliff R. (1993): Methods for dealing with reaction time outliers. *Psychol Bull* 114(3):510-
18
19 32.
20
21
- 22 Richards L, Chiarello C. (1995): Depth of associated activation in the cerebral hemispheres:
23
24 mediated versus direct priming. *Neuropsychologia* 33(2):171-9.
25
26
- 27 Rissman J, Eliassen JC, Blumstein SE. (2003): An event-related fMRI investigation of
28
29 implicit semantic priming. *J Cogn Neurosci* 15(8):1160-75.
30
31
- 32 Rossell SL, Bullmore ET, Williams SC, David AS. (2001): Brain activation during automatic
33
34 and controlled processing of semantic relations: a priming experiment using lexical-
35
36 decision. *Neuropsychologia* 39(11):1167-76.
37
38
- 39 Rossell SL, Price CJ, Nobre AC. (2003): The anatomy and time course of semantic priming
40
41 investigated by fMRI and ERPs. *Neuropsychologia* 41(5):550-64.
42
43
- 44 Ruff I, Blumstein SE, Myers EB, Hutchison E. (2008): Recruitment of anterior and posterior
45
46 structures in lexical-semantic processing: An fMRI study comparing implicit and
47
48 explicit tasks. *Brain Lang* 105(1):41-9.
49
50
- 51 Sachs O, Weis S, Zellagui N, Huber W, Zvyagintsev M, Mathiak K, Kircher T. (2008):
52
53 Automatic processing of semantic relations in fMRI: neural activation during
54
55 semantic priming of taxonomic and thematic categories. *Brain Research*.
56
57
- 58 Sass K, Krach S, Sachs O, Kircher T. (2009a): Lion - tiger - stripes: Neural correlates of
59
60 indirect semantic priming across processing modalities. *NeuroImage* 45(1):224-236.

- 1
2
3 Sass K, Sachs O, Krach S, Kircher T. (2009b): Taxonomic and thematic categories: Neural
4
5 correlates of categorization in an auditory-to-visual priming task using fMRI. *Brain*
6
7
8 *Research* 1270:78-87.
9
- 10 Sass K, Sachs O, Krach S, Kircher T. (2009c): Taxonomic and thematic categories: Neural
11
12 correlates of categorization in an auditory-to-visual priming task using fMRI. *Brain*
13
14
15 *Research* 1270(78-87).
16
- 17 Shallice T. (1988): Specialisation within the semantic system. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*
18
19
20 5(1):133-142.
21
- 22 Slotnick SD, Moo LR, Segal JB, Hart J, Jr. (2003): Distinct prefrontal cortex activity
23
24
25 associated with item memory and source memory for visual shapes. *Brain Res Cogn*
26
27
28 *Brain Res* 17(1):75-82.
29
- 30 Thompson-Schill SL, Aguirre GK, D'Esposito M, Farah MJ. (1999): A neural basis for
31
32
33 category and modality specificity of semantic knowledge. *Neuropsychologia*
34
35 37(6):671-6.
36
- 37 Tivarus ME, Ibinson JW, Hillier A, Schmalbrock P, Beversdorf DQ. (2006): An fMRI study
38
39
40 of semantic priming: modulation of brain activity by varying semantic distances.
41
42
43 *Cogn Behav Neurol* 19(4):194-201.
44
- 45 Tyler LK, Stamatakis EA, Dick E, Bright P, Fletcher P, Moss H. (2003): Objects and their
46
47
48 actions: evidence for a neurally distributed semantic system. *Neuroimage* 18(2):542-
49
50 57.
51
- 52 Vandenberghe R, Price C, Wise R, Josephs O, Frackowiak RS. (1996): Functional anatomy
53
54
55 of a common semantic system for words and pictures. *Nature* 383(6597):254-6.
56
- 57 Warrington EK, Shallice T. (1984): Category specific semantic impairments. *Brain* 107 (Pt
58
59 3):829-54.
60

Kircher et al., Semantic associations and cross-modal priming

1
2
3 Wible CG, Han SD, Spencer MH, Kubicki M, Niznikiewicz MH, Jolesz FA, McCarley RW,
4
5 Nestor P. (2006): Connectivity among semantic associates: an fMRI study of semantic
6
7 priming. *Brain Lang* 97(3):294-305.
8
9

10 Xiao Z, Zhang JX, Wang X, Wu R, Hu X, Weng X, Tan LH. (2005): Differential activity in
11
12 left inferior frontal gyrus for pseudowords and real words: an event-related fMRI
13
14 study on auditory lexical decision. *Hum Brain Mapp* 25(2):212-21.
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

For Peer Review

FIGURE LEGENDS***Figure 1: Correlates of the uni- and cross-modal priming effect.***


Significant areas of activation for the comparison of unrelated and related word-pairs. (A) Unimodal response suppression (unimodal unrelated > related; excl. masked with unimodal word-nonword) within bilateral fronto-parietal regions. (B) Cross-modal response suppression (cross-modal related > unrelated; excl. masked with cross-modal picture-nonword) within the right inferior frontal gyrus.

For Peer Review


1
2
3 **Figure 2: Correlates of modality-independent semantic processing and parameter**
4 **estimates.**
5
6

7
8 Significant areas of common deactivation for the contrast (unimodal unrelated + cross-modal
9 unrelated) > (unimodal related + cross-modal related), incl. masked with (unimodal unrelated
10 > related) and (cross-modal unrelated > related). Areas of overlapping activation were found
11 in bilateral fronto-temporal and left inferior parietal regions. Plots of mean parameter
12 estimates with 90% confidence interval for every significant deactivation showing response
13 amplitude for every condition: picture-word nonword (PWnon), picture-word related
14 (PWrel), picture-word unrelated (PWunrel), word-word nonword (WWnon), word-word
15 related (WWrel) and word-word unrelated (WWunrel). Labeling of the y-axis is in arbitrary
16 units. The graphs have different scaling and scaling steps.
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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **A.) Unimodal priming effect (word-word unrelated > word-related)**




21
22 **B.) Cross-modal priming effect (picture-word unrelated > picture-word related)**



37 Correlates of the uni- and cross-modal priming effect.

38 Significant areas of activation for the comparison of unrelated and related word-pairs. (A) Unimodal
39 response suppression (unimodal unrelated > related; excl. masked with unimodal word-nonword)
40 within bilateral fronto-parietal regions. (B) Cross-modal response suppression (cross-modal related
41 > unrelated; excl. masked with cross-modal picture-nonword) within the right inferior frontal gyrus.
42 250x229mm (300 x 300 DPI)

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Correlates of modality-independent semantic processing and parameter estimates.

Significant areas of common deactivation for the contrast (unimodal unrelated + cross-modal unrelated) > (unimodal related + cross-modal related), incl. masked with (unimodal unrelated > related) and (cross-modal unrelated > related). Areas of overlapping activation were found in bilateral fronto-temporal and left inferior parietal regions. Plots of mean parameter estimates with 90% confidence interval for every significant deactivation showing response amplitude for every condition: picture-word nonword (PWnon), picture-word related (PWrel), picture-word unrelated (PWunrel), word-word nonword (WWnon), word-word related (WWrel) and word-word unrelated (WWunrel). Labeling of the y-axis is in arbitrary units. The graphs have different scaling and scaling steps.

165x160mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Table 1: Stimuli used in the experiment

<i>related condition</i>	<i>unrelated condition</i>	<i>non – word condition</i>
<i>(English translation)</i>	<i>(English translation)</i>	<i>(English translation)</i>
UNIMODAL CONDITION		
Fahne – Mast	Fahne – Bahn	Fahne – Deisil
(flag – mast)	(flag – train)	(flag – deisil)
Dom – Altar	Dom – Kohle	Dom – Laugu
(cathedral – altar)	(cathedral – coal)	(cathedral – laugu)
Film – Kamera	Film – Hebel	Film – Makri
(Film – camera)	(film – lever)	(film – makri)
Pflug – Scheune	Pflug – Altar	Pflug – Tarla
(plough – barn)	(plough – altar)	(plough – tarla)
Tapete – Leim	Tapete – Bullauge	Tapete – Petul
(wallpaper – glue)	(wallpaper – porthole)	(wallpaper – petul)
Ofen – Kohle	Ofen – Plastik	Ofen – Stikpla
(oven – coal)	(oven – plastic)	(oven – stikpla)
Kompass – Nadel	Kompass – Marmor	Kompass – Soram
(compass – needle)	(compass – marble)	(compass – soram)
Dampfer – Bullauge	Dampfer – Nadel	Dampfer – Lune
(steamboat – porthole)	(steamboat – needle)	(steamboat – lune)
Naht – Saum	Naht – Mast	Naht – Musa
(seam – border)	(seam – mast)	(seam – musa)
Messer – Schneide	Messer – Pfeiler	Messer – Deische
(knife – edge)	(knife – pillar)	(knife – deische)
Terrasse – Markise	Terrasse – Geige	Terrasse – Ramke

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

(patio – awning)	(patio – electricity)	(patio – ramke)
Bagger – Schaufel	Bagger – Girlande	Bagger – Felau
(excavator – bucket)	(excavator – garland)	(excavator – felau)
Magnet – Eisen	Magnet – Abfluss	Magnet – Eisam
(magnet – iron)	(magnet – spout)	(magnet – eisam)
Fliese – Marmor	Fliese – Scheune	Fliese – Siesch
(tile – marble)	(tile – barn)	(tile – siesch)
Ablage – Zettel	Ablage – Markise	Ablage – Kise
(clipboard – note)	(clipboard – awning)	(clipboard – kise)
Apparat – Hebel	Apparat – Rauch	Apparat – Hebap
(apparatus – lever)	(apparatus – smoke)	(apparatus – hebap)
Beton – Pfeiler	Beton – Schneide	Beton – Feito
(concrete – pillar)	(concrete – edge)	(concrete – feito)
Boden – Teppich	Boden – Schaufel	Boden – Peti
(floor – carpet)	(floor – bucket)	(floor – peti)
Klingel – Rezeption	Klingel – Geige	Klingel – Gelik
(bell – reception)	(bell – violin)	(bell – gelik)
Lampion – Girlande	Lampion – Leim	Lampion – Mielal
(lampion – garland)	(lampion – glue)	(Lampion – mielal)
Leitung – Strom	Leitung – Saum	Leitung – Musal
(cable – electricity)	(cable – border)	(cable – musal)
Mine – Kuli	Mine – Kamera	Mine – Lune
(refill – ballpoint pen)	(refill – camera)	(refill – lune)
Orchester – Geige	Orchester – Teppich	Orchester – Otor
(orchestra – violin)	(orchestra – carpet)	(orchestra – otor)

1			
2			
3	Rohr – Abfluss	Rohr – Zettel	Rohr – Tehz
4			
5	(tube – drain)	(tube – note)	(tube – tehz)
6			
7	Schild – Schwert	Schild – Seide	Schild – Deisil
8			
9	(buckler – sword)	(buckler – silk)	(buckler – deisil)
10			
11	Schranke – Bahn	Schranke – Schwert	Schranke – Schrew
12			
13	(gate – railroad)	(gate – sword)	(gate – schrew)
14			
15	Seife – Wasser	Seife – Kuli	Seife – Feisuk
16			
17	(soap – water)	(soap – ballpoint pen)	(soap – feisuk)
18			
19	Tuch – Seide	Tuch – Rezeption	Tuch – Deisu
20			
21	(shawl – silk)	(shawl – reception)	(shawl – deisu)
22			
23	Tüte – Plastik	Tüte – Eisen	Tüte – Lastüt
24			
25	(bag – plastic)	(bag – iron)	(bag – lastüt)
26			
27	Zigarre – Rauch	Zigarre – Wasser	Zigarre – Chag
28			
29	(cigar – smoke)	(cigar – water)	(cigar – chag)
30			
31			
32	CROSS – MODAL CONDITION		
33			
34	Pinsel – Farbe	Pinsel – Lampe	Pinsel – Rafins
35			
36	(paint – brush – paint)	(paint – brush – lamp)	(paint – brush – rafins)
37			
38	Ring – Diamant	Ring – Farbe	Ring – Tantia
39			
40	(ring – diamond)	(ring – paint)	(ring – tantia)
41			
42	Schublade – Kommode	Schublade – Flügel	Schublade – Modos
43			
44	(drawer – bureau)	(drawer – aerofoil)	(drawer – modos)
45			
46	Absatz – Stiefel	Absatz – Schleife	Absatz – Schliefa
47			
48	(heel – boot)	(heel – bow)	(heel – schliefa)
49			
50	Bohrer – Dübel	Bohrer – Container	Bohrer – Tocob
51			
52	(borer – dowel)	(borer – container)	(borer – tocob)
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

Dose – Öffner**(can – can – opener)****Geschenk – Schleife****(present – bow)****Gewehr – Patrone****(gun – round)****Helm – Mofa****(helmet – moped)****Herd – Pfanne****(cooker – pan)****Kassette – Radio****(casette – radio)****Leiter – Sprosse****(ladder – rung)****Pullover – Wolle****(pullover – wool)****Schlüssel – Schloss****(key – lock)****BH – Spitze****(bra – lace)****Glühbirne – Lampe****(bulb – lamp)****Flugzeug – Flügel****(airplane – aerofoil)****Grill – Rost****Dose – Theater****(can – theatre)****Geschenk – Sprosse****(present – rung)****Gewehr – Bikini****(gun – bikini)****Helm – Kommode****(helmet – bureau)****Herd – Spitze****(cooker – lace)****Kassette – Schminke****(casette – make – up)****Leiter – Diamant****(ladder – diamond)****Pullover – Tabak****(pullover – tobacco)****Schlüssel – Schwamm****(key – sponge)****BH – Schraube****(bra – srew)****Glühbirne – Wäsche****(bulb – laundry)****Flugzeug – Schloss****(airplane – lock)****Grill – Note****Dose – Atera****(can – atera)****Geschenk – Rosek****(present – rosek)****Gewehr – Kineb****(gun – kineb)****Helm – Modehl****(helmet – modehl)****Herd – Tize****(cooker – tize)****Kassette – Minkat****(casette – minkat)****Leiter – Rosei****(ladder – rosei)****Pullover – Ellov****(pullover – ellov)****Schlüssel – Olsch****(key – olsch)****BH – Sarub****(bra – sarub)****Glühbirne – Schäb****(bulb – schab)****Flugzeug – Slog****(airplane – slog)****Grill – Etir**

1			
2			
3	(barbecue – gridiron)	(barbecue – note)	(barbecue – etir)
4			
5	Klammer – Wäsche	Klammer – Mofa	Klammer – Famo
6			
7	(peg – laundry)	(peg – moped)	(peg – famo)
8			
9			
10	Klavier – Note	Klavier – Stiefel	Klavier – Felav
11			
12	(piano – note)	(piano – boot)	(piano – felav)
13			
14			
15	Laster – Container	Laster – Wolle	Laster – Lowst
16			
17	(truck – container)	(truck – wool)	(truck – lowst)
18			
19			
20	Maske – Theater	Maske – Antenne	Maske – Ethas
21			
22	(mask – theater)	(mask – antenna)	(mask – ethas)
23			
24			
25	Muschel – Sand	Muschel – Patrone	Muschel – Danusch
26			
27	(clam – sand)	(clam) – round)	(clam – danusch)
28			
29			
30	Mutter – Schraube	Mutter – Radio	Mutter – Rautu
31			
32	(screw nut – screw)	(srew nut – radio)	(screw nut – radio)
33			
34	Pfeife – Tabak	Pfeife – Dübel	Pfeife – Batei
35			
36	(pipe – tobacco)	(pipe – dowel)	(pipe – batei)
37			
38			
39	Pool – Bikini	Pool – Rost	Pool – Ikino
40			
41	(pool – bikini)	(pool – gridiron)	(pool – ikino)
42			
43	Spiegel – Schminke	Spiegel – Geschirr	Spiegel – Ligisch
44			
45	(mirror – make – up)	(mirror – dishes)	(mirror – ligisch)
46			
47			
48	Spüle – Geschirr	Spüle – Sand	Spüle – Schegü
49			
50	(sink – dishes)	(sink – sand)	(sink – schgu)
51			
52			
53	Fernseher – Antenne	Fernseher – Pfanne	Fernseher – Entav
54			
55	(television – antenna)	(television – pan)	(television – entav)
56			
57			
58	Wanne – Schwamm	Wanne – Öffner	Wanne – Waman
59			
60	(tub – sponge)	(tub – opener)	(tub – waman)

Notes: Different stimuli were used for the different conditions. They were matched within and between

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

modalities, primes, targets and prime – target pairs regarding lexical frequency, word length, familiarity and relationship. In the cross – modal condition the prime word was replaced by a picture.

For Peer Review

Table 2: Results of the normative rating studies.

<i>Matching Criteria</i>	<i>within modality</i>	<i>between modality</i>		
		Primes	Targets	Word-pairs
Lexical frequency	.69	.61	.45	.96
Number of letters	.33	.86	.50	.61
Number of syllables	.26	.38	.54	.88
Mean rating score				.25

Notes: The within modality matching was done between primes and targets. Between modality the matching was done between uni- and cross-modal primes, uni- and cross-modal targets and uni- and cross-modal word-pairs. The results represent the p-values of the paired-sample t-tests.

For Peer Review

Table 3: Mean Reaction times and S.D. of condition.

<i>Condition</i>	<i>Mean RT (in ms)</i>	<i>S.D. (in ms)</i>	<i>priming effect (S.D.)</i>
cross-modal related	638.54	79.29	39.13 (53.69)
cross-modal unrelated	677.67	100.01	
unimodal related	644.46	85.20	31.34 (47.17)
unimodal unrelated	675.80	84.63	

Notes: RT = Reaction time; S.D. = standard deviation

For Peer Review

Table 4: Results of fMRI semantic priming effects and modality specific activations.

<i>Anatomical Region</i>	<i>BA</i>	<i>Coordinates</i>			<i>z-value</i>	<i>No. voxels</i>
		<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>		
WORD-WORD UNRELATED > WORD-WORD RELATED (EXCL. MASKED WITH WORD-NONWORD)						
Left inferior parietal lobule	40	-30	-74	40	5.25	1495
Right middle frontal gyrus	46	44	40	30	4.91	112
Left inferior parietal lobule	40	-42	-34	30	4.89	284
Left inferior frontal gyrus	44	-42	4	32	4.79	1722
Right superior frontal gyrus	6	26	6	68	4.75	78
Right precentral gyrus	4a	40	-14	48	4.52	129
Right inferior frontal gyrus	45	56	34	8	4.30	22
Right precuneus	7	26	-60	24	4.19	27
Right precentral gyrus	44	52	10	44	4.18	55
PICTURE-WORD UNRELATED > PICTURE-WORD RELATED (EXCL. MASKED WITH PICTURE-NONWORD)						
Right inferior frontal gyrus	45	44	18	8	4.22	27
COMMON AREAS OF ACTIVATION: [PICTURE-WORD UNRELATED + WORD-WORD UNRELATED] > [PICTURE-WORD RELATED + WORD-WORD RELATED]; INCL. MASKED WITH [PICTURE-WORD UNRELATED > RELATED] & [WORD-WORD UNRELATED > RELATED]						
Right inferior frontal gyrus	45	44	18	8	4.95	539
Left medial frontal gyrus	9	-16	32	30	4.87	407
Left inferior parietal lobule	40	-38	-34	32	4.41	55
Right fusiform gyrus	20	42	-34	-16	4.38	28

1							
2							
3	Left superior temporal gyrus	22	-32	-54	18	4.36	94
4							
5	Right inferior frontal gyrus	44, 45	54	18	32	4.36	64
6							
7							
8	Right middle temporal gyrus	21	44	-44	8	4.34	79
9							
10	Right middle frontal gyrus	9	40	38	38	4.31	39
11							
12	Right inferior frontal gyrus	9	32	2	32	4.11	30
13							
14							
15	Left caudate		-12	24	4	4.10	27
16							

Notes: Significance level and the size of the respective activation cluster (number of voxels) at $p < 0.05$, corrected. Coordinates are listed in MNI atlas space. BA is the Brodmann area nearest to the coordinate and should be considered approximate.