Neurobiology of Learning and Memory 139 (2017) 22–27

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Neurobiology of Learning and Memory

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ynlme

Preliminary evidence for a role of the personality trait in visual perceptual learning

Mingxia Zhang [a,b,1,*], Jiangbo Tu [a,1], Bo Dong [a,d], Chuansheng Chen [c], Min Bao [a,*]

[a] CAS Key Laboratory of Behavioral Science, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China
[b] National Key Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience and Learning, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China
[c] Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA
[d] University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 7 September 2016
Revised 2 December 2016
Accepted 13 December 2016
Available online 18 December 2016

Keywords:
Reinforcement
Monetary incentive
Visual perceptual learning
Harm avoidance
Reward dependence

ABSTRACT

Recent research has shown that reinforcement can facilitate visual perceptual learning (VPL), but no study has examined the relations between individual differences in reinforcement sensitivity and VPL. This study tested the hypothesis that when monetary incentive was involved, the personality traits of harm avoidance and reward dependence (HA and RD, two measures of reinforcement sensitivity) would be linked to VPL performance. We trained two groups of subjects with a visual motion direction discrimination task for six days. The experimental group received monetary incentive feedback, whereas the control group received non-monetary feedback. As expected, the score of HA was negatively correlated with VPL for the experimental group, but not for the control group. RD was not a significant predictor. These results were discussed in terms of the role of non-perceptual factors such as reinforcement, personality, higher cognition, and motivation in VPL.

1. Introduction

Organisms have an innate drive to maximize reward and minimize punishment (Daw & Frank, 2009). Therefore, reward and punishment can be used to reinforce learning. For decades, it has been generally assumed that the effects of reinforcement are limited to behavioral learning (Martin, 1963; Sigmund, Hauert, & Nowak, 2001; Stephens, 1933) and would not be relevant to visual perceptual learning (VPL) because VPL involves only the early stage of visual processing as shown in its specificity to the training location, feature, and eye (Bao, Yang, Rios, He, & Engel, 2010; Fahle & Morgan, 1996; Furmanski & Engel, 2000; Karni & Sagi, 1991; Pourtois, Rauss, Vuilleumier, & Schwartz, 2008; Schoups, Vogels, & Orban, 1995; Shiu & Pashler, 1992). Recent models, however, have suggested that VPL also depends on the modulation of later stages of processing (Bejjanki, Beck, Lu, & Pouget, 2011; Dosher, Jeter, Liu, & Lu, 2013; Petrov, Dosher, & Lu, 2005; Sasaki, Nanez, & Watanabe, 2010; Watanabe & Sasaki, 2015; Xiao et al., 2008; Yotsumoto & Watanabe, 2008; Zhang et al., 2010). For example, the reweighting model assumes that VPL occurs in the change of *read-out* connections to the decision unit (Bejjanki et al., 2011; Dosher et al., 2013; Petrov et al., 2005). In consistent with this idea, neuroimaging studies have revealed that VPL involves higher decision-making brain regions (e.g., lateral intraparietal area and medial frontal cortex), suggesting the involvement of reinforcement learning in some VPL tasks (Kahnt, Grueschow, Speck, & Haynes, 2011; Law & Gold, 2009).

Indeed several studies have provided evidence for a role of reinforcement in VPL (Franko, Seitz, & Vogels, 2010; Seitz, Kim, & Watanabe, 2009; Seitz & Watanabe, 2003; Xue, Zhou, & Li, 2015). For example, participants deprived of food and water showed improved VPL for the trained stimuli paired with the liquid rewards (Seitz et al., 2009). Money, the typical reinforcement for human beings, has also been found to influence VPL with higher monetary reward leading to better VPL performance (Weil et al., 2010; Xue et al., 2015). Weil et al. (2010) further reported that monetary feedback increased brain activity in reward related areas (e.g. the striatum and frontal cortex). Moreover, monetary reinforcement has been shown to affect somatosensory processing, with bigger monetary feedback resulting in better performance and stronger brain activations compared to smaller monetary or performance (non-monetary) feedback (Pleger, Blankenburg, Ruff, Driver, & Dolan, 2008; Pleger et al., 2009). It is speculated that money (and other forms of reinforcement) triggers the reinforcement signals in the higher-level system, which then makes the sensory system more sensitive to stimuli and facilitates sensory

---

* Corresponding authors at: CAS Key Laboratory of Behavioral Science, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China (M. Zhang).

E-mail addresses: zhangmx@psych.ac.cn (M. Zhang), baom@psych.ac.cn (M. Bao).

[1] These two authors contributed equally.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2016.12.009
1074-7427/© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

learning (Sasaki et al., 2010; Seitz & Watanabe, 2005; Shibata, Sagi, & Watanabe, 2014; Watanabe & Sasaki, 2015). This speculation is supported by neuroimaging evidence of reinforcement-modulated activation in the visual cortex (Arsenault, Nelissen, Jarraya, & Vanduffel, 2013; Noudoost & Moore, 2011; Serences, 2008; Zaldivar, Rauch, Whittingstall, Logothetis, & Goense, 2014).

However, individuals vary in their sensitivity to reinforcement in the environment (Elliot, 2008). This raises a question: Does the effect of reinforcement in VPL vary across individuals? The traits of reinforcement sensitivity can be measured by two dimensions of the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) (Cloninger, Przybeck, Svrakic, & Wetzel, 1994). Harm avoidance (HA) represents behavioral inhibition in response to signals of punishment and reward dependence (RD) describes the importance of reward in behavioral maintenance. HA and RD have been found to be related to reinforcement learning in educational and industrial psychology (Elliot & McGregor, 1999; Elliot & Sheldon, 1997; Joyce et al., 2007; Pessoa, 2009; Roskes, Elliot, Nijstad, & De Dreu, 2013; Van Dijk, Seger-Guttmann, & Heller, 2013).

The traits of reinforcement sensitivity have been associated with cognitive control and decision-making and their underlying brain regions such as the frontal cortex and insula (Cohen, Schoene-Bake, Elger, & Weber, 2009; Gardini, Cloninger, & Venneri, 2009; Paulus, Rogalsky, Simmons, Feinstein, & Stein, 2003). Despite the strong evidence that reinforcement affects VPL and individuals vary in reinforcement sensitivity with consequences for learning performance, no study thus far has examined the role of reinforcement sensitivity in VPL. A study of the relationship between the personality traits of reinforcement sensitivity and VPL performance can further our understanding of VPL and its modeling. For example, its results could indicate whether VPL depends only on the early visual cortex or on both low- and high-level systems and whether VPL models need to include "soft wired" factors such as motivational and personal factors.

In the current study, we trained two groups of subjects with a visual motion direction discrimination task for six days. The experimental group received performance-dependent monetary incentive. To examine whether reinforcement sensitivity was particularly relevant to VPL when monetary incentive was involved, the control group received non-monetary feedback. The personality traits of HA and RD were measured with TCI (Cloninger et al., 1994). Based on the literature review described above, we hypothesized that (1) the monetary group would show better VPL performance than the non-monetary group because of the reinforcement value of money; (2) the personality trait of RD would be positively related to VPL performance because high RD individuals would be more sensitive to the reward in the task (i.e., triggering more activations in higher-level areas and releasing stronger reward signals, which could facilitate VPL (Seitz et al., 2009; Xue et al., 2015)); (3) the personality trait of HA would be negatively related to VPL performance because high HA individuals are sensitive to punishment (i.e., showing higher anxiety, fear and stress and reducing the activations of higher-level areas which would have a negative effect on learning (Bishop, Duncan, Brett, & Lawrence, 2004; Hare et al., 2008; Hermann et al., 2007)); and (4) the associations between personality traits and VPL performance would be stronger for the monetary condition than the non-monetary condition, again because of the reinforcement value of money.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

Eighty healthy college students were recruited in this study and seventy-four of them completed the whole experimental procedure. One subject was removed from analysis because of the strongly deviant questionnaire score (more than three standard deviations from the group mean). The remaining seventy-three subjects were randomly assigned to two groups: the experimental group (monetary group, n = 40, 42.5% female, mean age = 22.9 - years, SD = 2.6) and the control group (non-monetary group, n = 33, 51.5% females, mean age = 23.4 years, SD = 2.7). All subjects were naive to visual perceptual learning. They had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and reported no history of neurological problems. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects. Experimental procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

2.2. Questionnaire

Reinforcement sensitivity was assessed using two dimensions (HA and RD) of the revised version of the Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI-R) (Cloninger, 1987; Cloninger et al., 1994). HA included four subscales: anticipatory worry &pessimism vs. uninhibited optimism (HA1, 11 items), fear of uncertainty (HA2, 7 items), shyness with strangers (HA3, 7 items), and fatigability & asthenia (HA4, 8 items). RD also included four subscales: sentimentality (RD1, 8 items), openness to warm communication vs aloofness (RD2, 10 items), attachment (RD3, 6 items), and dependence (RD4, 6 items).

2.3. Stimuli and apparatus

We used a classic visual motion direction discrimination task (Ball & Sekuler, 1982, 1987; Chen et al., 2015), in which two random-dot kinematograms (RDKs) were presented at fovea location (stimuli duration: 200 ms; interval duration: 600 ms). In each RDK, 400 black dots moved in the same direction within an 8° aperture on a gray background (dot diameter: 0.1°; speed: 10°/s). Subjects were asked to judge the direction of the second RDK relative to the first one (clockwise or counter-clockwise). Stimuli were presented on a gamma-corrected CRT monitor (1024 × 768 resolution at 85 Hz). Subjects viewed the stimuli from a distance of 57 cm. Their head position was stabilized using a head and chin rest. The monitor's mean luminance was 59 cd/m^2. Throughout the experiment, subjects were asked to fixate on a small black circle presented at the center of the visual stimuli (also the center of the monitor).

2.4. Procedure

Subjects first completed the TCI subscales mentioned before, followed by a pretest and six daily training sessions. In the pretest, all subjects performed the same motion direction discrimination task without any feedback (as the baseline). Each subject was randomly assigned two directions chosen from four directions: 22.5°, 67.5°, 292.5° and 337.5° (reference directions, 0° was the vertical direction in upper visual field and all four directions were in the upper visual field). The pretest included 12 blocks of 68 trials for each direction. In each trial, two displays of RDKs, with one in the reference direction and the other in the test direction (reference direction ± offset direction), were separated by an interval. The offset direction in each trial was manipulated under a 2-down-1-up staircase rule. In total, 45 levels of offset direction were predetermined for later use in the staircase. These levels increased logarithmically from 0.3° to 20° (the greater the level, the bigger the offset direction, the easier the trial). The starting offset direction for each staircase was 2.5 times the expected threshold based on the results from a pilot testing. The initial step size for the staircase was 3 levels, and then decreased to 1 level after 3 reversals.