


Provided for non-commercial research and education use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.


In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Neuroscience Letters

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

Natural split-brain? Lateralized memory for task contingencies in pigeons

Qian Xiao^{a,*}, Onur Güntürkün^b^a Department of Psychology, Queen's University, 62 Arch Street, Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6, Canada^b Department of Biopsychology, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, Faculty of Psychology, Ruhr University Bochum, 44780, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 January 2009

Received in revised form 3 April 2009

Accepted 15 April 2009

Keywords:

Lateralization

Interhemispheric transfer

Motion aftereffect

Bird

ABSTRACT

The motion aftereffect (MAE) is an illusory motion in the opposite direction after the sudden halt of a prolonged visual moving stimulus. Birds could perceive the MAE as humans and other mammals. The present study was to investigate whether hemispheric asymmetries of visual processes affect this illusion. To this end, pigeons were trained to discriminate grating patterns which moved up, or down or stood still. The transfer tests were conducted under the binocular or monocular viewing condition. The choice behaviors of pigeons under the binocular and right-eye viewing condition (left hemisphere) were highly indicative for the perception of a MAE. However, the animals under the left-eye viewing condition (right hemisphere) did not change their choice patterns according to the different task displayed on the central stimulus key, but always stuck to the default option of pecking the response key ipsilateral to the open eye. We assume that memory for task contingencies were confined to the left hemisphere and could not be reached by the right half brain due to the absence of the corpus callosum.

© 2009 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

Functional asymmetries of the visual system have been investigated in many species, especially in humans [2,32,35]. As a “natural split-brain” model, unihemispheric behavioral tests can be easily done in birds using eye caps since the optic nerves cross completely and the corpus callosum connecting both hemispheres is absent [39]. A large number of studies have revealed functional asymmetries of the avian visual system that the left hemisphere is superior in discriminating visual features and the right hemisphere has an advantage in relational spatial orientation (pigeon: [21,22,36]; chick: [24,29,33,34]; marsh tit: [4,5]; zebra finch: [1]; quail: [15]).

Asymmetries in the perception of illusory stimuli were first observed in patients with unilateral brain lesions and gradually attracted more research interest [3,11–13,18,23,25]. Several studies have indicated that birds can perceive optic illusions in a similar fashion as humans and other mammals (Ponzo illusion: [8]; geometric illusions: [16]; Mueller-Lyer illusion: [19]; MAE: [40]; amodal completion: [26]). However, few experiments have been conducted in birds to investigate whether there is a functional asymmetry for the illusion perception [16,26] and their underlying neural mechanism. Moreover, these studies were limited to static illusions but not moving one which represents a special class of illusory stimuli. Probably, the most prominent movement illusion is the motion aftereffect (MAE) or waterfall illusion which refers to

the illusory motion in the opposite direction after the sudden halt of a prolonged visual movement stimulus. Our behavioral experiment proved that pigeons can perceive a MAE [40]. The aim of the present study was to investigate whether there was a hemispheric asymmetry for this illusion in birds.

Four female and four male adult pigeons (*Columbia livia*) with body weights of 480–570 g were employed in the experiment. These animals were previously used to analyze the MAE [40]. The guidelines regarding the care and use of animals established by the Society of Neuroscience were applied. All animals were maintained at about 80% of their free feeding weights. They were trained and tested in a cubic aluminium box (34 × 34 × 34 cm). Four pecking keys (5 × 5 cm) were arranged like an inverted “T” on the frontal panel (Fig. 1). The moving and stationary stimuli that the birds had to discriminate were only presented on the central bottom stimulus key which was located 18 cm above the floor. Three other response keys were located on either side and directly above the stimulus key at distances of 2 cm from each other. Three response keys were illuminated red (left), yellow (top) and green (right) throughout training and testing periods. One white house-light was located in the ceiling of the chamber at a distance of 30 cm from the frontal panel. The feeder was located 12 cm below the stimulus key and 6 cm above the floor. A white feeder-light was placed 4 cm above it. The visual stimuli were produced by a computer and displayed on a monitor (HP 1530, TFT Flat Panel Display) mounted behind the back of the frontal panel. The apparatus was controlled by an IO interface with 8 outputs and 12 inputs from Frank Buschmann International Corporation via a computer. Normally, pigeons scrutinized pecking

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: qian.xiao@queensu.ca (Q. Xiao).




Fig. 1. Experimental setup for the training (A) and transfer test (B). During training and transfer test, each trial consisted of three phases. Two successive visual stimuli were shown on the central stimulus key during the transition from the adaptation phase to the response phase. A series of pecks on the stimulus key during 30 s of the adaptation phase activated three response keys illuminated with different colour. And then the pigeons had to peck one of response keys according to the displayed stimulus during the 3 s of response phase (static grating = yellow top key; downward moving grating = red left key; upward moving grating = green right key). Two illusion-inducing stimulus sequences were only used in the transfer test (B), in which a moving pattern (upward or downward) during the adaptation phase was followed by a static pattern during the subsequent response phase. If a MAE occurs, the animals should perceive the static pattern moving in the opposite direction to the movement one. The correct peck was rewarded with 3 s food. Incorrect choice was punished with 5 s time-out. Each trial was followed by 20 s ITI (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of the article).

keys from a distance of 55 mm (as measured from the center of two eyes) before pecking them [10]. The visual stimulus was a grating pattern consisted of black and white stripes of equal-widths with a spatial frequency of 0.12cycles/° and the motion speed was 40°/s. This pattern moved upward, downward or stood still.

In the training period, all birds were initially trained under the binocular viewing condition to correctly peck the central stimulus key at least 30 times within 30 s (Fig. 1A). This paradigm ensured sufficient exposure time to one of three visual stimuli (static grating, upward moving grating and downward moving grating) in the adaptation phase. The pecking counter and the timer started from the first correct peck onto the stimulus key. Subsequently, 3 s response phase started with a static, or a downward moving or an upward moving grating displayed on the central key. But a moving pattern during the adaptation phase was never followed by a static pattern during the response phase because such sequence might induce an illusory movement into the opposite direction. Therefore, it was only used at the illusion test trials (Fig. 1B). The response phase was also characterized by the activation of three differently coloured response keys surrounding the central stimulus key. It is important to stress that the pigeons were trained to peck one of response keys according to the stimulus displayed during the 3 s of the response phase (static grating pattern = yellow top key; downward movement = red left key; upward movement = green right key). If the birds pecked correctly, they were rewarded with 3 s

access to food. Otherwise, they were punished with 5 s of darkness. A 20 s inter-trial interval started after the response phase. Each training session included 70 normal trials with feedback (10 trials for each stimulus combination).

The pigeons were trained binocularly until the correct discrimination ratios for the task reached at least 85% in three consecutive days. In parallel, they were accustomed to wearing eye caps in the home cages. Subsequently, 10 sessions of monocular training for each eye were given before the first transfer test, with which the birds gradually adapted themselves to do the task with one eye in the chamber. No learning criterion was applied for these monocular training sessions.

In the testing period, each session included 70 normal trials with feedback as the training session. In addition, 6 randomly interspersed illusion test trials without feedback were given. These test trials consisted of three different stimulus sequences with each type being shown twice (adaptation phase followed by response phase: static–static; moving up–static; moving down–static; Fig. 1B). If a MAE occurs, the animals should perceive the static pattern in the response phase moving in the opposite direction compared to the movement pattern in the adaptation phase. Therefore, their choices of the response key should indicate this illusory perception. For example, a choice of the green right response key indicating upward movement after viewing the sequence “downward (30 s, adaptation phase) – static (3 s, response phase)” would be an indicator of perceiving a MAE. However, if the animals would peck the yellow top key (= ‘I saw a static pattern’), they probably did not perceive a MAE and responded only according to what was indeed displayed. Pecking the red left response key (= ‘I saw a downward movement’) signalled that the animals reported the stimulus displayed at the first 30 s and would not indicate a MAE. Each bird was alternatively tested under the binocular, left-eye or right-eye viewing condition every two days. Test sessions continued until 10 effective test trials were collected for each illusion-inducing stimulus sequence under three viewing conditions. A test trial was deemed ineffective if animals did not immediately switch to the activated response keys during the response phase.

All pigeons successfully learned the task under the binocular viewing condition, albeit with individual differences in their acquisition speed. Totally, they needed 50–90 sessions (71.25 ± 13.04 , mean \pm S.D.) before the correct discrimination ratios reached at least 85% in three consecutive days. In the subsequent monocular training, the birds were trained for 10 sessions (700 trials) in each eye condition. No test trials for MAE were used in these sessions and the animals did not need to reach a learning criterion. But the average performance levels of eight pigeons at the last session were 39.6% for left-eye, 54% for right-eye and 87.5% for the binocular viewing condition.

For the transfer tests under the monocular viewing condition, pecking ratios on the top (yellow) response key were significantly lower than that on the left and the right response keys ($p < 0.001$, χ^2 test). The static stimulus sequence (30 s of static pattern during the adaptation phase + 3 s of static pattern during the response phase) was only used as a control to ensure that animals were not affected by the absence of the feedback in transfer tests. Therefore, the further analysis was only conducted on pecking responses of the left and right response keys for two stimulus sequences (30 s of grating moving downward + 3 s of static pattern, 30 s of grating moving upward + 3 s of static pattern). Pecking ratios on the ipsilateral and the contralateral response key to the exposed eye showed a significant difference ($F(1, 63) = 42.58$, $p < 0.001$, One Way Analysis of Variance). And birds pecked the ipsilateral key more often than the contralateral one ($t_{62} = 13.911$, $p < 0.001$). Between two monocular viewing conditions, the left-eye exposed birds were more likely to peck the ipsilateral left response key than the contralateral right one ($t_{30} = 4.072$, $p < 0.001$) no matter what stimulus was shown on




Fig. 2. Responses towards the ipsilateral response key (A) and illusory perception (B). Left-eye viewing pigeons significantly preferred to peck the left response key ipsilateral to the open eye regardless of the displayed visual stimuli. But for the right-eye condition, the choice patterns toward ipsilateral and contralateral keys were balanced except pigeon 750 and 753 (A). Since no evidence of perceiving a MAE with the left-eye could be collected, only the illusion-guided responses of the right-eye viewing birds were shown with their performance under the binocular viewing condition (B). down: downward moving grating; up: upward; left: left-eye viewing condition; right: right-eye viewing condition; binocular: binocular viewing condition.

the central stimulus key ($H=0.238$, $p=0.721$, Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance) (Fig. 2A). This is exemplified by looking at the choice patterns: the pecking ratios on the left response key were 0.95 ± 0.06 (\pm S.D., $n=10$) and 0.94 ± 0.06 (\pm S.D., $n=10$) for grating moving downward and upward. Therefore, no evidence for perceiving a MAE with the left-eye could be collected.

The further analysis was done for “illusion” responses under the right-eye and binocular viewing conditions (Fig. 2B). On average, the “illusion” response ratios for two moving stimuli were 62.9% (downward) and 58.8% (upward) under the binocular viewing condition. These two visual stimuli contributed equally to induce a MAE ($F(1, 14)=0.12$, $p=0.75$). Under the right-eye viewing condition, some birds still preferred to peck the ipsilateral right response key as a default option (752 and 753). Thus, an unequal contribution to induce a MAE was shown between two moving stimuli ($F(1, 14)=13.715$, $p=0.002$). As described earlier, the correct response key signalling an “illusion” for the downward stimulus was on the right side which was also the ipsilateral response key to the exposed right-eye. Therefore, the grating moving downward seemingly induced a stronger MAE ($t_7=2.773$, $p=0.028$, paired t -test) with the right-eye. On the contrary, the birds had to peck the contralateral left response key to indicate a MAE for the grating moving upward. In general, the “illusion” responses were lower than that without eye caps ($t_7=-2.693$, $p=0.031$, paired t -test). But there were still two birds (739 and 746) whose “illusion” responses between the right-eye and binocular viewing condition were not significantly different ($p=0.78$, χ^2 test). The data clearly indicated that some birds with the right-eye exposure not only per-

ceived a MAE but also gave the correct responses according to the task contingencies learned in the training sessions although it was impossible for them with their left-eye.

Under the binocular viewing condition, pigeons do perceive a MAE [40]. This was now replicated in the present experiment. Additionally, the animals clearly evinced a MAE for two movement stimuli with the right-eye but not with the left-eye. At the first glance, our data could be interpreted as indicating a functional asymmetry for the perception of a MAE as previously reported using static illusions in birds [16,26]. However, this explanation would not explain the observations of the present experiment properly. The most striking result was that the left-eye viewing birds consistently pecked the left response key ipsilateral to the open eye as a default option. It was unlikely that these different behavioral responses under the monocular viewing condition resulted from the perceptual limitation between the two eyes because several studies could show that pigeons can master much more complex discrimination tasks with the left-eye [17,20,22,27,41]. Thus, one possible reason was that the left-eye viewing animals could not access the task contingencies which could be only used by the right-eye (left hemisphere).

A comparable observation was published by Nottelmann et al. [21]. In this experiment, the pigeons were always faced with two identical patterns arranged vertically. They had to peck the lower or the upper stimulus depending on the patterns being symmetrical or asymmetrical. Thus, the birds had to associate a visual feature with one of two motor alternatives. After six months of intense binocular training, the pigeons learned the task to criterion. Under the subsequent monocular condition, most animals could reach a high performance level with the right-eye, but completely failed with the left one. The authors assumed that under the binocular conditions their animals had initially learned the task only with the left hemisphere and the task contingencies were unable to be transferred to the right hemisphere. As a consequence, the right hemisphere (left-eye) was naive concerning the task procedure.

If the memory for task contingencies is primarily stored within the left hemisphere, why can't the birds access these unihemispheric memories in the monocular tests? In humans and other mammals, there is also evidence for a unilaterality of memory traces, but the read-out of this information from the contralateral hemisphere is efficiently achieved through the corpus callosum [6,7,9]. The absence of a corpus callosum in birds probably decreases this kind of interhemispheric access, which might result in a unilaterality of task knowledge [28,31].

The evidences for successful and failed interhemispheric transfer have been observed with diverse training conditions in pigeons [14,37,38]. In these studies, the proximity of the discriminative stimulus and the response key emerged as the most critical variable. When these two cues were spatially separated, the animals failed to transfer what they had learned with one hemisphere to another one. But they showed excellent interhemispheric transfer of learning when the stimulus and response keys were identical. The salient difference between these two training paradigms was whether the pigeons were required to integrate the visual signal with a motor response at the same locus or not. Our results also matched with these studies that the separate stimulus locus (central stimulus key) and response locus (response keys) resulted in inability of transferring the relevant contingencies from the left hemisphere (right-eye) to the right one (left-eye).

There is no conflict between these two interpretations for the impaired performance of interhemispheric transfer of learning. While Nottelmann et al. [21] argued that the lack of an interhemispheric transfer is due to the absence of a corpus callosum in birds, Watanabe and co-workers [28,37,38] identified that the task conditions could enable or hinder the transfer. Actually, both discussed that some task memory cannot be properly transferred between

two hemispheres. But the reason behind these phenomena is probably due to the absence of a corpus callosum in birds. Indeed, the studies on the split-brain patients whose corpus callosum was completely severed also indicated that simple categorical information can be transferred between two hemispheres but not more elaborate declarative knowledge [30]. In this respect, the pigeon indeed represents a “natural split-brain” model. The combination of asymmetrical visual system and reduced capability of interhemispheric transfer creates conditions of unihemispheric memory for task contingencies.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. Barrie J. Frost at the Queen's University for critically reading this manuscript. This work was supported by a grant of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Alfried Krupp zu Bohlen und Halbach Stiftung.

References

- [1] Y. Alonso, Lateralization of visual guided behavior during feeding in zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*), *Behav. Process.* 43 (1998) 257–263.
- [2] R.J. Andrew, J. Mench, C. Rainey, in: D.J. Ingle, M.A. Goodale, R.J.W. Mansfield (Eds.), *Right-left asymmetry of response to visual stimuli in the domestic chick. Advances in the Analysis of Visual Behavior*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 97–209.
- [3] A. Basso, E. Bisiach, P. Faglioni, The Mueller-Lyer illusion in patients with unilateral brain damage, *Cortex* 10 (1974) 26–35.
- [4] N.S. Clayton, J.R. Krebs, Lateralization and unilateral transfer of spatial memory in marsh tits: are two eyes better than one? *J. Comp. Physiol. A* 174 (1994) 769–773.
- [5] N.S. Clayton, J.R. Krebs, Lateralization in Paridae: comparison of a storing and a non-storing species on a one-trial associative memory task, *J. Comp. Physiol. A* 171 (1992) 779–806.
- [6] R.W. Doty, R. Fei, S. Hu, V. Kavcic, Long-term reversal of hemispheric specialization for visual memory in a split-brain macaque, *Behav. Brain Res.* 102 (1999) 99–113.
- [7] R.W. Doty, J.L. Ringo, J.D. Lewine, Interhemispheric sharing of visual memory in macaques, *Behav. Brain Res.* 64 (1994) 79–84.
- [8] K. Fujita, D.S. Blough, P.M. Blough, Pigeons see the Ponzo illusion, *Anim. Learn. Behav.* 19 (1991) 283–293.
- [9] M.S. Gazzaniga, Forty-five years of split-brain research and still going strong, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 6 (2005) 653–659.
- [10] M.A. Goodale, Visually guided pecking in the pigeon (*Columba livia*), *Brain Behav. Evol.* 22 (1983) 22–41.
- [11] A. Grabowska, A. Nowicka, O. Szymańska, Sex related effect of unilateral brain lesions on the perception of the Mueller-Lyer illusion, *Cortex* 35 (1999) 231–241.
- [12] A. Grabowska, A. Nowicka, O. Szymańska, I. Szatkowska, Subjective contour illusion: sex-related effect of unilateral brain damage, *Neuroreport* 12 (2001) 2289–2292.
- [13] A. Grabowska, O. Szymanska, A. Nowicka, M. Kwiecein, The effect of unilateral brain lesions on perception of visual illusions, *Behav. Brain Res.* 47 (1992) 191–197.
- [14] L. Green, N. Brecha, M.S. Gazzaniga, Interocular transfer of simultaneous but not successive discriminations in the pigeon, *Anim. Learn. Behav.* 6 (1978) 261–264.
- [15] E. Gülbetekin, O. Güntürkün, S. Dural, H. Cetinkaya, Asymmetry of visually guided sexual behavior in adult Japanese quail (*Coturnix japonica*), *Laterality* 12 (2007) 321–331.
- [16] O. Güntürkün, Visual lateralization in birds: from neurotrophins to cognition? *Eur. J. Morphol.* 35 (1997) 290–302.
- [17] O. Güntürkün, U. Hahmann, Visual acuity and hemispheric asymmetries in pigeons, *Behav. Brain Res.* 60 (1994) 171–175.
- [18] N. Houliard, P. Fraise, H. Hécaen, Effects of unilateral hemispheric lesions on two types of optico-geometric illusions, *Cortex* 12 (1976) 232–240.
- [19] R.W. Malott, M.K. Malott, J. Pokrzywinski, The effects of outward-pointing arrowheads on the Mueller-Lyer illusion in pigeons, *Psychon. Sci.* 9 (1967) 55–56.
- [20] C. Martinoya, J. Le Houezec, S. Bloch, Depth resolution in the pigeon, *J. Comp. Physiol. A* 163 (1988) 33–42.
- [21] F. Nottelmann, A. Wohlschlager, O. Güntürkün, Unihemispheric memory in pigeons- knowledge, the left hemisphere is reluctant to share, *Behav. Brain Res.* 133 (2002) 309–315.
- [22] H. Prior, O. Güntürkün, Parallel working memory for spatial location and food-related object cues in foraging pigeons: binocular and lateralized monocular performance, *Learn. Mem.* 8 (2001) 44–51.
- [23] P.D. Radoeva, J.D. Cohen, P.M. Corballis, T.G. Lukovits, S.G. Koleva, Hemispheric asymmetry in dissociation between the visuomotor and visuo-perceptual streams, *Neuropsychologia* 43 (2005) 1763–1773.
- [24] N. Rashid, R.J. Andrew, Right hemisphere advantage for topographical orientation in the domestic chick, *Neuropsychologia* 27 (1989) 937–948.
- [25] S. Rasmjou, M. Hausmann, O. Güntürkün, Hemispheric dominance and gender in the perception of an illusion, *Neuropsychologia* 37 (1999) 1041–1047.
- [26] L. Regolin, F. Marconato, G. Vallortigara, Hemispheric differences in the recognition of partly occluded objects by newly hatched domestic chicks (*Gallus gallus*), *Anim. Cogn.* 7 (2004) 162–170.
- [27] M. Remy, J. Emmerton, Directional dependence of intraocular transfer of stimulus detection in pigeons (*Columba livia*), *Behav. Neurosci.* 105 (1991) 647–652.
- [28] M. Remy, S. Watanabe, Two eyes and one world: studies of interocular and intraocular transfer in birds, in: H.P. Zeigler, H.-J. Bischof (Eds.), *Vision, Brain and Behavior in Birds*, MIT, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 333–350.
- [29] L. Rogers, Behavioral, structural and neurochemical asymmetries in the avian brain: a model system for studying visual development and processing, *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 20 (1996) 487–503.
- [30] J. Sergent, Furtive incursions into bicameral minds. Integrative and coordinating role of subcortical structures, *Brain* 113 (1990) 537–568.
- [31] M. Skiba, B. Diekamp, H. Prior, O. Güntürkün, Lateralized interhemispheric transfer of color cues: evidence for dynamic coding principles of visual lateralization in pigeons, *Brain Lang* 73 (2000) 254–273.
- [32] A.W. Toga, P.M. Thompson, Mapping brain asymmetry, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 4 (2003) 37–48.
- [33] L. Tommasi, G. Vallortigara, Hemispheric processing of landmark and geometric information in male and female domestic chicks (*Gallus gallus*), *Behav. Brain Res.* 155 (2004) 85–96.
- [34] G. Vallortigara, L. Regolin, G. Bortolomio, L. Tommasi, Lateral asymmetries due to preferences in eye use during visual discrimination learning in chicks, *Behav. Brain Res.* 74 (1996) 135–143.
- [35] G. Vallortigara, L.J. Rogers, A. Bisazza, Possible evolutionary origins of cognitive brain lateralization, *Brain Res. Brain Res. Rev.* 30 (1999) 164–175.
- [36] L. von Fersen, O. Güntürkün, Visual memory lateralization in pigeons, *Neuropsychologia* 28 (1990) 1–7.
- [37] S. Watanabe, Interocular transfer of learning in the pigeon: visuo-motor integration and separation of discriminanda and manipulanda, *Behav. Brain Res.* 19 (1986) 227–232.
- [38] S. Watanabe, S. Weis, A lack of interocular transfer of spatial conditional discrimination in pigeons, *Behav. Brain Res.* 12 (1984) 65–68.
- [39] C. Weidner, J. Reperant, D. Miceli, M. Haby, J.P. Rio, An anatomical study of ipsilateral retinal projections in the quail using radioautographic, horseradish peroxidase, fluorescence and degeneration techniques, *Brain Res.* 340 (1985) 99–108.
- [40] Q. Xiao, O. Güntürkün, Do pigeons perceive the motion aftereffect? A behavioral study, *Behav. Brain Res.* 187 (2008) 327–333.
- [41] Y. Yamazaki, U. Aust, L. Huber, M. Hausmann, O. Güntürkün, Lateralized cognition: asymmetrical and complementary strategies of pigeons during discrimination of the “human concept”, *Cognition* 104 (2007) 315–344.