Influence of Vestibular Signals on Bodily Self- Consciousness: Different Sensory Weighting Strategies Based on Visual Dependency

Ege Tekgün [1], Burak Erdeniz [1] [1] Department of Psychology, İzmir University of Economics, İzmir, Turkey Contact: etekgun@gmail.com, burak.erdeniz@ieu.edu.tr

Introduction

Bodily self-consciousness (BSC) referred to the basic sense of the self resulting from integration of multisensory bodily inputs which is investigated by full-body illusion (FBI) (Blanke, 2012). Similarly, verticality perception requires the process of sensory weighting and integration of vestibular, somatosensory, and visual signals (Lopez et al., 2011). To study verticality perception, people are asked to orient a line embedded in a tilted frame with respect to gravity – Rod and Frame Task (RFT) (Witkin & Asch, 1948). People with greater deviations are classified as visual field-dependent and those with smaller deviations are classified as visual field-independent.

We hypothesized that FD participants will make fewer errors in their verticality judgments after synchronous visuo-tactile stimulation in FBI which might be considered as illusory change in perceived self-orientation and thus they will experience a stronger FBI.



Methodology

- A total of 52 volunteers (21 male, 31 female) of İzmir University of Economics with a mean age of 24 (SD = 4.33) participated.
- A mixed-subject experiment was designed by including visuotactile stimulus (Synchronous vs. Asynchronous), visual field dependency (FD vs. FI) as between-subject factors and RFT condition (pre-FBI supine vs. post-FBI supine) as a within subject factor.

Results

 \succ The hierarchical cluster analysis revealed a group of 24 visual FD participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mean value of subjective visual Vertical = 14.48, SE = 1.08) and a group of 28 visual FI participants (mea value of subjective visual vertical = 4.55, SE = .36).

• There was a significant main effect of visuotactile stimulus for ownership (Q1), F(1,48) =9.10, p = .004, partial $\eta 2 = .159$, self-location (Q2), F(1,48) = 6.64, p = .013, partial $\eta 2 =$.112, orientation perception (Q4), F(1,48) =5.79, p = .020, $\eta 2 = .108$.





Conclusion and Discussion

✓ Our study introduced RFT as a new implicit measure of FBI. The results of our study suggest that FD participants are more prone to synchronous/asynchronous stimulation manipulations, and that they might utilize different sensory weighting strategies on body ownership, self-location, and orientation perception.

Altough the study include visuo-vestibular conflict, one should be cautious in interpreting the contribution of the vestibular system because of the the possibility of the involvement of somatosensory and proprioceptive signals.



References





• Blanke, O. (2012). Multisensory brain mechanisms of bodily selfconsciousness. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 13(8), 556-571.

• Lopez, C., Lacour, M., Magnan, J., & Borel, L. (2006). Visual field dependence-independence before and after unilateral vestibular loss. Neuroreport, 17(8), 797-803.

• Witkin, H.A., & Asch, S.E. (1948). Studies in space orientation. IV. Further experiments on perception of the upright with displaced visual fields. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 38(6), 762.