UNIVERSITÉ Concordia

Introduction

- Motor skill acquisition can be thought to involve distinct behavioural components such as accuracy and synchronization. In addition, encoding processes such as motor consolidation may facilitate performance gains overtime.
- Accuracy refers to the ability to make a "correct" response, whereas synchronization refers to being able to time a response.
- Improved accuracy has been associated with increased activity in the hippocampus, putamen, and frontal regions, whereas improved synchronization has been associated with activity in the primary motor cortex and cerebellum (Steele & Penhune, 2010).
- Consolidation refers to processes that "fix" a motor skill in memory following a period of practice (Krakauer & Shadmehr, 2006). Consolidation is usually defined as improvement in performance between the last block of training on Day 1, and the first block of training on Day 2.
- Sleep between Day 1 and Day 2 may affect consolidation (Brawn, Nusbaum, & Margoliash, 2010; Hall, 2010; Morgan, Kehne, Sprenger, & Malison, 2010).
- The type of task may affect consolidation (Robertson, Pascual-Leone, & Miall, 2004).

Objectives

• The current study aims to:

- Examine differences in improvement between accuracy and synchronization.
- Test for consolidation between Day 1 and Day 2 on both accuracy and synchronization using the MFST (or Multiple Finger Sequence Task).



Hypotheses

- For measures of accuracy and synchronization, participants were expected to show:
- Improved performance for a **repeating sequence**, but not for **non-repeated** sequences.
- Consolidation for a **repeating sequence**, but not for **non-repeated** sequences.

Multiple Components of Motor Sequence Learning Dilini K. Sumanapala, Christopher J. Steele, & Virginia B. Penhune CRDH and The Department of Psychology, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

Method

Participants

- **13** neurologically healthy individuals; **8** female, **5** male
- Aged between 18 35 years (M = 22.53, SD = 3.41)
- Right-handed
- Non-musicians

Procedure

- Each block of the **MFST** consists of **14** trials:
- Learning trials: fixed, repeating sequence of 13 elements (10 presentations)
- **Random** trials: variable, random sequence of 13 elements (4 presentations),
- but matched for transitions between fingers.
- The presentation of these trials is randomized within each block.

Results





- Main effect of Sequence Type. F(1, 12) = 54.46, $p < .01^{**}$, $\eta_p 2 = .819$
- Main effect of Block. F(11, 132) = 18.36, p < $.01^{**}$, $\eta_p 2$ = .605
- Statistically significant interaction between Sequence Type and Block.
- $F(11, 132) = 7.747, p < .01^{**}, \eta_p 2 = .392$

Consolidation on Accuracy and Synchronization between end of Day 1 and start of Day 2 Dotted line between Block 6 and Block 7 indicates separation between days.



• Main effect of Sequence Type. F(1, 12) = 44.55, $p < .01^{**}$, $\eta_p 2 = .788$ • Main effect of Block. F(1, 12) = 25.69, $p < .01^{**}$, $\eta_p 2 = .682$



• Main effect of Sequence Type. F(1, 12) = 12.52, $p < .01^{**}$, $\eta_p 2 = .511$ • Statistically significant interaction between Sequence Type and Block. $F(11, 132) = 3.761, p < .05^*, \eta_p 2 = .239$

• No statistically significant main or interaction effects.

- learning.



Conclusions

• Overall, improvement in accuracy for the single, repeating sequence was greater than for the **non-repeating**, **random** sequences.

• Improvements in accuracy on random sequences may be related to general task features, such as spatial relationships and overall timing.

Synchronization on random sequences appeared to worsen on Day 2. This worsening may be related to a learned expectation of the repeating sequence interfering with performance.

There was no evidence for sequence-specific consolidation on accuracy or synchronization measures.

• Lack of consolidation may be related to high task difficulty and order of practice patterns (repeating vs. non-repeating sequences).

Divergent patterns of improvement between accuracy and synchronization support the idea that separate components of motor learning may be regulated by different neural and cognitive processes.

 Future studies examining other behavioural components (such as velocity and duration) may provide further insights into the nature of motor sequence

References

• Brawn, T. P., Nusbaum, H. C., & Margoliash, D. (2010). Sleep-dependent consolidation of auditory discrimination learning in adult starlings. The Journal of Neuroscience, 30(2), 609-613. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4237-09.2010

• Hall, J. M. (2010). Memory encoding and sleep-dependent consolidation during sleep restriction with and without pharmacologically enhanced slow wave sleep (ProQuest Information & Learning). Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 70(10-). (2010-99080-522)

• Morgan, P. T., Kehne, J. H., Sprenger, K. J., & Malison, R. T. (2010). Retrograde effects of triazolam and zolpidem on sleep-dependent motor learning in humans. Journal of Sleep Research, 19(1), 157-164. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2869.2009.00757.x

• Robertson, E. M., Pascual-Leone, A., & Miall, R. C. (2004). Current concepts in procedural consolidation. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 5(7), 576-582. doi:10.1038/nrn1426

• Steele, C. J., & Penhune, V. B. (2010). Specific increases within global decreases: A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of five days of motor sequence learning. The Journal of Neuroscience, 30(24), 8332-8341. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5569-09.2010

Contact

Dilini Sumanapala Department of Psychology, Concordia University dilini.sumanapala@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

Fonds de la recherche en santé Duébec 🔹 🔹