Arbitrary associations are flexibly remembered in the recollection network

Item and unit recognition rely on different memory signals

Parahippocampal cortex and medial PFC are associated with recognition of novel units

Is a novel conceptual unit more than the sum of its parts?: fMRI evidence from an associative
recognition memory study

Regine Bader^{a,b}, Bertram Opitz^c, Wolfgang Reith^d, Axel Mecklinger^a

^aExperimental Neuropsychology Unit, Department of Psychology, Saarland University, P.O.
Box 15 11 50, 66041 Saarbrücken, Germany

^b Department of Cognitive and Clinical Neuroscience, Central Institute of Mental Health,
Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Square J5, 68159 Mannheim, Germany

^cSchool of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK

^dDepartment of Neuroradiology, Saarland University Hospital, Kirrberger Straße, 66421
Homburg, Germany

Corresponding Author:
Regine Bader
Department of Cognitive and Clinical Neuroscience
Central Institute of Mental Health
Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University
Square J5
68159 Mannheim, Germany
phone: +49-621-1703-6303
fax: +49-621-1703-6305
regine.bader@zi-mannheim.de

Abstract

Recollection, an effortful process relying on the integrity of a brain network including the hippocampus, is generally required to remember arbitrary associations whereas a simple familiarity signal arising in the perirhinal cortex is sufficient to recognize single items. However, the integration of separate items into a single configuration (unitization) leads to reduced involvement of recollection and greater reliance on familiarity. This seems to imply that unitized associations are processed similar to single items. Here, using functional magnetic resonance imaging, we investigated the effects of unitization as encoding strategy on retrieval processes in a between-group-design. A definition was provided that allows combining two unrelated words into a novel conceptual unit (e.g., milk taxi = a delivery service, which is directly dispatched from a farm). We compared this to an encoding strategy in which the words were studied as parts of a sentence. We included pairs in reversed order at test because reversing a unitized word pair is assumed to disrupt the unit while leaving item familiarity for the single constituents intact. This enabled us to compare recognition memory for novel units and single items. Sentence encoding led to a flexible recruitment of brain areas previously associated with recollection, irrespective of the order of the test pair. Unitization encoding reduced the involvement of the recollection network and specifically engaged regions within the parahippocampal cortex and the medial prefrontal cortex for novel units. In contrast, recognition of reversed pairs involved activation of BA 45 in the left inferior frontal gyrus. This possibly suggests that familiarity for novel units and single items are associated with different brain networks.

Key words: recognition memory; familiarity; recollection; unitisation

1. Introduction

Imagine that you were unable to remember the associations between the persons, objects, and locations that make up specific episodes. The constant experience of your life would be an incoherent mixture of familiar and novel situations. The ability to remember associations is essential for episodic remembering. A means of investigating this ability is the associative recognition memory paradigm requiring participants to recognize a previously encountered specific association or combination of items. Essential to this paradigm is that participants have to discriminate between pairs reappearing in the same pairing as during study and new combinations of studied items, i.e. recombined pairs. Both types of pairs comprise constituents that were previously encountered and thus are equally familiar. Therefore, they can only be discriminated on the basis of associative information. According to traditional dual-process models of recognition memory (for a review see Yonelinas, 2002), an effortful recollection process is required to retrieve the link between distinct items, whereas a simple familiarity signal for studied items is sufficient in order to recognize single items. Neurocognitive models of recognition memory specify the brain regions supposedly being involved in recognition memory (Aggleton & Brown, 2006; Diana, Yonelinas, & Ranganath, 2007; Eichenbaum, Yonelinas, & Ranganath, 2007; Norman & O'Reilly, 2003; Skinner & Fernandes, 2007). The medial temporal lobes (MTL) are concordantly ascribed a key role in memory encoding and retrieval. In more detail, the hippocampus has been linked to recollection because it is able to create pattern-separated representations of to-be-associated items. By this, it establishes novel associations between items and contextual information and enables the retrieval of contextually rich memories. By contrast, familiarity has been associated with activity modulation in the perirhinal cortex (PrC), which is the anterior part of the MTL cortices (MTLC). It is assumed to deal with representations of individual stimuli by enhancing the relative sharpness of item representations (Norman & O'Reilly, 2003). In line with these models and the traditional view on associative memory, functional magnetic

1 resonance imaging (fMRI) studies have demonstrated enhanced hippocampal activity when
2 arbitrary associations are encoded (e.g., Davachi & Wagner, 2002; Park & Rugg, 2008;
3 Staresina & Davachi, 2006) and retrieved (Giovanello, Schnyer, & Verfaellie, 2004, 2009).
4
5 Moreover, patients with lesions limited to the hippocampus and spared PrC have been found
6
7 to exhibit selective impairment in memory for arbitrary associations (Mayes et al., 2001;
8
9 Turriziani, Fadda, Caltagirone, & Carlesimo, 2004; Vargha-Khadem et al., 1997).
10
11
12
13

14 Recent advancements of dual-process models of recognition memory, however,
15
16 propose that an association between two or more items can be familiar if the parts are unitized
17
18 (Diana et al., 2007; Ranganath, 2010; Yonelinas, 2002; Yonelinas, Aly, Wang, & Koen, 2010;
19
20 Yonelinas, Kroll, Dobbins, & Soltani, 1999), i.e. integrated into one single configuration
21
22 (Ceraso, 1985). Generally, unitized associations are embedded within an entity defining
23
24 framework and are therefore perceived as one single whole (Mecklinger & Jäger, 2009). Units
25
26 feature emergent properties, i.e. properties which cannot be directly inferred from the
27
28 properties of their constituents (Ceraso, 1985; Graf & Schacter, 1989). For instance, the
29
30 symmetry of a face cannot be predicted by the properties of the different face parts. Moreover,
31
32 in contrast to arbitrary associations, which are bound in a relatively flexible manner, units
33
34 exhibit a rigid configuration (Henke, 2010; Horowitz & Prytulak, 1969). As Yonelinas et al.
35
36 (2010) noticed, unitization is rather a continuum than a dichotomy coming along with
37
38 different forms and various ways of creating unitized associations. One important dimension
39
40 on which unitized representations vary is whether they are pre-existing (i.e. stored in semantic
41
42 memory) or newly created. Whereas the former holds for example for compound word pairs
43
44 (e.g., motor-cycle), the latter can be induced by means of an encoding strategy such as
45
46 creating a mental image of a unified interactive scene of two objects.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Evidence for stronger reliance on familiarity for pre-existing unitized word pairs such
56
57 as compound pairs in contrast to semantically unrelated word pairs (e.g., poker-curl) has been
58
59 found with various methodological approaches. Giovanello, Keane, & Verfaellie (2006) let
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 amnesic patients with damage to the hippocampus perform an associative memory task with
2 unitized as well as unrelated word pairs. Being forced to rely primarily on familiarity due to
3
4 their impairment, these patients showed significantly better associative memory performance
5
6 for unitized than for unrelated word pairs. Findings from an fMRI study suggest a shift in the
7
8 relative contribution of familiarity and recollection in healthy participants as they showed a
9
10 reduction of hippocampal activation and an enhancement of perirhinal involvement for pre-
11
12 existing units in contrast to unrelated word pairs (Ford, Verfaellie, & Giovanello, 2010; for
13
14 confirming evidence from event-related potentials (ERP) see Rhodes & Donaldson, 2007).
15
16 This has been taken as evidence that pre-existing unitized associations are remembered in a
17
18 similar way as single items.
19
20
21
22
23

24 An important question is whether this is also the case for previously unrelated items
25
26 which are unitized not until encoding. Even though it has been suggested that one learning
27
28 trial can be sufficient for unitization to induce subsequent familiarity-based remembering
29
30 subserved by the PrC (e.g., Henke, 2010), this notion has not yet been tested with brain
31
32 imaging techniques. Notably, a neuropsychological study by Quamme, Yonelinas, and
33
34 Norman (2007) showed that the hippocampus is not inevitable for recognition of arbitrary
35
36 pairings when unitization is used as an encoding strategy. They found that amnesic patients
37
38 with damage limited to the hippocampus, who exhibit severe recollection deficits, are much
39
40 more likely to remember unrelated word pairs when the two words have been combined to a
41
42 novel conceptual unit (definition encoding: CLOUD-LAWN = A yard used for sky-gazing) in
43
44 contrast to when the two words are studied as distinct lexical items within the context of a
45
46 sentence (sentence encoding: He watched the CLOUD float by as he sat on the LAWN.). In
47
48 contrast, patients with damage to the hippocampus plus the surrounding MTLC did not show
49
50 any difference between encoding instructions. This suggests an increased contribution of
51
52 MTLC-mediated familiarity-based remembering for unitized associations. Using the same
53
54 paradigm, Haskins, Yonelinas, Quamme, and Ranganath (2008) showed by means of fMRI
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 increased engagement of the PrC during the encoding of previously unrelated word pairs as
2 novel conceptual units. Moreover, activation in this region during encoding covaried with
3
4 levels of subsequent familiarity for these units. This suggests an important role of the PrC for
5
6 familiarity-based associative memory, comparable to familiarity for single items.
7
8

9
10 However, the brain structures involved in the retrieval of novel conceptual units
11 cannot readily be inferred from these studies. As indicated by the results from two ERP
12 studies from our laboratory, investigating the retrieval of such type of novel compounds
13
14 (Bader, Mecklinger, Hoppstädter, & Meyer, 2010; Wiegand, Bader, & Mecklinger, 2010),
15
16 familiarity for novel conceptual units and single items is associated with different ERP
17
18 signatures. Thus, the aim of the current study was two-fold. The first aim was to compare the
19
20 brain regions generally involved in the retrieval of experimentally unitized associations to
21
22 those involved in the retrieval of arbitrary associations. The second aim was to identify brain
23
24 regions which are involved in recognition of single items and those involved in recognition of
25
26 novel units. In the current report, we will refer to these two signals as item familiarity and unit
27
28 familiarity, respectively. However, note that the present use of the two terms is solely
29
30 motivated by the different kinds of representations the two types of familiarity processes
31
32 operate on but the way these processes differ remains to be elucidated. Analogous to our
33
34 previous ERP studies (Bader et al., 2010; Wiegand et al., 2010), we compared neural
35
36 correlates of associative recognition memory for unrelated word pairs in two different
37
38 encoding conditions. For this purpose, we contrasted definition and sentence encoding in a
39
40 between-group design by means of fMRI. Encoding instruction was manipulated between
41
42 subjects to avoid any strategy carry-over between the two instructions. Moreover, we opted
43
44 for incidental encoding conditions because we wanted to reduce the probability that
45
46 participants apply individual encoding strategies, which could obscure the intended effects of
47
48 the instructions. During recognition, different word pairs were presented: same pairs, reversed
49
50 pairs (studied pairings in reversed order), recombined pairs, and completely new pairs. Same
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and reversed pairs had to be classified as ‘old’ whereas recombined and new pairs had to be classified as ‘new’.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Figure 1 displays the pair types used in the test phase as well as the fMRI contrasts. In the fMRI analyses, we contrasted types of pairs that are most distinct with respect to the process of interest but very similar with respect to all other aspects of recognition (e.g., Henson, Hornberger, & Rugg, 2005). Generally, we expected associative recognition in the sentence group to be mainly driven by recollection. In contrast, in the definition group recollection should play a minor role in associative recognition memory as reduced engagement of regions normally associated with recollection has already been shown for pre-existing unitized pairs (Ford et al., 2010) and the putative ERP correlate of recollection is attenuated when novel conceptual units are retrieved (Bader et al., 2010). In line with previous studies (e.g., Ford et al., 2010; Giovanello et al., 2009), brain regions involved in associative memory were examined by contrasting correct responses to same and recombined pairs as item familiarity should not be diagnostic to distinguish these pair types. In the sentence group, this contrast was assumed to reveal mostly brain regions associated with recollection including the hippocampus, the posterior cingulate cortex and the ventral posterior parietal cortex (PPC; e.g., Daselaar, Fleck, & Cabeza, 2006; Henson et al., 2005; Vilberg & Rugg, 2008; Yonelinas, Otten, Shaw, & Rugg, 2005). In contrast, the engagement of this network was expected to be smaller in the definition group. Here, familiarity-related regions should be more engaged. These should be limited to regions involved in unit familiarity (see below).

Additionally, we conducted a general recognition memory contrast between same and new pairs as the former condition reflects recognized items in general and the latter condition

1 is a memory free baseline condition. For the sentence group, we expected a similar pattern as
2 in the same vs. recombined contrast. For the definition group, this contrast should have the
3 maximal potential to disclose all the brain structures involved in both hypothesized familiarity
4 processes. Thus, we generally predicted deactivation in the PrC as well as activation in other
5 regions previously associated with familiarity such as the lateral prefrontal cortex (PFC; BA
6 45/46) and the dorsal PPC (e.g., Aly, Yonelinas, Kishiyama, & Knight, 2011; Daselaar et al.,
7 2006; Henson et al., 2005; Montaldi, Spencer, Roberts, & Mayes, 2006; Vilberg & Rugg,
8 2008; Yonelinas et al., 2005).

19 Effects specific to unit recognition should only be present in the definition group and
20 absent in the sentence group. As the exact configuration is a key feature of units (Haskins et
21 al., 2008; Henke, 2010; Horowitz & Prytulak, 1969; Wiegand et al., 2010) and reversing the
22 order of the pair disrupts this newly created unit in the definition group, we assume the effects
23 of unitization to be present in this group for same pairs only, while pure item recognition
24 mechanisms should be diagnostic for reversed pairs. This should be indicated on the
25 behavioral level as decreased performance and longer reaction times for reversed compared to
26 same pairs in the definition group but not in the sentence group. Brain regions which are
27 specific to unit familiarity were determined by contrasting same and reversed pairs. These two
28 pair types are equal with respect to item familiarity for their constituents but differ with
29 respect to their degree of unitization. Due to the lack of previous studies, we did not have any
30 specific expectations with respect to the localization of these regions. From the data reported
31 by Haskins et al. (2008), a familiarity signal should be expected in the PrC for same in
32 contrast to new pairs. However, it is unclear whether this would be additional to the
33 familiarity signal for the single items (in magnitude or spatial extent) and therefore visible in
34 the same vs. reversed contrast.

1 In contrast, item recognition signals should be observable in both groups across both
2 same and reversed word pairs. As reversed pairs are not assumed to evoke unit familiarity,
3 they should be a more sensitive indicator of pure item familiarity than same pairs when
4 contrasted to new pairs.¹ Given that recollection is assumed to play a minor role in the
5 definition group, the reversed vs. new contrast is expected to reveal mostly activity
6 modulation in regions previously associated with familiarity. In particular, given that a signal
7 decrease in the PrC is usually associated with familiarity for single items (Henson, Cansino,
8 Herron, Robb, & Rugg, 2003; Montaldi et al., 2006), we predicted decreased activation for
9 reversed compared to new pairs in this region. As recollection-based processing in the
10 sentence group should be flexible with respect to the order of the pair (Giovanello et al.,
11 2009), the pattern of results in the sentence group was expected to be similar to the same vs.
12 new contrast.

13 2. Methods

14 2.1. Participants

15 Forty native German speakers, all students from Saarland University, took part in the
16 experiment and were randomly assigned to the two encoding groups. Mean age was 22.3 (19-
17 28) and 23.2 (19-29) in the definition (10 female) and the sentence (10 female) encoding
18 group, respectively. All participants had no known neurological problems, had normal or
19 corrected-to-normal vision (contact lenses or MRI compatible goggles) and were right-handed
20 as assessed by the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971). One additional
21 participant took part, but had to be excluded because of excessive motion artifacts during
22 scanning. The experiment was approved by the local ethics committee of Saarland University.

23 ¹We chose reversed pairs and not recombined pairs for this contrast because the requirement to classify recombined pairs as
24 'new' allows that not recognized unfamiliar recombined pairs are correctly rejected. This makes recombined pairs more
25 heterogeneous in terms of familiarity and therefore less suitable for the item recognition contrast.

Participants gave informed consent and were reimbursed with course credit or payment (€ 8 /hour) for participation.

2.2. Materials

Stimuli were built from 160 pairs of conceptually unrelated German 3-10 letter nouns with a mean lexical frequency of 54/million (Baayen, Piepenbrock, & Gulikers, 1995). Pairings had to fulfill the requirement of being suitable for a compound combination in German in original and reversed order. To this end, some of the words were used in plural form. Original and reversed pairs did not differ according to the frequency of plural words occurring in first and second position. Unrelatedness of word pairs (for original as well as reversed order and all recombined pairs) was assured by a pre-experimental rating study (each word pair was rated by 16 participants on average who belonged to the same student population as above but did not participate in the actual experiment). For definition encoding, a definition combined each word pair to denote a novel concept (e.g., MILK TAXI – a delivery service, which is directly dispatched from a farm). Only synonyms or associates of the words were used in the definitions. Likewise, there were no repetitions of the words in the sentences of the sentence group. Here, the words were part of a sentence as separate lexical items but were substituted by placeholders (e.g., MILK TAXI – The _____ was spilled inside the _____).

Study lists comprised 128 word pairs together with either the corresponding definitions or sentences. In the test phase, 32 of these pairs reappeared in the same combination and order as in the study phase. Another 32 were in the original combination but in reversed order. The remaining 64 pairs were used to build 32 recombined pairs consisting of new combinations of studied words whereby only one word of each original pair was used. First and second positions of the single words were maintained from original to recombined pairs. Additional

32 word pairs served as new pairs. Assignment of word pairs to the 4 pair types (same, reversed, recombined, and new) was counterbalanced across participants.

2.3. Procedure

The experiment was designed and presented using E-Prime Professional 2.0 (Psychology Software Tools, Inc.). The experiment consisted of three parts: a study phase, a motor response task in the retention interval, and a test phase. All three parts were run in the scanner. Participants responded via two 2-button response grips using their thumbs and index fingers of both hands. Participants were not aware of the final memory test.

Participants' head movements were minimized using cushions and a headrest. Stimuli were viewed through a mirror attached to the head coil on which they were projected via a translucent screen. All stimuli were presented in white on a black background. Word pairs were presented next to each other separated by four blank spaces. In the study phase, word pairs and definitions/sentences were displayed one above the other, slightly above and below the center of the screen. In the test phase, word pairs were presented in central vision.

Encoding instruction was manipulated between subjects. The definition group had to give a subjective rating on a scale from 1 ('very badly') to 4 ('very well') according to how well the definition combined the meanings of the two words into a novel compound. To facilitate the rating, they were told to create a mental image of the new concept. In the sentence group, participants were supposed to rate the plausibility of the sentence on a 4-point-scale after having mentally inserted the two words into the placeholders in the given order. To prevent unitization, participants were told to imagine each single object separately. Assignment of fingers and ratings was counterbalanced across subjects. In both encoding groups, a trial started with a 500 ms fixation cross followed by 300 ms blank screen. Then, the stimulus appeared on the screen for 4000 ms after which participants were given a 1500 ms response window for the rating judgment indicated by a question mark. The inter-stimulus

interval (ISI) was jittered in steps of 1000 ms following an approximately exponential distribution (mean: 7000 ms, range: 4000–12000 ms). It included the response window and a blank screen. In the middle of the study phase, there was a break of 46.2 s.

After the study phase, there was a retention interval of about 10 minutes in which a simple motor response task had to be performed. Participants were then informed about the upcoming memory test. In the test phase, both encoding groups saw exactly the same stimuli and had the same task. Participants had to classify same and reversed pairs as ‘old’ and recombined and new pairs as ‘new’. They were instructed to indicate if they were sure or unsure about their classification resulting in four possible responses. Mapping of responses and fingers was counterbalanced across subjects. Trials started with a 500 ms fixation cross followed by a 300 ms blank screen. Word pairs were presented for 1000 ms. The response window expanded additional 1750 ms with a blank screen. If participants failed to respond until then, they saw a warning ‘Too slow!’ for 500 ms. The ISI included the response window and the warning if applicable. The remaining time was filled with a blank screen. ISI duration was jittered in steps of 1000 ms following an approximated exponential distribution (mean: 4000 ms, range: 3000–9000 ms). In the middle of the test phase, there was a break of 46.2 s.

2.4. Data acquisition and processing

A Siemens Skyra 3T system was used for MRI data acquisition. For functional MR scans T2-weighted gradient-echo planar imaging sequences were used (Matrix: 94, FOV = 192 mm, TR = 2200 ms, TE = 30 ms, flip angle = 90°). Thirty axial slices with a thickness of 3 mm, an inter-slice gap of .75 mm, and an in-plane resolution of 2.04 x 2.04 mm were acquired parallel to the AC-PC plane covering the whole brain. In order to allow for T1 equilibration, the first four volumes of each functional run were discarded. Prior to the experiment, high resolution (.9 x .9 x .9 mm) T1-weighted anatomical brain scans (MP-RAGE) were obtained. In order to foster the co-registration of these anatomical images with

the functional images, 3 mm thick T1-weighted images (TR = 250 ms, TE = 2.5 ms, flip angle = 70°, in-plane resolution of .6 x .6 mm) in plane with the functional images were acquired.

MRI data was processed using Brain Voyager QX (Brain Innovation; Goebel, Esposito, & Formisano, 2006). First, the 366 functional volumes of the test phase were slice scan time corrected to the beginning of each volume scan using cubic spline interpolation. Second, all images were motion corrected to the first volume of the run applying a trilinear detection and sinc interpolation rigid-body-transformation. There were no group differences in all six motion parameters (p-values > .27). Following spatial smoothing (Gaussian kernel with a full width at half maximum of 4 mm), low-frequency signal changes and baseline drifts were removed by a high-pass filter at .004 Hz. Transformation parameters gained by co-registration of functional and anatomical images were applied to the preprocessed fMR images to create a representation of the functional time series in 3D space which was subsequently normalized into stereotactic Talairach space (Talairach & Tournoux, 1988) and re-sampled to a resolution of 2 x 2 x 2 mm.

2.5. Data analysis

Only data of the test phase was analyzed for the current report. Behavioral data was analyzed using SPSS 18. Accuracy as indicated by the percentage of correctly classified items and reaction times for correct items were entered into a 4 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA, Pillai's trace) with the within-subjects factor of Pair Type (same, reversed, recombined, new) and the between-subjects factor of Encoding Group (definition, sentence). Proportion of high confidence judgments of correct items was analyzed in a Confidence (high, low) x Encoding Group (definition, sentence) MANOVA. The significance level of the aforementioned analyses was set to $\alpha = .05$. P-values in post-hoc comparisons were corrected for Type-I-error accumulation using Holm's sequential Bonferroni correction method (Holm, 1979).

The functional time series were analyzed with least-squares estimation using a mixed effects general linear model. The event-related design matrix was created by modeling the hemodynamic response function for each predictor using a box-car function with a 1 s event duration convolved with a 2-gamma function model (onset: 0, time to response peak: 5 s, time to undershoot peak: 15 s) starting at the onset of the critical events. Correctly responded to items were used to build four levels of Pair Type which entered the GLM as predictors (same, reversed, recombined, new). Mean/minimum numbers of analyzed trials were 25.8/19 (same), 21.9/16 (reversed), 23.7/13 (recombined), and 30.1/26 (new) in the definition group and 26.7/22 (same), 25.7/17 (reversed), 25.3/18 (recombined), and 30.5/21 (new) in the sentence group. All incorrectly classified items, key presses as well as 3-D motion parameters estimated during motion correction were added as predictors of no interest. Because of high susceptibility in the MTLC resulting in low signal intensities, no intensity threshold (usually employed to segregate intracranial from extracranial voxels) was applied. Baseline was calculated as the average of all non-modeled time points. Second-level analysis determined active clusters for four contrasts of interest. Generally, clusters of voxels were considered as active when the t-test for the contrast exceeded a threshold of $p < .001$ for at least 10 contiguous voxels in a statistical map using non-interpolated data (see Lieberman & Cunningham, 2009, for arguments in favor of using a voxel extent threshold). Due to the lower-signal-to-noise-ratio in the MTL, the threshold was set to $p < .005$ for at least 5 contiguous voxels (e.g., Schacter & Wagner, 1999; Staresina & Davachi, 2006).

In order to get an overview of the regions being generally involved in recognition of the word pairs, we first examined the general recognition memory contrast between correctly recognized same and new pairs. Regions involved in associative recognition were identified by contrasting correctly identified same and recombined pairs. Item recognition regions were defined as regions which were more active for correctly recognized reversed than for new pairs. Brain regions specific to unit recognition were determined by the same vs. reversed

pairs contrast. For all four contrasts, we conducted three different analyses to disentangle effects specific to each group and common for the two groups. In the first analysis, common group effects were revealed by a conjunction analysis identifying the overlap between active regions in both groups (Friston, Penny, & Glaser, 2005). In the other two analyses, we identified group specific effects for each group by exclusively masking active regions in the other group. Exclusion masks were thresholded at a liberal threshold of $p < .05$ in order to reduce the probability of missing a truly active region. Note that a liberal threshold in the exclusion mask is equivalent to a conservative procedure to detect group specific effects (see Desseilles et al., 2009; Uncapher, Otten, & Rugg, 2006, for a similar rationale).

3. Results

3.1. Behavioral results

As can be seen in Figure 2, performance in the sentence group seemed to be generally better than in the definition group. A MANOVA of accuracy as indicated by percentage of correctly classified items with the factors Pair Type and Encoding Group revealed a significant main effect of Pair Type ($F(3,36) = 67.07, p < .001$), a significant main effect of Encoding Group ($F(1,38) = 6.30, p = .016$), and a marginally significant interaction ($F(3,36) = 2.75, p = .057$). Dissolving the interaction, post-hoc comparisons between encoding groups for each pair type separately yielded only one significant difference, namely higher accuracy for reversed pairs in the sentence group ($M = .80, SE = .12$) than in the definition group ($M = .68, SE = .10; t(38) = 3.48, p = .005$). Comparisons of same pairs (definition: $M = .80, SE = .11$; sentence: $M = .83, SE = .09$), recombined pairs (definition: $M = .74, SE = .15$; sentence: $M = .79, SE = .13$), and new pairs (definition: $M = .94, SE = .06$; sentence: $M = .95, SE = .08$) across encoding groups were not significant (p -values $> .62$). These results show that the overall difference is mainly driven by the lower performance for reversed pairs in the definition group. Furthermore, testing our specific hypotheses regarding accuracy for same

1 pairs and reversed pairs, planned t-tests revealed that reversed pairs were remembered
2 significantly worse than same pairs in the definition group ($t(19) = 4.22, p < .001$), but not in
3 the sentence group ($p = .276$) suggesting processing difficulties for disrupted units in the
4 definition group. The proportion of time-outs ($RT > 2750$ ms) was low in both groups and for
5 all pair types ($< 1\%$).
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
61
62
63
64
65
INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212

The proportion of high confidence judgments of all correct responses shows that participants in both groups were highly confident (Figure 2), but consistently higher in the sentence group than in the definition group for same pairs (definition: $M = .85$, $SE = .03$; sentence: $M = .93$, $SE = .02$), reversed pairs (definition: $M = .80$; $SE = .05$, sentence: $M = .94$, $SE = .02$), recombined pairs (definition: $M = .56$, $SE = .05$; sentence: $M = .68$, $SE = .06$), and new pairs (definition: $M = .63$, $SE = .05$; sentence: $M = .68$, $SE = .06$). A Pair Type $\times$ Encoding Group MANOVA yielded a significant main effect of Pair Type ($F(3,36) = 22.54$, $p < .001$) and of Encoding Group ($F(1,38) = 4.31$, $p = .045$), the latter reflecting participants' higher confidence in the sentence group than in the definition group. The interaction did not reach significance ($p = .187$). Post-hoc t-tests revealed that 'old' responses were generally given with higher confidence than 'new' responses irrespective of encoding group: same vs. recombined ($t(39) = 8.41$, $p < .001$), same vs. new ($t(39) = 6.19$, $p < .001$), reversed vs. recombined ($t(39) = 6.71$, $p < .001$), reversed vs. new ($t(39) = 4.98$, $p < .001$). All other comparisons were not significant (p -values $> .27$). Thus, recognition of word pairs studied within sentence frames was accomplished with higher confidence. Moreover, confidence in recognizing studied pairs was higher than in rejecting non-studied pairs.

3.2. Imaging results

3.2.1. Same vs. new pairs: General recognition memory

In order to see the general pattern of active regions underlying successful associative recognition, active regions contrasting correctly classified same vs. new pairs were explored. The results are listed in Table 2. Activation clusters common to both groups were found on the left medial and lateral surface of the parietal lobe. Specifically in the sentence group, activation on the medial surface was generally more widespread, also including the right hemisphere, and the activation in the PPC extended further ventral. Additionally, there were

activation clusters in the left middle frontal gyrus, the left superior frontal gyrus, left and right superior temporal gyrus, the thalamus, and in a region at the boarder of the left hippocampus and entorhinal cortex (Figure 3.B). In the definition group, the activation in the PPC spread further dorsal and medial. No clusters were identified in the new > same contrast.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

3.2.2. Same vs. recombined pairs: Associative recognition

In order to identify regions specific to associative recognition, same and recombined pairs were compared. As listed in Table 3, whole brain analysis revealed activation common to both groups in regions on the medial surfaces of the PFC and the parietal lobe. In the sentence group, there was additional activation on the medial and lateral surfaces of the PFC, the cingulate gyrus, the superior temporal gyrus, the posterior cingulate, the ventral PPC, the amygdala, and the hippocampus (Figure 3.B). Specific to the definition group was an anterior extension of the common activation in the left anterior cingulate, additional clusters in the right anterior cingulate, and the caudate nucleus. Clusters showing a higher activation for recombined than same pairs were not revealed.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

3.2.3. Reversed vs. new pairs: Item recognition

The results of the reversed vs. new pairs contrast are listed in Table 4. Activation in this contrast common to both groups was found in the left PPC. This activation pattern spread more ventral in the sentence group. Additionally, there was activation specific for the sentence group in the left lateral and medial surfaces of the PFC, the insula, the thalamus, the posterior

cingulate, the lingual gyrus, the amygdala, the left hippocampus, and the left parahippocampal gyrus (BA 36; Figure 3.B). Regions exclusively activated in the definition group were found in the left IFG (BA 45), the left claustrum, the caudate nucleus, and in a more dorsal and more medial extension of the common activation in the PPC.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

3.2.4. Same vs. reversed pairs: Unit recognition

In search for regions specific to unitization, we contrasted same and reversed pairs. Clusters being more activated by same than reversed pairs were found neither exclusively for the sentence group nor in the conjunction analysis. However, in the definition group, the whole-brain analysis revealed one cluster in the left claustrum (peak voxel: $x = -32$, $y = 4$, $z = -2$; $t = 6.48$; size = 88 voxels) and the MTL analysis revealed one cluster in the right parahippocampal gyrus (BA 36; peak voxel: $x = 35$, $y = -33$, $z = -10$; $t = 4.01$; size = 72 voxels, Figure 3.A). No clusters were revealed in the reversed greater than same pairs contrast.

3.2.5. Unit vs. item recognition

In the same vs. reversed pairs contrast, which was intended to identify clusters specific to unit recognition, the whole-brain analysis revealed only one relatively small cluster in the claustrum. However, there were different patterns of activation for same and reversed pairs when each of them was compared to the same memory free baseline (new pairs) in the definition group. This suggests that there are subtle differences in the processing of same and reversed pairs which might not have been revealed when directly contrasting the two pair types. Therefore, we conducted two additional, more exploratory, sets of analyses for the definition group that might be more sensitive to detect regions specific to unit and item

1 recognition. In order to isolate unit recognition regions, the same > new contrast was masked
2 by the reversed > new contrast (exclusive mask thresholded at $p < .05$). Thus, this analysis
3 revealed regions which are activated by same pairs contrasted with new pairs, but not for
4 reversed pairs contrasted with new pairs. To ensure that the outcome of this contrast is
5 specific to the definition group, we exclusively masked it also by the same contrast in the
6 sentence group ($p < .05$). Activation clusters were found in the left medial frontal gyrus, the
7 left posterior cingulate, the left precuneus as well as the left PPC (Table 5 and Figure 4.A). In
8 order to identify regions specific to item recognition, the reversed > new contrast was masked
9 by the same > new contrast. This analysis revealed regions which show greater activation for
10 the reversed compared to new pairs but not for same compared to new pairs (again also
11 masked by the same contrast in the sentence group). Only one activation cluster in the left
12 IFG (BA 45) was found in this analysis (Table 5 and Figure 4.B).

31 INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

32 INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

41 4. Discussion

43 The current study compared neural activity during associative retrieval for unrelated
44 word pairs which were either encoded in a unitized or in a non-unitized manner. We wanted to
45 explore which brain regions are generally involved in retrieval of unrelated word pairs when
46 they have been unitized in only one study trial compared to non-unitized word pairs.
47 Importantly, our design allowed to directly compare brain regions associated with unit
48 recognition to those associated with recognition of single items within one experiment.
49 Unitization was manipulated between subjects. In the definition group, participants encoded
50 word pairs together with a definition combining the two words to a novel conceptual unit. In

the sentence group, participants were provided with a sentence frame in which they had to fill in the two words of the pair separately minimizing the degree of unitization. At test, participants had to discriminate same, reversed, and recombined versions of the studied pairs as well as completely new pairs.

4.1. Behavioral evidence for effects of unitization in the definition group

Assessment of behavioral data revealed that participants in the two groups generally performed at the same level but differed according to how well they could deal with reversed pairs. Consistent with our assumption, the definition group recognized reversed pairs significantly worse than the sentence group. This is in line with a less flexible retrieval processing being engaged after definition encoding relying on a familiarity signal for novel conceptual units, which is sensitive to the exact configuration of the pair and is disrupted by reversed test cues. Thus, the missing unit familiarity signal for reversed pairs makes the participants falsely rejecting these item pairs. Also consistent with greater reliance on unit familiarity in the definition group was the speed advantage for the definition group, which was found for all except for reversed pairs. This speed advantage can also be observed for new and recombined pairs as the attempt to recollect study details, even if unsuccessful, should always take more time than merely assessing the presence or absence of a familiarity signal. Within-group comparisons between same and reversed pairs complement this pattern. Decreased performance and slower reaction times for recognition of reversed pairs compared to same pairs was shown only in the definition group but not in the sentence group. In the case of reversed pairs, participants in the definition group probably perceive interference when item familiarity indicates that the two items are old but missing unit familiarity indicates that the pair is new. In line with our hypothesis of a reduced reliance on recollection for unitized word pairs is the lower confidence with which participants gave their responses

1 because recollection based responses are thought to be associated with on average higher
2 confidence (see Yonelinas, 2002).
3
4
5
6

7 4.2. Flexible recollection in the sentence group 8

9 Analyses revealed greater activation for studied pairs (same and reversed) than non-
10 studied pairs (recombined and new) in the posterior cingulate, the ventral PPC, and the hippo-
11 campus which was more extended in the sentence group than in the definition group or even
12 exclusive as in the case of the hippocampus. In addition, one cluster in the parahippocampal
13 cortex was revealed only in the reversed > new contrast with an activation pattern that is very
14 similar to the one observed in the hippocampus. All these regions were previously identified
15 as being associated with recollective processing (e.g., Dobbins, Rice, Wagner, & Schacter,
16 2003; Henson et al., 2005; Henson, Rugg, Shallice, Josephs, & Dolan, 1999; Vilberg & Rugg,
17 2009; Yonelinas et al., 2005). Thus, these results are in line with the prediction that associa-
18 tive recognition of word pairs which were studied as separate lexical items within sentence
19 frames recruits a network typically associated with recollection. Joining the low number of
20 fMRI studies examining the retrieval phase of associative recognition memory for arbitrary
21 word-word associations (e.g., Ford et al., 2010; Giovanello et al., 2004, 2009), the current
22 experiment provides further evidence that in healthy young participants recognition of arbi-
23 trary word pairs strongly engages the recollection network including the hippocampus.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Under the assumption that activation in this network reflects recollective processing
47 also in the current study, this pattern of brain activation highlights flexibility as a core charac-
48 teristic of the recollection process complementing the behavioral results. Such flexibility is
49 needed when word pairs encoded in a specific configuration (word order in the sentence) have
50 to be retrieved regardless of whether retrieval is initiated by a specific (same pairs) or unspe-
51 cific (reversed pairs) retrieval cue. This view is supported by our finding of overlapping ac-
52 tivity in the anterior hippocampus (see Figure 4.B) for both, the same vs. new and the re-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

versed vs. new contrast. This extends behavioral findings from recall paradigms implicating that recollection is less reliant on the precise configuration of the association (e.g., Kahana, 2002) and one other fMRI study showing flexibility of the anterior hippocampus with respect to order of the association (Giovanello et al., 2009). The current results extend the findings of Giovanello et al. (2009) showing flexibility also for other regions in the recollection network such as the posterior cingulate and the ventral PPC.

4.3. Reduced recollection in the definition group

Assuming that the lack of an involvement of the hippocampus and substantially reduced activity in the posterior cingulate and the ventral PPC in the same vs. new pairs contrast indicates diminished recollection, the definition group exhibited less recollection as compared to the sentence group which is in line with our prediction. However, the residual activity in the posterior cingulate and the PPC either suggests some minor contribution of recollection in the definition group or another functional role of these regions after definition encoding. Notably, recollection-related activation in the definition group was primarily found when same pairs were presented as test cues. Thus, recollection in the definition group was dependent on the exact repetition of the study cue. This speaks in favor of successful integration during encoding and a less flexible retrieval process than after sentence encoding. The lower performance for reversed pairs in the definition group is also consistent with this view. In sum, these results imply an attenuated contribution of recollection to recognition memory when word pairs have been unitized in contrast to non-unitized word pairs. Although evidence for reduced recollection for unitized associations has been reported before in ERP (Bader et al., 2010; Jäger, Mecklinger, & Kipp, 2006; Kriukova, Bridger, & Mecklinger, 2013) as well as fMRI studies (Ford et al., 2010), this finding has until now received only little attention. Reduced recollection for unitized representations could reflect that more effortful recollective retrieval processes are less recruited if unit familiarity provides a sufficiently diagnostic signal

as in the definition condition. Note that some ERP studies did not find evidence for reduced recollection for unitized associations when study conditions promoted the contribution of recollection. For example in the Wiegand et al. (2010) study, all word pairs were studied twice, a condition which is known to increase recollection (Jacoby, Jones, & Dolan, 1998; Opitz, 2010a) while in the Rhodes and Donaldson studies (2007, 2008) multiple short study-test-cycles were used. The exact boundary conditions of when unitization attenuates recollection still have to be determined (see below).

4.4. Familiarity-related regions activated in the definition group

Whereas activation within the PPC extended into more ventral areas in the sentence group (for same > new, same > recombined, and reversed > new), activation spread more dorsal and medial into the vicinity of the intra-parietal sulcus in the definition group (for same > new and reversed > new). This corresponds well with a dissociation which has previously been reported associating ventral PPC regions around the angular gyrus with recollection and more dorsal areas near the intra-parietal sulcus with memory strength / familiarity (Henson et al., 2005; Hutchinson et al., 2014; Vilberg & Rugg, 2008). Although the dorsal area has often been associated with familiarity-based responses, there are doubts about the memory-specificity of its function (see Vilberg & Rugg, 2008). However, irrespective of the exact functional interpretation, the differential activation patterns across the sub-regions of the PPC suggest stronger reliance on recollection in the sentence group and more familiarity-based responding in the definition group. As the pattern of activation was comparable for same and reversed pairs which are thought to engage unit and item familiarity, respectively, when contrasted to new pairs, this familiarity-related processing seems to be general and neither specific to unit nor item familiarity.

One region in the left IFG (BA 45) was more activated for reversed than new pairs selectively in the definition group. This region has previously been associated with increased

activation during familiarity-based retrieval (Angel et al., 2013; Yonelinas et al., 2005) and damage to this region leads to a selective deficit in familiarity (Aly et al., 2011). Thus, the finding of activation in the left IFG supports the notion that there was a tendency to base decisions on familiarity signals in the definition group. In support of this view, a cluster within this region was selectively activated by the reversed vs. new contrast and not by the same vs. new contrast suggesting a specific role of this region in item familiarity. An alternative explanation for this activation pattern, however, could be that it reflects stronger engagement during the specification of the retrieval cue (Dobbins, Foley, Schacter, & Wagner, 2002). Cue specification might be more demanding for reversed pairs when participants choose the strategy to mentally reverse the test cue whenever they do not immediately recognize it as 'old' or 'new'. Although the consistent use of a reversal strategy by all participants in the reversed condition would also be consistent with our behavioral data, we consider a significant employment of such a specific strategy as rather unlikely because of the following reasoning: On the one hand, if all participants in the definition group had employed this strategy consistently during the experiment, performance in the reversed condition should be more comparable to performance in the same condition as reversing a reversed pair renders it equal to a same pair test cue. On the other hand, if only some participants had applied this strategy, we would assume that slower participants should be more accurate than faster participants. However, across participants in the definition group, there was no correlation between reaction time and percentage of correct responses for reversed pairs (Pearson's $r = -.03$, $p = .913$). Yet another possibility is that the reversal strategy was employed by all participants but only during some trials. In this case longer reaction times in each individual participant would more likely be associated with an accurate response than shorter reaction times. The opposite pattern was revealed by a point-biserial correlation analysis: longer reaction times were associated with inaccurate (accuracy = 0) responses rather than accurate (accuracy = 1) responses (mean $r = -.16$, $p < .01$). However, as we cannot completely rule out this alternative interpretation, future

research is warranted to better understand the role of the inferior frontal gyrus in familiarity processing.

In the same > reversed contrast, which should reflect activation specific for unit recognition, we found one cluster in the definition group located in the parahippocampal cortex extending to fusiform gyrus and is characterized by activation that is selective for same pairs studied as novel conceptual units. Binder, Desai, Graves, & Conant (2009) propose that this region constitutes “an interface between lateral semantic memory and medial episodic memory encoding networks” (p. 2777). In line with this proposal we assume that the activity in the parahippocampal cortex reflects the process of linking the novel conceptual unit to pre-existing knowledge about the constituents (see also Opitz, 2010b, for a related view). The increase in activation found here stands in opposition to the familiarity-related activation decrease in more anterior parts of the MTLC, i.e. in the PrC, which is usually observed for single items (see Diana et al., 2007). The increase as opposed to a decrease in activation might be explained by a still ongoing integration process as normally observed during encoding (e.g., Haskins et al., 2008; Meyer, Mecklinger, & Friederici, 2010). The recruitment of the semantic system during recognition is thus more important for novel conceptual units than for pre-experimentally known items. Lastly, it is also possible that the activation reflects recollection as the parahippocampal cortex has often been associated with recollection. However, we consider this latter view as unlikely because there were no condition differences in this cluster in the sentence group, in which recollection is thought to play a major role. Furthermore, the same > reversed contrast did not reveal any other clusters in a brain network indicative for recollection.

In contrast to our predictions, we did not observe activation related to item familiarity in the PrC. One possible reason of this null finding is that fMRI signals in the MTL can suffer from susceptibility-induced signal loss (e.g., Asano, Mihara, Kirino, & Sugishita, 2004) leading to a poor signal-to-noise ratio. This might differentially affect anterior and posterior re-

gions of the MTLC. As we could not directly contrast activation patterns for item and unit familiarity within the MTLC, future studies will have to further follow up the hypothesis that item and unit familiarity are associated with signals in the anterior and posterior parts of the MTLC, respectively.

The whole-brain analysis contrasting same and reversed pairs did not reveal activation clusters except for the claustrum. It is conceivable that the differences in memory-related brain activation for the two types of familiarity signals are too subtle to be detected by this contrast. The situation is even changed for the worse by a less optimal signal-to-noise ratio for the reversed pairs due to the poor performance for this pair type in the definition group. However, we conducted an additional contrast which might be more sensitive to detect brain regions which are specific to unit recognition, namely, regions which were selectively activated in the same vs. new contrast, but not in the reversed vs. new contrast. Most notably, one region specific to the same vs. new contrast was found in BA 10 in the mPFC. Moreover, this region was also activated in the same > recombined contrast in the definition group and the same holds for the same > new contrast when the voxel extent threshold was reduced to five contiguous voxels. A recent model forwarded by Preston and Eichenbaum (2013) ascribes an important role to the mPFC in the retrieval of information which is congruent with pre-existing (schema) knowledge. Similarly, according to van Kesteren, Ruiter, Fernández, and Henson (2012), the mPFC detects if incoming information is congruent to information stored in memory. In this case, mPFC inhibits hippocampal processing. Grounded on the increased mPFC activation and lack of hippocampal activation for unitized pairs in the present study, it could be speculated that unitization encoding renders word pairs congruent with pre-existing memories, as for example FOREST-BEER and TANK-SOUP can be integrated as novel instances of ‘beer’ and ‘soup’. This integration might be performed and still ongoing in the parahippocampal cortex (see above), which is in turn detected by the mPFC. In support of this hypothesis, post-hoc analyses revealed that activation differences between same and reversed

pairs in the mPFC cluster and the parahippocampal cortex cluster are correlated across participants in the definition group (Pearson's $r = .49$, $p < .05$) but not in the sentence group ($r = .09$, $p = .704$). This suggests that these two regions might be involved concertedly in the retrieval of novel conceptual units.

With respect to the functional differences between recognition of items and units, one possible explanation is that single items and newly created units might be recognized on the basis of two different but interwoven familiarity signals as suggested by our previous ERP studies (Bader et al., 2010; Wiegand et al., 2010). Single items with pre-existing meanings undergo an increment in familiarity relative to their pre-experimental baseline familiarity (Bridger, Bader, & Mecklinger, 2014; Mandler, 1980; Stenberg, Hellman, Johansson, & Rosén, 2009) reflecting whether an item has recently been encountered (relative familiarity). In our previous ERP studies, item familiarity was associated with the mid-frontal old/new effect (FN400) (Wiegand et al., 2010). It is possible that the left IFG, as one of the possible generators of the mid-frontal old/new effect (see Bridger, Bader, Kriukova, Unger, & Mecklinger, 2012, for a discussion), is involved in assessing the increment in familiarity relative to a pre-experimental baseline as it was suggested for the mid-frontal old/new effect (Bridger et al., 2014; Stenberg et al., 2009). Consistent with this notion, studies relating this region to familiarity used pre-existing single items (Aly et al., 2011; Angel et al., 2013; Yonelinas et al., 2005). In contrast, for newly created units an absolute familiarity signal is more diagnostic when compared to new pairs which, as a whole, are completely unfamiliar (MacKenzie & Donaldson, 2007). Thus, an absolute familiarity signal reflects whether the unit has been encountered ever before. The schema-related interpretation of the mPFC activation for novel units would be consistent with an absolute familiarity account: successful integration into pre-existing knowledge implies that something is familiar in an absolute sense and this is signaled by the concerted activation of the mPFC and parahippocampal cortex. However, future studies will have to establish a link between activation in these brain areas and behavioral measures

of unit and item familiarity.

4.5. Conclusions

The current results show that recognition of arbitrary associations encoded within sentence frames recruits a network of brain regions that has previously been associated with recollection. This is in line with the importance of recollection in memory for arbitrary associations. Moreover, large parts of this network were shown to be highly flexible with respect to the order of the retrieval cue. Concordantly, memory performance for reversed pairs was comparable to same pairs in the sentence group. In contrast, using unitization as an encoding strategy as in the definition group leads to a limited involvement of this network. Consistent with this, we found faster reaction times and less confident responses in the definition group, which is commensurate with reduced reliance on recollection. This suggests that effortful recollection is recruited only if it yields additional diagnostic value for an associative memory task. Possibly, this is already determined during encoding which is why recollection could not be recruited for reversed pairs during the test although it would have been advantageous. In contrast, recognition of novel conceptual units was associated with increased activation in the parahippocampal cortex. Moreover, an additional set of exploratory analyses suggests that BA 10 in the mPFC was also activated during the retrieval of novel conceptual units whereas activation in BA 45 was specific for reversed pairs, i.e. is possibly associated with item recognition. Hence, unit recognition and item recognition recruit qualitatively different networks in the brain which are possibly associated with unit and item familiarity, respectively.

Acknowledgments

We thank Jérôme Rimpel and Julia Schneiders for their help with data acquisition and analysis and Patric Meyer for comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This

research was supported by the German Research Foundation under grant DFG-IRTG-1457
and was conducted in the International Research Training Group “Adaptive Minds” hosted by
Saarland University, Saarbrücken (Germany) as partial fulfillment of the requirements for
R.B.’s Ph.D. thesis.

References

- Aggleton, J. P., & Brown, M. W. (2006). Interleaving brain systems for episodic and recognition memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 455–463.
- Aly, M., Yonelinas, A. P., Kishiyama, M. M., & Knight, R. T. (2011). Damage to the lateral prefrontal cortex impairs familiarity but not recollection. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 225, 297–304.
- Angel, L., Bastin, C., Genon, S., Balteau, E., Phillips, C., Luxen, A., ... Collette, F. (2013). Differential effects of aging on the neural correlates of recollection and familiarity. *Cortex*, 49, 1585–1597.
- Asano, S., Mihara, B., Kirino, T., & Sugishita, M. (2004). Anatomical constraints on visualization of the human hippocampus using echo-planar imaging. *Neuroradiology*, 46, 535–540.
- Baayen, R. H., Piepenbrock, R., & Gulikers, L. (1995). *The CELEX lexical database [weblex]*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania, Linguistic Data Consortium.
- Bader, R., Mecklinger, A., Hoppstädter, M., & Meyer, P. (2010). Recognition memory for one-trial-unitized word pairs: Evidence from event-related potentials. *NeuroImage*, 50, 772–781.
- Binder, J. R., Desai, R. H., Graves, W. W., & Conant, L. L. (2009). Where is the semantic system? A critical review and meta-analysis of 120 functional neuroimaging studies. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 2767–2796.
- Bridger, E. K., Bader, R., Kriukova, O., Unger, K., & Mecklinger, A. (2012). The FN400 is functionally distinct from the N400. *NeuroImage*, 63, 1334–1342.
- Bridger, E. K., Bader, R., & Mecklinger, A. (2014). More ways than one: ERPs reveal multiple familiarity signals in the word frequency mirror effect. *Neuropsychologia*, 57, 179–190.

- 1 Ceraso, J. (1985). Unit formation in perception and memory. *Psychology of Learning and*
2 *Motivation: Advances in Research and Theory*, 19, 179–210.
- 3
4 Daselaar, S. M., Fleck, M. S., & Cabeza, R. (2006). Triple dissociation in the medial temporal
5 lobes: Recollection, familiarity, and novelty. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 96, 1902–
6 1911.
- 7
8
9
10
11 Davachi, L., & Wagner, A. D. (2002). Hippocampal contributions to episodic encoding:
12 Insights from relational and item-based learning. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 88,
13 982–990.
- 14
15
16
17
18 Desseilles, M., Balteau, E., Sterpenich, V., Dang-Vu, T. T., Darsaud, A., Vandewalle, G., ...
19 Schmidt, C. (2009). Abnormal neural filtering of irrelevant visual information in
20 depression. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 29, 1395–1403.
- 21
22
23
24
25
26 Diana, R. A., Yonelinas, A. P., & Ranganath, C. (2007). Imaging recollection and familiarity
27 in the medial temporal lobe: A three-component model. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*,
28 11, 379–386.
- 29
30
31
32
33 Dobbins, I. G., Foley, H., Schacter, D. L., & Wagner, A. D. (2002). Executive control during
34 episodic retrieval: Multiple prefrontal processes subserve source memory. *Neuron*, 35,
35 989–996.
- 36
37
38
39
40 Dobbins, I. G., Rice, H. J., Wagner, A. D., & Schacter, D. L. (2003). Memory orientation and
41 success: Separable neurocognitive components underlying episodic recognition. *Neu-*
42 *ropsychologia*, 41, 318–333.
- 43
44
45
46
47 Eichenbaum, H., Yonelinas, A. P., & Ranganath, C. (2007). The medial temporal lobe and
48 recognition memory. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 30, 123–152.
- 49
50
51
52
53 Ford, J. H., Verfaellie, M., & Giovanello, K. S. (2010). Neural correlates of familiarity-based
54 associative retrieval. *Neuropsychologia*, 48, 3019–3025.
- 55
56
57
58
59 Friston, K. J., Penny, W. D., & Glaser, D. E. (2005). Conjunction revisited. *NeuroImage*, 25,
60 661–667.
- 61
62
63
64
65

- 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
61
62
63
64
65
- Giovanello, K. S., Keane, M. M., & Verfaellie, M. (2006). The contribution of familiarity to associative memory in amnesia. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*, 1859–1865.
- Giovanello, K. S., Schnyer, D. M., & Verfaellie, M. (2004). A critical role for the anterior hippocampus in relational memory: Evidence from an fMRI study comparing associative and item recognition. *Hippocampus*, *14*, 5–8.
- Giovanello, K. S., Schnyer, D., & Verfaellie, M. (2009). Distinct hippocampal regions make unique contributions to relational memory. *Hippocampus*, *19*, 111–117.
- Goebel, R., Esposito, F., & Formisano, E. (2006). Analysis of FIAC data with BrainVoyager QX: From single-subject to cortically aligned group GLM analysis and self-organizing group ICA. *Human Brain Mapping*, *27*, 392–401.
- Graf, P., & Schacter, D. L. (1989). Unitization and grouping mediate dissociations in memory for new associations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *15*, 930–940.
- Haskins, A. L., Yonelinas, A. P., Quamme, J., & Ranganath, C. (2008). Perirhinal cortex supports encoding and familiarity-based recognition of novel associations. *Neuron*, *59*, 554–560.
- Henke, K. (2010). A model for memory systems based on processing modes rather than consciousness. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *11*, 523–532.
- Henson, R. N., Cansino, S., Herron, J. E., Robb, W. G. K., & Rugg, M. D. (2003). A familiarity signal in human anterior medial temporal cortex? *Hippocampus*, *13*, 301–304.
- Henson, R. N., Hornberger, M., & Rugg, M. D. (2005). Further dissociating the processes involved in recognition memory: An fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *17*, 1058–1073.

- Henson, R. N., Rugg, M. D., Shallice, T., Josephs, O., & Dolan, R. J. (1999). Recollection and familiarity in recognition memory: An event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 19, 3962–3972.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 6, 65–70.
- Horowitz, L. M., & Prytulak, L. S. (1969). Redintegrative memory. *Psychological Review*, 76, 519–531.
- Hutchinson, J. B., Uncapher, M. R., Weiner, K. S., Bressler, D. W., Silver, M. A., Preston, A. R., & Wagner, A. D. (2014). Functional heterogeneity in posterior parietal cortex across attention and episodic memory retrieval. *Cerebral Cortex*, 24, 49–66.
- Jacoby, L. L., Jones, T. C., & Dolan, P. O. (1998). Two effects of repetition: Support for a dual-process model of knowledge judgments and exclusion errors. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 5, 705–709.
- Jäger, T., Mecklinger, A., & Kipp, K. H. (2006). Intra- and inter-item associations doubly dissociate the electrophysiological correlates of familiarity and recollection. *Neuron*, 52, 535–545.
- Jarmasz, J., & Hollands, J. G. (2009). Confidence intervals in repeated-measures designs: The number of observations principle. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 63, 124–138.
- Kahana, M. J. (2002). Associative symmetry and memory theory. *Memory & Cognition*, 30, 823–840.
- Kriukova, O., Bridger, E., & Mecklinger, A. (2013). Semantic relations differentially impact associative recognition memory: Electrophysiological evidence. *Brain and Cognition*, 83, 93–103.

- Lieberman, M. D., & Cunningham, W. A. (2009). Type I and Type II error concerns in fMRI research: Re-balancing the scale. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 4, 423–428.
- MacKenzie, G., & Donaldson, D. I. (2007). Dissociating recollection from familiarity: Electrophysiological evidence that familiarity for faces is associated with a posterior old/new effect. *NeuroImage*, 36, 454–463.
- Mandler, G. (1980). Recognizing: The judgment of previous occurrence. *Psychological Review*, 87, 252–271.
- Mayes, A. R., Isaac, C. L., Holdstock, J. S., Hunkin, N. M., Montaldi, D., Downes, J. J., ... Roberts, J. N. (2001). Memory for single items, word pairs, and temporal order of different kinds in a patient with selective hippocampal lesions. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 18, 97–123.
- Mecklinger, A., & Jäger, T. (2009). Episodic memory storage and retrieval: Insights from electrophysiological measures. In F. Rösler, C. Ranganath, B. Röder, & R. H. Kluwe (Eds.), *Neuroimaging of human memory: Linking cognitive processes to neural systems* (pp. 357–381). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, P., Mecklinger, A., & Friederici, A. D. (2010). On the processing of semantic aspects of experience in the anterior medial temporal lobe: An event-related fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22, 590–601.
- Montaldi, D., Spencer, T. J., Roberts, N., & Mayes, A. R. (2006). The neural system that mediates familiarity memory. *Hippocampus*, 16, 504–520.
- Norman, K. A., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2003). Modeling hippocampal and neocortical contributions to recognition memory: A complementary-learning-systems approach. *Psychological Review*, 110, 611–646.
- Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: The Edinburgh Inventory. *Neuropsychologia*, 9, 97–113.

- 1 Opitz, B. (2010a). Context-dependent repetition effects on recognition memory. *Brain and*
2 *Cognition*, 73, 110–118.
3
- 4 Opitz, B. (2010b). Neural binding mechanisms in learning and memory. *Neuroscience &*
5 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34, 1036–1046.
6
- 7 Park, H., & Rugg, M. D. (2008). The relationship between study processing and the effects of
8 cue congruency at retrieval: fMRI support for transfer appropriate processing.
9 *Cerebral Cortex*, 18, 868–875.
10
- 11 Preston, A. R., & Eichenbaum, H. (2013). Interplay of hippocampus and prefrontal cortex in
12 memory. *Current Biology*, 23, R764–R773.
13
- 14 Quamme, J. R., Yonelinas, A. P., & Norman, K. A. (2007). Effect of unitization on associative
15 recognition in amnesia. *Hippocampus*, 17, 192–200.
16
- 17 Ranganath, C. (2010). A unified framework for the functional organization of the medial
18 temporal lobes and the phenomenology of episodic memory. *Hippocampus*, 20, 1263–
19 1290.
20
- 21 Rhodes, S. M., & Donaldson, D. I. (2007). Electrophysiological evidence for the influence of
22 unitization on the processes engaged during episodic retrieval: Enhancing familiarity
23 based remembering. *Neuropsychologia*, 45, 412–424.
24
- 25 Rhodes, S. M., & Donaldson, D. I. (2008). Electrophysiological evidence for the effect of
26 interactive imagery on episodic memory: Encouraging familiarity for non-unitized
27 stimuli during associative recognition. *NeuroImage*, 39, 873–884.
28
- 29 Schacter, D. L., & Wagner, A. D. (1999). Medial temporal lobe activations in fMRI and PET
30 studies of episodic encoding and retrieval. *Hippocampus*, 9, 7–24.
31
- 32 Skinner, E. I., & Fernandes, M. A. (2007). Neural correlates of recollection and familiarity: A
33 review of neuroimaging and patient data. *Neuropsychologia*, 45, 2163–2179.
34
- 35 Staresina, B. P., & Davachi, L. (2006). Differential encoding mechanisms for subsequent
36 associative recognition and free recall. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 26, 9162–9172.
37

- 1 Stenberg, G., Hellman, J., Johansson, M., & Rosén, I. (2009). Familiarity or conceptual
2 priming: Event-related potentials in name recognition. *Journal of Cognitive*
3
4 *Neuroscience*, 21, 447–460.
5
6
- 7 Talairach, J., & Tournoux, P. (1988). *Co-planar stereotaxic atlas of the human brain: 3-*
8
9 *dimensional proportional system: An approach to cerebral imaging*. Stuttgart,
10
11 Germany: Thieme.
12
13
- 14 Turriziani, P., Fadda, L., Caltagirone, C., & Carlesimo, G. A. (2004). Recognition memory for
15
16 single items and for associations in amnesic patients. *Neuropsychologia*, 42, 426–433.
17
18
- 19 Uncapher, M. R., Otten, L. J., & Rugg, M. D. (2006). Episodic encoding is more than the sum
20
21 of its parts: An fMRI investigation of multifeatured contextual encoding. *Neuron*, 52,
22
23 547–556.
24
25
- 26 van Kesteren, M. T. R., Ruiter, D. J., Fernández, G., & Henson, R. N. (2012). How schema
27
28 and novelty augment memory formation. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 35, 211–219.
29
30
- 31 Vargha-Khadem, F., Gadian, D. G., Watkins, K. E., Connelly, A., Van Paesschen, W., &
32
33 Mishkin, M. (1997). Differential effects of early hippocampal pathology on episodic
34
35 and semantic memory. *Science*, 277, 376–80.
36
37
- 38 Vilberg, K. L., & Rugg, M. D. (2008). Memory retrieval and the parietal cortex: A review of
39
40 evidence from a dual-process perspective. *Neuropsychologia*, 46, 1787–1799.
41
42
- 43 Vilberg, K. L., & Rugg, M. D. (2009). Functional significance of retrieval-related activity in
44
45 lateral parietal cortex: Evidence from fMRI and ERPs. *Human Brain Mapping*, 30,
46
47 1490–1501.
48
49
- 50 Wiegand, I., Bader, R., & Mecklinger, A. (2010). Multiple ways to the prior occurrence of an
51
52 event: An electrophysiological dissociation of experimental and conceptually driven
53
54 familiarity in recognition memory. *Brain Research*, 1360, 106–118.
55
56
- 57 Yonelinas, A. P. (2002). The nature of recollection and familiarity: A review of 30 years of
58
59 research. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 46, 441–517.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Yonelinas, A. P., Aly, M., Wang, W.-C., & Koen, J. D. (2010). Recollection and familiarity:
2 Examining controversial assumptions and new directions. *Hippocampus*, 20, 1178–
3
4 1194.
5
6
7 Yonelinas, A. P., Kroll, N. E., Dobbins, I. G., & Soltani, M. (1999). Recognition memory for
8
9 faces: When familiarity supports associative recognition judgments. *Psychonomic*
10
11 *Bulletin & Review*, 6, 654–661.
12
13
14 Yonelinas, A. P., Otten, L. J., Shaw, K. N., & Rugg, M. D. (2005). Separating the brain
15
16 regions involved in recollection and familiarity in recognition memory. *Journal of*
17
18 *Neuroscience*, 25, 3002–3008.
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
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Mean reaction times (ms) for the four different pair types in both encoding conditions (standard error of the mean).

	same	reversed	recombined	new
definition	1401 (53)	1512 (56)	1677 (72)	1476 (66)
sentence	1567 (49)	1554 (41)	1910 (52)	1770 (52)

Table 2. Brain regions showing significantly different BOLD signals for **same** vs. **new** pairs (general recognition). Side of activation (hemi; L = left, R = right), Brodmann areas (BA), size of activation (in anatomical voxels), Talairach coordinates of peak voxels (for group-specific clusters) or center of gravity (for inclusion analysis), and t-value of peak voxel are indicated. Note that there is no peak voxel in a conjunction analysis.

region of activity	hemi	BA	size	x	y	z	t-value
both groups							
<i>same > new</i>							
Posterior Cingulate	L	31	520	-5	-46	27	
Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	40	88	-41	-56	37	
Angular Gyrus	L	39	136	-50	-60	32	
Angular Gyrus	L	39	416	-42	-68	32	
<i>new > same</i>							
no clusters							
sentence group							
<i>same > new</i>							
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	6	96	-6	39	34	5.51
Superior Frontal Gyrus	L	8	80	-21	23	49	4.89
Superior Frontal Gyrus	L	6	88	-18	13	56	5.45
Middle Frontal Gyrus	L	8	136	-47	11	39	5.21
Middle Frontal Gyrus	L	6	176	-39	0	45	5.25
Thalamus	L		88	-4	-13	10	7.14
Cingulate Gyrus	L	31	216	-14	-47	26	5.50
Posterior Cingulate	L	30	752	-3	-47	14	6.64
Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	22	88	53	-51	11	4.47
Posterior Cingulate	R	23	80	5	-53	20	4.90
Angular Gyrus	L	39	168	-55	-59	37	5.06
Superior Temporal Gyrus	L	39	1640	-52	-62	19	8.03
Precuneus	L	31	88	-13	-64	23	5.33
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	19	120	-38	-78	20	5.50
Superior Occipital Gyrus	L	19	152	-39	-80	28	5.36
Hippocampus / Entorhinal Cortex	L	28	176	-17	-21	-12	4.65
<i>new > same</i>							
no clusters							

definition group							
<i>same > new</i>							
Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	40	152	-39	-52	44	5.59
Precuneus	L	19	160	-32	-72	36	6.29
<i>new > same</i>							
no clusters							

Table 3. Brain regions showing significantly different BOLD signals for **same vs. recombined** pairs (associative recognition). See Table 2 for details.

region of activity	hemi	BA	size	x	y	z	t-value
both groups							
<i>same > recombined</i>							
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	10	144	-7	50	15	
Anterior Cingulate	L	24	88	-2	38	3	
Posterior Cingulate	L	23	80	-2	-49	25	
<i>recombined > same</i>							
no clusters							
sentence group							
<i>same > recombined</i>							
Superior Frontal Gyrus	R	8	152	8	50	38	5.42
Medial Frontal Gyrus	R	9	88	4	47	33	5.20
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	8	88	-7	45	37	6.18
Anterior Cingulate	L	32	272	-6	34	20	6.96
Anterior Cingulate	L	24	160	0	33	6	6.75
Superior Frontal Gyrus	L	6	80	-9	27	58	5.95
Superior Frontal Gyrus	R	6	104	17	19	60	6.15
Superior Frontal Gyrus	L	6	88	-16	19	61	4.80
Middle Frontal Gyrus	L	6	80	-37	12	49	5.40
Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	21	152	53	-3	-9	5.58
Cingulate Gyrus	L	23	152	0	-23	30	5.53
Cingulate Gyrus	L	24	176	0	-23	39	5.25
Cingulate Gyrus	R	31	136	5	-31	35	5.35
Posterior Cingulate	R	23	488	11	-47	25	7.08
Posterior Cingulate	L	31	96	-8	-50	24	4.77
Inferior Parietal Lobule	R	40	496	47	-51	35	6.01
Posterior Cingulate	L	30	1064	-6	-51	13	6.64
Superior Temporal Gyrus	L	39	520	-50	-60	27	7.05
Superior Temporal Gyrus	L	22	744	-58	-60	17	8.36
Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	39	192	-47	-62	42	5.54
Amygdala	R		112	22	-3	-11	3.85
Amygdala	L		48	-17	-3	-18	5.67
Hippocampus	L		240	-23	-10	-20	5.06
Hippocampus	R		48	22	-13	-18	4.65
Hippocampus	R		40	28	-21	-9	4.64

Hippocampus	L	80	-27	-33	-5	3.76
-------------	---	----	-----	-----	----	------

recombined > same

no clusters

definition group

same > recombined

Anterior Cingulate	L	32	304	-3	44	7	6.18
--------------------	---	----	-----	----	----	---	------

Anterior Cingulate	R	32	80	5	36	-6	4.86
--------------------	---	----	----	---	----	----	------

Anterior Cingulate	R	32	88	13	33	20	6.30
--------------------	---	----	----	----	----	----	------

Caudate Nucleus	R		104	7	11	7	5.79
-----------------	---	--	-----	---	----	---	------

recombined > same

no clusters

Table 4. Brain regions showing significantly different BOLD signals for **reversed vs. new** pairs (item recognition). See Table 2 for details.

region of activity	hemi	BA	size	x	y	z	t-value
both groups							
<i>reversed > new</i>							
Angular Gyrus	L	39	104	-45	-62	35	
Precuneus	L	39	80	-37	-66	35	
<i>new > same</i>							
no clusters							
sentence group							
<i>reversed > new</i>							
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	9	128	-4	52	18	5.87
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	6	208	-6	39	22	7.17
Anterior Cingulate	L	32	104	-7	35	24	5.89
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	9	216	-10	31	32	6.24
Superior Frontal Gyrus	L	6	144	-23	17	60	5.36
Insula	L	13	80	-38	1	-3	6.87
Precentral Gyrus	L	6	96	-49	1	46	6.72
Thalamus	L		208	-4	-16	10	7.40
Posterior Cingulate	R	23	216	11	-47	24	6.25
Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	40	80	-47	-47	20	5.20
Posterior Cingulate	L	31	2176	-11	-55	19	7.93
Lingual Gyrus	L	18	96	-18	-55	4	4.76
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	19	4016	-38	-77	21	9.13
Hippocampus	L		208	-22	-19	-13	5.20
Parahippocampal Gyrus	L	36	184	-25	-31	-12	5.24
Amygdala	L		96	-16	-7	-9	6.06
<i>new > reversed</i>							
no clusters							
definition group							
<i>reversed > new</i>							
Inferior Frontal Gyrus	L	45	240	-48	23	20	5.94
Clastrum	L		88	-30	15	1	5.01
Caudate Nucleus	L		112	-10	4	10	5.03

Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	39	624	-36	-63	41	6.98
Precuneus	L	19	96	-32	-71	35	4.90

new > reversed

no clusters

Table 5. Brain regions which were selectively activated for same > new and reversed > new in the definition group. In this analysis, each contrast was exclusively masked by the other contrast and by the same contrast in the sentence group. See Table 2 for details.

region of activity	hemi	BA	size	x	y	z	t-value
<i>same > new masked by reversed > new</i>							
Medial Frontal Gyrus	L	10	80	-12	51	7	6.62
Posterior Cingulate	L	31	112	-10	-50	22	5.34
Precuneus	L	7	96	-4	-59	31	5.97
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	39	176	-41	-70	28	5.24
<i>reversed > new masked by same > new</i>							
Inferior Frontal Gyrus	L	45	96	-44	19	12	4.87

Figure 1. Schematic illustration of pairs used in the test phase and the fMRI contrasts for the example study pairs A B and C D. fMRI analyses contrasted types of pairs that are most distinct with respect to the process of interest but very similar with respect to all other aspects of recognition. Pair types which should be perceived as “old” are marked in dark gray and those which should be perceived as “new” are marked in light gray (note that this does not necessarily correspond with the correct response as in the case of unit recognition). For instance, associative recognition should lead to perception of “old” for same pairs and to perception of “new” for recombined pairs. Only pairs with correct responses were used for the fMRI analyses.

Figure 2. Probability of correct responses for all four pair types in the two encoding groups. Shaded parts indicate the proportion of responses that were given with high confidence. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals for the Encoding Group x Pair Type interaction (Jarmasz & Hollands, 2009).

Figure 3. Activation clusters in the MTL revealed by three different contrasts in the sentence group and one contrast in the definition group. The clusters are overlaid on a T1-weighted image of one participant and coordinates indicate slice position. Note that left hemisphere is depicted on the right side. For descriptive purpose, bar graphs show mean beta values averaged for the indicated clusters for all four pair types in both encoding groups. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.

Figure 4. Selected clusters in the left hemisphere which were selectively activated for same > new and reversed > new, respectively, in the definition group. In this analysis, each contrast was exclusively masked by the other contrast. The clusters are overlaid on a T1-weighted image of one participant and coordinates indicate slice position.

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

test phase						
pairs			contrasts			
pair type	example	correct response	general recognition	associative recognition	unit recognition	item recognition
same	A B	,old'				
reversed	B A					
recombined	A D	,new'				
new	E F					

Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)