



HAL
open science

Do manufactured and natural objects evoke similar motor information? The case of action priming.

Marc Godard, Yannick Wamain, Solène Kalénine

► To cite this version:

Marc Godard, Yannick Wamain, Solène Kalénine. Do manufactured and natural objects evoke similar motor information? The case of action priming.. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2019, Quarterly journal of experimental psychology (2006), 72 (12), pp.2801-2806. 10.1177/1747021819862210 . hal-02960030

HAL Id: hal-02960030

<https://hal.univ-lille.fr/hal-02960030>

Submitted on 7 Oct 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Do manufactured and natural objects evoke similar motor information? The case of action priming.

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-STD-18-410.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Godard, Marc; Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 9193 – SCALab – Sciences Cognitives et Sciences Affectives, F – 59000, France, Psychology Wamain, Yannick; Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 9193 – SCALab – Sciences Cognitives et Sciences Affectives, F – 59000, France, Psychology Kalénine, Solène; Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 9193 – SCALab – Sciences Cognitives et Sciences Affectives, F – 59000, France, Psychology
Keywords:	embodied cognition, priming, action representations, object concepts, semantic categorization

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Do manufactured and natural objects evoke similar motor information?**
4

5
6 **The case of action priming.**
7

8
9 Marc Godard, Yannick Wamain, Solène Kalénine*

10
11 Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 9193 – SCALab – Sciences Cognitives et Sciences Affectives, F –
12
13
14 59000, France
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ***Corresponding author:** Solène Kalénine (solene.kalenine@univ-lille.fr)
29

30
31 Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 9193 – SCALab – Sciences Cognitives et Sciences Affectives, F –
32
33
34 59000, France
35
36
37
38
39

40 Word count total (including: abstract, main text, figures, tables, footnotes): 3639
41

42 Word count (abstract): 181
43

44
45 Word count (Title page): 34
46

47
48 Number of references: 26 references
49

50
51 Number of pages (without figures and tables): 17 pages
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

There is considerable evidence that visually presented manipulable objects evoke motor information, supporting the existence of affordance effects during object perception. However, most arguments come from stimulus-response compatibility paradigms, raising the issue of the automaticity of affordance effects. Action priming paradigms overcome this issue but show less reliable results, possibly because affordance effects are moderated by additional factors. The present study aimed to assess whether affordance effects highlighted in action priming paradigms could be affected by object category (manufactured or natural). Twenty-four young adults performed a semantic categorization task on natural and manufactured target objects presented after neutral (non-grasping hand postures) or action (congruent power or precision grips) primes. Results revealed a modulation of action priming effects as a function of object category. Object semantic categorization was faster after action than neutral primes, but only for manufactured objects. Results suggest that natural and manufactured objects evoke distinct types of affordances and that action priming paradigms favour the evocation of functional affordances during object semantic categorization. This finding fuels the debate on the nature of the motor information evoked by visual objects.

Keywords: *embodied cognition, priming, action representations, object concepts, semantic categorization*

Introduction

The literature on visual perception highlights close connections between action and the perception and recognition of objects, in accordance with embodied and grounded views of cognition (e.g., Barsalou, 2008; Gallese & Lakoff, 2013). In particular, motor affordance effects show that object perceptual and conceptual processing is affected by the evocation of their typical gestures (Thill, Caligiore, Borghi, Ziemke, & Baldassarre, 2013; van Elk, van Schie, & Bekkering, 2014, for review). At the neural level, affordances effects are supported by the activation of motor brain areas during perception and identification of manipulable objects (Gerlach, Law, & Paulson, 2002).

Classically, the effects of object affordances on perceptual and semantic judgements are demonstrated in visuo-motor tasks (e.g., Bub, Masson, & van Mook, 2018; Lindemann, Abolafia, Girardi, & Bekkering, 2007; Tucker & Ellis, 2001). In one first study, Tucker and Ellis (2001) showed activation of object motor properties during object semantic categorization using a stimulus-response compatibility paradigm. Real objects that could be small (i.e. grasped with a precision grip) or large (i.e. grasped with a power grip) were presented. Participants had to determine whether objects were natural or manufactured by grasping a device with either a precision or a power grip. Response times were faster when the response grip was compatible with the grip evoked by object real size. Results were interpreted as automatic activation of the specific grasp gestures associated with the object when accessing the object concept. Yet this interpretation faces two challenges. First, real object perception provides direct visual information about object size. Thus, affordance effects could occur without motor information being a part of the object conceptual representation. The issue has been overcome by displaying objects in a standardized size (Borghi et al., 2006; Ni, Liu, & Yu, 2018; Yu, Abrams, & Zacks, 2014). Second, the presence of a specific motor response questions the automaticity of affordance effects. Some authors

1
2
3 have thus proposed alternative paradigms that do not involve specific motor responses to
4
5 investigate affordance effects during object visual processing.
6
7

8 Action priming paradigms may be particularly relevant in this regard (Borghi et al., 2006;
9
10 Helbig, Steinwender, Graf, & Kiefer, 2010; Kalénine, Bonthoux, & Borghi, 2009; Ni et al.,
11
12 2018; Perraudin & Mounoud, 2009). In one first priming study, Borghi et al. (2006) presented
13
14 object pictures in their standardized size that were primed by pictures of hand postures. Each
15
16 object was presented three times, once with a compatible hand posture (e.g., orange-clench),
17
18 once with an incompatible hand posture (e.g., orange-pinch) and once with a non-grasping
19
20 hand posture (e.g., orange-palm). Participants had to categorize target objects as manufactured
21
22 or natural by pressing two different keys. When the prime displayed the palm posture, they
23
24 had to refrain from responding (catch-trials). The authors reported a priming effect with
25
26 shorter response times after compatible than incompatible action primes, but only when the
27
28 grasp presented in the prime had been previously practiced by the participants. Although the
29
30 demonstration of priming effects is promising, the presence of prior action practice weakens
31
32 the impact of priming results regarding the automaticity of affordance evocation.
33
34
35
36
37

38 However, many additional factors may explain the low reliability of action priming
39
40 effects. For instance, affordance effects have been shown to be modulated by the visual scene
41
42 (e.g., Kalénine, Shapiro, & Buxbaum, 2013), action intentions (e.g., Lee, Middleton, Mirma,
43
44 Kalénine, & Buxbaum, 2013), task demands (e.g., Tipper, Paul, & Hayes, 2006), and object
45
46 types (e.g., Ferri, Riggio, Gallese, & Costantini, 2011). Interestingly, when Ferri et al. (2011)
47
48 asked participants to categorize objects as natural or manufactured using compatible or
49
50 incompatible reach-to-grasp movements, they found affordance effects for manufactured
51
52 objects but not for natural objects. Thus, the difficulty to highlight priming effects in studies
53
54 such as Borghi et al. (2006) may also be due to the mix of different object categories, some of
55
56 them showing the effect and some others not. The present study aims to assess whether
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 manufactured and natural objects show similar affordance effects in action priming. An
4
5 adaptation of Borghi et al. (2006)'s paradigm was used. If object category accounts, at least to
6
7 some extent, for the vulnerability of action priming effects, then we should observe a
8
9 modulation of action priming according to object category with greater (or even exclusive)
10
11 priming for manufactured objects.
12
13

14 15 **Method**

16 17 18 **Participants**

19
20
21 Twenty-four adults (mean age = 25; age range 18 – 53, 14 women) took part in the
22
23 experiment¹. All participants were right-handed and had normal or corrected-to-normal visual
24
25 acuity. The entire protocol was approved by the Ethical Committee of the University and was
26
27 in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki (1964, revised in 2013). All participants gave
28
29 written informed consent and were not paid for their participation.
30
31

32 33 **Stimuli**

34
35
36 Photographs of manipulable objects were selected from open source database (Pixabay).
37
38 Object size was standardized. Objects were displayed in a fictive square of 500 x 500 pixels
39
40 on a black background centered on their horizontal axis. Among the 50 objects selected (40
41
42 for test-trials + 4 for catch-trials + 6 for practice-trials), 25 were manufactured (e.g., bowl)
43
44 and 25 were natural (e.g., apple). In each category, half of the objects were usually grasped
45
46 with a precision grip (e.g., cherry, marble) and half were usually grasped with a power grip
47
48 (e.g., apple, bowl) according to their real size. The 40 test object pictures are presented in
49
50
51
52 Appendix 1.
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹ “Sample size was determined using the `power.t.test` function of the `pwr` R package
59 considering a medium effect size and a statistical power of 0.80 for the expected priming
60 advantage for artifact vs. natural objects”.

1
2
3 Photographs of a hand in five different postures were designed and displayed on a black
4 background. The center of the hand was placed in the middle of the screen. Among the five
5 hand pictures, twice displayed a grasping hand posture (power or precision grip) and three
6 displayed a non-grasping hand posture (palm-up, palm-down and fist). All pictures were
7 displayed on a 27" screen (1920 x 1080 pixels, 120 Hz) with MatLab 9.2 (MathWorks,
8 Natick, USA) and Psychophysics Toolbox extensions.

17 *Controls of the stimuli*

19
20 Thirteen additional participants judged the overall manipulability and the variability of manipulation
21 of the 40 objects used the experiments presented among 40 fillers selected from Salmon, McMullen
22 and Filliter (2010). They rated on a 5-point Likert scale a) "the manipulability of the object according
23 to how easy it is to grasp and use the object with one hand" and b) "the extent to which the way you
24 manipulate the object can vary for each manipulation". Natural and artifact objects were judged highly
25 and equally manipulable (median = 5 [range of value: 5 to 5] for natural objects and median: 5 [range:
26 5 to 5] for manufactured objects). Moreover, natural and artefact objects showed low and equivalent
27 variability in the way they are manipulated (median = 2 [range of value: 1 to 2] for natural objects and
28 median: 2 [range of value: 1 to 3] for manufactured objects).

39 **Procedure**

40
41
42 Participants were seated 60 cm from the screen. Stimuli were inserted in an action priming
43 paradigm with hand pictures as primes and object pictures as targets. Each trial started with a
44 fixation cross presented at the center of the screen for 500 ms followed by one of the hand
45 primes for 500 ms (Figure 1). Then the object target was presented until participants' response
46 or for a maximum of 4000 ms. Participants were asked to categorize the object as natural or
47 manufactured by pressing the "q" and "m" keys of an Azerty keyboard with their left and
48 right hand. Response mapping was counterbalanced between participants. Response times and
49 errors were recorded.

1
2
3 During the test phase, each target object was presented twice, once with the appropriate
4 grasping hand prime (power or precision grip) in the action priming condition and once with
5 one of two non-grasping hand primes (palm-down or fist) in the neutral priming condition,
6 leading to 80 experimental trials. Eight additional catch-trials (10%) were designed using four
7 additional target objects presented with the palm-up “no-go” prime. On catch-trials,
8 participants were asked to refrain from responding in order to ensure that they paid attention
9 to the primes. The 88 trials were randomly presented.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Participants performed 20 representative practice trials beforehand involving six additional
21 target objects.

22
23
24
25 --- Insert Figure 1 about here ---
26
27
28
29

30 **Results**

31
32
33
34 Performance on catch-trials was verified for each participant (mean accuracy = 93%, min =
35 63%) but analyses were restricted to critical trials. Response times (RTs) inferior to 200 ms
36 and superior to 3000 ms (1%) and RTs for incorrect responses (3%) were excluded from the
37 analyses. RTs were finally trimmed by removing those exceeding 3 standard deviations from
38 the participant’s mean in each condition. Overall, 3.13% of RTs were excluded (3.96% for
39 neutral priming x manufactured objects; 4.38% for action priming x manufactured objects,
40 2.71% for neutral priming x natural objects and 2.08% for action priming x manufactured
41 objects). Mean RTs and standard deviations in the different conditions are reported in Table 1
42 and raw data are available here
43 https://osf.io/8qzkc/?view_only=4f0b14f72e3940f38bfff87bfa2499c0.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
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

1
2
3 A mixed-effect model was used to analyze log transformed RTs as a function of Priming
4 (action, neutral) and Category (natural, manufactured). Mixed-effect-linear models do not
5
6 require prior averaging of the data and allow taking into account differences between
7
8 individuals and variation in their sensitivity to the factors of interest (Baayen, Davidson, &
9
10 Bates, 2008; “random intercepts” and “random slopes”, see below). In the present experiment,
11
12 there were 24 subjects x 20 items = 480 RTs in each Priming x Category condition. We also
13
14 added Grasp type (power and precision grip) to the model, as it has been shown to influence
15
16 RTs (Borghetti et al., 2006). Thus, fixed effects corresponded to the effect of Priming, Category,
17
18 Grasp Type and their interactions. We predicted possible main effects of Priming, Category,
19
20 Grasp Type and a Category x Grasp Type interaction but more critically, we expected an
21
22 interaction between Priming and Category. The random effect structure of the model included
23
24 participants as random effect factor with random intercepts and random slopes for priming
25
26 (analyses conducted with lme4 3.0-1 package of R version 3.4.4).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

--- Insert Table 1 about here ---

42 LmerTest package (version 3.0-1) was used to obtain significance F-tests of fixed effects.
43
44 Denominator degrees of freedom were approximated using Satterthwaite’s approximations. A
45
46 R-squared value for the whole model was provided using the r.squaredGLMM function of the
47
48 MuMIn package (version 1.42.1). Cohen d effect sizes were computed for relevant t-tests as
49
50 the ratio between the estimated mean difference between conditions and the square root of the
51
52 sum of the residual variance and the variance of the random effects of the model, following
53
54 Westfall, Kenny and Judd (2014).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The entire linear model explained 37% of variance ($R^2 = 0.37$). There was a main effect of
4
5 Category [$F(1,1826.02) = 13.1, p = 0.001$]. RTs were shorter for natural than for
6
7 manufactured objects (estimate [manufactured – natural] = $+1.7 \times 10^{-2}$, $SE = 0.498 \times 10^{-2}$, d
8
9 = 0.13). Importantly, we observe a main effect of Priming [$F(1,671.31) = 9.91, p = 0.002$].
10
11 RTs were 26 ms shorter for correct than neutral action priming (estimate [neutral – action] =
12
13 $+1.63 \times 10^{-2}$, $SE = 0.5 \times 10^{-2}$, $d = 0.12$). There was no main effect of Grasp type
14
15 [$F(1,1826.03) = 0.68, p = 0.41$] but a marginal two-way interaction between object Grasp type
16
17 and Category [$F(1,1826.02) = 3.8, p = 0.053$]. The advantage of natural (n) objects over
18
19 manufactured (m) objects tended to be greater for objects grasped with a power grip
20
21 compared to precision grip (estimate [(m-n)power grip – (m-n)precision grip] = $+1.9 \times 10^{-2}$,
22
23 $SE = 0.957 \times 10^{-2}$, $d = 0.14$). The predicted interaction between Priming and Category was
24
25 significant [$F(1,1826.02) = 4.2, p = 0.041$]. As expected, the interaction was due to the
26
27 presence of a priming effect for manufactured objects [estimate = $+1.4 \times 10^{-2}$, $t = 3.66$, $SE =$
28
29 0.7×10^{-2} , $p = 0.001$, $d = 0.20$] but not for natural objects [estimate = $+0.2 \times 10^{-2}$, $t = 0.79$,
30
31 $SE = 0.7 \times 10^{-2}$, $p = 0.43$, $d = 0.04$]. No other effect was significant.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Discussion

45
46
47 The present experiment confirms that the evocation of motor information associated with
48
49 manipulable objects affects their semantic processing. Results showed that overall, object
50
51 semantic categorization was faster after action primes than neutral primes. Specifically, the
52
53 presentation of typical grasping postures facilitated object categorization, even when
54
55 displayed in a standardized size that does not provide direct information about the appropriate
56
57 grip aperture. Furthermore, the priming paradigm did not involve the execution of specific
58
59
60

1
2
3 grasping responses, reinforcing the idea that grasping postures may be evoked in the absence
4 of specific motor plan. The functional role of motor information in object concepts is still
5 largely debated (Mahon & Caramazza, 2008). In this context, the present results support the
6 hypothesis that some motor attributes evoked by visual objects, along with other perceptual
7 and non-perceptual features, are integrated to object conceptual representations, in line with
8 embodied and grounded views of concepts (e.g., Barsalou, 2008). Critically, the present
9 experiment further demonstrates that the facilitative effect of action priming on object
10 semantic categorization is modulated by object category. Overall, semantic categorization was
11 faster for natural than artifact objects, consistent with previous priming studies and with an
12 interpretation of category-specific deficits related to the higher structural similarity among
13 natural than artifact objects (Gerlach, 2017). Yet natural objects did not benefit from action
14 priming. In contrast, results showed that the advantage of action primes over neutral primes
15 was driven by manufactured objects, and was actually not present for natural objects. The
16 difference of action priming effects between object categories could not be accounted for by
17 differences in overall manipulability or variability in object manipulation between natural and
18 artifact object categories, since natural objects were judged as highly manipulable and as
19 steady in their manipulation as artifact objects. The methodological and theoretical
20 consequences of this distinction are discussed below.

21
22 Although Borghi et al. (2006) used a similar priming protocol, their priming results were not
23 as clear-cut. In particular, they did not succeed to highlight action priming effects when the
24 participants had no motor practice with the hand primes. The need of motor practice nuances
25 the role of affordances in object concepts and may be a drawback for strong embodied views.
26 At least, it suggests that action priming effects are not very robust. In the light of the present
27 results, one possibility is that action priming effects in Borghi et al. (2006) are minimized
28 with the use of different object categories. However, the authors did not report any
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

1
2
3 modulation of the action priming effect by object category. The discrepancy may therefore
4 originate from methodological choices. First, Borghi et al. (2006)'s protocol involved more
5 object repetitions, which may have reduced the impact of action primes on target processing.
6
7 Second, priming effects were computed using different baselines: incongruent action primes
8 in their study (e.g., precision grip-orange) and neutral non-action primes (e.g., fist-orange)
9 here. A more continuous activation of action information may have limited the activation of
10 object-specific motor information (e.g., power or precision grip) on a trial basis and diminish
11 the priming effect amplitude. In Borghi et al. (2006)'s experiment 2, motor practice may have
12 decreased the impact of repetition by increasing attention to the primes and trained the motor
13 system to differentiate the two specific grasping postures, facilitating the emergence of
14 priming effects. Consistent with this explanation, facilitative action priming effects have been
15 observed with dynamic action primes (Vainio, Symes, Ellis, Tucker, & Ottoboni, 2008). In
16 this study, participants performed a similar natural/manufactured semantic categorization task
17 on object pictures that were preceded by several frames of the grasping movement. Although
18 it benefited to action priming, important motor simulation of the action primes was not
19 sufficient to highlight a modulation of action priming effect by object category in none of the
20 studies. One interpretation is that it changes the nature of the motor information evoked by
21 hand primes. The theoretical interpretation of the category effects proposed below might be
22 consistent with this possibility.
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 Theoretically, the impact of object category on action priming effects is highly relevant as it
48 addresses the critical issue of the nature of the motor information evoked during conceptual
49 processing of visual objects. Recent development of affordance theories have proposed a
50 distinction between several types of affordances (Borghi & Riggio, 2015; Buxbaum &
51 Kalénine, 2010). If natural and manufactured objects evoke distinct types of affordances and
52 this type of action priming paradigm favours the perception of one type of affordances over
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the other, then action priming effects should be differentially visible depending on object
4 category. Borghi and Riggio (2015) disentangled stable from variable affordances. Stable
5 affordances correspond to affordances that are not context-dependent, such as those related to
6 object usual size. Variable affordances correspond to affordances that are context-dependent,
7 such as those related to object orientation or location in space. In a similar line, Buxbaum and
8 Kalénine (2010) distinguished functional from structural affordances. Functional affordances
9 correspond to the evocation of the gestures associated with the typical use of the object (such
10 as when manipulating the object according to its typical function). In contrast, structural
11 affordances correspond to the evocation of the gestures associated with the typical grasp of
12 the object (such as when picking-up the object according to its structural shape). The
13 definition of functional affordances may overlap to a certain extent with that of stable
14 affordances above, although it may be more restrictive: all functional affordances should be
15 stable but not all stable affordances are functional (e.g., size-related motor information).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 In the light of these recent distinctions, we suggest that the type of affordances evoked in the
34 present action priming paradigm using hand primes are stable, and more specifically
35 functional affordances. As natural objects are usually not associated with specific use actions,
36 functional affordances are the privilege of manufactured objects. Thus, the presence of
37 category-selective action priming effects indicates that accessing object semantic involves the
38 evocation of functional – but not structural – affordances. In other words, results suggest that
39 the information related to how picking-up the object (structural affordance) does not
40 participate in object semantic categorization while motor information related to how using the
41 object (functional affordance) does, leading to a different action priming effects for natural
42 and artifact object categories. This interpretation is consistent with the very recent priming
43 results reported by Ni et al. (2018). Although Ni et al. (2018) did not directly compare
44 priming effects between natural and manufactured categories, they showed that naming
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 manipulable objects affording both functional and structural actions (e.g., a gun affording
4 trigger and power grip actions) is facilitated by functional action primes but not structural
5 action primes. The present results reflect the consequences of the functional/structural
6 distinction between affordances on the relation between action and object semantic categories.
7
8 It further suggests that functional affordances are not only critical for accessing single
9 concepts of manufactured objects but also for accessing their superordinate category, despite
10 previous evidence of weaker facilitative effects of action priming on superordinate compared
11 to basic-level categorization (Kalénine et al., 2009). The superordinate categorization of
12 manufactured objects would rely in part on the perception of their functional affordances, a
13 phenomenon that may induce an additional cost. This cost may be reduced by the prior
14 activation of functional gesture representations.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 To conclude, we report facilitative action priming effects on object semantic categorization.
30
31 Importantly, the effect was driven by manufactured objects and was not present for natural
32 objects. The modulation of action priming by object category is consistent with recent
33 distinctions between affordances and suggests that the paradigm assesses the evocation of
34 functional affordances during object semantic categorization. Action priming paradigms may
35 thus be a promising direction to refine affordance theories (e.g., Thill et al., 2013) while
36 taking into account the different nature of the motor information evoked by natural and
37 manufactured object categories.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Acknowledgments**

49
50 This work was funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR-16-CE28-0003 and
51 ANR-11-EQPX-0023), supported by European funds (FEDER SCV-IrDIVE) and benefited
52 from a regional fellowship (Hauts-de-France) to M. Godard.
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Conflict of interest statement**

1
2
3 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
4
5

6 **Supplementary Material**

7

8 The Supplementary Material is available at: qjep.sagepub.com
9

10 **Open Practices**

11

12 The data from the present experiment are publicly available at the Open Science Framework website:
13

14 https://osf.io/8qzkc/?view_only=4f0b14f72e3940f38bfff87bfa2499c0
15
16

17 **References**

18

19
20
21 Baayen, R. H., Davidson, D. J., & Bates, D. M. (2008). Mixed-effects modeling with crossed
22 random effects for subjects and items. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *59*(4), 390–
23 412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.12.005>
24
25

26
27
28 Barsalou, L. W. (2008). Grounded Cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*(1), 617–645.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093639>
31

32
33
34 Borghi, A. M., Nicoletti, R., Ricciardelli, P., Bonfiglioli, C., Lugli, L., & Rubichi, S. (2006).
35 Are visual stimuli sufficient to evoke motor information? *Neuroscience Letters*, *411*(1),
36 17–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2006.10.003>
37
38

39
40
41 Borghi, A. M., & Riggio, L. (2015). Stable and variable affordances are both automatic and
42 flexible. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *9*(June), 1–16.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00351>
45
46

47
48
49 Bub, D. N., Masson, M. E. J., & van Mook, H. (2018). Switching between lift and use grasp
50 actions. *Cognition*, *174*, 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.01.013>
51
52

53
54 Buxbaum, L. J., & Kalénine, S. (2010). Action knowledge, visuomotor activation, and
55 embodiment in the two action systems. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*,
56 *1191*, 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05447.x>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ferri, F., Riggio, L., Gallese, V., & Costantini, M. (2011). Objects and their nouns in
4
5 peripersonal space. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(13), 3519–3524.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.09.001>
8
9
10 Gallese, V., & Lakoff, G. (2013). The brain's concepts: The role of the sensory-motor system
11
12 in conceptual knowledge. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *22*(3–4), 455–479.
13
14 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02643290442000310>
15
16
17
18 Gerlach, C. (2017). Normal and abnormal category-effects in visual object recognition: A
19
20 legacy of Glyn W. Humphreys. *Visual Cognition*, *25*(1–3), 60–78.
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2016.1258022>
23
24
25 Gerlach, C., Law, I., & Paulson, O. B. (2002). When action turns into words. Activation of
26
27 motor-based knowledge during categorization of manipulable objects. *Journal of*
28
29 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, *14*(8), 1230–1239.
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892902760807221>
32
33
34
35 Helbig, H. B., Steinwender, J., Graf, M., & Kiefer, M. (2010). Action observation can prime
36
37 visual object recognition. *Experimental Brain Research*, *200*(3–4), 251–258.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-009-1953-8>
40
41
42
43 Kalénine, S., Bonthoux, F., & Borghi, A. M. (2009). How action and context priming
44
45 influence categorization: A developmental study. *British Journal of Developmental*
46
47 *Psychology*, *27*(3), 717–730. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151008X369928>
48
49
50 Kalénine, S., Shapiro, A. D., & Buxbaum, L. J. (2013). Dissociations of action means and
51
52 outcome processing in left-hemisphere stroke. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(7), 1224–1233.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.03.017>
55
56
57 Lee, C.-L., Middleton, E., Mirma, D., Kalénine, S., & Buxbaum, L. J. (2013). Incidental and
58
59 context-responsive activation of structure- and function-based action features during
60

1
2
3 object identification, 39(9), 257–270. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1037/a0027533>

4
5
6 Lindemann, O., Abolafia, J. M., Girardi, G., & Bekkering, H. (2007). Getting a Grip on
7
8 Numbers: Numerical Magnitude Priming in Object Grasping. *Journal of Experimental*
9
10 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 33(6), 1400–1409.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.33.6.1400>

13
14
15 Mahon, B. Z., & Caramazza, A. (2008). A critical look at the embodied cognition hypothesis
16
17 and a new proposal for grounding conceptual content. *Journal of Physiology Paris*,
18
19 102(1–3), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphysparis.2008.03.004>

20
21
22 Ni, L., Liu, Y., & Yu, W. (2018). The dominant role of functional action representation in
23
24 object recognition. *Experimental Brain Research*, 1–13. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-018-5426-9)
25
26 018-5426-9

27
28
29 Perraudin, S., & Mounoud, P. (2009). Contribution of the priming paradigm to the
30
31 understanding of the conceptual developmental shift from 5 to 9 years of age.
32
33 *Developmental Science*, 12(6), 956–977. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00847.x)
34
35 7687.2009.00847.x

36
37
38 Salmon, J. P., McMullen, P. A., & Filliter, J. H. (2010). Norms for two types of
39
40 manipulability (graspability and functional usage), familiarity, and age of acquisition for
41
42 320 photographs of objects. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42(1), 82–95.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.1.82>

45
46
47 Thill, S., Caligiore, D., Borghi, A. M., Ziemke, T., & Baldassarre, G. (2013). Theories and
48
49 computational models of affordance and mirror systems: An integrative review.
50
51 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(3), 491–521.
52
53 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.01.012>

54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Tipper, S. P., Paul, M. A., & Hayes, A. E. (2006). Vision-for-action: The effects of object

1
2
3 property discrimination and action state on affordance compatibility effects.

4
5 *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 13(3), 493–498. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193875>

6
7
8 Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (2001). The potentiation of grasp types during visual object

9
10 categorization. *Visual Cognition*, 8(6), 769–800.

11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506280042000144>

13
14
15 Vainio, L., Symes, E., Ellis, R., Tucker, M., & Ottoboni, G. (2008). On the relations between

16
17 action planning, object identification, and motor representations of observed actions and

18
19 objects. *Cognition*, 108(2), 444–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.03.007>

20
21
22 van Elk, M., van Schie, H., & Bekkering, H. (2014). Action semantics: A unifying conceptual

23
24 framework for the selective use of multimodal and modality-specific object knowledge.

25
26 *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(2), 220–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2013.11.005>

27
28
29 Westfall, J., Kenny, D. A., & Judd, C. M. (2014). Statistical Power and Optimal Design in

30
31 Experiments in Which Samples of Participants Respond to Samples of Stimuli. *Journal*

32
33 *of Experimental Psychology*, 143(5), 2020–2045. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000014>

34
35
36 Yu, A. B., Abrams, R. A., & Zacks, J. M. (2014). Limits on action priming by pictures of



37
38 objects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*,

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
40(5), 1861–1873. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037397>

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Procedure of an experimental trial in the two priming conditions: neutral priming (left) vs. action priming (right).

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



500 ms

Priming
Neutral Action



or



500 ms



4 sec or until response

Manufactured or Natural ?

Table 1. Mean RTs in milliseconds (SD) as a function of Category (Manufactured, Natural), Grasp Type (Power Grip, Precision Grip) and Priming (Action, Neutral).

Manufactured				Natural			
Power Grip		Precision Grip		Power Grip		Precision Grip	
Action	Neutral	Action	Neutral	Action	Neutral	Action	Neutral
650.4	716.1	641.8	681.6	641.5	657.2	656	639.9
(139.2)	(170.1)	(120.2)	(201)	(176.3)	(182.9)	(162.7)	(115.2)