subjectivity and neuroimaging; bridging the gap

Published: 13-10-2006
Last updated: 14-05-2024

The general aim is to 1) obtain first-person data through an adequate, rigorous and refined description of inner experience (*lived experience*) enabling subjects to thematize important but otherwise tacit aspects of experience, and 2) to use these...

Ethical review	Approved WMO
Status	Pending
Health condition type	Other condition
Study type	Interventional

Summary

ID

NL-OMON29922

Source
ToetsingOnline

Brief title
neurophenomenology

Condition

- Other condition

Synonym
healthy volunteers

Health condition

onderzoek is niet stoornis gerelateerd

Research involving
Human

Sponsors and support

Primary sponsor: Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen
Source(s) of monetary or material Support: Ministerie van OC&W

Intervention

Keyword: neurophenomenology, phase-synchrony, subjectivity, visual illusion task

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

The study parameter is the contents of the experience like 'expectantly' or

'surprised' related to the degree of phase coherence on the

Electro-EncephaloGram (EEG) before and after the training.

Secondary outcome

Is not applicable

Study description

Background summary

The status of introspective reports in psychology and psychiatry has been subject to debate. Nevertheless, especially in psychiatry clinicians have no other means but to rely on subjective reports in order to establish a diagnosis. Both in mainstream psychiatry and in psychology, the criticism of introspective methods led to the rejection of virtually all subjective reports in laboratory investigations.
The focus of modern neuroscientific research in psychology and psychiatry is on an objective and controllable measurement of verbal reports in response to presentation of different stimuli.
In actual experimental protocols using cognitive (e.g. visual recognition) tasks it is assumed that there is a *neutral* baseline condition enabling the investigator to study the net-effects on brain dynamics of cognitive stimuli. Thus, in neuroscientific practice, subjective accounts describing inner experiences are in fact ignored, unless they have been induced by external stimuli. There are several problems using this approach. There is a large degree of variability in brain dynamics using most cognitive and emotional tasks, and this variability is interpreted a *noise*. In the light of recent

evidence it is questionable whether the interpretation of *noise* is correct. When introspective subjective (*first-person*) data are incorporated in the experiment it has been shown that depending on strictly defined subjective characteristics obtained from introspective reports, there is no such thing as a neutral baseline. Taking this first-person perspective into account has shown that the brain- response of subjects during *baseline*, and before the actual cognitive experiment is already different, dependent on the subjective state the subject is in.

Study objective

The general aim is to 1) obtain first-person data through an adequate, rigorous and refined description of inner experience (*lived experience*) enabling subjects to thematize important but otherwise tacit aspects of experience, and 2) to use these first-person data to uncover new third-person data (brain dynamics) about physiological processes that are influenced by small variations in subjective experience.

Study design

It concerns an observational design

Intervention

In order to investigate whether the effect of training has the effect we expect, we will as a first condition, include the same control subjects in the same experiment without the trainig (within-subject design).
In experiment I subjects will receive no instructions before the start of the task.
In experiment II, the same control-subjects will receive a training in the neurophenomenological method.

Study burden and risks

The burden is restricted to the time investment by the participants.
Actualy there is no serious risk associated with participation.

Contacts

Public
Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen

Schuttevaerkade 80-88; Postbus 110 (E. de Jong)
8000 AC Zwolle (E. de Jong)

Nederland
Scientific
Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen

Schuttevaerkade 80-88; Postbus 110 (E. de Jong)
8000 AC Zwolle (E. de Jong)
Nederland

Trial sites

Listed location countries

Netherlands

Eligibility criteria

Age
Adults (18-64 years)
Elderly (65 years and older)

Inclusion criteria

Healthy males or females
Older than 18 years
Normal vision and hearing
Righthanded (through questionnaire)
Normal verbal intelligence (through WAIS or GIT)

Exclusion criteria

Neurological complaints (present as well as past) (through questionnaire)
Use of drugs that may effect task performance (through questionnaire)
Claustrophobia (through questionnaire)

Study design

Design

Study type: Interventional

Masking:	Open (masking not used)
Control:	Uncontrolled
Primary purpose:	Other

Recruitment

NL

Recruitment status:	Pending
Start date (anticipated):	01-09-2006
Enrollment:	12
Type:	Anticipated

Ethics review

Approved WMO

Application type:	First submission
Review commission:	METC Universitair Medisch Centrum Groningen (Groningen)

Study registrations

Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

In other registers

Register	ID
CCMO	NL11445.042.06