

UNCLASSIFIED

2

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE			IDENTIFICATION PAGE		Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188												
1a. RE AD-A205 090			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS TOP FILE COPY														
2a. SE			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.														
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFOSR-TR-89-0194														
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)																	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION The Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) NL		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Air Force Office of Scientific Research													
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 2232 Webster Street San Francisco, CA 94115				7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bldg. 410 Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332													
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION AFOSR		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) NL		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AFOSR-85-0380													
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bldg. 410 Bolling AFB, DC 20332-6448		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS <table border="1"><tr><td>PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102F</td><td>PROJECT NO. 2313</td><td>TASK NO. A5</td><td>WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.</td></tr></table>				PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102F	PROJECT NO. 2313	TASK NO. A5	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.								
PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102F	PROJECT NO. 2313	TASK NO. A5	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.														
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Visual Processing of Object Velocity + Acceleration																	
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McKee, Suzanne P.																	
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final Tech. Report		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 10-01-85 TO 9-30-88		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) Sept 88													
15. PAGE COUNT 3																	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION																	
17. COSATI CODES <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>FIELD</th><th>GROUP</th><th>SUB-GROUP</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>			FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP										18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP															
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The human ability to discriminate small differences in velocity has been used to explore human motion processing. Velocity discrimination is independent of target contrast above a contrast of 2 - 5%. A model based on the ratio of signals in two temporal mechanisms (sustained and transient) can explain this contrast independence at low contrast levels, but fails at high contrast levels. Human observers have difficulty detecting acceleration which may be due to physiological summation (integration) of the velocity signals from many motion sensors. Human observers cannot use disparity information to translate the angular velocity signal (deg/sec) into a precise estimate of objective velocity (cm/sec), a result that suggests that there is no mechanism for velocity constancy. <i>Visual acuity, vision. (JES)</i>																	
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☐ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED														
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL J. H. F. Lammy			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 961-5021														
			22c. OFFICE SYMBOL NL														

DD Form 1473, JUN 85

Previous editions are obsolete.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

15 DEC 1988

FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT
AFOSR-85-0380

During the course of this grant, the following projects have been completed:

1) Several years ago, we found that velocity discrimination is independent of contrast at contrast levels above 2 - 5%. In addition, human observers do not confuse changes in contrast with changes in velocity. Because the single neural units that respond to changes in velocity also respond to changes in contrast, the meaning of the change signaled by the response from individual units is ambiguous. Models based on autocorrelation (Reichardt; Van Santen and Sperling) or oriented space-time filters (Adelson and Bergen) also confound changes in contrast with changes in velocity. Velocity per se can be estimated from the ratio of signals in two different groups of single units, provided each group is tuned to a different temporal range. By analogy with color vision, we have constructed a model based on the ratio of two temporal mechanisms. We have used this model to predict the basic shape of the velocity discrimination function. Although velocity and contrast are no longer confounded in the ratio model, it still predicts that velocity discrimination should improve with increases in contrast, because the underlying signal/noise ratio in the temporal filters is improving. Human velocity discrimination does not improve with contrast, which suggests that there is a source of central noise in motion processing which limits precision at high contrast levels.

2) McKee and Welch (1985) found an improvement in the velocity discrimination for sampled motion as the number of samples increased. A plausible explanation for this improvement was simple linear summation within a single large motion sensor responding to the target. The Adelson-Bergen model would, in fact, predict such an improvement. This prediction was specifically tested. Observers were asked to judge the relative asynchrony between two adjacent targets -- velocity discrimination for two-point apparent motion. Two additional points were flashed about 50 msec before and after the test pair; these additional points were separated spatially from the test targets and presented with a fixed temporal asynchrony so they provided no information about the asynchrony separating the test pair. Velocity discrimination for the test pair was significantly impaired by the presence of the additional points. We initially assumed that this degraded performance was due to velocity integration within a single "motion energy" sensor. If the human motion system averages the timing signals from all four points, the ability to discriminate the asynchrony of the test pair will be "swamped" by the signal from the additional interfering pair. However, we found that the spatial separation between the interfering pair and the test pair could be as large as one degree in size. A single "motion energy" sensor

optimally tuned to respond to the test pair should not even "see" the outer two interfering points. In fact, if the interfering stimuli are high spatial frequency targets (Difference-of-Gaussians) they are as effective as points in degrading performance. Again a large (low spatial frequency) motion sensor would not detect the high spatial frequency interfering stimuli and therefore, this simple model predicts that the interfering points should have no effect on performance. We conclude that there exists a second stage of motion processing which consists of a network connecting motion energy "sub-units" along a crude trajectory-- an idea originally proposed by Barlow and Levick to explain directional selectivity in the rabbit retina.

3) We have shown that the human observers are unable to use disparity information to transform the angular velocity signal into a precise object-based code. The Weber fraction for discriminating changes in objective velocity (cm/sec) is about twice the Weber fraction for discriminating changes in angular velocity (deg/sec), and is substantially higher than predicted from a combination of the errors in judging disparity and angular velocity. Under identical conditions, observers made precise judgments of the length of the traverse, a size judgment. We found that objective size discrimination (cm) is equal to angular size discrimination (deg) for a disparity range of ± 45 arc min. These results demonstrate that size constancy is quite robust, but suggest that there is no neural mechanism for velocity constancy.

Publications:

McKee, S.P., Silverman, G.H., Nakayama, K. (1986) Precise velocity discrimination despite random variations in temporal frequency and contrast. Vision Res., 26, 609-619.

Mitchison, G.J. and McKee, S.P. (1987) Interpolation and the detection of fine structure in stereoscopic matching. Vision Res., 27, 295-302.

Kowler, E. and McKee, S.P. (1987) Sensitivity of smooth eye movement to small differences in target velocity. Vision Res., 27, 993-1015.

McKee, S.P. (1987) The challenge of the real observer. Frontiers of Visual Science, Proceedings of the 1985 Symposium, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. 38-50.

McKee, S.P. and Welch, L. (1988) Is there a constancy for velocity? Vision Res., (In Press).

Bowne, S.F., McKee, S.P. and Glaser, D.A. (1988) Motion interference in sampled motion. J.Opt.Soc.Amer.A, (In Press).

Welch, L. (1988) The preception of moving plaids reveals two motion processing stages. Nature, (In Press).

Abstracts from Papers presented at Meetings

McKee, S.P. and Welch, L. Velocity constancy does not exist. ARVO meeting, Florida, May, 1986.

Nakayama, K. and McKee, S.P. Sensitivity to changing velocity. OSA meeting, Seattle, October, 1986.

Bowne, S.F. and McKee, S.P. Speed discrimination using simple sampled-motion stimuli. ARVO meeting, Florida, May, 1987.

McKee, S.P. and Nakayama, K. Velocity integration along the trajectory. ARVO meeting, Florida, May, 1988.

Bowne, S.F. and McKee, S.P. Contrast discrimination cannot explain speed discrimination. ARVO meeting, Florida, May, 1988.

McKee, S.P. and Bowne, S.F. Predicting the velocity discrimination function. OSA meeting, Santa Clara, October, 1988.

Bowne, S.F. and Welch, L. Coherence determines speed discrimination. OSA meeting, Santa Clara, October, 1988.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☒
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	