

Integration of Action and Size Perception Through Practice

Alexandre Coutte, Thomas Camus, Loïc P Heurley, Denis Brouillet

▶ To cite this version:

Alexandre Coutte, Thomas Camus, Loïc P Heurley, Denis Brouillet. Integration of Action and Size Perception Through Practice. Perception, 2017, 46 (10), pp.1194-1201. 10.1177/0301006617715378 . hal-04301911

HAL Id: hal-04301911 https://hal.science/hal-04301911

Submitted on 23 Nov 2023

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. $See \ discussions, stats, and \ author \ profiles \ for \ this \ publication \ at: \ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317649341$

Integration of Action and Size Perception Through Practice

Article in Perception \cdot June 2017

DOI: 10.1177/0301006617715378



1	Integration of Action and Size Perception Through Practice				
2					
3	Alexandre Coutté ^{1, 2} , Thomas Camus ³ , Loïc Heurley ¹ & Denis Brouillet ³				
4					
5					
6					
7	¹ Centre de Recherche sur le Sport et le Mouvement (CeRSM),				
8	Université Paris Nanterre, France.				
9 10 11	² Laboratoire d'Anthropologie et de Psychologie Cliniques, Cognitives et Sociales (LAPCOS), Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis, France.				
12 13	³ Laboratoire Ensylon				
14	Université Paul Valery Montpellier 3, France.				
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20 21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27 28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33	Corresponding author:				
34 25	Alexandre Coutte,				
36	52 avenue raimenner, 95011 Paris France				
37	Email: a.coutte@u-paris10.fr				
38					

39 Abstract

40 Size perception is known to influence our usual interactions with environment. Numerous studies 41 highlighted that during the visual presentation of an object, the properties of manual actions vary as a function of this object's size. In order to better understand the dynamic variations of 42 43 relationships between size perception and action, we used an experimental paradigm consisting in 44 two phases. During a previous implicit learning phase, a manual response (right or left) was 45 specifically associated with the appearance of a large or small stimulus. During further test phase, 46 participants were required to prepare a response while discriminating the color of a stimulus 47 (GO/No GO task). We observed that the response execution was faster when the size of the 48 stimulus was congruent with the size that had been associated to this response (during implicit 49 learning phase). These results suggest that when a response usually co-occurs with visual stimuli 50 characterized by a specific size pattern, the response and the size pattern become integrated. Any 51 subsequent preparation and execution of this action are therefore influenced by the reactivation of 52 this visual pattern. This result brings out new insights on how sensorimotor interactions may 53 modulate the ability to anticipate perceptive size variations in the environment.

54

55 **Keywords:** sensorimotor integration, size perception, perception/action, stimulus-response 56 compatibility, perceptual learning.

57

58 Introduction

59 For several decades, a growing body of works has been exploring the relationships between 60 visual perception and action (Bridgeman & Tseng, 2011; Creem-Regehr & Kunz, 2010; Gibson, 61 1979; Heurley & Ferrier, 2015; Proffitt & Linkenauger, 2013). In this framework, some authors 62 have specifically focused on the importance of size perception for appropriate interactions with 63 the environment. On the one hand, the perception of an object's size allows a better evaluation of 64 its distance, speed and movement. Therefore, it strongly constrains our dynamic interactions with 65 it (e.g., interception: DeLucia, 2005; Hosking & Crassini, 2010, 2011; Paivio, 1975). On the 66 other hand, the perception of the object's size also influences hand-related actions like reaching 67 or grasping. During reach-to-grasp movements for instance, the movement kinematics and the 68 amplitude of hand opening during the reaching phase are closely correlated to the size of to-be-69 grasped objects (Corradini, Gentilucci, Leo, & Rizzolatti, 1992; Jeannerod, 1984). In the same 70 vein, the object's size (i.e., small vs. large) determines the kind of grasp used for its manipulation 71 (e.g., a precision grip between the thumb and the forefinger vs. a power grip with the whole hand; 72 Napier, 1956; Newell, Scully, Tenenbaum, & Hardiman, 1989). Several studies recently 73 demonstrated that the mere perception of an object potentiates the optimal grasp necessary to 74 interact with it, even without any intention to reach-and-grasp it: A small object (e.g., a cherry) 75 would potentiate a precision grip while a larger object (e.g., an apple) would rather potentiate a 76 power grip (Ellis & Tucker, 2000; Olivier & Velay, 2009). Similarly, Borghi et al. (2007) found a 77 compatibility effect between the hand visual prime posture (precision vs. power) and the grip 78 required to grasp the target-object (precision grip vs. power grip). When the prime was a hand 79 mimicking a precision grip action, participants responded faster and more accurately when the 80 subsequent target objects were graspable with a precision grip (e.g., key, grape) than with a 81 power grip (e.g., bottle, banana). When the hand mimicked a power grip action, the reverse 82 pattern was observed. Comparable results were observed using video-clip of hands rather than 83 static images (Vainio, Symes, Ellis, Tucker, & Ottoboni, 2008). Taken together, these researches 84 point out close and automatic links between size perception and action. The present study aims at 85 better understanding how these links may develop through practice and the implicit learning 86 related to our usual interactions with environment.

According to the Theory of Event Coding (TEC), strong relationships exist between perception
and action. More precisely, the perception goes along with both sensorial and motor components

to be integrated in an episodic memory trace, or Event-file (Hommel, 1998; see Zmigrod & Hommel, 2013, for a review). The perception of a visual object would therefore require the integration of its visual characteristics, the motor responses usually associated to it and the sensorial consequences of such motor responses (Hommel, 1998, 2004). For instance, the mere presentation of a stimulus activates a response spatially congruent with the stimulus even if the stimulus location is irrelevant for the task (Hommel, 2011; Kornblum, 1994; Proctor, 2011).

95 The co-occurring of sensorial and motor components (i.e., of stimulus-response combinations) is 96 thought to be sufficient to strengthen the link between them, suggesting that such coupling could 97 evolve across practicing (cf. Kühn, Keizer, Colzato, Rombouts, & Hommel, 2011). Elsner and 98 Hommel (2001) notably developed an experimental paradigm allowing highlighting this dynamic 99 link between perception, action, and consequences of action. During a first phase, the participants 100 heard a sound right after having to randomly press one of the two available buttons (right or left). 101 The sound was either a high- or low- pitched one, depending on the mapping with the previous 102 button. According to Elsner and Hommel (2001), this phase created an association between an 103 action (button press) and a sensorial consequence (sound presentation), although the sound was 104 not relevant to the task. During the second phase, half of the participants were required to press 105 either the right button when a high-pitched tone was presented or the left button for a low-pitched 106 tone (i.e., situation compatible with the first phase). The other half received the opposite 107 instructions (i.e., situation incompatible with the first phase). Results showed that reaction times 108 were shorter for the group in compatible situation than for the other one. According to the 109 authors, the repeated occurrence of a stimulus (i.e., sensorial consequences) just following a 110 specific manual response (i.e., an action) induced their integration into a particular event. Further 111 presentation of the stimulus thus potentiated the associated action. It is important to note that 112 such integration creates bidirectional links between the various sensory components: The 113 sensorial consequences and the object properties are both potentiated when an action toward the 114 object is planned (Fagioli, Hommel, & Schubotz, 2007; Wykowska, Schubö, & Hommel, 2009). 115 In this paper, the term action planning refers to the mechanisms that prepare the system to reach a 116 goal, that is, to produce an intended effect (Hommel, Müsseler, Aschersleben, & Prinz, 2001).

117 With regard to those researches, the question remains to what extent the arbitrary association 118 between a response and the size of a stimulus may also result in their integration in a unified 119 event-file across interactions. More precisely, since a particular action followed by the 120 presentation of a stimulus should result in the integration of their various sensory components (cf.

121 Camus, Brouillet, & Brunel, 2016), we therefore expect that any further planning of that action

122 should reactivate the size of the previously associated stimulus, leading to a compatibility effect

- 123 only when a stimulus with a compatible size is presented.
- 124

125 Method

126 Participants

Twenty-eight right-handed students ($M = 21.4 \pm 2.4$) participated in the study. All of them gave their informed consent. They were not aware of the purpose of the experiment and they all reported normal or corrected-to-normal vision as well as no learning disabilities or psychiatric history.

131

132 Materials and Procedure

133 The work was carried out in accordance with the Code of Ethics of the World Medical134 Association (Declaration of Helsinki).

This experiment was divided into two successive phases: a learning and a test phase. During both phases, participants were seated in front of a 17-in. screen at a viewing distance of 60 cm. In addition, the screen was positioned in order that the stimuli appeared at eye level. The experimental procedure was controlled by E-Prime software (Psychology Software Tools, Inc., Sharpsburg, PA).

140 During the learning phase, participants had to place their right index and middle finger 141 respectively on the 4 and 6 of the numeric pad, while having their left index on space bar of a 142 usual AZERTY keyboard (Figure 1). Herein, each trial started with the presentation of a number 143 (4 or 6) in the center of the screen. Participants were instructed to press the corresponding button 144 on the numeric pad. Immediately after pressing the button, the number was replaced by a red or a 145 blue circle in the center of the screen (Figure 1). This circle was either visually larger ($\emptyset = 100$ mm) or smaller ($\emptyset = 28$ mm) than the number (73 x 48 mm). When this circle was blue, the 146 147 participant had to press the space bar.

148 When it was red, he or she had to wait $(1500 \text{ ms})^1$. The intertrial interval was 1000 ms long. For

149 14 participants (Group 1), large circles were always presented after pressing the 6 whereas small

¹ The response on the space bar aimed at controlling whether the participants perceived the circle (i.e., press the space bar only when the circle is blue).

circles were presented after pressing the 4. For the other half (Group 2), this presentation pattern was counterbalanced: The small circles were always presented after pressing the 6, whereas large circles were presented after pressing the 4. For both groups, the learning phase consisted of 80 randomly ordered trials resulting from the possible combinations of the circle's color (blue vs. red), its size (large vs. small) and the number (4 or 6).

155 During the test phase, participants had to keep on placing their right index and middle finger 156 respectively on the keys 4 and 6 of the numeric pad. In this phase, each trial started with the 157 presentation of a central arrow during 1500 ms. This arrow was oriented either to the left or to 158 right side of the screen (73 x 48 mm). Participants were instructed to prepare to press the spatially 159 corresponding button only if a blue circle then appeared. More concretely, after an arrow pointing 160 to the left, participants had to press the key 4 of the numeric pad, whereas when an arrow 161 pointing to the right was presented, they had to press the key 6. Then appeared a circle that could 162 be either large ($\emptyset = 100 \text{ mm}$) or small ($\emptyset = 28 \text{ mm}$). When this circle was blue, participants had 163 to execute the prepared response (Go). When it was red (No Go), they just had to wait (1500 ms). 164 The intertrial interval was 1000 ms long (Figure 1). This phase consisted of 128 randomly 165 ordered trials resulting from the possible combinations of the circle's color (blue vs. red), its size 166 (large vs. small) and the direction of the arrow (right vs. left).





168

- 169 Figure 1. On the left, example of the two learning phase trials for a participant of Group 1. After having pressed the
- 170 "6" button on keyboard (as required on the screen), the presented circle is always large. After having pressed the
- 171 "4" button on keyboard, the presented circle is always small. The participant has to press the space bar only if the
- 172 circle is blue (e.g., example in the top). On the right, example of the two test phase trials for a participant of Group 1.
- 173 After the arrow, stimuli are equiprobable large or small. The participant has to respond exclusively to blue stimuli
- 174 (e.g., example in the top). He is required to press either the "4" (i.e., left button) after a left arrow or the "6" (i.e.,
- right button) after a right arrow.
- 176
- 177 Results

178 During the learning phase, the participants made less than 1% of incorrect responses. We 179 computed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the times to respond on the space bar, in which 180 (a) the circle's size (large vs. small) is a within-subjects factor and (b) instructions (Group 1 vs. 181 Group 2) is a between-subjects factor. The participants of Group 1 responded in 464 ms (SD =182 45) to large circles (i.e., presented after pressing the right button), whereas they responded in 484 183 ms (SD = 45) to small circles (i.e., presented after pressing the left button). Participants of Group 184 2 responded in 442 ms (SD = 36) to large circles (i.e., presented after pressing the left button), 185 whereas they responded in 479 ms (SD = 32) to small circles (i.e., presented after pressing the right button). The participants of both groups responded faster to large circles than small circles. 186 $F(1, 26) = 18.75, p < .01 (\eta^2 = .41)$. The ANOVA revealed no significant effect of instructions 187 (F<1), nor interaction between instructions and the circle's size, F(1, 26) = 1.75, p = .20. 188

189 In order to test our hypothesis, the statistical analyses on the data of the test phase were 190 performed on the data collected for blue circles during the test phase. More precisely, we 191 computed an ANOVA on response times (hereafter RTs) in which (a) circle's size (large vs. 192 small) and (b) compatibility between response and circle's size (compatible vs. incompatible) are 193 both within-subjects factors and (c) instructions (Group 1 vs. Group 2) is a between- subjects 194 factor. The compatible condition refers to trials in which the circle's size and the response were 195 associated with regard to the learning phase. Conversely, the incompatible condition refers to 196 trials in which the size and the response were not associated with regard to the learning phase. A 197 series of one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests revealed that participants' performance was distributed normally around the group means (all p > .05). We excluded from the analyses the 198 trials in which (a) incorrect responses were given (less than 1% of data of the test phase)² and (b) 199

² During the test phase, an incorrect response is defined as the action to press a key that was opposite to the arrow.

200 RTs were below or above two standard deviations (6% of data).

As expected, we observed a significant effect of compatibility, F(1, 26) = 5.20, p < .05 ($\eta^2 = .16$). More specifically, RTs were shorter for compatible trials (M = 431 ms; SD = 63.5) than for

incompatible trials (M = 442 ms; SD = 72). The ANOVA also revealed a significant effect of

- 204 size, F(1, 26) = 4.46, p < .05 ($\eta^2 = .14$). Indeed, RTs were shorter for large stimuli (M = 430 ms;
- SD = 66) than for small stimuli (M = 442 ms; SD = 69). Additionally, neither the main effect of
- group (F < 1), nor the interactions between size and group (F < 1), between compatibility and
- 207 group (F < 1), between compatibility and size (F < 1), and between size, group and compatibility 208 (F = 1) reached significance (see Table 1).
- 209

	Large		Small	
	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Incompatible
Group I	421 (41)	422 (63)	429 (57)	449 (72)
Group 2	43I (7I)	446 (8I)́	44I (77)	449 (67)

210

Table 1. Mean (SD) in millisecond for the "Go condition" (blue circles) in the test phase.

212

213 Discussion

214 The present experiment aimed at testing whether the arbitrary association between a response and 215 the size of a stimulus may result in their integration across sensorimotor interactions. More 216 precisely, the experimental design investigated whether the preparation of a response would 217 induce the reactivation of the size variations (a circle either larger or smaller than the previous 218 stimulus) specifically associated to this response during a previous learning phase. Our results 219 notably showed that RTs were shorter for compatible trials than for incompatible trials. This 220 compatibility effect is in line with our hypothesis. In the theoretical framework of previous 221 studies (e.g., Elsner & Hommel, 2001; Hommel, 2011), such a compatibility effect suggests that 222 during the learning phase, each response became associated to the subsequent appearance of a 223 specific stimulus and more precisely to its size (e.g., for the Group 1, left and right responses 224 were associated respectively with a small or large circle, whereas the opposite association was 225 induced for the Group 2). The motor response and the circle's size have thus become integrated 226 as a sensorimotor event, as if the action was associated to its visual and proprioceptive

227 consequences (for a similar interpretations, see Elsner & Hommel, 2001; Hommel, 2004; Kühn et 228 al., 2011). During the test phase, planning the response seems to have reactivated the previously 229 integrated stimulus properties, leading to faster response execution when a compatible stimulus 230 was presented than when an incompatible one was presented. For instance, when a participant 231 had to respond to a large circle, the response execution was more efficient if it had been 232 previously associated with a large circle than with a small one. Noticeably, the present study 233 showed that such a compatibility effect can be observed under minimalistic and arbitrary 234 conditions. Indeed, the 80 trials of the learning phase were enough to implicitly integrate a 235 specific manual response to a stimulus size (although the stimulus size was not relevant to the 236 task) and furthermore influence any subsequent execution of this response. Thus even if the size 237 of this compatibility effect was small in our study, it seems reasonable with regard to previous 238 research (cf. Hommel, 2011) to assume its generalization to less constraining situations. Besides, 239 our results also showed a significant effect of the stimulus size. This effect is in line with results 240 previously described in the literature (cf. Tucker & Ellis, 2001). In fact, it could result from a 241 faster discrimination of the blue color (i.e., the GO signal) for large circles compared to small 242 ones (due to a larger quantity of color on the screen for large circles). RTs were thus shorter.

243 To conclude, our results suggested that when a response is associated to a specific pattern of size, 244 any subsequent preparation and execution of this action are influenced by the reactivation of this 245 visual pattern. Further investigations using complementary methodologies (e.g., measures of 246 movement kinematic properties) are necessary to better understand how this association between 247 an action and a size pattern may influence subsequent the action planning and the initiation 248 decision. But already, this result may have important implications to our understanding of how 249 sensorimotor interactions can modulate the ability to anticipate perceptive size variations in our 250 environment, especially when an object is getting closer or further. More generally, this study 251 brings out concrete ways to explore the ontogenetic development of our abilities to adapt our 252 manual movements to efficiently reach and grasp objects.

253 References

- Borghi, A. M., Bonfiglioli, C., Lugli, L., Ricciardelli, P., Rubichi, S., & Nicoletti, R. (2007). Are
 visual stimuli sufficient to evoke motor information? Studies with hand primes. Neuroscience
 Letters, 411, 17–21.
- 257 Bridgeman, B., & Tseng, P. (2011). Embodied cognition and the perception-action link. Physics

258 of Life Reviews, 8, 73–85.

- Camus, T., Brouillet, D., & Brunel, L. (2016). Assessing the functional role of motor response
 during the integration process. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and
 Performance, 42, 1693–1702.
- 262 Corradini, M. L., Gentilucci, M., Leo, T., & Rizzolatti, G. (1992). Motor control of voluntary arm
 263 movements: Kinematic and modelling study. Biological Cybernetics, 67, 347–360.
- Creem-Regehr, S. H., & Kunz, B. R. (2010). Perception and action. Wiley Interdisciplinary
 Reviews Cognitive Science, 1, 800–810.
- DeLucia, P. R. (2005). Does binocular disparity or familiar size override effects of relative size
 on judgments of time to contact? The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology A, 58,
 865–886. doi: 10.1080/02724980443000377
- Ellis, R., & Tucker, M. (2000). Micro-affordance: The potentiation of components of action by
 seen objects. British Journal of Psychology, 91, 451–471.
- Elsner, B., & Hommel, B. (2001). Effect anticipation and action control. Journal of Experimental
 Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 27, 229–240.
- Fagioli, S., Hommel, B., & Schubotz, R. I. (2007). Intentional control of attention: Action
 planning primes action-related stimulus dimensions. Psychological Research, 71, 22–29.
- 275 Gibson, J. J. (1979). The ecological approach to visual perception. Boston, MA: Houghton
- 276 Mifflin. Heurley, L. P., & Ferrier, L. P. (2015). What are memory-perception interactions for?
 277 Implications for action. Frontiers in Psychology, 5, 1553. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01553.
- Hommel, B. (1998). Event files: Evidence for automatic integration of stimulus-response
 episodes. Visual Cognition, 5, 183–216.
- Hommel, B. (2004). Event files: Feature binding in and across perception and action. Trends in
 Cognitive Sciences, 8, 494–500.
- Hommel, B., Müsseler, J., Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (2001). The theory of event coding
- 283 (TEC): A framework for perception and action planning. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 24,

284 849–877.

- Hommel, B. (2011). The Simon effect as tool and heuristic. Acta Psychologica, 136, 189–202.
- Hosking, S. G., & Crassini, B. (2010). The effects of familiar size and object trajectories on timeto-contact judgements. Experimental Brain Research, 203, 541–552. doi: 10.1007/s00221010-2258-7.
- Hosking, S. G., & Crassini, B. (2011). The influence of optic expansion rates when judging the
 relative time to contact of familiar objects. Journal of Vision, 11, 1–13. doi:
 10.1167/11.6.20 Jeannerod, M. (1984). The timing of natural prehension movements. Journal
 of Motor Behaviour, 16, 235–254.
- Kornblum, S. (1994). The way irrelevant dimensions are processed depends on what they overlap
 with: The case of Stroop and Simon-like stimuli. Psychological Research, 56, 130–135.
- Kühn, S., Keizer, A. W., Colzato, L. S., Rombouts, S. A. R. B., & Hommel, B. (2011). The
- 296 neural underpinnings of event-file management: Evidence for stimulus-induced activation of
- and competition among stimulus-response bindings. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 23,896–904.
- Napier, J. R. (1956). The prehensile movements of the human hand. Journal of Bone and Joint
 Surgery B, 38, 902–913.
- Newell, K. M., Scully, D. M., Tenenbaum, F., & Hardiman, S. (1989). Body scale and the
 development of prehension. Developmental Psychobiology, 22, 1–14.
- Olivier, G., & Velay, J. L. (2009). Visual objects can potentiate a grasping neural simulation
 which interferes with manual response execution. Acta Psychologica, 130, 147–152.
- Paivio, A. (1975). Perceptual comparisons through the mind's eye. Memory & Cognition, 3,
 653–647. doi: 10.3758/BF03198229
- Proctor, R. W. (2011). Playing the Simon game: Use of the Simon task for investigating human
 information processing. Acta Psychologica, 136, 182–188.
- Proffitt, D. R., & Linkenauger, S. A. (2013). Perception viewed as a phenotypic expression. In
 W. Prinz, M. Beisert, & A. Herwig (Eds.), Tutorials in action science (pp. 171–197).
 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tucker, M., & Ellis, R. (2001). The potentiation of grasp types during visual object
 categorization. Visual Cognition, 8, 769–800.
- 314 Vainio, L., Symes, E., Ellis, R., Tucker, M., & Ottoboni, G. (2008). On the relations between

- action planning, object identification, and motor representations of observed actions and
 objects. Cognition, 108, 444–465.
- 317 Wykowska, A., Schubö, A., & Hommel, B. (2009). How you move is what you see: Action
- 318 planning biases selection in visual search. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human
- 319 Perception and Performance, 35, 1755–1769.
- 320 Zmigrod, S., & Hommel, B. (2013). Feature integration across multimodal perception and action:
- 321 A review. Multisensory Research, 26, 143–157.