



# Slow changing postural cues cancel visual field dependence on self-tilt detection



C. Scotto Di Cesare<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, T. Macaluso<sup>a</sup>, D.R. Mestre<sup>a</sup>, L. Bringoux<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, ISM UMR 7287, France

<sup>b</sup> Cognitive Neuroscience Department and Cognitive Interaction Technology – Center of Excellence, Bielefeld University, Germany

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 21 February 2014  
Received in revised form 15 September 2014  
Accepted 24 September 2014

### Keywords:

Spatial orientation  
Tilt perception  
Interindividual differences  
Field dependence  
Multisensory integration

## ABSTRACT

Interindividual differences influence the multisensory integration process involved in spatial perception. Here, we assessed the effect of visual field dependence on self-tilt detection relative to upright, as a function of static vs. slow changing visual or postural cues. To that aim, we manipulated slow rotations (i.e.,  $0.05^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) of the body and/or the visual scene in pitch. Participants had to indicate whether they felt being tilted forward at successive angles. Results show that thresholds for self-tilt detection substantially differed between visual field dependent/independent subjects, when only the visual scene was rotated. This difference was no longer present when the body was actually rotated, whatever the visual scene condition (i.e., absent, static or rotated relative to the observer). These results suggest that the cancellation of visual field dependence by dynamic postural cues may rely on a multisensory reweighting process, where slow changing vestibular/somatosensory inputs may prevail over visual inputs.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Since observations by Aubert [1], it is well known that the perception of spatial orientation is biased by static roll body tilt yielding, for instance, a deviation of the perceived longitudinal body axis in the direction of tilt (e.g., [2]). Similar deviations induced by static body tilt appear in pitch when visually estimating the body longitudinal axis [2,3] or the egocentric eye level [4].

In parallel, static tilt of a visual scene has also been found to influence subjective visual vertical (SVV; e.g., [5]) as well as self-orientation estimates, such as adjusting the body to vertical (body adjustment test; [6,7]). In their pioneer work, Asch and Witkin conducted a set of experiments in which they showed that SVV deviates in the same direction as the static roll tilt of the visual scene [8,9]. Strikingly, they observed large interindividual differences, which were interpreted as reflecting that some individuals may rely more on vision than others, namely visual field dependent ('FD') or independent ('FI') subjects.

Available data regarding the influence of combined changes in body and visual scene orientation were rarely issued from dynamic rotations (e.g., [10]), and rather concerned static tilts with a variable time delay between the end of body tilt and the task onset [4,11–13]. In this context, while some studies showed that errors during combined head and visual scene static tilts appeared as an additive combination of the errors observed for each single tilt [4,11], other studies revealed that these errors were mainly induced by the visual tilt [12,13]. Although the influence of visual field dependence on spatial perception has been investigated during static tilt of the body/head and a visual scene [14], it has never been studied during very slow rotations, where cues were continuously – although slowly – refreshed.

Here, we assessed visual field dependence on self-tilt detection relative to upright, during slow continuous rotations of the body and/or the visual scene (i.e.,  $0.05^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) performed below semicircular canals stimulation [15]. Slow rotation profiles were previously shown to impair self-tilt detection in subjects who were not a priori selected on the basis of their degree of field dependence [16]. We expected that FD would be more sensitive to slow visual rotation alone compared to FI. However, we hypothesized that these interindividual differences would disappear during actual slow body rotation, whatever the presence and the orientation of the visual background. This second hypothesis

\* Corresponding author at: Cognitive Neuroscience & CITEC, Bielefeld University, Universitätsstrasse 25, 33615 Bielefeld, Germany. Tel.: +49 521 106 5704.  
E-mail address: [cecile.scotto@gmail.com](mailto:cecile.scotto@gmail.com) (C. Scotto Di Cesare).

was supported by recent data suggesting a 'vestibular/somatosensory capture' relative to visual cues as soon as the body is not upright anymore [17].

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Participants

In order to drastically select subjects relative to their visual field dependence, 100 participants (55 males; 45 females; mean age  $\pm$  SD:  $20.6 \pm 2.3$  years) were recruited among the students of Aix-Marseille University, and were submitted to a portable rod-and-frame test (RFT). Subjects reported having normal or corrected-to-normal vision and no neurological or sensorimotor disorders. All participants gave written informed consent prior to the experiment, in accordance with the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki.

The RFT consisted in setting a tilted visual rod along the gravitational vertical when facing a tilted visual frame (i.e., SVV task). Three roll frame tilts (0 and  $\pm 18^\circ$ ) and random initial rod orientations of  $\pm 18^\circ$  were manipulated. According to Nyborg and Isaksen's method [18], we computed the 'frame effect' (tendency to align the visual rod towards the frame) at  $18^\circ$ . The magnitude of the 'frame effect' determined the degree of visual field dependence, with high scores for visually-dependent subjects and low scores for visually-independent subjects [8]. Extreme scores (i.e., highest and lowest scores) were identified and enabled us to define two groups of eight subjects being either highly visually-dependent (8 females;  $19.6 \pm 1.3$  years; mean 'frame effect':  $8.6 \pm 1.3^\circ$ ) or visually-independent (3 females and 5 males;  $20.1 \pm 1.1$  years; mean 'frame effect':  $1.0 \pm 0.3^\circ$ ). Strikingly, the sample size of both groups was in the range of those manipulated in [18,19]. Furthermore, we considered that the strict selection process, leading to a marked differentiation between groups, increased the chance of finding a significant difference, if it actually existed.

Finally, prior to the experiment, stereoscopic vision acuity was checked for each selected subject using the Randot Stereotest<sup>®</sup> with all individual scores greater than 70 s of arc.

### 2.2. Apparatus

Subjects were seated in a tilting chair, firmly maintained by a six-point seatbelt. The chair could be rotated in the pitch dimension, around an axis positioned under the seat (see Fig. 1a). The rotation was produced by lengthening/shortening an electric jack (Phoenix Mecano<sup>®</sup>, thrust: 3 kN, clearance: 0.6 m, precision 0.12 mm) attached to the back of the seat. The angular profile of the tilt was servo-assisted using an inclinometer fixed to the chair (AccuStar<sup>®</sup>; resolution:  $0.1^\circ$ ; range:  $\pm 60^\circ$ ). The rotation velocity was set at  $0.05^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$  following an acceleration phase at  $0.005^\circ \text{ s}^{-2}$ , below the threshold for semicircular canals stimulation [15]. During the experimental trials, earphones provided white noise to mask any auditory cues. Two push buttons held by subjects in both hands were used to sample the digital response for judgement settings.

A 3D head-mounted display (HMD, 3D Cybermind hi-Res900<sup>®</sup>, Cybermind Interactive Nederland, The Netherlands; resolution:  $800 \times 600$  pixels; field of view:  $31.2^\circ$  diagonal for each eye) was fixed horizontally onto a headrest attached to the seat. This headrest was adjustable in elevation to the subject size. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the HMD was used to display a stereoscopic 3D visual background, composed of a full furnished and polarized room. The room was 3 m width  $\times$  2.25 m height, which corresponded to a relative standard room size, and was 6 m length. The distance of the virtual scene front was set at 1.7 m from subjects' eye in the transverse plane, in order that the

front wall could be fully visible according to the HMD field of view. The virtual room displayed in the HMD could rotate in the pitch dimension around the same axis as the rotating chair. Overall, the HMD device prevented subjects from having visual feedback from the experimental setup and about their current body location.

A real-time acquisition system (ADwin-Pro<sup>®</sup>, Jäger, Lorsch, Germany) running at 10 kHz was driven by a customized software (Docometre) to synchronously control visual background and/or chair rotations. The lag measured between visual and chair stimulus was negligible ( $< 55$  ms, that is, less than  $0.003^\circ$ ).

### 2.3. Procedure

During the experiment, subjects, seating in the rotating chair, were asked to indicate whether they felt being tilted forward, i.e., away from vertical [16,21,22]. To that aim, subjects were required to respond to a binary choice via the push buttons, thus indicating 'Yes, I feel being tilted forward' by pressing the right hand-held button or 'No, I do not feel being tilted forward' by pressing the left hand-held button.

For each condition, the chair and the visual background were initially set at  $0^\circ$  (i.e., at vertical). Subjects gave their subjective response when prompted by an auditory tone every  $1^\circ$ , from  $0^\circ$  to  $18^\circ$  of body and/or visual scene rotations. Once the body and/or the visual scene was rotated by  $18^\circ$ , the visual scene disappeared. If the body was actually rotated, the chair was rotated back to  $0^\circ$  with a profile in which we varied the magnitude and duration of the acceleration and deceleration phases. This pseudo-random profile was chosen such that the subjects did not infer the angle of tilt they previously reached. Between trials, the HMD was removed and a period of rest in full ambient light, during at least 1 min, was consistently provided before the next condition started. This resting period was used to suppress post-rotational effects due to semicircular canal stimulation [15] and to limit possible fatigue. The subsequent body and/or visual scene rotations condition began only when subjects did not feel tilted anymore.

During the experiment, we manipulated tilts of the body and/or the visual scene in the pitch dimension with forward body rotation and backward visual scene rotation up to  $18^\circ$ . The same velocity profile was used to reach  $18^\circ$  as subjects were asked to perform the task during the continuous rotation(s), so that these rotations were comparable. Overall, 4 experimental conditions were presented:  $S_{\text{bwd}}$ : backward visual scene rotation (top towards the observer) without body rotation;  $B_{\text{fwd}}$ : forward body rotation without scene (no visual background);  $B_{\text{fwd}}S$ : forward body rotation with a visual scene remaining static relative to the subject;  $B_{\text{fwd}}S_{\text{bwd}}$ : forward body rotation with backward visual scene rotation relative to the observer.

All 16 subjects performed 3 repetitions in each of the 4 aforementioned conditions, which were presented in a pseudo-random, counterbalanced order, to avoid any potential learning effect. A training session without body and/or visual scene rotations was provided before data collection actually started, to familiarize subjects with the task. The whole experimental session lasted about 2 h.

### 2.4. Data processing

We first determined the threshold for body tilt detection in each condition. Responses were converted into binary values, with '1' corresponding to the response 'Yes, I feel being tilted forward' and '0' to the response 'No, I do not feel being tilted forward'. A Probit model, using a non-linear regression analysis for binomial values

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6205706>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6205706>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)