

Illusory Motion of the Motion Aftereffect Induces Postural Sway

Vivian Holten¹, Maarten J. van der Smagt¹, Stella F. Donker¹, and Frans A. J. Verstraten²

¹Helmholtz Institute, Utrecht University, and ²The University of Sydney

Received 10/16/13; Revision accepted 5/17/14

Psychological Science
2014, Vol. 25(9) 1831–1834
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0956797614540177
pss.sagepub.com
SAGE

Since the pioneering work of David Lee and his colleagues (Lee & Aronson, 1974; Lishman & Lee, 1973), the significant role that visual stimulation plays in postural control has been well established. For instance, visual stimuli simulating self-motion through the environment generate potent postural adjustments in observers (Bronstein & Buckwell, 1997; Guerraz & Bronstein, 2008; Lestienne, Soechting, & Berthoz, 1977; Meyer, Shao, White, Hopkins, & Robotham, 2013; van Asten, Gielen, & van der Gon, 1988). In all the studies just cited, the postural adjustments occurred as a result of motion information in a visual stimulus that was presented to the observer (i.e., direct visual stimulation).

It remains an open question, however, whether this perception-action cycle is the result of direct visual stimulation only, or whether postural adjustments also occur when the motion of the visual stimulus is illusory. Here, we show that the latter is the case. Prolonged viewing of visual motion results in neural adaptation, and subsequent viewing of a stationary stimulus normally results in illusory motion in the opposite direction, a famous phenomenon known as the motion aftereffect (MAE; Anstis, Verstraten, & Mather, 1998). Surprisingly, this sequence of stimulation also causes postural sway in the direction consistent with the perceived illusory motion. Control test patterns that do not generate an MAE after identical adaptation do not induce sway. This suggests that the visuo-vestibular interactions that govern postural control are not influenced by visual stimulation per se, but can be modulated by an illusory motion signal (e.g., the internal neural signal responsible for the MAE).

Different Test Patterns Cause Different Postural Sway

Visual experience is often the direct result of visual stimulation. Hence, it is not surprising that most research on visuo-vestibular interactions has used direct visual stimulation, such as optic-flow stimuli simulating self-motion

(Masson, Mestre, & Pailhous, 1995; Stoffregen, 1986). To be able to disentangle actual (direct) visual stimulation from visual experience, we used the MAE. During our experiment, observers ($N = 7$) stood in a completely dark room on a force plate (Fig. 1a). The recorded posturographic data were used to analyze the center-of-pressure (COP) displacement in the medial-lateral direction. Observers stood in front of a projection screen ($87^\circ \times 56^\circ$) and visually adapted to a binary random-pixel array (RPA; 50% dark pixels, 50% bright pixels) that was translating leftward or rightward with a speed of approximately $3^\circ/\text{s}$. The RPA was initially presented for 40 s to build up adaptation; 20-s top-up adaptation epochs were used between trials to keep observers maximally adapted. Each adaptation epoch was followed by a black screen for 2 s and then a 14-s presentation of the test pattern. Observers had to press a button to report when the MAE dissipated, if its duration was shorter than 14 s.

Three different test patterns were used: a static version of the RPA, a dynamic version of the RPA in which each pixel was randomly assigned a dark or bright polarity every 16.7 ms (Verstraten, van der Smagt, & van de Grind, 1998), and a black screen. The dynamic test pattern was expected to generate a shorter MAE than the static test pattern, as previous results have shown that following adaptation to low-speed moving stimuli, longer MAEs are induced by static test patterns compared with dynamic test patterns (Verstraten et al., 1998). The black screen served as a control condition that was expected not to induce an MAE, because no reference cues were present on the screen. Therefore, any postural sway induced by this black test pattern could be considered to be the result of postural compensation. (For additional information on the experimental method, including data analysis, see Methodological Details in the Supplemental Material available online.)

Corresponding Author:

Vivian Holten, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 1, Utrecht 3584CS, The Netherlands
E-mail: v.holten@uu.nl




Fig. 1. Illustration of the experimental setup and experimental results. During the main experiment, observers stood on a force plate and viewed a projection screen (a). They visually adapted to a binary random-pixel array (50% dark pixels, 50% bright pixels) that was translating leftward or rightward at a rate of approximately 3°/s. Each adaptation epoch was followed by a black screen and then a presentation of the test pattern. The recorded posturographic data were used to analyze the center-of-pressure (COP) displacement in the medial-lateral direction. The graphs in (b) show COP deviation and reported offset of the motion aftereffect (MAE; vertical bars) for the three test patterns (static, dynamic, black) used in the main experiment. The left graph shows results averaged across observers ($N = 7$) over the time course of a trial. The dark-gray region between 20 and 22 s after stimulus onset indicates the black screen that was presented between the adaptation and test patterns in all conditions. The right graph shows results averaged across observers with the COP at the start of the test pattern serving as baseline. Note that the time scale is changed, so that Time 0 is the onset of the test pattern. The graph in (c) shows COP deviations and corresponding MAE offsets (vertical bars) from the monocular and interocular-transfer (IOT) conditions in the supplemental experiment. Results are averaged across observers ($N = 3$) with the COP at the start of the test pattern serving as baseline (again, Time 0 is the onset of the test pattern). In all the graphs, results for the two motion directions are collapsed, with all trials converted to leftward adaptation. The bold lines indicate averages across observers, and the light shaded regions represent ± 1 SEM.

The reported MAE duration and the amount of postural sway averaged across observers are depicted in Figure 1b. During adaptation, the observed postural sway was in the same direction as the motion direction of the stimulus; this result corroborates previous findings (Bronstein, 1986; Holten, Donker, Verstraten, & van der Smagt, 2013; Lestienne et al., 1977). After the adaptation stimulus was replaced by a black test pattern, the COP gradually returned to baseline (i.e., the COP at the start of the trial). Observers did not report an MAE in most of these trials (94%). As expected, the static test pattern induced an MAE that was significantly longer than the one induced by a dynamic test pattern, $t(6) = 3.34$, $p = .047$, $r = .81$. Moreover, the static test pattern caused the COP to move beyond baseline in the direction opposite that observed during adaptation.

In accordance with the MAE durations observed, the dynamic test pattern appeared to generate less postural sway than the static test pattern. To compare the amount of postural sway generated by the test patterns, we set the COP at the start of the test pattern to zero and calculated the area under the curve of each test pattern (mean integral; static test pattern: 32.9; dynamic test pattern: 12.4; black screen: 2.8; see Fig. 1b, and Fig. S1 in the Supplemental Material). A repeated measures analysis of variance demonstrated a main effect of test-pattern type on the amount of postural sway, $F(2, 12) = 6.99$, $p = .010$, $\eta_p^2 = .54$. Post hoc pairwise comparisons showed that more postural sway was generated by the static than by the black test pattern ($p = .019$). The static test pattern also generated a longer MAE than the black test pattern did, $t(6) = 4.00$, $p = .021$, $r = .85$. The results therefore show that after identical adaptation, the type of test pattern affects the amount of postural sway and the perceived strength (duration) of the MAE in a similar fashion.

Interocular Transfer of the MAE and Postural Sway

Further evidence that the illusory experience of visual motion influences postural sway comes from a supplemental experiment in which we used interocular transfer (IOT) of the MAE. The method of this experiment was largely identical to that of the main experiment, except that adaptation to the translating RPA was monocular and the following static test pattern was presented to either the same, adapted, eye (monocular condition) or the other eye (IOT condition). (For details of the methodological differences between the two experiments, see Methodological Details in the Supplemental Material.) IOT of the MAE is suboptimal, and therefore the duration of the MAE is shorter in the IOT condition compared with the monocular condition (Wade, Swanston, & de Weert, 1993). If postural sway is related to the experience of visual motion rather than to the veridical sensory input

itself, less postural sway should be induced in the IOT condition than in the monocular condition. As expected, the duration of the MAE was shorter in the IOT condition than in the monocular condition, and there was also less postural sway in the IOT condition, $t(2) = -4.869$, $p = .040$, $r = .96$ (Fig. 1c). These results indicate that the illusory motion of the MAE, and not merely postural compensation and recalibration, caused the postural sway during the presentation of the static test pattern.

Conclusion

Our results are relevant to the as-yet-unresolved discussion on whether perception is *indirect* or *direct* (i.e., whether perception is top-down and inferential or whether it is exclusively derived from afferent retinal information; Wertheim, 1994). Our results show that the neural motion signal from the MAE influences the perception-action cycle. Therefore, it seems that it is not the veridical sensory input itself but rather the integration of sensory information and perhaps prior expectations that drive postural sway. This would be in line with predictive processing in which the brain matches prior top-down expectations and predictions with incoming sensory inputs (Clark, 2013). All in all, the visuo-vestibular interactions involved in visual-motion-induced sway seem to be influenced by the actual experience of visual motion, rather than visual stimulation per se.

Author Contributions

All the authors contributed to the study design. Data collection and data analysis were performed by V. Holten. All the authors contributed to the interpretation of the data. V. Holten drafted the manuscript, and M. J. van der Smagt, S. F. Donker, and F. A. J. Verstraten provided critical revisions. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared that they had no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article.

Funding

This research was supported by a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to F. A. J. Verstraten.

Supplemental Material

Additional supporting information can be found at <http://pss.sagepub.com/content/by/supplemental-data>

References

- Anstis, S., Verstraten, F. A. J., & Mather, G. (1998). The motion aftereffect. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2, 111–117.
- Bronstein, A. M. (1986). Suppression of visually evoked postural responses. *Experimental Brain Research*, 63, 655–658.

- Bronstein, A. M., & Buckwell, D. (1997). Automatic control of postural sway by visual motion parallax. *Experimental Brain Research*, 113, 243–248.
- Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 36, 181–204.
- Guerraz, M., & Bronstein, A. M. (2008). Mechanisms underlying visually induced body sway. *Neuroscience Letters*, 443, 12–16.
- Holten, V., Donker, S. F., Verstraten, F. A. J., & van der Smagt, M. J. (2013). Decreasing perceived optic flow rigidity increases postural sway. *Experimental Brain Research*, 228, 117–129.
- Lee, D. N., & Aronson, E. (1974). Visual proprioceptive control of standing in human infants. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 15, 529–532.
- Lestienne, F., Soechting, J., & Berthoz, A. (1977). Postural readjustments induced by linear motion of visual scenes. *Experimental Brain Research*, 28, 363–384.
- Lishman, J. R., & Lee, D. N. (1973). The autonomy of visual kinaesthesia. *Perception*, 2, 287–294.
- Masson, G., Mestre, D. R., & Pailhous, J. (1995). Effects of the spatio-temporal structure of optical flow on postural readjustments in man. *Experimental Brain Research*, 103, 137–150.
- Meyer, G. F., Shao, F., White, M. D., Hopkins, C., & Robotham, A. J. (2013). Modulation of visually evoked postural responses by contextual visual, haptic and auditory information: A “virtual reality check.” *PLoS ONE*, 8(6), Article e67651. Retrieved from <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0067651>
- Stoffregen, T. A. (1986). The role of optical velocity in the control of stance. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 39, 355–360.
- van Asten, W. N. J. C., Gielen, C. C. A. M., & van der Gon, J. J. D. (1988). Postural adjustments induced by simulated motion of differently structured environments. *Experimental Brain Research*, 73, 371–383.
- Verstraten, F. A. J., van der Smagt, M. J., & van de Grind, W. A. (1998). Aftereffect of high-speed motion. *Perception*, 27, 1055–1066.
- Wade, N. J., Swanston, M. T., & de Weert, C. M. M. (1993). On interocular transfer of motion aftereffects. *Perception*, 22, 1365–1380.
- Wertheim, A. H. (1994). Motion perception during self-motion: The direct versus inferential controversy revisited. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 17, 293–355.