



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Representational Momentum reveals visual anticipation differences in the upper and lower visual fields.

Gottwald, V.M.; Lawrence, G.P.; Hayes, A.E.; Khan, M.A.

Experimental Brain Research

DOI:

[10.1007/s00221-015-4294-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4294-9)

Published: 01/05/2015

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Gottwald, V. M., Lawrence, G. P., Hayes, A. E., & Khan, M. A. (2015). Representational Momentum reveals visual anticipation differences in the upper and lower visual fields. *Experimental Brain Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4294-9>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

The final publication is available at Springer via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4294-9>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1
2
3 **Representational Momentum reveals visual anticipation differences in the upper and lower**
4 **visual fields.**

5
6
7 Victoria M. Gottwald¹

8 Gavin P. Lawrence¹

9 Amy E. Hayes¹

10 Michael A. Khan²

- 11
12
13 1. Institute for the Psychology of Elite Performance
14 School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University
15 2. Department of Kinesiology, University of Windsor, CA

16
17 Correspondence address: Dr Vicky Gottwald
18 School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences
19 Institute for the Psychology of Elite Performance
20 Bangor University
21 George Building
22 Holyhead Rd
23 Bangor
24 Gwynedd
25 LL57 2PZ

26 Email: v.m.gottwald@bangor.ac.uk

27 Tel: +44 (0)1248 382824

28
29 **Keywords:** stimulus perception, visual hemifields, anticipatory processes.

Abstract

1
2
3 Recent empirical research has revealed differences in functional capacity between the
4 upper and lower visual fields (VFs), with the lower VF exhibiting superiority in visual
5 perception skills. Similarly, functional differences between the left and right hemispheres elicit a
6 predominance for visuospatial processing in the left visual field (left VF). Both anatomical as
7 well as evolutionary arguments have been adopted in accounting for these variations in function.
8 Preceding upper and lower VF research has typically investigated either static stimulus
9 perception or the visual processing of upper limb action. The aim of the current research was to
10 investigate whether the lower VF benefits associated with limb control transcend to visual
11 anticipation (the perception of motion). Methods were based on Khan and Lawrence (2005), who
12 investigated upper/lower VF differences in visuomotor control, but utilising a representational
13 momentum paradigm to isolate perceptual processes. Thirty two participants were randomised
14 into either a left or right VF group and completed a perceptual computer based task in the upper
15 and lower VF, where they were required to judge the final position of a moving object before it
16 disappeared. Two aspects of the distributions of *same* responses were then analysed; the central
17 tendency (weighted means) and the variability. Results revealed that in the left VF, weighted
18 means for the lower VF were significantly greater than for the upper VF ($t(14)=2.242, p=.042$).
19 In both left and right VFs, variability was greater in the upper compared to lower VF. This
20 provides new findings regarding visual processes in the different visual fields. While visual
21 search and large scene perception has been found to be superior in the upper VF, here we find
22 that visual anticipation, like target directed visuomotor skill, is superior in the lower VF.

23

1 Representational Momentum reveals visual anticipation differences in the upper and lower visual
2 fields.

3
4 Recent empirical research has revealed advantages in the lower VF for both visual
5 perception and visual based control of actions (Carlsen, Maslovat, Chua & Franks, 2007;
6 Danckert & Goodale, 2001; Khan & Lawrence, 2005; Krigolson & Heath, 2006) whereas an
7 upper VF advantage is reported for tasks involving visual search (Danckert & Goodale, 2003;
8 Efron, Yund, & Nichols, 1990; Fecteau, Enns & Kingstone, 2000; Lee, Kaneoke, Kakigi, &
9 Sakai, 2009; Previc, 1990; Previc & Bloom, 1993). From an anatomical standpoint, explanations
10 for these differences may reside from the fact that there is a greater density of ganglion cells
11 (responsible for transmitting image forming and non-image forming information to brain
12 regions) appearing in the superior hemi-retina of the eye compared to the inferior hemi-retina
13 (Curcio, Sloan, Packer, Hendrickson, & Kalina, 1987; Curcio & Allen, 1990). Additionally, in
14 the striate cortex of each VF, the lower VF is represented above the calcarine fissure and the
15 upper VF below. Thus, in the extrastriate cortex the visual fields are represented dorsally and
16 ventrally, respectively (Felleman & Van Essen, 1991; Galati, Lobel, Vallar, Berthoz, Pizzamiglio
17 & Le Bihan, 2000; Rubin, Nakayama & Shapley, 1996).

18 In agreement with the functional segregation of the dorsal and ventral visual cortical
19 pathways (Goodale & Milner, 1992), Previc (1990; also see Danckert & Goodale, 2003)
20 proposed an evolutionary explanation to account for the upper and lower VF differences with the
21 former primarily responsible for processing vision in extrapersonal space (beyond reaching
22 distance) and the latter in peripersonal space (close to the body). The evolution of everyday
23 human daily needs and action have resulted in a specialisation of the upper VF for large scene
24 perception and visual search (ventrally controlled visual processing) whereas a specialisation for

1 target directed actions such as reaching and pointing/grasping (dorsally controlled visual
2 processing) has occurred within the lower VF.

3 These upper and lower VF differences have recently been reported to be dependent on the
4 location of stimuli within the left and right visual fields with only the left VF revealing different
5 response properties between the upper and lower VF (Lee et al., 2009). These findings may be
6 due to the functional differences between the left and right hemispheres (Heilman & Ven Den
7 Abell, 1980) with the right hemisphere (left VF) having a predominance for visuospatial
8 processing and the left hemisphere (right VF) for verbal processing (Lee et al., 2009).

9 Because the majority of the upper and lower VF research has investigated either static
10 stimulus perception (Carlsen et al., 2007) or the visual processing of upper limb action (Dancerkert
11 & Goodale, 2001; Khan & Lawrence, 2005), the aim of the current research was to investigate
12 the implications of the previously reported lower VF benefits on visual anticipation. In order to
13 achieve this, the methods of the current study were to some extent a replication of Khan and
14 Lawrence's (2005) investigation into differences in visuomotor control between the upper and
15 lower VFs. Here, researchers adopted a visuomotor task in which participants were required to
16 move a cursor from a home position to a target under concurrent full vision conditions. Results
17 revealed that movement endpoints were more accurate and less variable in the lower VF.
18 Additionally, both online and offline movement adjustments were greater in the lower VF
19 indicating that movement control within this field is more adjustable compared to the
20 movements in the upper VF. To extend the understanding of the upper and lower VF differences,
21 the current study endeavored to isolate *perceptual* processes to determine whether visual
22 anticipation might contribute to the improved motor performance observed in the research of
23 Khan and Lawrence. In addition, because recent research has suggested the upper and lower VF

1 differences are removed in the right VF, we also investigated the interaction effects between the
2 upper/lower and the left/right VFs during visual anticipation.

3 To achieve this, we utilised a representation momentum (RM) paradigm that has been
4 adopted by researchers to investigate the visual perception of moving objects. Specifically, RM
5 refers to the phenomenon that when observers attempt to remember the final observed position of
6 an object undergoing implied or actual motion, they tend to misremember the final location as
7 further along in the direction of continued motion (Freyd & Finke, 1984). In Freyd and Finke's
8 (1984) seminal article, participants were required to view a sequence of three images of a
9 rectangle, each indicating an implicit direction of the rectangle's rotation. The task was to
10 remember the orientation of the third rectangle prior to the presentation of a test rectangle either
11 in the same position as the third rectangle or rotated in the implicit or reverse direction.
12 Participants experienced difficulty in detecting a difference between the third and fourth
13 rectangle when the fourth rectangle was rotated in the implicit direction, suggesting that the
14 participant remembered the third rectangle as being rotated further forward from its original
15 position. This effect is now well established in the literature and has been demonstrated using a
16 diverse selection of tasks and stimuli, for example continuous vertical and horizontal motion of
17 simple objects (Hubbard & Bharucha, 1988), static stimuli where motion is implied (Freyd &
18 Pantzer, 1995; Freyd, Pantzer & Chang, 1988, Reed & Vinson, 1996) and more recently, in the
19 complex and dynamic environment of a driving simulator (Blättler, Ferrari, Didierjean, Elslände
20 & Marmèche, 2010; Thornton & Hayes, 2004).

21 Research has investigated the effects of various factors on RM, such as stimulus speed
22 (Freyd & Finke, 1985) and acceleration (Finke, Freyd & Shyi, 1986), conceptual knowledge

1 regarding the stimulus (Reed & Vinson, 1996), expertise (Blättler et al., 2010), and age
2 (Piotrowski & Jakobson, 2011). In addition, RM has been investigated within special populations
3 such as children born preterm and at term (Taylor & Jakobson, 2010), and those individuals with
4 autism spectrum disorder (Hudson, Burnett & Jellema, 2012). The typical RM effects observed
5 within past research have been hypothesised to reflect an anticipatory component of perception
6 which supports effective action (for a review of RM findings and theory see Hubbard, 2005).
7 Thus, if processes associated with RM support action, it might be expected that the RM effect
8 should be stronger in the lower VF than the upper VF, because utilisation of visual feedback for
9 the control of action is superior in the lower VF (Khan & Lawrence, 2005).

10 In the current investigation, participants were asked to perform either a left VF or a right
11 VF RM task in both the upper and lower VF. It was hypothesized that the RM effect would be
12 greater in lower VF compared to the upper VF. That is, participants would extrapolate the
13 predicted motion of objects and recall the last observed position of objects further forward in the
14 lower VF compared to the upper VF. Furthermore, because the upper and lower VF differences
15 are removed in the right VF (Lee et al., 2009), it was expected that our hypothesized differences
16 in object anticipation between the upper and lower VF would be stronger in the left VF.

17

18 Methods

19 *Participants*

20 Thirty-two undergraduate students (29 males, 3 females; mean age 21.23, SD = 2.16)
21 from the School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, participated as
22 partial fulfillment of a course requirement. All were naïve to the research hypotheses and
23 inexperienced at the experimental task. They gave their informed written consent prior to

1 participation and all reported normal or corrected to normal vision. The experiment was
2 conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines laid down by the ethics committee of the
3 School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University for research involving human
4 participants.

5 *Apparatus and stimuli*

6 Stimuli were presented on a 22" ViewSonic FuHzion monitor (120 Hz) that was
7 positioned on a table top in front of the participants. The monitor was surrounded on all sides by
8 50 cm of black card to prevent any logos, scratches or scuffs on the monitor casing being used as
9 visual reference points during the experimental trials. The participant's head was placed in a
10 chin/head rest such that their face was parallel to the monitor and their eyes were at a distance of
11 40 cm and directly in line with the monitor's horizontal centre line. A fixation point, consisting
12 of a 4 mm black circle, was positioned at the centre point of the monitor and viewing position
13 was centred so that each eye was equidistant from the fixation point.¹ The stimulus cursor
14 consisted of an 8 mm black circle that appeared in the upper or lower VF and moved horizontally
15 from the periphery to the centre line. The start position of the upper VF stimuli in the right VF
16 was located 24 cm to the right and 8 cm above the fixation point, and direction of movement was
17 right-to-left. These distances were the same for the left VF but the orientation of the start
18 position was located to the left of the participant and direction of movement was left-to-right. In
19 both the right and left, upper VF conditions, the stop position was located 8 cm directly above
20 the fixation point and in the lower VF conditions the stop position was located 8 cm below the
21 fixation point. The distance of 8 cm from the fixation point to the stop position created a visual

¹ To verify these vertical and horizontal eye positions, participants viewed the fixation point through the 8 mm diameter circular bore of a cylinder (25 mm diameter; 32 mm length) that was placed perpendicular against the monitor screen; adjustments to the chin/head rest were made until the fixation point appeared to the participant to be centred in the cylindrical bore.

1 angle of 16°. Both direction of motion (i.e. towards the centre) and the 16 degree visual angle
2 were direct replications of Khan and Lawrence's (2005) methods, in an effort to determine
3 whether visual anticipation is at least partly responsible for the reported functional benefits of
4 visuomotor control in the lower VF.

5 To ensure participants maintained fixation during the experimental trials, a Sony CVX-
6 VIP colour video camera (lens diameter = 8 mm) was positioned to capture video of the
7 participants' eyes. The experimenter monitored the output from the camera using a digital Sony
8 Video Walkman GV/D 900E placed on the experimenter's desk.

9 *Task and Procedure*

10 Participants were randomly assigned to either a right or left VF group. Due to the
11 demanding nature of the task in maintaining fixation whilst making perceptual judgements away
12 from the fovea, researchers made the decision to use the direction component as a between
13 subjects factor. This also enabled them to manage the large number of experimental trials
14 participants were required to complete. They were told that their eye movements were being
15 monitored, and at the beginning of each trial, participants were required to maintain their gaze on
16 the fixation point. A warning tone, informing the participant that the trial was about to begin,
17 was then presented and the stimulus cursor appeared at the start location. Following a variable
18 foreperiod (1500 ms to 2500 ms), the cursor travelled across the monitor screen (at one of five
19 movement time speeds; 400 msec, 425 msec, 450 msec, 475 msec, 500 msec) and terminated
20 directly above (upper VF condition) or below (lower VF condition) the fixation point. Motion of
21 the cursor was at a constant velocity (i.e., motion did not contain acceleration and deceleration)
22 and movement time speeds equated to 0.60 m/s, 0.56 m/s, 0.53 m/s, 0.51 m/s and 0.48 m/s,
23 respectively. Upon reaching the termination point, the cursor disappeared for a period of 250

1 msec before reappearing at one of three possible test positions; either forward (+5 mm); directly
2 in line with (0 mm); or backwards (-5 mm) of the termination point. Participants were then asked
3 to verbally report whether the test cursor appeared in the same location (*same*) as the termination
4 point, or whether it appeared too far forwards (*forward*) or too far backwards (*back*) along the
5 direction of motion. The experimenter recorded the response on a Compusys computer for later
6 analysis. Trials for which eye movements occurred were marked for exclusion and subsequently
7 omitted from later analyses. Percentages of these trials were extremely low, with an average of
8 1% eye movement trials in the lower VF and 2% in the upper VF.

9 Participants completed two blocks of 90 trials, one where the cursor moved in the upper
10 VF and one where the cursor moved in the lower VF. The order of visual fields was
11 counterbalanced between participants. Within each block of trials the cursor travelled at each of
12 the five different movement time speeds, and reappeared at each of the three test positions. The
13 numbers of trials within the components of these two factors were equal and the order of the
14 trials was randomized within each block. Thus for both the upper and lower VFs, this resulted in
15 a total of 30 trials at each test position with six of those occurring at each speed. At the beginning
16 of each block, participants were given seven familiarisation trials.

17 *Dependent measures and analyses*

18 Two aspects of the distributions of *same* responses were analysed; the central tendency
19 and the variability.

20 *Central tendency (RM)*. The RM effect can be quantified by calculating the central
21 tendency of the distribution of *same* responses across test positions; the central tendency
22 represents the remembered position of the target. Under conditions of RM, the distribution of
23 same responses is biased toward the forward compared to the backward test positions. Central

1 tendency was estimated by calculating the mean probe position endorsed as *same* for each
2 condition (upper/lower VF x speed) for each participant. For this calculation each *same* response
3 was weighted by the probe position value at which it occurred (i.e. a *same* response at the
4 backward test position would be assigned a value of -1, a *same* response at the *true same* position
5 would be assigned a value of 0, and a *same* response at the forward test position would be
6 assigned a value of +1), and the average of these weighted *same* responses was calculated. This
7 measure of central tendency has been termed the weighted mean (Freyd & Jones, 1994).

8 *Variability.* The variability of the distribution represents the precision of responses about
9 the central tendency². The variability associated with the distribution of *same* responses was
10 estimated by calculating the average absolute deviation score for each participant. For each
11 condition, the absolute difference between the test position value (-1, 0, or +1) associated with
12 each *same* response and that participant's weighted mean was calculated. These absolute
13 deviations were summed and divided by the total number of *same* responses.³

14 *Analyses.* To test whether the weighted means in the upper and lower fields represented
15 significant forward RM shifts, one-sample t-tests were conducted, separately for the left and
16 right VF groups. To test for differences among conditions, the weighted mean and average
17 absolute deviation scores were subjected to 2 x 2 x 5 (upper/lower VF x stimulus side x speed)
18 mixed model ANOVAs with upper/lower VF and speed as within subjects factors and stimulus
19 side as a between subjects factor. Significant between-subject effects were broken down using

² Hayes & Freyd (2002) have demonstrated in an RM paradigm that precision of responses about the central tendency decreases under dual task conditions. Other perceptual judgments, such as of colour, orientation, and static location, also become less precise under dual task conditions (e.g. Prinzmetal, Amiri, Allen, & Edwards, 1998). It might be expected, then, that any differences in attentional deployment to the upper vs. lower visual fields might be reflected in changes in the variability of the distributions of *same* responses.

³ Following Prinzmetal and Wilson (1997), this measure of variability was used because it is more robust to violations of assumptions of analysis of variance than is the standard deviation (Keppel, 1991, p. 102.).

1 Tukeys *HSD* post hoc tests while significant within-subject effects were broken down into their
2 simple main effects. In line with the assumptions of ANOVA homogeneity of variance and
3 sphericity were tested; for all computational statistics conducted there were no violations of
4 homogeneity or sphericity.

5 6 Results and Discussion

7 *Data screening*

8 Data from one participant who misunderstood the “forward” and “backward” response
9 mappings in the lower VF condition were excluded from the data set. Data from a second
10 participant were excluded because there were no *same* responses in some conditions and
11 therefore weighted means could not be calculated for those conditions. Data from the remaining
12 30 participants (15 participants for each stimulus side) were analysed.

13 *Descriptive statistics*

14 Figure 1 shows the mean distributions of *same* responses as a function of probe position
15 for upper and lower VF, shown separately for the two stimulus sides. Data are collapsed across
16 target speed and participant.

17
18

19 Insert figure 1 about here

21 *Inferential statistics*

22 *Central tendency (RM)*. Weighted means for the left VF group were significantly greater
23 than zero in both upper VF (0.11; $t(14)=2.359, p=.033$) and lower VF (0.29; $t(14)=4.217,$

1 $p=.001$; see figure 2). The weighted means were not significantly different from zero for the right
2 VF group in either the upper VF (0.01 ; $p=.900$) or the lower VF (-0.06 ; $p=.496$).

3 The ANOVA on the weighted means revealed a main effect of stimulus side ($F(1, 28) =$
4 7.387 , $p = .011$, $\eta^2 = .209$) with greater weighted means for left VF (0.20) than for right VF ($-$
5 0.03). There was a significant upper/lower VF x stimulus side interaction ($F(1, 28) = 4.258$, $p =$
6 $.048$, $\eta^2 = .132$). Post-hoc analyses (Tukey *HSD*) revealed that for left VF, weighted means for
7 lower VF ($M=0.29$, $SD=0.26$) were significantly greater than for upper VF ($M=0.11$, $SD=0.19$)
8 ($p<0.05$), whereas for the right VF group, there was no significant difference in weighted means
9 for the two visual fields. Furthermore, in the lower VF, left VF target motion produced
10 significantly greater weighted means ($M=0.29$, $SD=0.26$) than right VF target motion ($M=-0.06$,
11 $SD=0.33$) ($p<0.05$), whereas in the upper VF there was no effect of stimulus side.

12
13
14
15

Insert figure 2 about here

17 These central tendency results establish that the anticipatory RM bias occurs in both the
18 upper and lower VF, but only for the stimuli presented in the left VF. Moreover, for these left VF
19 stimuli the RM effect is stronger in the lower VF compared to the upper VF. This upper/lower
20 VF difference was predicted based on findings that visual perception for the control of action is
21 superior in the lower VF (Danckert & Goodale, 2001; Khan & Lawrence, 2005); this connection
22 between RM and control of action will be addressed further in the General Discussion.

1 The difference in RM between the upper and lower VF only occurs in the left VF, which
2 supports the findings of Lee et al. (2009) that upper/lower VF differences in visual processing
3 occur in the left VF only.

4 *Variability.* The analysis revealed a significant main effect for upper/lower VF ($F(1, 28)$
5 = 13.961, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .333$), with greater average absolute deviation in upper VF (.52) than
6 lower VF (.43). No other main effects or interactions were significant. This result indicates that
7 although performance in the lower VF was less accurate in the sense that the anticipatory RM
8 bias was larger, responses were less variable, which may reflect superior deployment of visual
9 attention (Prinzmetal & Wilson, 1997).

10

11 General Discussion

12 It was predicted that RM would be larger in the lower VF, based on the finding that
13 visual control of upper limb target directed movements has been found to be superior in the
14 lower VF (Danckert & Goodale, 2001; Khan & Lawrence, 2005). It was hypothesised that if
15 anticipatory visual processes support this visuomotor skill, then RM should also be stronger in
16 the lower VF. The findings support this hypothesis, in that performance for lower VF stimuli was
17 less variable and showed a stronger RM bias than in the upper VF for left VF stimuli. As
18 predicted, this was not the case for the right VF, which may be because upper/lower VF
19 perceptual differences are not found in the right VF (Lee et al., 2009). However, in the present
20 study the null result in the right VF could also be due to the fact that RM biases did not occur in
21 the right VF and therefore RM effects were insufficiently strong to demonstrate upper/lower VF
22 differences. This result is consistent with previous findings that RM effects are stronger for
23 stimuli in the left VF than for stimuli in the right VF (White, Minor, Merrell, & Smith, 1993). An

1 additional consideration is that stimuli in the left VF condition moved from left to right, whereas
2 stimuli in the right VF moved from right to left. Previous findings indicate that memory
3 distortions are greater when viewing objects moving from left to right. Halpern and Kelly (1993)
4 have presented multiple explanations for this finding. One proposition is left and right
5 hemispheric functional differences, with the right hemisphere (left VF) predisposed to
6 visuospatial processing and the left hemisphere (right VF) predisposed to verbal processing. An
7 alternative or supplementary explanation used to account for this finding is reading habits, which
8 for English speakers/readers is typically done in the left to right direction. Halpern and Kelly
9 suggest that the process of tracking ahead when reading in this direction may extend to the
10 tracking of visual objects and hence account for a larger memory bias when processing objects
11 moving in the left-to-right direction.

12 However, a consequence and limitation of replicating Khan and Lawrence's (2005)
13 methods, albeit to investigate perceptual as opposed to motor effects, was that potential visual
14 hemisphere and direction of motion confounds were not possible to disentangle. That is, it cannot
15 be confirmed whether an RM effect in the left VF was a result of direction of motion specifically
16 (left to right), or because motion occurred primarily in the left VF. Additionally, Left and right
17 VFs were based on the region that motion of the stimulus cursor occurred in i.e., the right visual
18 field group completed trials in which the stimulus began on the right hand side of the monitor
19 and travelled in a right to left direction towards the centre of the monitor. However, it should be
20 noted that in some trials (+ 5mm test position) the test cursor would have reappeared a small
21 distance (5 mm; just over half the diameter of the cursor) into the opposite visual field, therefore
22 stimuli have not been completely isolated to the right or left VF. Disentangling the source of the
23 differential RM effects in the left and right VF remains a topic for future investigation.

1 The current research provides support for the theory that the anticipatory visual processes
2 that underlie RM are an adaptive response to action demands in the everyday environment (see
3 Hubbard, 2005). Thorpe, Fize and Marlot (1996) suggest that it takes up to 150 ms to visually
4 process an object. Thus, viewing a *moving* object should theoretically result in a consequential
5 delay between perceptual and actual location of that object. However, in reality we are able to
6 compensate for this latency by further extrapolating an object's motion (Kharuna & Nijhawan,
7 1995; Berry, Brivanlou, Jordan & Meister, 1999). This strategy may be necessary in everyday
8 life to elicit an effective motor response, such as reaching or grasping a falling object. Shepard's
9 (1981) work has previously advocated some perceptual processes as being a function of the
10 enduring characteristics of our environment. This notion is also in line with Danckert and
11 Goodale (2003) who suggest that functional benefits of visuomotor control in the lower VF are
12 likely a consequence of evolution as a result of these tasks predominantly occurring in the lower
13 VF. With this in mind, researchers have suggested that one possible function of the RM effect is
14 in bridging the gap between perception and action (Hubbard, 2005). The current findings suggest
15 that participants were better able to accomplish this functional displacement in the lower VF,
16 which is consistent with visuomotor superiority (Khan & Lawrence, 2005) and other perceptual
17 processing advantages previously identified in this region; Carlsen et al., (2007) found that
18 performance in a visual inspection task was superior when performed in the lower versus upper
19 VF.

20 The physiological characteristics of humans, whether a consequence of evolution or not,
21 facilitate our understanding of perceptual processes. Researchers (e.g. Lennie, 1981, Berry et al.,
22 1999) have long since indicated the pertinence of retinal ganglion cells in perceptual processing
23 as well as confirming a disproportionate ganglion cell distribution favouring the lower VF

1 (Curcio et al., 1987; Curcio & Allen, 1990). This, combined with an over-representation of the
2 lower VF in the dorsal stream, provides a physiological explanation for this greater RM shift in
3 the lower VF.

4 In conclusion, these results provide new findings regarding visual processes in the upper
5 and lower VFs. While visual search and large scene perception has been found to be superior in
6 the upper VF, here we find that visual anticipation, like target directed visuomotor skill, is
7 superior in the lower VF. This is consistent with the theory that anticipatory processes associated
8 with RM support successful action, and future research testing RM and visuomotor tasks
9 concurrently between the upper and lower VFs can test this link directly. Moreover, many
10 perceptual processes modulate the magnitude of the RM effect, including expectations based on
11 the identity of the object (Reed & Vinson, 1996; Vinson & Reed, 2002) and expectations
12 regarding the unfolding event (Verfaillie & d'Ydewalle, 1991). Future research is needed to
13 determine how these modulatory effects may differ between the upper and lower VFs.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

1 References

- 2 Berry, M. J., Jr., Brivanlou, I. H., Jordan, T. A., & Meister, M. (1999). Anticipation of moving
3 stimuli by the retina. *Nature*, 398, 334-338.
- 4 Blättler, C., Ferrari, V., Didierjean, A., Elslande, P., & Marmèche, E. (2010). Can expertise
5 modulate representational momentum? *Visual Cognition*, 18, 9, 1253-1273.
- 6 Blättler, C., Ferrari, V., Didierjean, A., & Marmèche, E. (2011). Representational momentum in
7 aviation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37,
8 5, 1569-1577.
- 9 Carlsen, A.N., Maslovat, D., Chua, R., & Franks, I.M. (2007). Perceptual processing time
10 differences owing to visual field asymmetries. *Neuroreport, Vision*, 18, 10, 1067-1070.
- 11 Curcio, C.A. & Allen, K.A. (1990). Topography of ganglion cells in human retina. *Journal of*
12 *Comparative Neurology*, 300, 5-25.
- 13 Curcio, C.A. Sloan, K.R., Packer, O., Hendrickson, A.E., & Kalina, R.E. (1987). Distribution of
14 cones in human and monkey retina: individual variability and radial asymmetry. *Science*,
15 236, 579-581.
- 16 Danckert, J., Goodale, M. (2001). Superior performance for visually guided pointing in the lower
17 visual field. *Experimental Brain Research*, 137, 303–308.
- 18 Danckert, J., & Goodale, M. (2003). Ups and downs in the visual control of action. In: Johnson-
19 Frey SH (Ed.). *Taking action: cognitive neuroscience perspectives on intentional actions*.
20 MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 29-64.
- 21 Efron, R., Yund, E., & Nichols, D. (1990). Detectability as function of target location: effects of
22 spatial configuration. *Brain Cognition*, 12, 102–116.

1 Fecteau, J.H., Enns, J.T., & Kingstone, A. (2000). Competition-induced visual field differences
2 in search. *Psychological Science, 11*, 5, 386-393.

3 Felleman, D.J., & Van Essen, D.C. (1991). Distributed hierarchical processing in the primate
4 cerebral cortex. *Cerebral Cortex, 1*, 1-47.

5 Freyd, J.J., & Finke, R.A. (1984). Representational momentum. *Journal of Experimental*
6 *Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 10*, 126-132.

7 Freyd, J.J., & Finke, R.A. (1985). A velocity effect for representational momentum. *Bulletin of*
8 *the Psychonomic Society, 23*, 6, 443-446.

9 Freyd, J.J., Finke, R.A., & Shyi, G.C. (1984). Implied velocity and acceleration induce
10 transformations of visual memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 115*, 2, 175-188.

11 Freyd, J.J. & Jones, K. T. (1994). Representational momentum for a spiral path. *Journal of*
12 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 20*, 4, 968-976.

13 Freyd, J.J., & Pantzer, T.M. (1995). Static patterns moving in the mind. In S.M. Smith, T.B.
14 Ward, & R.A. Finke (Eds), *The creative cognition approach* (pp. 181-204). Cambridge,
15 MA: MIT Press.

16 Freyd, J.J., & Pantzer, T.M., & Chang, J.L., (1988). Representing statics as forces in equilibrium.
17 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 117*, 395-407.

18 Galati, G., Lobel, E., Vallar, G., Berthoz, A., Pizzamiglio, L., & Le Bihan, D. (2000). The neural
19 basis of egocentric and allocentric coding of space in humans: a functional magnetic
20 resonance study. *Experimental Brain Research, 133*, 156-164.

21 Goodale, M.A., & Milner, A.D. (1992). Separate visual pathways for perception and action.
22 *Trends in Neurosciences, 15*, 1, 20-25.

- 1 Halpern, A.R., & Kelly, M.H. (1993). Memory biases in left versus right implied motion.
2 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 19, 471-484.
- 3 Hayes, A. E., & Freyd, J. J. (2002). Representational momentum when attention is divided.
4 *Visual Cognition*, 9, 8-27.
- 5 Heilman, K.M., & Ven Den Abell, T. (1980). Right hemisphere dominance for attention.
6 *Neurology*, 30, 3, 327.
- 7 Hubbard, T.L. (2005). Representational momentum and related displacements in spatial memory:
8 A review of the findings. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 12(5), 822-851.
- 9 Hubbard, T.L., & Bharucha, J.J., (1988). Judged displacement in apparent vertical and horizontal
10 motion. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 44, 211-221.
- 11 Hudson, M., Burnett, H.G., & Jellema, T. (2012). Anticipation of action intentions in autism
12 spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 42, 1684-1693.
- 13 Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and analysis: a researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle
14 River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 15 Khan, M.A., & Lawrence, G.P. (2005). Differences in visuomotor control between the upper
16 and lower visual fields. *Experimental Brain Research*, 164, 395–398.
- 17 Khurana, B., Nijhawan, R. (1995). Extrapolation or attention shift? *Nature*, 378, 565-566.
- 18 Krigolson, O., & Heath, M. (2006). A lower visual field advantage for endpoint stability but no
19 advantage for online movement precision. *Experimental Brain Research*, 170, 127–135.
- 20 Lee, B., Kaneoke, Y., Kakigi, R., & Sakai, Y. (2009). Human brain response to visual
21 stimulus between lower/upper visual fields and cerebral hemispheres. *International*
22 *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 74, 81-87.

- 1 Lennie, P. (1981). The physiological basis of variations in visual latency. *Vision Research*,
2 21, 815-824.
- 3 Piotrowski, A.S., & Jakobson, L.S. (2011). Representational momentum in older adults. *Brain*
4 *and Cognition*, 77, 106-112.
- 5 Previc, F. (1990). Functional specialization in the lower and upper visual fields in humans: its
6 ecological origins and neurophysiological implications. *Behavioural Brain Science*, 13,
7 519–575.
- 8 Previc, F., Blume, J. (1993). Visual search asymmetries in three-dimensional space. *Vision*
9 *Research*, 33, 2697–2704.
- 10 Prinzmetal, W., Amiri, H., Allen, K., & Edwards, T. (1998). Phenomenology of attention: 1.
11 color, location, orientation, and spatial frequency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
12 *Human Perception and Performance*, 24, 1, 261-282.
- 13 Prinzmetal, W., & Wilson, A. (1997). The effect of attention on phenomenal length. *Perception*,
14 26, 2, 193-205.
- 15 Reed, C.L., & Vinson, N.G. (1996). Conceptual effects on representational momentum. *Journal*
16 *of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 22, 4, 839-850.
- 17 Rubin, N., Nakayama, K., & Shapley, R. (1996). Enhanced perception of illusory contours in
18 the lower versus upper visual hemifields. *Science*, 271, 5249, 651-653.
- 19 Shepard, R.N. (1981). Psychophysical complementarity. In M. Kubovy & J.R. Pomerantz
20 (Eds.). *Perceptual organisation* (pp. 279-341). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 21 Taylor, N.M. & Jakobson, L.S. (2010). Representational momentum in children born preterm
22 and at term. *Brain and Cognition*, 72, 464-471.

1 Thornton, I.M. & Hayes, A.E. (2004). Anticipating action in complex scenes. *Visual Cognition*,
2 11, 341-370.

3 Thorpe, S., Fize, D., & Marlot, C. (1996). Speed of processing in the human visual system.
4 *Nature*, 381, 520-522.

5 Verfaillie, K. & d'Ydewalle, G. (1991). Representational momentum and event course
6 anticipation in the perception of implied periodical motions. *Journal of Experimental*
7 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 17, 2, 302-313.

8 Vinson, N., & Reed, C.L. (2002). Sources of object-specific effects in representational
9 momentum. *Visual Cognition*, 9, 1/2, 41-65.

10 White, H., Minor, S. W., Merrell, J., & Smith, T. (1993). Representational-momentum effects in
11 the cerebral hemispheres. *Brain and Cognition*, 22, 2, 161-170.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20


21

22

23


1 Figure 1. Percent "same" responses as a function of test position for stimuli appearing in the
2 upper and lower VFs shown separately for the left and right VF groups. Test position values are
3 relative to the final seen position, with positive values indicating positions further in the direction
4 of continued motion. Error bars indicate standard error of the mean.

5
6
7



15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Figure 2. Weighted means for stimuli appearing in the upper and lower VFs for the left and right VF groups. Error bars indicate standard error of the mean.



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7