



Butler University
Digital Commons @ Butler University

Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

2-3-2010

Initial Findings on Visual Acuity Thresholds in an African Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*)

Melissa R. Shyan-Norwalt
Butler University

Jeff Peterson
The Indianapolis Zoo

Barbara Milankow King
The Indianapolis Zoo

Timothy E. Staggs
Butler University

Robert H.I. Dale
Butler University, rdale@butler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers

 Part of the [Animals Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Zoology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shyan-Norwalt, M. R., Peterson, J., Milankow King, B., Staggs, T. E., & Dale, R. H. I. (2010). Initial findings on visual acuity thresholds in an African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*). *Zoo Biology*, 29(1), 30-35. doi: 10.1002/zoo.20259. Available from: http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers/353

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

Initial Findings on Visual Acuity Thresholds in an African Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*)

Melissa R. Shyan-Norwalt, Jeff Peterson, Barbara Milankow King, Timothy E. Staggs, and Robert H.I. Dale

Department of Psychology, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana
The Indianapolis Zoo, Indianapolis, Indiana

Abstract

There are only a few published examinations of elephant visual acuity. All involved Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*) and found visual acuity to be between 8' and 11' of arc for a stimulus near the tip of the trunk, equivalent to a 0.50 cm gap, at a distance of about 2 m from the eyes. We predicted that African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*) would have similarly high visual acuity, necessary to facilitate eye-trunk coordination for feeding, drinking and social interactions. When tested on a discrimination task using Landolt-C stimuli, one African elephant cow demonstrated a visual acuity of 48' of arc. This represents the ability to discriminate a gap as small as 2.75 cm in a stimulus 196 cm from the eye. This single-subject study provides a preliminary estimate of the visual acuity of African elephants.

Introduction

Studies of elephant sensory systems have emphasized hearing [Heffner and Heffner, 1982; Langbauer, 2000; Poole et al., 1988; Wood et al., 2005], smelling [Rasmussen, 1998], and, more recently, seismic communication [O'Connell-Rodwell et al., 2006]. There have been surprisingly few studies of vision in elephants [Daniel, 1999; Nissani et al., 2005; Rensch, 1957] and only one study of visual acuity in (Asian) elephants [Bennett, 1987].

Most anatomical/topographical studies of the retina have examined Asian elephants [Murphy et al., 1992], although Yokoyama et al. [2005] showed that both Asian and African elephants share visual pigments with human color-blind deuteranopes. Stone and Halasz [1989], studying the eye of a stillborn African elephant calf, found the usual pattern of ganglion cells concentrated on a horizontal axis across the retina below the optic disc. They also found a unique pattern: ganglion cells concentrated in the upper temporal retina, and speculated that this extra concentration would allow visual monitoring of the trunk. The most thorough study of elephant brain structure [Shoshani et al., 2006] indicates that the occipital lobe is relatively underdeveloped compared to the olfactory lobes and the temporal lobes, consistent with an interpretation that, for elephants, hearing and smell are much more elaborate senses than vision.

We tested binocular visual acuity in one African elephant using established techniques [Bartley, 1962; Herman et al., 1975; Nachtigall, 1989]. We predicted that visual acuity would be




Fig. 1. Stimuli and automatic feeder distances from the elephant were determined by three anatomical dimensions.

sufficiently sensitive as to facilitate feeding, drinking, and tool use with the trunk [Chevalier-Skolnikoff and Liska, 1993; Gordon, 1966; Hart et al., 2001, 2008] and social interactions [e.g., Moss, 1982; Moss and Poole, 1983; Poole et al., 1988; Schulte, 2000; Sukumar, 2003].

Materials and Methods

Subject

Tombi was a 17-year-old female African elephant at the Indianapolis Zoo. She was not food deprived during study.

Stimuli

The discrimination test used a high-contrast black/white closed circle as the reinforced stimulus (S+) and a set of Landolt C's, high-contrast black/white open circles of uniform dimension [Bartley, 1962], as the nonreinforced stimuli (S-). The size of the gap in of the circle—the “Angle of Arc”—differed systematically across S- stimuli (see Fig. 1). We chose Landolt Cs because at lower (barn-like) illuminations they provide more sensitive visual acuity measures than several other stimuli [Bartley, 1962].

All pretesting/training stimuli were painted with nontoxic acrylic latex “Sears Best” ® 30 67522 Gloss Black Enamel and 30 67512 Gloss White Enamel nonphotochemically reactive paints. Testing stimuli were computer-generated high/contrast black/white stimuli on heavy card stock. All stimuli had a 30.5 cm inside diameter. The gap in the Landolt C stimuli (S-) varied from 21.6 cm (6° 18') to 2.2 cm (0° 39') at an average distance of 196cm (±6cm) from Tombi's eyes [Graham and Sorgenfrey, 1990].

Stimuli were placed in a custom-designed (Sanderson Enterprises) automatic response-reinforcement apparatus. It accepted trunk-pushes directly on each stimulus. Correct responses (S+ presses) produced a 1,000Hz tone (secondary reinforcer) and 3–30 g of monkey chow (primary reinforcer) in a box centered below the two stimuli. Incorrect responses (S– presses) produced no reinforcement and locked the apparatus to prevent “second guesses.” Training stimuli slid into plywood holders. During testing, these holders were covered by a 0.30mm thick acrylic window (for cleaning between trials). The distance between the centers of the two stimuli was 94 cm, and the center of each stimulus was 27 cm above the floor.

Stimulus Illumination

Illumination was provided by overhead fluorescent lights, skylights, and two 3.5m open doorways behind the elephant. Cloud cover and moving shadows affected the ambient light level. We controlled for stimulus illumination by randomly assigning the S+ to the left and right sides of the apparatus. This manipulation also provided methodological control for unequal light/dark ratios of the S+ and S– stimuli (S+s had a higher black/white ratio than did S–s). Ambient light level in the testing area averaged 639 lux ($n = 3$, range 486–772 lux). Reflected illumination levels from the stimulus boards to the subject’s left and her right were 289 lux ($n = 6$, range 192–400 lux) and 271 lux ($n = 6$, range 156–341 lux), respectively (digital light meter: Davis Instruments No. UN633111 Model: DLM2).

General Procedure

Tombi was stationed in front of the apparatus. A handler stood next to her, facing backwards to avoid cuing. Tombi had to push the Complete-Circle (S+) and not the Landolt C (S–). S+ and S– locations were randomized, with the restriction that the S+ not be presented in the same location more than three consecutive times. If correct, reinforcement occurred automatically. If incorrect, the experimenter (behind a blind) told the keeper, the keeper told Tombi “No,” and re-stationed her if needed. Between trials, the experimenter wiped the stimuli with a wet sponge, evenly distributing smell/mucous cues. To avoid accidental cues, the stimulus to the animal’s left was always wiped, removed, and replaced before the stimulus to her right.

In animal psychophysical tasks, low motivation, weak reinforcers, or satiation can produce falsely low estimates of sensory thresholds. To avoid this, we used a variant of the “staircase” psychophysical technique [Cornsweet, 1962]. We established a running criterion of 80% correct over 10 consecutive trials. Each time the subject met this criterion, the discrimination was made harder (Angle of Arc reduced by one step). If Tombi failed to reach criterion across 16 trials (i.e., failed to produce any 8/10 correct in 10 trials, over a 16 trial block), the task was made easier (one step larger Angle of Arc). This minimized the risk of accidentally extinguishing her response by making the discrimination too difficult. However, additional criteria were set (see below) before the elephant could move to a new phase of the study. Each new session started with the last successful stimuli from the previous session. Tombi received an average of 40 trials per day. The study had three phases:

Pretraining (Three-Dimensional S+ vs. Blank/White S–)

Initial training with flat black-and-white stimuli and response levels produced no learning, so a tactile/visual 3-D element was added and responding was changed to direct pushes on stimulus boards. We chose tactile cues as potential mediating stimuli because, with other species, researchers have used mediating stimuli to overcome similar “task-demand” difficulties [Forestall and Herman, 1988; Wright et al., 1990]. First, a 1.27 cm high (elevated) black circle S+ (2.5 cm wide, 30.5 cm diameter) was contrasted with a blank, flat, white S-. Once Tombi reached a criterion of 90% CR across two sessions, the thickness of the S+ was reduced to 0.64cm. Once she reached criterion again, the 3-D cue was eliminated. Training stimuli were introduced.

Training

The S+ remained a complete circle. The S- began as a 5.1 cm long, horizontal black arc. For both stimuli, line thickness was increased to 3.65 cm. The response criterion was changed to 85% CR during one session. When criterion was reached, the S- was systematically modified in 2.5 or 5.0 cm increments to increase the length of the black “C” shape presented. Once the gap in the S- reached 90°, testing began.

Testing

Testing with the computer-generated comparison stimuli continued with increasingly difficult discriminative stimuli until Tombi reached chance performance (50% CR) across two sessions.

Results and Discussion

Tombi received 489 test trials across 13 sessions. Table 1 shows critical data from sessions 10-13. Visual acuity was defined as the minimum gap for which Tombi made 75% correct responses (halfway between guessing, 50% CR, and perfect accuracy, 100% CR). This occurred with a 2.75 cm gap at a distance of 196 cm (Angle of arc = 48°), indicating that Tombi could see a small object (2.75 cm) at the tip of her trunk. This initial estimate of visual acuity is better than that proposed by some prior literature [e.g., Nissani et al., 2005; Savage et al., 1994], but worse than the visual acuity observed with Asian elephants. Bennett [1987] reported that two female Asian elephants had visual acuities of 8' and 8'4" at 213 and 216 cm, respectively, a 0.50 cm gap, and that Altevogt [1955] obtained a visual acuity of 10'20" of arc at 163 cm distance, also a 0.50 cm gap, with a male Asian elephant. It is not clear whether the observed difference between African elephant and Asian elephants reflects species differences, methodological differences (the previous studies used black/white grid discrimination tasks while we used Landolt Cs), or individual subject differences. The visual acuity for Tombi, measured behaviorally, was also not as good as a theoretical estimate [Stone and Halasz, 1989] based on eye anatomy [about 15'; see Kirk and Kay, 2004].

Our results lend support to the hypothesis that extra ganglion cell concentrations in the upper temporal retina of African elephants relate to visual monitoring [Stone and Halasz, 1989]. They are consistent with suggestions that the elephant's visual acuity must be high enough to recognize visual displays by conspecifics during social interactions [Langbauer, 2000; Schulte,

Table 1. Proportion of correct responses (CR) by Tombi during sessions 10-13 and the overall response accuracy for the Landolt-C stimuli with the smallest gap sizes (Angles of Arc)

Gap size (Angle of Arc)	Proportion of correct responses				Overall accuracy (% CR)
	Session 10	Session 11	Session 12	Session 13	
2.90 (51°)	3/4	9/10	—	—	86%
2.75 (48°)	8/10	3/4	8/11	1/2	74%
2.48 (43°)	10/16	8/10	2/5	—	65%
2.28 (40°)	5/14	—	—	—	36%

2000] and that highly social species may use well-developed visual systems [Savage et al., 1994].

Acknowledgments

This study was approved by the Indianapolis Zoo’s Research Committee and Butler University’s IACUC and complied with the “Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research,” published in *Animal Behavior*, Volume 43, 1993. The authors thank the Indianapolis Zoo’s elephant management staff for its help and cooperation in this project, Debbie Olsen of the Indianapolis Zoo (now Director of the International Elephant Foundation), and Debra L. Forthman of Zoo Atlanta for their helpful comments in reviewing this manuscript. This research was supported in part by a grant to the first author from the Holcomb Research Institute of Butler University. The Indianapolis Zoo provided the subject, facilities, staff help, and reinforcers.

References

1. Altevogt R. 1955. Das visuelle Minimum separabile eines indischen Elefanten. *Z vergl Physiol* 37:325–337. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00303154>
2. Bartley SH. 1962. The psychophysiology of vision. In: Stevens SS, editor. *Handbook of experimental psychology*. New York: Wiley. p 87–92.
3. Bennett C. 1987. Visual discrimination and visual acuity in the Asian elephant. *Proc 8th Ann Ele Managers Workshop*, 54–61. North Carolina Zoo, November.
4. Chevalier-Skolnikoff S, Liska J. 1993. Tool use by wild and captive elephants. *Anim Behav* 46:209–219. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1993.1183>
5. Cornsweet TN. 1962. The staircase method in psychophysics. *Am J Psychol* 75:485–491. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1419876>
6. Daniel JC. 1999. Visual range of the African elephant. *Proc 1999 Ele Managers Workshop/ 4th Int Ele Res Symp* 5–11. Zoo Atlanta, June 17–22.
7. Forestall PH, Herman LM. 1988. Delayed matching of visual materials by a bottlenosed dolphin aided by auditory symbols. *Anim Learn Behav* 16:137–146. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03209056>
8. Gordon JA. 1966. Elephants do think. *Afr Wildl* 20:75–79.

9. Graham RH, Sorgenfrey JA. 1990. Trigonometry with applications. Geneva, IL: Houghton Mifflin Company.
10. Hart BL, Hart LA, McCoy M, Sarath CR. 2001. Cognitive behaviour in Asian elephants: use and modification of branches for fly switching. *Anim Behav* 62:839–847. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2001.1815>
11. Hart BL, Hart LA, Pinter-Wollman N. 2008 Large brains and cognition: where do elephants fit in? *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 32:86–98. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2007.05.012>
12. Heffner R, Heffner H. 1982. Hearing in the elephant (*Elephas maximus*). *J Comp Phys Psychol* 96:926–944. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.96.6.926>
13. Herman LM, Peacock MF, Yunker MP, Madsen CJ. 1975. Bottlenosed dolphin: double-slit pupil yields equivalent aerial and underwater diurnal acuity. *Science* 189:650–652. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1162351>
14. Kirk EC, Kay RF. 2004. The evolution of high visual acuity in the anthropoidea. In: Ross CF, Kay RF, editors. *Anthropoid origins: new visions*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum. p 539–602.
15. Langbauer Jr WR. 2000. Elephant communication. *Zoo Biol* 19:425–445. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2361\(2000\)19:5<425::AID-ZOO11>3.0.CO;2-A](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2361(2000)19:5<425::AID-ZOO11>3.0.CO;2-A)
16. Moss CJ. 1982. *Portraits in the wild*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
17. Moss CJ, Poole JH. 1983. Relationships and social structure in African elephants. In: Hinde RA, editor. *Primate social relationships: an integrated approach*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Press. p 315–325.
18. Murphy CJ, Kern TJ, Howland HC. 1992. Refractive state, corneal curvature, accommodative range and ocular anatomy of the Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*). *Vis Res* 32:2013–2021. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989\(92\)90062-N](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0042-6989(92)90062-N)
19. Nachtigall PE. 1989. Visual acuity of the Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) in air. Paper presented at the 30th Annual meeting of the Psychonomic Society. Atlanta (GA), November.
20. Nissani M, Hoefler-Nissani D, Tin Lay U, Wan Htun U. 2005. Simultaneous visual discrimination in Asian elephants. *J Exp Anal Behav* 83:15–29. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1901/jeab.2005.34-04>
21. O'Connell-Rodwell CE, Wood JD, Rodwell TC, Puria S, Partan SR, Keefe R, Shriver D, Arnason BT. 2006. Wild elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) breeding herds respond to artificially transmitted seismic stimuli. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 59:842–850. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00265-005-0136-2>
22. Poole JH, Payne KB, Langbauer Jr WR, Moss CJ. 1988. The social contexts of some very low frequency calls of African elephants. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 22:385–397. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00294975>
23. Rasmussen LEL. 1998. Chemical communication: an integral part of functional Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) society. *Ecoscience* 5:410–426.
24. Rensch B. 1957. The intelligence of elephants. *Sci Am* 196:44–49. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0257-44>
25. Savage A, Rice JM, Brangan JM, Martini DP, Pugh JA, Miller CD. 1994. Performance of African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*) and California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) on

- a two-choice object discrimination task. *Zoo Biol* 13:69–75. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/zoo.1430130109>
26. Schulte BA. 2000. Social structure and helping behavior in captive elephants. *Zoo Biol* 19: 447–459. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2361\(2000\)19:5<447::AID-ZOO12>3.0.CO;2-#](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2361(2000)19:5<447::AID-ZOO12>3.0.CO;2-#)
 27. Shoshani J, Kupsky WJ, Marchant GH. 2006. Elephant brain part I: gross morphology, function, comparative anatomy, and evolution. *Brain Res Bull* 70:124–157. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brainresbull.2006.03.016>
 28. Stone J, Halasz P. 1989. Topography of the retina in the elephant *Loxodonta africana*. *Brain Behav Evol* 34:84–95. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000116494>
 29. Sukumar R. 2003. *The living elephants: evolutionary ecology, behavior and conservation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 30. Wood JD, McCowan B, Langbauer Jr W, Viljoen JJ, Hart LA. 2005. Classification of African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) rumbles using acoustic parameters and cluster analysis. *Bioacoustics* 15:143–161. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2005.9753544>
 31. Wright AA, Shyan MR, Jitsumori M. 1990. Auditory same/different concept learning by monkeys. *Anim Learn Behav* 18:287–294. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03205288>
 32. Yokoyama S, Takenaka N, Agnew DW, Shoshani J. 2005. Elephants and human color-blind deuteranopes have identical sets of visual pigments. *Genetics* 170:335–344. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1534/genetics.104.039511>