



Structural Information Theory

The Simplicity of Visual Form

Emanuel Leeuwenberg
and Peter A. van der Helm

CAMBRIDGE

Structural Information Theory

The Simplicity of Visual Form

Emanuel Leeuwenberg

Peter A. van der Helm



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press,
New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107029606

© Emanuel Leeuwenberg and Peter A. van der Helm 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by the MPG Books Group

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Leeuwenberg, E. L. J. (Emanuel Laurens Jan) author.

Structural information theory : the simplicity of visual form /

Emanuel Leeuwenberg, Peter A. van der Helm.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-02960-6 (hardback)

1. Human information processing. 2. Information theory in psychology.

I. Helm, Peter A. van der, author. II. Title.

QP396.L44 2013

612.8 – dc23 2012020254

ISBN 978-1-107-02960-6 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Structural Information Theory

The Simplicity of Visual Form

Structural information theory is a coherent theory about the way the human visual system organizes a raw visual stimulus into objects and object parts. To humans, a visual stimulus usually has one clear interpretation even though, in theory, any stimulus can be interpreted in numerous ways. To explain this, the theory focuses on the nature of perceptual interpretations rather than on underlying process mechanisms, and adopts the simplicity principle, which promotes efficiency of internal resources, rather than the likelihood principle, which promotes veridicality in the external world. This theoretically underpinned starting point gives rise to quantitative models and verifiable predictions for many visual phenomena, including amodal completion, subjective contours, transparency, brightness contrast, brightness assimilation, and neon illusions. It also explains phenomena such as induced temporal order, temporal context effects, and hierarchical dominance effects, and extends to evaluative pattern qualities such as distinctiveness, interestingness, and beauty.

EMANUEL LEEUWENBERG is Emeritus Associate Professor at the Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour at Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

PETER A. VAN DER HELM is Assistant Professor at the Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour at Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Preface

This book does not provide a comprehensive survey of perception research. Rather, it deals with a specific, some might say idiosyncratic, approach to perception, and to visual form in particular. This approach is called structural information theory (SIT). Basically, SIT is a theory about structures irrespective of whether these structures are perceptual. Historically, however, SIT has been developed within the domain of visual perception research. A fundamental phenomenon in this domain is that, to humans, a visual stimulus usually has one clear interpretation even though any stimulus can, in principle, be interpreted in numerous ways. SIT addresses this phenomenon and aims at producing quantified and falsifiable predictions concerning the human interpretation of visual stimuli.

SIT was initiated, in the 1960s, by Emanuel Leeuwenberg and has been elaborated further by Hans Buffart, Peter van der Helm, and Rob van Lier. It began as a quantitative coding model of visual pattern classification that, in interaction with empirical research, developed into a general theory of perceptual organization. The home of SIT has always been the Radboud University Nijmegen, where it has been tested in collaboration with Harry van Tuijl, Frans Boselie, Rene Collard, Lucas Mens, Hans Mellink, Jantien van der Vegt, Cees van Leeuwen, Jackie Scharroo, Tessa de Wit, Arno Koning, Árpád Csathó, Gert van der Vloed, Matthias Treder, and Vinod Unni. Contributions and applications from elsewhere include those by Frank Restle, Hans-Georg Geissler, Ursula Schuster, Friedhart Klix, Ulrich Scheidereiter, Martina Puffe, Giovanni Adorni, Luigi Burigana, Albina Lucca, Remco Scha, Mehdi Dastani, Rens Bod, and Kasper Souren.

Our goal with this book is to provide an overview of SIT in a way that is accessible to a broad audience. We presuppose no special knowledge in the reader, neither of perception nor of SIT. In the Introduction, we discuss the unique status of perception and the roots of SIT. Then, we discuss SIT, in twelve chapters grouped in three parts. Part I shows how SIT's starting assumptions emerge from attempts to explain visual

form phenomena. At the end of this section, an overview is presented of SIT's assumptions and theoretical foundations. Part II begins with a coding manual presenting practical heuristics that can be used to describe various stimulus types. The subsequent chapters report applications of SIT to visual form perception. Part III attends to aspects of visual form beyond the scope of SIT and to applications of SIT beyond the field of visual form. We end the book with an overview and a conclusion. Complementary to this empirically oriented book is a book by Van der Helm (2013) which is focused on SIT assumptions and foundations.

Emanuel Leeuwenberg and Peter A. van der Helm

Contents

<i>Figures</i>	page vii
<i>Tables</i>	xiv
<i>Preface</i>	xv

Introduction	1
--------------	---

Part I Towards a theory of visual form

1	Borders of perception	9
1.1	The stimulus	9
1.2	Knowledge	16
2	Attributes of visual form	24
2.1	Features	24
2.2	Dimensions	27
2.3	Transformations	34
2.4	Gestalt properties	38
3	Process versus representation	45
3.1	Process criteria	45
3.2	Representation criteria	51
4	Models and principles	64
4.1	Two representation models	64
4.2	Two perception principles	74
5	Assumptions and foundations	83
5.1	Visual information processing	83
5.2	Mental and symbolic codes	86
5.3	Theoretical foundations	91

Part II Applications to visual form

6	Formal coding model	109
6.1	Structural information	109
6.2	Attributes of simplest codes	113

7	A perceptual coding manual	120
7.1	Line drawings	121
7.2	Surfaces	127
7.3	Objects	134
8	Preference effects	147
8.1	Occluding layers	148
8.2	Translucent layers	156
8.3	Rivalry	171
9	Time effects	181
9.1	Induced temporal order	181
9.2	Induced simultaneity	189
10	Hierarchy effects	198
10.1	Superstructure dominance	198
10.2	Mental rotation	204
10.3	Orientation frames	216

Part III Extensions

11	Perception beyond SIT	224
11.1	Metrical information	224
11.2	Image versus mirror-image	234
12	SIT beyond perception	251
12.1	Alphabetic letter series	251
12.2	Evaluative pattern qualities	260
	Overview	283
	Conclusion	291
	<i>References</i>	297
	<i>Author index</i>	313
	<i>Subject index</i>	317

The colour plates are situated between pages 208 and 209.

Figures

1.1 A Maxwell demon who, like perception, turns chaos into order	<i>page 2</i>
1.2 The difference between structural and metrical information	4
1.1 Eight object images which are hardly identifiable as different views of the same object	10
1.2 Stimulus objects involved in image versus mirror-image discrimination experiments	11
1.3 Image versus mirror-image discrimination is easier for simple objects than for complex objects	13
1.4 Different views of a prism can be imagined due to its view-independent representation	13
1.5 Judged likelihoods of configurations presuppose classification of these configurations	14
1.6 The perceptual representation of a partly occluded pattern is equivalent to that of the completed pattern	15
1.7 Conscious reasoning and perception may lead to different completions of occluded patterns	15
1.8 A Gestalt is determined not only by its parts but also by the relationships between these parts	17
1.9 Only primes showing perceptually plausible target parts may affect the target interpretation	17
1.10 Specific knowledge may favour a specific visually plausible interpretation of a pattern	18
1.11 A pattern may give rise to a few plausible interpretations and many implausible ones	20
2.1 Feature complexity and visual complexity are opposite functions of set size	27
2.2 The triangular inequality in terms of pattern differences does not hold in perception	29
2.3 Prototypes are either unambiguous patterns or simple patterns	30

2.4	Distinctive structures are more salient but common structures are primary	32
2.5	In motion patterns, common structures tend to be suppressed gradually	33
2.6	Stepwise construction of a pattern by way of rigid transformations of parts	34
2.7	Partly overlapping regularities in a pattern cannot be combined into one representation	40
2.8	Three options for representing segments and regularities	40
2.9	Pattern interpretations depend on the actual strengths of Gestalt cues in patterns	42
3.1	A case in which minimal complexity per stage prevails over maximal cluster per stage	46
3.2	A case in which maximal cluster per stage prevails over minimal complexity per stage	46
3.3	Examples of patterns from the restricted application domain of the global precedence hypothesis	49
3.4	Examples of patterns to which the global precedence hypothesis does not apply	50
3.5	Clustering of randomly positioned subpatterns on the basis of their orientations	51
3.6	Hierarchy in pattern codes specifies relations between superstructures and subordinate structures	52
3.7	Hierarchy in object codes specifies relations between superstructures and subordinate structures	54
3.8	The superstructure in an object code does not always coincide with the largest object component	54
3.9	The superstructure of parallel oriented 2-D substructures is the largest pattern component	55
3.10	The superstructure of parallel oriented 3-D substructures is the largest object component	56
3.11	The hierarchically highest distinctive code component determines the clustering of subpatterns	57
3.12	Structural hierarchy prevails over metrical hierarchy	59
3.13	Structural hierarchy guarantees object invariance under rotation of superstructures	60
3.14	Spatial contiguity tends to exclude metrically hierarchical codes	61
3.15	Objects describable only by metrical hierarchy tend to be odd and not spatially contiguous	62
4.1	RBC attributes for the cross-sections and axes of geon objects	65

4.2	In case of two equally long axes, RBC prefers the axis with the most regular cross-section	66
4.3	An RBC code combining positive and negative geons is not always visually plausible	67
4.4	Compared to RBC codes, SIT codes differentiate more between different objects	67
4.5	Stimuli, described by RBC as dual shapes, for which SIT discerns dual and single shapes	68
4.6	RBC codes and SIT codes yield different predictions regarding similarity of shapes	70
4.7	A code not only describes a concrete pattern but also classifies it	72
4.8	A simpler object code describes a smaller class of objects	73
4.9	Linearity is a more valid non-accidental property than symmetry and parallelism	76
4.10	A design showing pros and contras of the avoidance of coincidence principle	77
5.1	The inverse routes of perception and perception research	84
5.2	The simplicity principle in perceptual organization	88
5.3	A semantic mapping for a random dot stimulus	89
5.4	Illustration of the spatial contiguity demand	90
5.5	Simplicity versus likelihood in amodal pattern completion	93
5.6	Holographic versus transformational structure of symmetry and repetition	97
5.7	Transparallel pencil selection versus serial and parallel pencil selection	103
6.1	Formal representation of regularity in symbol strings	110
6.2	Figural goodness of symbol strings on the basis of their simplest codes	116
6.3	Simplicity and figural goodness are related but different	118
7.1	Illustrations of serial forward and backward scanning of line patterns and branching patterns	122
7.2	Radiation patterns described either from their centres or from their envelopes	123
7.3	Coincidental positions of hypothesized objects contribute to complexity	125
7.4	If clockwise contour scanning fills-in surfaces, anti-clockwise scanning describes holes	128
7.5	Two equally coloured areas sharing just one point cannot be described as one surface	129

7.6 Symmetry codes based on contour scanning should reflect surface symmetry	130
7.7 A single surface, even one with equal contour segments, may be interpreted as multiple surfaces	131
7.8 Quantification of various coincidental spatial relationships between two surfaces	132
7.9 Quantification of the strength of transparency interpretations relative to mosaic interpretations	132
7.10 The number of elements needed to amodally complete a pattern contributes to complexity	133
7.11 Quantification of the strength of occlusion interpretations relative to mosaic interpretations	133
7.12 Quantification of the strength of 3-D interpretations relative to 2-D interpretations	135
7.13 The two stylized corkscrews that are employed to describe 3-D turns	135
7.14 Illustration of the usage of corkscrews to hierarchically describe 3-D objects	137
7.15 Hierarchical descriptions of 3-D objects with mass filling-in	139
7.16 Hierarchical descriptions of 3-D objects with both mass filling-in and mass cut-off	141
7.17 For line patterns, 3-D interpretations may be simpler than 2-D interpretations	143
7.18 Alternating filling-in and cut-off operations on object planes may fixate complex objects	144
8.1 In amodal pattern completion, local completions are not against the global simplicity principle	148
8.2 Even if completion yields simple shapes, the mosaic interpretation may still be simpler	149
8.3 Mosaic and occlusion predictions by local cues and by unified and dissociated codes	152
8.4 Mosaic and occlusion interpretations predicted correctly by codes but not by local cues	153
8.5 Occlusion versus non-occlusion interpretations of subjective contour stimuli	153
8.6 Quantification of the strength of segmentations of line drawings	157
8.7 Coding details for various segmentations of line drawings	158
8.8 Transparency and non-transparency interpretations of surfaces with differently coloured parts	160

8.9 Easy and poor perceptual separability of intertwined submelodies	161
8.10 Illusory neon interpretations versus non-neon interpretations	163
8.11 Quantification of the strength of illusory neon interpretations	165
8.12 Contrast and assimilation effects	167
8.13 Simple parts lead to contrast effects and simple wholes lead to assimilation effects	167
8.14 Contrast and assimilation effects explained in terms of transparent layer compositions	168
8.15 Quantification of the strength of assimilation interpretations relative to contrast interpretations	170
8.16 Set of primes and test pairs used in a primed-matching experiment	173
8.17 Extended set of primes and test pairs used in a primed-matching experiment	174
8.18 Effects of occlusion primes suggest the concurrent presence of non-dominant completions	175
8.19 Effects of occlusion primes suggest the perceptual generation of multiple completions	176
8.20 Stimuli designed to test the perceptual presence of suppressed pattern interpretations	177
8.21 Bias corrected data suggest the concurrent presence of alternative pattern interpretations	178
9.1 The serial order of the two snapshots as a function of their semantic interpretations	182
9.2 Unambiguous and semi-ambiguous patterns may induce subjective temporal orders	184
9.3 Prediction of temporal order effects	186
9.4 Pattern presentation order may lead to code asymmetry	191
9.5 Code asymmetry as indicator of visual integration time	192
9.6 Partly symmetrical stimuli used to test the integrability of successively presented parts	194
10.1 Unity and duality of shapes depend on superstructures rather than on subordinate structures	199
10.2 Stimuli used in a primed-matching experiment to test superstructure dominance	201
10.3 Prime effects supporting superstructure dominance	202
10.4 Visualization of mental rotations about the X, Y, and Z axes	204

10.5	A display for the task to assess whether a specific rotation turns one shape into the other	205
10.6	Object cues for rotations that turn a shape into its mirror version	206
10.7	Object images, used in a mental rotation experiment, with their RBC and SIT codes	208
10.8	Various test combinations of an object and its mirror version	209
10.9	Test results as a function of the object cues mirror symmetry and point symmetry	211
10.10	Test results as a function of the code components mirror symmetry and point symmetry	214
10.11	Judged orientation of parts is affected by the orientation of the superstructure	217
10.12	Global frame orientations affect local pattern interpretations	219
11.1	Metrical complexity determines preference in case of structural ambiguity	227
11.2	Metrical complexity of transitions between surface parts affects the interpretation of surfaces	227
11.3	Subpatterns with lower metrical complexity tend to be seen as foreground	228
11.4	Factors relevant for assessing the metrical complexity of patterns	230
11.5	Simple line patterns used in a judged complexity study	231
11.6	Structural complexity is perceptually more important than metrical complexity	234
11.7	In 3-D, images and mirror images are equal but objects and their mirror versions are different	235
11.8	Natural and stylized versions of right-turning and left-turning corkscrews	236
11.9	Representations of hill and valley shapes by a handedness-sensitive system	238
11.10	A handedness-sensitive system supplies a cue for pattern handedness	240
11.11	Handedness-sensitive coding of right-turning and left-turning screws in canonical orientations	241
11.12	Handedness assessment of compositions of screws by a handedness-sensitive system	242
11.13	Representations of hill and valley shapes by a symmetry-sensitive system	245

11.14	Symmetry-sensitive coding of right-turning and left-turning screws in canonical orientations	246
12.1	Configurations of four distracters and one target each, with quantified target distinctiveness	261
12.2	Clustering distracters and targets by shared features supplies indices for target distinctiveness	263
12.3	Interestingness is a function of both complexity and redundancy	266
12.4	Stimuli ranging from regular to irregular configurations used in a study on interestingness	267
12.5	Beauty correlates with hidden order	272
12.6	Beauty values for rectangles with hidden order	273
12.7	The independence of feather shape and colour pattern explains the beauty of peacock feathers	274
12.8	A weaker relationship between shape and colour enhances beauty	275
12.9	Quantification of the beauty of interlace patterns	276
12.10	In chess, the least plausible move of two checkmate moves is the most aesthetical one	278
12.11	Serial patterns without abrupt shape and colour transitions have higher beauty values	278
12.12	In melodies, an unexpected tone contributes to beauty if its unexpectedness is resolved later on	280
C.1	Plato's metaphor of visual perception as a prisoner held captive in a cave since birth	292

Tables

11.1	Ranked metrical loads and ranked judged complexities of simple line patterns	<i>page</i> 232
12.1	Predictions and test results for extrapolation of alphabetic letter series	256

Introduction

This book is about structural information theory (SIT) and its application to visual form perception. Here, by way of general introduction, we highlight several unique characteristics of perception and we give a sketch of the scientific roots of SIT.

The uniqueness of perception

Almost all textbooks introduce perception by showing visual illusions. Indeed, visual illusions are salient phenomena. The core issues in perception are less salient, however. In fact, they are rather inaccessible and often confusing. This may be illustrated as follows. In every research domain – be it biology, physics, psychology, you name it – perception is the mediating instrument for making observations. The goal is to establish properties of objects. An observation may, for instance, establish that a leaf is green. Notice that this proposition merely deals with the relationship between a leaf and its colour. What is meant by a leaf and by green is supposed to be known. In perception research, however, perception is both mediating instrument and topic of study (Rock, 1983). As a topic of study, perception is the process that starts from an assembly of patches of light at various positions on the retina. This process assesses which patches are grouped together to constitute a leaf, for instance. In other words, the objects we perceive belong to the output of perception and not to the input. The goal of perception is not to establish properties of given objects but to establish objects from properties of the given retinal image.

Hence, in perception research, the two roles of perception (i.e., mediating instrument and topic of study) are virtually opposed to each other. Nevertheless, often, they are hardly distinguished. Usually, only one role is attributed to perception, namely, that of mediating instrument. This role is relevant at the conscious level involved in the everyday human communication of propositions. At this level, there is no sensation of the actual visual input which is an assembly of unstructured patches on the retina. There is also no experience of the perception process. The process