

The effects of voluntary movements on auditory-haptic and haptic-haptic temporal order judgments

Ilja Frissen^{a,b}, Mounia Ziat^c, Gianni Campion^d, Vincent Hayward^e, Catherine Guastavino^{a,b}

^a Multimodal Interaction Lab, School of Information Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

^b Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Music Media and Technology (CIRMMT), Montréal, Québec, Canada

^c Department of Psychology, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI, USA

^d McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

^e Institut des Systèmes Intelligents et de Robotique, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Paris, France

CORRESPONDENCE

Ilja Frissen

LUNAM Université, CNRS, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, IRCCyN (Institut de Recherche en Communications et Cybernétique de Nantes)

1 rue de la Noë, BP 92101, 44321 Nantes Cedex 3, FRANCE

Tel : + 33 (0)2 40 37 69 00

Fax : +33 (0)2 40 37 69 30

Email: iljafirissen@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

In two experiments we investigated the effects of voluntary movements on temporal haptic perception. Measures of sensitivity (JND) and temporal alignment (PSS) were obtained from temporal order judgments made on intermodal auditory-haptic (Experiment 1) or intramodal haptic (Experiment 2) stimulus pairs under three movement conditions. In the baseline, static condition, the arm of the participants remained stationary. In the passive condition, the arm was displaced by a servo-controlled motorized device. In the active condition, the participants moved voluntarily. The auditory stimulus was a short, 500 Hz tone presented over headphones and the haptic stimulus was a brief suprathreshold force pulse applied to the tip of the index finger orthogonally to the finger movement. Active movement did not significantly affect discrimination sensitivity on the auditory-haptic stimulus pairs, whereas it significantly improved sensitivity in the case of the haptic stimulus pair, demonstrating a key role for motor command information in temporal sensitivity in the haptic system. Points of subjective simultaneity were by-and-large coincident with physical simultaneity, with one striking exception in the passive condition with the auditory-haptic stimulus pair. In the latter case, the haptic stimulus had to be presented 45 ms before the auditory stimulus in order to obtain subjective simultaneity. A model is proposed to explain the discrimination performance.

PsychINFO classification:

2300 (human experimental psychology), 2320 (sensory perception), 2330 (motor processes)

KEYWORDS:

Multisensory, Temporal Processes, Auditory, Haptic, Movement

1. Introduction

1
2 Tactile sensations arise when we are the object of touch (i.e., passive touch) or when we are the
3 agent of touch (i.e., active touch, or haptics) (Grünwald, 2008, Lederman & Klatzky, 2009). In many
4 circumstances, it is known that touch sensations depend not only on cutaneous inputs, but also on
5 proprioceptive information, motor planning, motor execution, inputs from other modalities,
6 endogenous states, and other sources (Bays et al., 2006; Behrmann et al., 1995; Carter et al., 2008;
7 Smith et al., 2009; Stein & Meredith, 1993; Voss et al., 2007). Motor commands are issued during
8 voluntary movements. These commands are thought to be available to the central nervous system in
9 the form of so-called efference copies, (von Holst & Mittelstaedt, 1950, for a review see Cullen,
10 2004), and are instrumental in anticipating the sensory consequences of voluntary movement (e.g.,
11 Blakemore et al., 1999).

12
13 The present focus is on haptic temporal perception during active movements. Temporal
14 perception has received considerable attention for purely haptic stimulation (e.g., Hirsch & Sherrick,
15 1961; Marks et al. 1982) as well as for intermodal combinations involving the haptic system (see
16 Keetels & Vroomen, 2012 and Occelli et al., 2011 for reviews). Many of the previous studies
17 investigated haptic temporal perception when the participants were exposed to stimuli resulting from
18 the activity of an external agent. The haptic system, however, most frequently operates under an
19 active condition, that is, when stimulation occurs during the production of voluntary movement. We
20 therefore wondered whether voluntary movements could play a role in the acuity of haptic temporal
21 perception.

22
23 A common experimental paradigm for studying temporal perceptual processes is the temporal
24 order judgment (TOJ) task. In this task two stimuli are presented at various onset asynchronies
25 (SOA) and participants judge which one of the two came first. Another task is the simultaneity
26 judgment (SJ), in which participants judge whether the two had been presented simultaneously or
27 not. Two distinct measures of performance can be derived from the behavior of observers (Coren,
28 Ward, & Enns, 1999). The first measure is the just-noticeable-difference (JND), which is the
29 smallest temporal interval an observer can reliably distinguish. The JND, therefore, is a measure of
30 the observer's 'temporal sensitivity'. The second measure is the point of subjective simultaneity
31 (PSS), where the observer is maximally unsure about the temporal order of the stimuli. A non-zero
32 PSS means that one of the stimuli has to be presented earlier than the other for the two to be
33 perceived as occurring simultaneously. In other words, the PSS is a measure of the internal
34 'temporal alignment' of the sensory signals. Although, the TOJ and SJ should theoretically provide
35 the same estimates for the JND and PSS, they rarely do so. In particular, because of the SJ's
36 dependence on internal decision criteria, the TOJ is the preferred method (Keetels & Vroomen,
37 2012).

38
39 When studying the effects of movement on temporal perception it is possible to distinguish
40 voluntary (i.e., active) movements from the same physical movements performed without the motor
41 command information. This testing condition can be achieved by having the movement produced
42 through the use of a robotic device. Unfortunately, the term 'passive' is also often used to describe
43 conditions in which the stimulus is applied to the participants' skin without any movement on their
44 part whatsoever. We will refer to this latter condition as a 'static' condition.

45
46 Only a few studies have looked at the consequences of voluntary movement on the temporal
47 processing of sensory inputs. They are summarized in Table 1. Some of these studies investigated
48 the perception of temporal ordering of intermodal stimulus pairs, i.e., between haptic inputs on the
49 one hand and auditory (Adelstein et al. 2003; Kitagawa et al., 2009; Wenke & Haggard, 2009) or
50 visual (Shi et al., 2008; Vogels, 2004) inputs on the other. Yet others have been concerned with
51 temporal processing within the haptic sense (Wenke & Haggard, 2009; Winter et al., 2008). Vogels
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (2004) found that the JND for asynchronies between haptic and visual stimuli was slightly, yet
2 significantly, higher when moving actively in comparison to a static condition. Shi et al. (2008), on
3 the other hand, found that voluntary movements significantly reduced the JND. In addition, they
4 observed that moving actively produced a temporal shift in the perceptual alignment between the
5 two senses. When the participants did not move their arms, the visual stimuli had to be presented on
6 average 20 ms before the haptic stimulus in order for the two to be perceived as simultaneous. With
7 active arm movements this value was reduced to around 5 ms. The source of the contrasting results
8 in JND between the Shi et al. and the Vogels studies can likely be found in methodological
9 differences. Vogels (2004) employed a SJ task and used a cross-experiment comparison to infer
10 effects of movement, which make the study susceptible to decisional criteria and order effects,
11 respectively. Shi et al. (2008) used a TOJ task and a balanced, within-subjects design, which is
12 arguably a more appropriate procedure. Shi et al. attributed the difference mostly to the fact that, in
13 their study, the visual and haptic stimuli were spatially coincident, whereas in Vogels' experiment
14 the visual and haptic stimuli were spatially disparate. Winter et al. (2008) studied the effect of
15 voluntary movements on intramodal haptic temporal alignment. Using an SJ task, they asked
16 participants to voluntarily tap a Morse key with their right index finger while statically receiving
17 delayed taps on the left index finger. They observed that a statically felt stimulus had to be presented
18 about 30 ms before the actively produced stimulus in order for the two to be perceived as being
19 simultaneous, although direct statistical significance could not be achieved. Because in this
20 procedure the static and active stimuli were compared directly on a trial-by-trial basis, it was not
21 possible to determine whether there was a difference in discrimination sensitivity between the two.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 -----
29 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE
30 -----
31

32
33 The studies discussed so far employed static and active conditions only. These conditions do not
34 test whether differences in performance may be attributed to proprioceptive signals arising from the
35 movement *per se* or from an active, voluntary arm movement which also includes motor command
36 information (efference copy). To address this limitation, Kitagawa et al. (2009) asked participants to
37 make auditory-haptic temporal order judgments under static and active, as well as passive
38 movements. In the static condition, a motorized device tapped the participants' index fingers. In the
39 passive condition, the finger was moved by a motorized device. In the active condition, the
40 participants hit a button voluntarily. They found an increase in sensitivity for the active 'voluntary'
41 condition by as much as 45% relative to the static condition. The inclusion of a passive 'involuntary'
42 condition allowed for the assessment of the contribution of the finger movement in the absence of an
43 efference copy informing the central nervous system in advance of the execution of the occurrence
44 of movement. Performance in this Passive condition did not differ significantly from the static
45 condition. The authors concluded that the improved temporal discrimination performance in active
46 touch could be attributed to an efference copy rather than due to movement *per se*. Wenke and
47 Haggard (2009) also employed a passive condition to study the effects of voluntary movement on
48 haptic temporal discrimination. They found that voluntary movements impaired the temporal
49 discrimination of tactile stimuli applied to the index and the middle finger of the same moving hand,
50 but only when the stimulation occurred close in time to the movement (around 150 ms).
51
52

53 Thus, our current knowledge on the effects of voluntary movements on temporal perception is
54 sparse and divergent. Voluntary movement has been found to either improve (Kitagawa et al., 2009;
55 Shi et al., 2008) or to worsen temporal discrimination (Vogels, 2004; Wenke & Haggard, 2009).
56 Some studies report JNDs only and others PSSs only, and these measures are either based on TOJ
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 tasks (Kitagawa et al., 2009; Shi et al., 2008) or SJ tasks (Vogels, 2004; Wenke & Haggard, 2009;
2 Winter et al., 2008). A further complication is that some studies used intermodal stimulus pairs
3 whereas others used intramodal stimuli. Finally, only the Kitagawa et al. (2009) and Wenke and
4 Haggard (2009) studies created conditions that could potentially distinguish between the
5 contributions of movements *per se* and motor command information.

6 The aim of the present study was to use a single paradigm, the TOJ task, to investigate the effect
7 of voluntary movements on haptic temporal perception. The task was performed under static,
8 passive, and active movement conditions in order to distinguish between the contributions of the
9 cutaneous, proprioceptive, and motor command information. In the baseline, static condition, the
10 right arm of the participants remained stationary. In the passive condition, the arm was displaced by
11 a servo-controlled motorized device, which also delivered haptic stimuli. In the active condition, the
12 participants moved voluntarily as the device was programmed to offer negligible resistance to
13 movement. Care was taken to match the conditions in terms of movement speed and intensity of the
14 haptic stimuli. To determine the effect of the particular stimulus pair used we performed two
15 experiments. In Experiment 1, we used an intermodal stimulus pair where the occurrence of the
16 haptic stimulus was judged in relation to the occurrence of an auditory stimulus. In Experiment 2,
17 we used an intramodal stimulus pair where the occurrence of a haptic stimulus received by a moving
18 hand was compared to a similar haptic stimulus applied to the contralateral static hand. Finally,
19 because the PSS and JND are distinct measures of temporal perception we report and discuss both
20 individually.
21

22 The divergence of results in the literature precludes the formulation of clear predictions
23 regarding the effect of active arm movements on haptic temporal perception, particularly for PSEs.
24 Nevertheless, for JNDs, three possible patterns of results can be anticipated. It could be that
25 performance improves during voluntary movement (i.e., JNDs become smaller; Kitagawa et al.,
26 2009; Shi et al., 2008). Such an outcome would argue in favor of a mechanism that takes motor
27 command information into account in order to enhance the temporal acuity of the haptic system. On
28 the other hand, performance could worsen (Vogels, 2004; Wenke & Haggard, 2009), which could
29 then be related to earlier physiological studies showing that the transmission of tactile inputs is
30 diminished, or “gated”, during the course of active movements (e.g., Chapman, 1994). Lastly,
31 voluntary arm movement could have no effect on performance.
32

33 2. Experiment 1

34 The first experiment addressed the temporal discrimination of auditory and haptic stimuli during
35 voluntary movements. The experiment revisited the study of Kitagawa et al. (2009) with several
36 methodological differences. Haptic pulse stimuli were produced at random instants during
37 movement and in a direction orthogonal to the movement. The resulting stimulus situation was akin
38 to exploring an unknown smooth surface and unexpectedly “bumping into a rough spot”. These
39 testing conditions minimized possible confounds arising from anticipation and mental motor
40 imagery (Behrmann et al., 1995). The effect was to reduce the apparent causality between motor
41 efference and sensory afference.
42

43 2.1. Method

44 2.1.1. Participants

45 Twenty-four participants (15 female, 18–36 yrs) completed the experiment and were paid for their
46 participation. None of them had had any extensive experience with psychophysical procedures.
47 Participants gave their informed consent before participating. Procedures for this and the next
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 experiment were in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Declaration of Helsinki. The
2 McGill University ethics committee approved the experimental protocol.

3
4 *2.1.2. Apparatus and Stimuli*

5 The main apparatus was a Pantograph, a high-performance haptic device (Figure 1a; see also
6 Campion et al., 2005, for a more complete description), developed for rendering virtual surfaces.
7 However, in the present study the device's capabilities were exploited to generate a force pulse on
8 the finger tip and to move the participants' arm. Otherwise, no surface was rendered and the
9 participant felt a smooth surface when engaging with the device. The Pantograph can produce forces
10 of up to 2 N in a two-dimensional workspace of 100 × 60 mm and has a flat response from DC to
11 400 Hz. The torque commands were processed by a low pass reconstruction filter, so that the
12 commands to the motors matched the mechanical bandwidth of the system. To further reduce
13 possible stimulus artefacts, the device was retrofitted with viscous dampers based on the principle of
14 eddy current brakes (Gosline et al., 2006). The main purpose of these devices was to increase the
15 passivity margin of the closed-loop control when employed to guide the participants in the passive
16 condition and guarantee the absence of artefacts that are often present during the closed-loop control
17 of haptic interfaces (Hayward & MacLean, 2007, Section 4). In the passive testing condition (see
18 below) the haptic device controlled the position of the participant's finger by feedback servo control.
19 In the active condition, the device offered negligible resistance to movement. The participants
20 placed their right index finger on a small horizontal surface and an adjustable Velcro strap helped to
21 keep the finger in place. The entire setup was hidden from view by placing it in a dark box with an
22 aperture for the participant's arm.

23 The operation of the Pantograph device was quiet since it has no mechanical transmissions,
24 however, a faint acoustic 'tick' could emanate from the actuators when producing a force pulse,
25 which may taint the results. Participants therefore wore sound isolation headphones (Direct Sound
26 EX-29) playing a white-noise background that effectively masked any sounds made by the device.
27 The auditory stimulus was a 100 ms, 500 Hz tone superimposed onto the masking noise. The haptic
28 stimulus consisted of a 10 ms force pulse with an amplitude of 1.4 N, applied orthogonally to the
29 finger movement (see Figure 1c). The haptic and the auditory stimuli were suprathreshold.

30
31 -----
32 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE
33 -----
34
35

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 *2.1.3. Procedure*

44 The participant engaged in an unspeeded temporal order judgment (TOJ) task and was asked to
45 indicate whether the auditory or the haptic stimulus had been presented first. On each trial an
46 auditory-haptic stimulus pair was presented with one of nine stimulus onset asynchronies (SOA)
47 taken from the interval of -300 ms to +300 ms in steps of 75 ms. The task was administered under
48 three different conditions, which were counterbalanced across participants and run twice according
49 to an ABC-CBA scheme. Thus, there were a total of six, relatively short (approx. 5 min), blocks of
50 randomized trials. There were 10 replications of each SOA per block, giving a total of 180 trials for
51 each of the three conditions, and a grand total of 540 trials per participant.

52 In the static condition, the participants placed their right index finger on the finger pad, and
53 remained stationary throughout. Throughout the experiment the arm was comfortably supported by
54 soft gel packs near the right elbow. A trial in the static condition proceeded as follows. A stimulus
55 pair was presented and the program controlling the experimental procedure waited for the
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 participant to enter their response on a keyboard with their left hand. After the answer was registered
2 there was a random interval between 1100 and 1200 ms before the next stimulus pair was presented.

3 In the two conditions with movement the participants were required to move forearm, hand, and
4 finger as one, and adherence was checked by the experimenter. The gel packs near the right elbow
5 now also served as the pivot point. The starting position of the arm was near the left boundary of the
6 Pantograph's work surface and stimuli were presented as the arm moved from left to right. A
7 haptic stimulus was produced only if the finger was within the central 60 mm-wide band of the work
8 surface. The onset of the first stimulus in a pair occurred with a random delay (100 - 200 ms) after
9 the finger had moved inside this active area. The entire stimulus pair was presented well before the
10 movement of the hand had ceased.

11 In the passive condition the participant's arm movements were controlled by the Pantograph
12 device. The velocity was arbitrarily set to 70 mm/s, which was considered to be a comfortable speed
13 and representative of normal surface exploration. After the device had moved the arm and delivered
14 the haptic stimulus it waited in the rightmost position until the participant entered a response, after
15 which it moved the arm back to the starting position. To initiate the next trial the participant pressed
16 the spacebar.

17 In the active condition, participants were asked to voluntarily move their arms from left to right
18 while the Pantograph ensured that the movement was performed in a straight line. That is, a "virtual
19 corridor" constrained the fingertip movements along a straight path. To match the movement
20 velocities in the active and passive conditions, a simple trial-to-trial feedback was provided (see also
21 Vitello et al., 2006) and no stimulus was presented if the participant moved too fast (> 100 mm/s) or
22 too slowly (< 40 mm/s), in which case they were required to try again. After completing the
23 movement the participant kept their arm at the rightmost position until they entered their response,
24 after which they moved the arm back to the starting position.

25 Before any data were collected the participants were familiarized with the three conditions and
26 the different procedures by performing 15 practice trials without feedback for each condition. The
27 SOAs were all set to 300 ms so that the task was relatively easy. During training the conditions were
28 run in a fixed order, static, passive, and active.

29 2.1.4. Data Analysis

30 Figure 2 illustrates how the dependent measures were obtained. We first pooled the raw data for the
31 two blocks of each condition. We calculated for each SOA the proportion of trials in which the
32 auditory stimulus had been perceived first. Individual psychometric functions were obtained by
33 fitting cumulative Gaussians using the software package 'psignifit' (Wichmann & Hill, 2001; see
34 <http://bootstrap-software.org/psignifit/>). From the fits we calculated the PSS and JND. Statistical
35 analyses were conducted using R (version 2.12.1). We used a significance level of 0.05.

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

66 2.2. Results and discussion

67 The mean JND and PSS in the three conditions are summarized in Table 2. None of the conditions
68 produced a significant correlation between individual JNDs and PSSs, all $|\rho| < 0.39$, all p -
69 values > 0.24 .

70 For the JNDs, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA with movement condition as factor did not
71 show a significant effect ($F(2,46) = 2.05$, $p = 0.14$). This lack of a difference between movement
72 conditions is in contrast to the results obtained by Kitagawa et al. (2009) who found an improvement

1 in their active condition. One possible cause of the difference is the predictability of the onset of the
2 haptic stimulus. In Kitagawa et al.'s experiment there was a strong causal relationship between the
3 onset of the haptic stimulus and the finger movement, causing the perceived time of the haptic
4 stimulus to be predictable. Based on another experiment in which the onset of the auditory stimulus
5 was purposefully highly predictable, Kitagawa et al. argued this predictability hypothesis could not
6 explain the advantage for voluntary movement. However, one could counter that this manipulation
7 of the auditory stimulus was not a strong test for the predictability hypothesis, since it does not
8 preclude the possibility that the predictability of the onset time of the *haptic* stimulus was enhanced.
9 Moreover, this effect may not even require the presence of the motor command information. In our
10 experiment, the arm movement and the onset of the haptic stimulus were decoupled and therefore
11 the causal relationship between the two was broken. This meant that the onset of the haptic stimulus
12 was less predictable and changes in performance in the active condition were more likely to be due
13 to the availability of motor command information.
14
15
16

17 -----
18 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE
19 -----
20
21
22

23 The mean PSS for the static, passive, and active conditions were 4 ms, -45 ms, and 12 ms,
24 respectively. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA with movement condition as factor showed a
25 significant effect of condition ($F(2,46) = 7.22, p = 0.002$). Subsequently, Bonferroni corrected,
26 paired t-tests confirmed significant differences between the passive and the static condition
27 ($t(23) = 3.56, p = 0.002$) and between the passive and active condition ($t(23) = 3.24, p = 0.004$).
28 There was no significant difference between the static and active conditions ($t(23) = 0.005,$
29 $p = 0.99$). We tested whether the PSSs were significantly different from zero (i.e., physical
30 simultaneity). This was the case for the passive condition ($t(23) = 2.93, p < 0.01$), but not for static
31 ($t(23) = 0.29, p = 0.78$), or active conditions ($t(23) = 0.17, p = 0.86$). Thus, in the passive condition,
32 the haptic stimulus had to be presented on average 45 ms before the sound in order to achieve
33 subjective simultaneity. We defer possible explanations for this remarkable result to the general
34 discussion. We defer possible explanations for this remarkable result to the general
35 discussion.
36
37
38
39

40 **3. Experiment 2**

41 As discussed in the introduction, one complicating factor in the study of the effects of voluntary
42 movement on temporal perception is the use of intermodal (auditory-haptic, or visual-haptic)
43 stimulus pairs in some studies and intramodal (haptic) in others. As a comparison to the intermodal
44 stimulus pair Experiment 2 was similar to Experiment 1, but the auditory stimulus was replaced by a
45 haptic stimulus delivered to the left hand.
46
47

48 *3.1. Method*

49 *3.1.1. Participants*

50 Eighteen new participants (11 female, 18 and 36 yrs) completed the experiment and were paid for
51 their participation. None of them had had any extensive experience with psychophysical procedures.
52
53

54 *3.1.2. Apparatus and Stimuli*

55 The setup of Experiment 1 was extended with a second Pantograph (see Figure 1b) to stimulate the
56 left hand, which was stationary at all times. The entire setup was hidden from view by placing a
57 blindfold over the participant's eyes. Since both hands were engaged, participants entered their
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 response using a sturdy, industrial-grade foot pedal (Immersion). The pedal comprises a mechanical
2 toggle switch indicating its state which was polled at 1000 Hz. The left hand was always static and
3 only the right hand moved, exactly as in Experiment 1.

4 Because this second device was operated in open loop, it was not retrofitted with damping
5 hardware, and since for the two machines the signal was a short transient force pulse containing
6 mostly high frequencies, inertial dynamics dominated the response over the viscous dynamics.
7 Nevertheless, there was a small but invariable residual difference between the left and right
8 stimuli—and therefore between the two hands. Because we were measuring differences between
9 movement conditions, any small bias was second-order and had no bearing on the results.

12 3.1.3. Procedure

13 On each trial, a stimulus pair was presented with one of nine stimulus onset asynchronies (SOA; -
14 300 ms to +300 ms in steps of 75 ms). Each SOA was tested 20 times. The participant engaged in a
15 temporal order judgment (TOJ) task and was asked to indicate to which hand the haptic stimulus had
16 been presented first. Before any data were collected the participants were familiarized with the three
17 conditions and the different procedures by performing 16 practice trials for each condition. The
18 SOAs were all set to ± 300 ms so the task was relatively easy although there was no feedback.
19 During training the conditions were run in a fixed order: static, passive and active.
20
21
22
23

24 3.2. Results and discussion

25 The mean JND and PSS in the three conditions are summarized in Table 3. In none of the conditions
26 was there a correlation between individual PSS and JNDs, all $|\rho| < 0.19$, all p -values > 0.44 .

27 For the JND a one-way repeated measures ANOVA with movement condition as factor showed
28 a significant effect ($F(2,34) = 9.98$, $p < 0.001$). Subsequent, Bonferroni corrected, paired t-tests
29 revealed significant differences between the static and the active condition ($t(17) = 3.18$, $p = 0.016$),
30 and between the passive and the active condition ($t(17) = 4.66$, $p < 0.001$). There was no significant
31 difference between the static and the passive condition ($t < 1$). The significant improvement in the
32 JND in the active condition in comparison to both the static and passive conditions is in contrast to
33 Experiment 1 as well as Wenke and Haggard's (2009). We return to this in the general discussion.
34
35
36
37
38

39 -----
40 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE
41 -----
42

43 The mean PSS for the static, passive, and active conditions were 10 ms, 28 ms, and 16 ms,
44 respectively. A positive value in this case meant that the stimulus to the left hand had to be
45 presented earlier than the one to the right hand. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA with
46 movement condition as a factor showed no significant effect ($F(2,34) = 1.50$, $p = 0.24$). The overall
47 mean PSS was significantly different from zero ($F(1,17) = 4.93$, $p = 0.04$) at around 18 ms. The
48 finding that the overall PSS was non-zero can be attributed to the difference between the two
49 Pantographs. That is, even though the same stimulus was commanded to both devices, it could have
50 been sensed slightly differently at the two hands. The stimuli sensed by the right hand could be more
51 salient and there is evidence that the processing time of a tactile stimulus depends on its saliency.
52 For instance, Efron (1963) delivered electrical stimuli to the left and right index fingers and the
53 participants were asked to perform a temporal order judgment. When the stimulus to the left hand
54 was weaker it had to be presented earlier with respect to the relatively stronger right hand stimulus
55 (by about 5 ms), and vice versa. The fact that PSSs were not different from each other across
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 conditions suggests that the shift observed in the passive condition in Experiment 1 is restricted to
2 intermodal stimulus conditions.

3 We also made comparisons between the two experiments for each condition using corrected
4 unpaired two sample t-tests. The JNDs were significantly smaller in Experiment 2 in all three
5 conditions (all t 's > 3.25 , all p -values < 0.003). The PSSs were significantly different between the
6 two experiments for the passive condition ($t = 3.97$, $p < 0.001$), but not for the static and active
7 conditions (both t 's < 1).
8
9

10 **4. General discussion**

11 In two experiments we examined the effects of voluntary movements on temporal perception both in
12 terms of temporal sensitivity (JNDs) and temporal alignment (PSS). The fact that we found no
13 correlation between the JNDs and PSSs in either experiment confirms our contention that these
14 measures reflect distinct aspects of temporal perception (see introduction) and therefore warrant
15 separate discussion.
16
17

18 A comparison between the experimental results showed that the intermodal stimulus pair
19 (Experiment 1) produced larger JNDs than the intramodal pair (Experiment 2). This is consistent
20 with what has been reported in the literature (Fiori et al., 2003; Fujisaki & Nishida, 2009). However,
21 the more striking and pertinent result came from the active conditions. When compared to the extant
22 literature we found yet another pattern of effects of voluntary movements on temporal perception.
23 For the intermodal stimulus pair, performance in the active condition was not different from either
24 the static or passive conditions. For the intramodal stimulus pair, on the other hand, discrimination
25 performance in the active condition was superior, not only compared to the static condition but also
26 to the passive condition. The latter difference is important because it shows that the improvement in
27 performance cannot be attributed to proprioceptive signals from the arm movements *per se*. This
28 then shows, for the first time, a key role of motor command information in improving the temporal
29 processing of proprioceptive signals.
30
31
32

33 The main results for the PSSs can be summarized as follows. For the intermodal stimulus pair
34 we observed a significant shift in the PSS in the passive condition. That is, the haptic stimulus had
35 to be presented 45 ms before the sound in order to reach subjective simultaneity. For the intramodal
36 stimulus pair we did not find a significant difference between the movement conditions, and if
37 anything, there was an overall tendency for a shift in the opposite direction.
38
39

40 In the following sections we discuss these main findings in more detail and address the
41 limitations of the present study as well as the outlook it creates.
42
43

44 *4.1. Effect of voluntary arm movement on haptic temporal sensitivity (JND)*

45 To summarize and interpret the findings, we developed a descriptive model that is illustrated in
46 Figure 3. The figure illustrates the combination of two factors, movement condition (static vs.
47 active) and the involved sensory systems (intramodal vs. intermodal). Since there was no difference
48 in JNDs between the static and passive condition we chose the static condition as the baseline. There
49 are two critical components, one for each factor. First, an active arm movement produces an
50 efference copy, which is absent in the static and passive movement conditions. We postulate a
51 process in which the utilization of the efference copy improves the processing of proprioceptive
52 signals (e.g., Craske & Cranshaw, 1975; Gritsenko et al., 2007; Winter et al., 2005) and extend its
53 range to include the temporal aspect of these signals (e.g., Miall et al., 1993). Second, in order to
54 make a temporal comparison of two signals they converge on a locus where the comparison is
55 implemented. Moreover, this additional step adds processing noise (Fujisaki & Nishida, 2005;
56 2009).
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Consider the case of *static intramodal* TOJ (Figure 3, top left panel), which in the present
2 conception represents the simplest scenario. The sensory signals from the haptic system are
3 propagated directly to the perceptual process that extracts the temporal order of the two signals. For
4 the *static intermodal* TOJ (bottom left panel), the additional step of crossmodal convergence adds
5 processing noise to the sensory signals (i.e., the variance in the signals becomes larger). These
6 noisier signals are then propagated to the process that performs the temporal order estimation. This
7 additional processing noise would explain why we observe larger JNDs with intermodal stimulus
8 pairs compared to intramodal stimulus pairs. When performing the *active intramodal* TOJ (top right
9 panel) the influence of the efference copy becomes operational. Finally, temporal order extraction,
10 convergence, and efference copy, come together in the *active intermodal* TOJ (bottom right panel).
11 Critically, the model suggests that the beneficial effects of the efference copy are cancelled out by
12 the noise added in the crossmodal convergence. The model predicts that performance on the active
13 intermodal TOJ is either equal to, or better than *static intermodal*. However, in the case of an
14 improvement, this would be of a smaller magnitude than for the intramodal case.
15
16
17
18

19 -----
20 INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE
21 -----
22
23

24 Note that the model does not incorporate the substantial physiological evidence that during
25 active movements both cutaneous and proprioceptive inputs are attenuated, or gated (Chapman et al.
26 1987; Collins et al. 1998; Seki et al. 2003). In spite of the demonstrable physiological effects of
27 gating, a considerable number of psychophysical studies have failed to show a difference between
28 passive and active touch (Chapman, 1994; Chapman et al., 1987; Feine et al., 1990; Konczak et al.
29 2008; Lamb, 1983; Lederman, 1981; Post et al., 1994; Sciutti et al., 2010; Schwarz et al., 1975;
30 Vega-Bermudaz, et al., 1991), suggesting that gating does not affect perception. However, more
31 recently, careful psychophysical experiments have been reported showing that active movements
32 indeed impair performance on *spatial* discrimination tasks. For instance, Vitello et al. (2006)
33 reported a phenomenon they refer to as tactile suppression that is analogous to saccadic suppression.
34 They measured the motion-direction discrimination performance for tactile stimuli moving laterally
35 on the index finger. Performance was measured under three conditions similar to the ones in the
36 present study; static, only tactile stimuli were presented without any movement; active, the
37 participant made active arm movements; passive, the participant's arm was moved by a robotic
38 device mimicking the active arm movement. In comparison to the static condition performance in
39 the active condition was worse. Also, referring to tactile suppression of displacement, Ziat et al.
40 (2010) found that when participants moved their fingers over a tactile display, a small displacement
41 of a tactile stimulus went unnoticed. Smith et al. (2009), employing a force feedback device that can
42 independently produce both lateral forces on the fingertip as well as horizontal displacements,
43 report that for a horizontal displacement of a finger, categorization thresholds were higher and
44 magnitude estimates were smaller during active movement discrimination. These findings of
45 impaired performance during active touch are, of course, consistent with the presence of active,
46 movement-related suppression of sensory inputs.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 These first reports of impaired performance during active touch are contrary to our postulated
55 improvement of the processing of proprioceptive signals through the use of the efference copy.
56 However, these studies looked at spatial, not temporal perception, which presents the fascinating
57 hypothesis that during voluntary movements, there may be a trade-off of spatial acuity in favor of
58 temporal acuity. Although the functional purpose of such a trade-off remains unclear, the hypothesis
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 is testable. Future experiments should be designed to measure both spatial and temporal
2 discrimination thresholds during passive as well as active movements within the same participant.
3

4 *4.2. Effect of passive arm movement on intermodal temporal alignment (PSS)*

5 For the intermodal stimulus pairs we found that the haptic stimulus had to be presented 45 ms before
6 the sound in order to reach subjective simultaneity. This was not a statistical fluke given that 18 out
7 24 of the participants exhibited this effect. Here we consider two candidate explanations for the
8 shift.
9

10 One account is that the shift is a haptic version of the so-called flash lag effect (FLE) (Kitagawa
11 et al., 2009). In the FLE one perceives a stationary and briefly presented visual stimulus (i.e., a
12 flash) to lag behind a spatially aligned moving stimulus (Nijhawan, 1994). A number of
13 explanations for the FLE have been put forward, but in essence, the phenomenon is a consequence
14 of temporal aspects of visual processing of motion (Ichikawa & Masakura, 2006). For instance, the
15 effect could be due to a difference in processing times of moving versus stationary stimuli (e.g.,
16 Whitney & Murakami, 1998), or to a misperception of the location of the moving stimuli (e.g.,
17 Eagleman & Sejnowski, 2000). The FLE is typically elicited with passively received visual stimuli,
18 that is, the observer simply views the stimuli as they occur on a screen. A recent study found,
19 however, that when the observer has a measure of control over the moving stimulus, the FLE is
20 significantly reduced (Ichikawa & Masakura, 2006, but see Scocchia et al., 2009). Moreover, the
21 FLE is apparently not restricted to the visual system. It also occurs crossmodally between the
22 auditory and visual modalities (Alais & Burr, 2003), and, more pertinent, there is evidence for a
23 “motor flash-lag” effect within the visuo-motor system (Nijhawan & Kirschfeld, 2003). Observers
24 moved their right hand which was gripping a steel rod, while during the movement, a light emitting
25 diode was flashed at various positions relative to the unseen rod. There was a strong flash-lag effect;
26 the flash was perceived as “centered” on the felt position of the rod was when it was, in fact, leading
27 by about 8 cm in the direction of the movement.
28

29 From these observations we can construct a haptic analogue as follows. Let the arm movement
30 correspond to a moving stimulus and let the haptic pulse stimulus correspond to a “flash”. Since the
31 haptic stimulus is applied to the finger, which is attached to the arm, a spatial offset between the
32 moving stimulus and the flash is physically impossible. On the other hand, given that motion
33 corresponds to a displacement in space over a time interval, fixing the displacement leaves only time
34 as a degree of freedom. We can therefore speculate that the brain converts the spatial offset (which it
35 “knows” cannot be veridical) to a temporal offset. This temporal offset manifests itself as the
36 delayed occurrence of the haptic stimulus. Because having control over the moving stimulus reduces
37 the FLE (Ichikawa & Masakura, 2006), the haptic FLE occurs in the passive condition but is
38 reduced (or in present case, abolished) in the active condition. The FLE account also explains why
39 no difference in the PSS was found between the static and active condition because the FLE requires
40 a moving stimulus which is obviously lacking in the static condition. The FLE account is an
41 interesting possibility that remains to be tested explicitly. However, the present study seems to
42 provide the first evidence against it since the temporal offset was not found in the passive condition
43 of Experiment 2.
44

45 A second account is based on the nervous system’s tendency to bind actions and their effects in
46 conscious awareness, making an action and its sensory consequences appear closer in time than they
47 actually were (Haggard et al., 2002). For instance, Tsakiris and Haggard (2003) had participants
48 voluntarily press a button with their left index finger which triggered a TMS pulse over the left
49 motor cortex, which in turn elicited a twitch in the right hand. In separate sessions the participants
50 reported the onset of either the action or the twitch. In yet other sessions, the button press was
51 involuntary in that a device pressed the participant’s finger on the button. The judgments were
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 compared to a baseline in which either the action or the twitch was presented in isolation. They
2 found that during a voluntary movement there is an attractive effect. Thus, the onset of the action
3 was perceived to be later (on average by 26 ms) compared to baseline, while the onset of the twitch
4 was perceived to be earlier (9 ms). Interestingly, when the movement was involuntary (i.e., passive),
5 the opposite occurred, in which case the onset of the action was perceived to be earlier (9 ms), while
6 the onset of the twitch was perceived to be later (15 ms). If we presume the same sensory processes
7 for registering the twitch in Tsakiris and Haggard's experiment and the stimulus in our own
8 experiment then we could expect a delay, which can be offset by advancing the haptic stimulus in
9 time. This account can also explain why the shift only occurred during passive movements.
10
11

12 4.3. *Limitations and outlook*

13 One limitation is that the model for the JNDs does not explain the results from previous studies (see
14 Table 1). The primary explanation for this could be the vast methodological differences between the
15 various studies that get in the way of making any direct comparisons. In fact, it was one of the main
16 motivations of the present study to overcome some of these differences by using a single paradigm
17 and procedure to address a number of potentially important factors. There are, however, very likely
18 to be a number of other potential key factors that need to be addressed.
19
20

21 One major factor is the means by which the haptic stimulus is generated. Indeed, each of the
22 previous studies investigating the effects of voluntary movement on temporal perception used a
23 qualitatively different haptic stimulus. For instance, Wenke and Haggard (2009) used electrical
24 shocks applied to the right index and middle fingers, which were taped together. Winter et al. (2008)
25 and Kitagawa et al. (2009) used mechanical taps to the fingers and/or lower arm. The haptic
26 stimulus in Shi et al.'s (2008) study was delivered to the finger through a thimble on a PHANToM
27 device, while Vogel's (2004) participants held a force-feedback joystick, thus applying a force to the
28 entire hand. Not only do all of these methods created distinct haptic stimuli, they also impose rather
29 different constraints on the voluntary movements executed by the participants. Future research
30 should strive to standardize the mode of haptic stimulation and limb movement.
31
32

33 Another factor is whether the haptic stimulus is presented to one hand or to the two hands. This
34 might explain why Wenke and Haggard (2009) found an impairment in temporal perception during
35 voluntary movements, while we obtained the opposite result. Whereas our stimuli were presented to
36 the two index fingers of each hand, Wenke and Haggard presented the stimuli to the index and
37 middle fingers of the right hand. Kuroki et al. (2010) demonstrated that temporal perception is
38 highly dependent on the somatopic organization of the stimulation (as opposed to the position of the
39 hands in space, or spatiotopic). For instance, they found that JNDs in a TOJ task increased by as
40 much as 50% when electrical stimuli were presented to the index and middle finger of one hand (50
41 ms) in comparison to when stimuli were presented between hands (33 ms). Given this difference in
42 temporal processes we qualify our conclusions, for the time being, to be valid to inter-manual
43 conditions only.
44
45

46 Our haptic stimuli were produced at random instants during movement, which simulated the
47 everyday behaviour of exploring an unknown surface and suddenly hitting a salient feature on that
48 surface. This was considerably different from, for instance, Kitagawa et al.'s (2009) procedure in
49 which the haptic stimulus was generated as a result of the finger movement. Although more natural,
50 the latter procedure creates a potential confound. Improvement in performance, as the authors
51 argued, can be attributed to the contribution of motor command information. However, as we have
52 already observed, it can also be argued that the improved performance was due to being better able
53 to predict the onset of the haptic stimulus. The objective of our manipulation was to reduce the
54 apparent causality between motor efference and sensory afference and thereby reducing the
55 predictability of the stimuli. However, because the haptic stimulus was applied in the direction
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 orthogonal to the movement it introduced an unnatural feature. Thus, in a sense the stimulus was
2 incidental to the movement making it more akin to static touch. It remains an open question
3 whether, or to what extent, the incidental nature of the stimulus changes the effect of voluntary
4 movement on temporal haptic perception.

5 Finally, it has been suggested that the auditory-haptic stimulus presentation is somewhat
6 restrictive because the auditory and haptic stimuli are presented from two distinct spatial locations,
7 which could have affected performance. However, interestingly, the spatial separation is generally
8 found to be advantageous to crossmodal temporal discrimination (Vroomen & Keetels, 2010).
9 Applied to our case, spatially collocated stimuli would have lead to even bigger differences in the
10 JNDs between the two experiments. Nevertheless, using headphones was a procedural necessity
11 because it allowed us to mask extraneous sound from the Pantograph and to control the presentation
12 of the auditory stimulus (see section 2.1.2.).
13
14
15

16 4.4. Conclusion

17 The haptic modality is capable of fine temporal discrimination. We found that the production of
18 voluntary movement, as opposed to absence of movement or to involuntary movement, had a
19 determinant effect on the participants' temporal perception acuity. Voluntary movements improved
20 temporal processing of haptic information, which strongly suggests that the perceptual mechanisms
21 for processing temporal information in the haptic system depend on motor command information.
22 However, the beneficial effect was restricted to when the timing of a haptic stimulus was made with
23 reference to another haptic stimulus. When the reference was an auditory stimulus, no significant
24 effect of active movement was observed. Understanding the differential effects of the modality of
25 the reference will enable us to better clarify the role of active movements in haptic temporal
26 perception. We tentatively put forward a qualitative model that can account for these differences and
27 proposed that additional processing noise from the crossmodal comparison counteracts the
28 beneficial effects of the motor command information.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Acknowledgments

35 This research was supported by NSERC grants (SRO and CRD programs) to C.G. and V.H. (P.I. M.
36 Wanderley and A. Berry). We would like to thank Pascal Fortier-Poisson for helpful discussions and
37 Jennifer Campos. The results of Experiment 1 have been presented at the 15th International
38 Multisensory Research Forum, in New York City on 1st July 2009.
39
40
41

42 References

- 43 Adelstein., B.D., Begault, D.R., Anderson, M.R., & Wenzel, E.M. (2003). Sensitivity to haptic-
44 audio asynchrony. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Multimodal Interfaces*,
45 Vancouver, Canada, pp. 73-76.
46 Alais, D., & Burr, D. (2003) The “flash-lag” effect occurs in audition and cross-modally. *Current*
47 *Biology*, 13, 59-63.
48 Bays, P.M., Flanagan, J.R., & Wolpert, D.M. (2006). Attenuation of self-generated tactile sensations
49 is predictive, not postdictive. *PLoS Biology*, 4, e28.
50 Behrmann, M., Kosslyn, S. M., & Jeannerod, M. Eds. (1995). *The neuropsychology of mental*
51 *imagery*. New york: Pergamon.
52 Blakemore, S.J., Frith, C.D., & Wolpert, D.M. (1999). Spatio-temporal prediction modulates the
53 perception of self-produced stimuli. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 11, 551-559.
54 Campion, G., Wang, Q., & Hayward, V. (2005) The Pantograph mk-II: a haptic instrument.
55 *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 723-728.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Carter, O.L., Konkle, T., Wang, Q., Hayward, V., & Moore, C.I. (2008). Tactile Rivalry
2 Demonstrated with an Ambiguous Apparent-Motion Quartet. *Current Biology*, *18*, 1050-1054.
- 3 Chapman, C.E., Bushnell, M.C., Miron, D., Duncan, G.H., & Lund, J.P. (1987). Sensory perception
4 during movement in man. *Experimental Brain Research*, *68*, 516-524.
- 5 Chapman, C.E. (1994). Active versus passive touch: factors influencing the transmission of
6 somatosensory signals to primary somatosensory cortex. *Canadian Journal of Physiology and
7 Pharmacology*, *72*, 558-570.
- 8 Coren, S., Ward, L. M., & Enns, J. T. (1999). *Sensation and perception*. Harcourt Brace, Fort
9 Worth, TX.
- 10 Cullen, K. E. (2004). Sensory signals during active versus passive movement. *Current Opinion in
11 Neurobiology*, *14*, 698-706.
- 12 Craske, B., & Crawshaw, M. (1975). Shifts in kinesthesia through time and after active and passive
13 movement. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, *40*, 755–761.
- 14 Efron, R. (1963). The effect of stimulus intensity on the perception of simultaneity in right- and left-
15 handed subjects. *Brain*, *86*, 285-294
- 16 Eagleman, D. M., & Sejnowski, T. J. (2000) Motion integration and postdiction in visual awareness.
17 *Science*, *287*, 2036–2038.
- 18 Feine, J.S., Chapman, C.E., Lund, J.P., Duncan, G.H., & Bushnell, M.C. (1990). The perception of
19 painful and nonpainful stimuli during voluntary motor activity in man. *Somatosensory and
20 Motor Research*, *7*, 113-124.
- 21 Fiori, M., Tinazzi, M., Bertolasi, L., & Aglioti, S.M. (2003). Temporal processing of visuotactile
22 and tactile stimuli in writer's cramp. *Annals of Neurology*, *53*, 630-635.
- 23 Fujisaki, W., & Nishida, S. (2005). Temporal frequency characteristics of synchrony-asynchrony
24 discrimination of audio-visual signals. *Experimental Brain Research*, *166*, 455-464.
- 25 Fujisaki, W., & Nishida, S. (2009). Audi-tactile superiority over visuo-tactile and audio-visual
26 combinations in the temporal resolution of synchrony perception. *Experimental Brain
27 Research*, *198*, 245-259.
- 28 Gosline, A.H., Campion, G., & Hayward, V. (2006) On the use of eddy current brakes as tunable,
29 fast turn-on viscous dampers for haptic rendering. *Proceedings of EuroHaptics*, pp. 229-234.
- 30 Gritsenko, V., Krouchev, N.I., & Kalaska, J.F. (2007). Afferent input, efference copy, signal noise,
31 and biases in perception of joint angle during active versus passive elbow movements. *Journal
32 of Neurophysiology*, *98*, 1140–1154.
- 33 Grünwald, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Human Haptic Perception: Basics and Applications*. Basel,
34 Switzerland: Birkhäuser.
- 35 Haggard, P., Clark, S., & Kalogeras, J. (2002). Voluntary action and conscious awareness. *Nature
36 Neuroscience*, *5*, 382-385.
- 37 Hayward, V. & MacLean, K. E. (2007). Do it yourself haptics, Part-I. *IEEE Robotics and
38 Automation Magazine*, *14*(4), 88-104.
- 39 Hirsh, I.J. & Sherrick, C.E. Jr. (1961). Perceived order in different sense modalities. *Journal of
40 Experimental Psychology*, *62*, 423-432.
- 41 Ichikawa, M., & Masakura, Y. (2006) Manual control of the visual stimulus reduces the flash-lag
42 effect. *Vision Research*, *46*, 2192-2203.
- 43 Keetels, M. & Vroomen, J. (2012). Perception of synchrony between the senses. In M. M. Murray
44 and M. T. Wallace (Eds.), *Frontiers in the neural basis of multisensory processes* (pp. 147-
45 177). London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- 46 Kitagawa, N., Kato, M., & Kashino, M. (2009) Assessing the effect of voluntary action on
47 sensitivity to temporal asynchrony between auditory and somatosensory events. *Poster
48 presented at the 10th International Multisensory Research Forum*, June 29 - July 2, New York.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Konczak, J., Li, K.Y., Tuite, P.J., & Poizner, H. (2008) Haptic Perception of Object Curvature in
2 Parkinson's Disease. *PLoS ONE* 3(7): e2625.
- 3 Kuroki, S., Watanabe, J., Kawakami, N., Tachi, S., & Nishida, S. (2010). Somatopic dominance in
4 tactile temporal perception. *Experimental Brain Research*, 203, 51-62.
- 5 Lamb, G.D. (1983). Tactile discrimination of textured surfaces: psychophysical performance
6 measurements in humans. *Journal of Physiology*, 338, 551-565.
- 7 Lederman, S.J. (1981) The perception of surface roughness by active and passive touch. *Bulletin of*
8 *the Psychonomic Society*, 18, 253-255.
- 9
10 Lederman, S.J., & Klatzky, R.L. (2009). Haptic perception: A tutorial. *Attention, Perception, &*
11 *Psychophysics*, 71, 1439-1459.
- 12 Marks, L.E., Girvin, J.P., O'Keefe, M.D., Ning, P., Quest, D.O., Atunes, J.L., & Dobbelle, W.H.
13 (1982). Electrocutaneous stimulation: III. The perception of temporal order. *Perception &*
14 *Psychophysics*, 32, 537-541.
- 15 Miall, R.C., Weir, D.J., Wolpert, D.M., & Stein, J.F. (1993). Is the cerebellum a Smith predictor?
16 *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 25, 203–216.
- 17 Nijhawan, R. (1994) Motion extrapolation in catching. *Nature*, 370, 256-257.
- 18 Nijhawan, R., & Kirschfeld, K. (2003) Analogous mechanisms compensate for neural delays in the
19 sensory and the motor pathways: evidence from motor flash-lag. *Current Biology*, 13, 749-753.
- 20 Ocelli, V., Spence, C., & Zampini, M. (2011). Audiotactile interactions in temporal perception.
21 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18, 429-454.
- 22 Post, L.J., Zompa, I.C., & Chapman, C.E. (1994) Perception of vibrotactile stimuli during motor
23 activity in human subjects. *Experimental Brain Research*, 100, 107-120.
- 24 Schwartz, A.S., Perey, A.J., & Azulay, A. (1975) Further analysis of active and passive touch in
25 pattern discrimination. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 6, 7-9.
- 26 Sciutti, A., Squeri, V., Gori, M., Masia, L., Sandini, G., & Konczak, J. (2010). Predicted sensory
27 feedback derived from motor commands does not improve haptic sensitivity. *Experimental*
28 *Brain Research*, 200, 259-267.
- 29 Scocchia, L., Actis Grosso, R., de'Sperati, C., Stucchi, N., & Baud-Bovy, G. (2009) Observer's
30 control of the moving stimulus increases the flash-lag effect. *Vision Research*, 49, 2363-2370.
- 31 Shi, Z., Hirche, S., Schneider, W.X., & Muller, H. (2008). Influence of visuomotor action on visual-
32 haptic simultaneous perception: A psychophysical study. Symposium on *Haptic Interfaces for*
33 *Virtual Environments and Teleoperator Systems*, Reno, Nevada, USA, March 13-14.
- 34 Smith, A.M., Chapman, C.E., Donati, F., Fortier-Poisson, P., & Hayward, V. (2009). Perception of
35 simulated local shapes using active and passive touch. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 102, 3519-
36 3529.
- 37 Stein, B.E., & Meredith, M.A. (1993) *Merging of Senses*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- 38 Tsakiris, M., & Haggard, P. (2003). Awareness of somatic events associated with a voluntary action.
39 *Experimental Brain Research*, 149, 439-446.
- 40 Vega-Bermudez, F., Johnson, K.O., & Hsiao, S.S. (1991) Human tactile pattern recognition: active
41 versus passive touch, velocity effects and patterns of confusion. *Journal of Neurophysiology*,
42 65, 531-546.
- 43 Vitello, M.P., Ernst, M.O., & Fritsch, M. (2006). An instance of tactile suppression: Active
44 exploration impairs tactile sensitivity for the direction of lateral movement. *Proceeding of*
45 *Eurohaptics*, July 3-6, Paris, pp. 351-355.
- 46 Vogels, I.M. (2004) Detection of temporal delays in visual-haptic interfaces. *Human Factors*, 46,
47 118-134.
- 48 Von Holst, E., & Mittelstaedt, H. (1950) Das reafferenzprinzip. *Naturwissenschaften*, 37, 464-476.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Voss M., Bays P.M., Rothwell J.C., & Wolpert DM (2007). An improvement in perception of self-
2 generated tactile stimuli following theta-burst stimulation of primary motor cortex.
3 *Neuropsychologia*, 45, 2712-2717.
- 4 Vroomen, J., & Keetels, M.N. (2010). Perception of intersensory synchrony: A tutorial review.
5 *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 72, 871-884.
- 6 Wenke, D., & Haggard, P. (2009) How voluntary actions modulate time perception. *Experimental*
7 *Brain Research*, 196, 311-318.
- 8 Whitney, D., & Murakami, I. (1998). Latency difference, not spatial extrapolation. *Nature*
9 *Neuroscience*, 1, 656–657.
- 10 Wichmann, F.A., & Hill, N.J. (2001) The psychometric function: I. fitting, sampling, and goodness
11 of fit. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 63, 1293-1313.
- 12 Winter, J.A., Allen, T.J., & Proske, U. (2005). Muscle spindle signals combine with the sense of
13 effort to indicate limb position. *Journal of Physiology*, 568, 1035–1046.
- 14 Winter, R., Harrar, V., Gozdzik, M., & Harris, L.R. (2008). The relative timing of active and passive
15 touch. *Brain Research*, 1242, 54-58.
- 16 Ziat, M, Hayward, V., Chapman, C.E., Ernst, M.O., & Lenay, C. (2010). Tactile suppression of
17 displacement. *Experimental Brain Research*, 206, 299-310.
- 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Qualitative summary of previous studies on the effect of voluntary movement on temporal perception. Entries are in alphabetical order. The second column (n) indicates the number of participants in the study. For the movement conditions “+” indicates that the corresponding condition was included in the study. Tasks were either temporal order judgments (TOJ) or simultaneity judgments (SJ) (see Introduction). Stimulus pairs: AH, auditory-haptic; VH, visuo-haptic; HH, haptic-haptic. For the effect on JND, “+” indicates that performance improved (lower JND) and “-“ that performance was impaired (higher JND). A question mark indicates that the effect could not (reliably) be determined from the study or was not reported.

Study	n	Movement conditions			Task	Stimulus pair	Effect active movement	
		Static	Passive	Active			JND	PSS*
Adelstein et al., 2003	12	-	-	+	TOJ	AH	?	?
Kitagawa et al., 2009	11	+	+	+	TOJ	AH	+	?
Shi et al., 2008	9	+	-	+	TOJ	VH	+	V → H
Vogels, 2004	5	+	-	+	SJ	VH	-	H → V ?
Wenke & Haggard, 2009	19	-	+	+	SJ	HH	-	?
Winter et al., 2008	13	+	-	+	SJ	HH	?	Static → Active

* Entries with an arrow indicate the stimulus order at PSS.

Table 2. Summary of Experiment 1. A negative PSS indicates that the right hand tactile stimulus was presented before the sound. The right-most column (ρ) lists the correlation between the JND and PSS.

Movement	JND (ms)		PSS (ms)		ρ
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	
Static	102	14	4	12	-0.11
Passive	94	9	-45	15	-0.39
Active	114	12	12	21	0.11

Table 3. Summary of Experiment 2. A positive PSS indicates that the left hand stimulus was presented before the right hand stimulus. The right-most column (ρ) lists the correlation between the JND and PSS.

Movement	JND (ms)		PSS (ms)		ρ
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	
Static	52	3	10	7	-0.19
Passive	55	2	28	4	0.07
Active	35	3	16	6	-0.16

Figure captions


1
2
3 **Figure 1.** Apparatus and tactile stimulus presentation. (a) The Pantograph (with eddy current
4 brakes). It features a planar parallel mechanism (five bar linkage) with a nonslip plate on which the
5 finger pad rests. Judiciously programmed tangential interaction forces at the plate have the effect of
6 causing fingertip deformations and tactile sensations that resemble exploring real surfaces (see
7 Champion et al., 2005, for a more detailed description of the device). (b) Setup in Experiment 2 with
8 the two Pantographs. (c) A schematic representation (to scale) of the Pantograph during a trial in the
9 passive and active conditions. On each trial the arm moved from the start position on the left to the
10 end position on the right (grey dotted lines circles). The first stimulus in the pair was presented after
11 the finger pad had entered the “active” area (dotted black vertical lines) within the window indicated
12 by the grey vertical lines at t_1 (see also procedure for experiment 1). The double arrow represents
13 anterior-posterior axis along which the haptic stimulus was delivered. We considered the fact that
14 the net force pulse of the haptic stimulus could potentially be diminished due to small forces applied
15 by the participant on the finger pad. To ensure that haptic stimuli were suprathreshold we varied the
16 direction of the stimulus on a trial by trial basis according to the instantaneous force applied by the
17 participant at the time of stimulus presentation. Thus, if the participant was applying a force,
18 however slightly, away from the body the stimulus was presented away from the body as well, and
19 vice versa. The shaded area is a cartoon (i.e., not representative of the physical parameters) of the
20 “virtual corridor” that was put in place to ensure a smooth and linear path.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Figure 2.** An illustrative example of the analysis of the passive and active conditions for one
28 participant. The figure demonstrates how the PSS and JND were extracted from cumulative
29 Gaussian fits to the response data. On the abscissa are the SOAs and on the ordinate, the proportion
30 of times that the auditory stimulus was perceived before the tactile stimulus. The solid lines are the
31 corresponding fits, which included a nuisance parameter λ in order to account for non task-related
32 observer lapses (Wichmann & Hill, 2001). The PSS (black dotted lines) is the SOA that corresponds
33 to $p = 0.5$. The JND (grey dotted lines) is the difference (Δ) between the SOAs corresponding to $p =$
34 0.25 and $p = 0.75$ divided by two.
35
36
37

38 **Figure 3.** A tentative model (see also paragraph 4.1.). The auditory stimulus is referred to with A,
39 and T_L and T_R refer to the tactile stimulus to the left and right hand, respectively. The passage of a
40 certain amount of time is indicated with Δt . The up and down arrows in the two rightmost panels
41 indicates movement of the arm. The amount of noise in the sensory signal is illustrated by the width
42 of the Gaussians.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

a



b



c




Figure 2

Author's copy. Final version in Acta Psychologica 141 (2012) 140–148





Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Highlights

[Click here to download Supplementary Files: Frissen et al. Highlights.docx](#)

Peer review copy, Final Version
Acta Psychologica 141 (2012) 140–148

The effects of voluntary movements on auditory-haptic and haptic-haptic temporal order judgements

Ilja Frissen^{a,b}, Mounia Ziat^c, Gianni Campion^d, Vincent Hayward^e, Catherine Guastavino^{a,b}

^a Multimodal Interaction Lab, School of Information Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

^b Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Music Media and Technology (CIRMMT), Montréal, Québec, Canada

^c Department of Psychology, Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI, USA

^d McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

^e Institut des Systèmes Intelligents et de Robotique, UPMC Univ Paris 06, Paris, France

CORRESPONDENCE

Ilja Frissen

LUNAM Université, CNRS, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, IRCCyN (Institut de Recherche en Communications et Cybernétique de Nantes)

1 rue de la Noë, BP 92101, 44321 Nantes Cedex 3, FRANCE

Tel : + 33 (0)2 40 37 69 00

Fax : +33 (0)2 40 37 69 30

Email: ilja.frissen@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr

ABSTRACT

In two experiments we investigated the effects of voluntary movements on temporal haptic perception. Measures of sensitivity (JND) and temporal alignment (PSS) were obtained from temporal order judgments made on intermodal auditory-haptic (Experiment 1) or intramodal haptic (Experiment 2) stimulus pairs under three movement conditions. In the baseline, static condition, the arm of the participants remained stationary. In the passive condition, the arm was displaced by a servo-controlled motorized device. In the active condition, the participants moved voluntarily. The auditory stimulus was a short, 500 Hz tone presented over headphones and the haptic stimulus was a brief suprathreshold force pulse applied to the tip of the index finger orthogonally to the finger movement. Active movement did not significantly affect discrimination sensitivity on the auditory-haptic stimulus pairs, whereas it significantly improved sensitivity in the case of the haptic stimulus pair, demonstrating a key role for motor command information in temporal sensitivity in the haptic system. Points of subjective simultaneity were by-and-large coincident with physical simultaneity, with one striking exception in the passive condition with the auditory-haptic stimulus pair. In the latter case, the haptic stimulus had to be presented 45 ms before the auditory stimulus in order to obtain subjective simultaneity. A model is proposed to explain the discrimination performance.

PsychINFO classification:

2300 (human experimental psychology), 2320 (sensory perception), 2330 (motor processes)

KEYWORDS:

Multisensory, Temporal Processes, Auditory, Haptic, Movement