

**Developmental
Science**

Development of motion processing in children with autism

Journal:	<i>Developmental Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	DS-05-08-0121-P.R2
mss type:	Paper (<8000 words)
Keywords:	autism, biological motion, form-from-motion, motion coherence, developmental disorders, trajectory analyses
Subject Area:	Developmental disorders



Pre-Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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

Development of motion processing in children with autism

Review Copy Only

Abstract

Recent findings suggest that children with autism may be impaired in the perception of biological motion from moving point-light displays. Some children with autism also have abnormally high motion coherence thresholds. In the current study we tested a group of children with autism and a group of typically developing children aged 5 to 12 years of age on several motion perception tasks, in order to establish the specificity of the biological motion deficit in relation to other visual discrimination skills. The first task required the recognition of biological from scrambled motion. Three quasi-psychophysical tasks then established individual thresholds for the detection of biological motion in dynamic noise, of motion coherence and of form-from-motion. Lastly, individual thresholds for a task of static perception – contour integration (Gabor displays) were also obtained. Compared to controls, children with autism were particularly impaired in processing biological motion in relation to any developmental measure (chronological or mental age). In contrast, there was some developmental overlap in ability to process other types of visual motion between typically developing children and the children with autism, and evidence of developmental change in both groups. Finally, Gabor display thresholds appeared to develop typically in children with autism.

Keywords: autism, biological motion, form-from-motion, motion coherence, developmental disorders, trajectory analyses

Introduction

Several recent studies have demonstrated impairments in motion perception in individuals with autism. This corpus of work suggests abnormalities in different types of motion perception including: increased sensitivity thresholds for detecting coherent motion from random motion (Milne *et al.*, 2002; Pellicano, Gibson, Maybery, Durkin, & Badcock, 2005; Spencer & O'Brien, 2006; Spencer *et al.*, 2000); reduced sensitivity to second, but not first, order motion (Bertone, Mottron, Jelenic, & Faubert, 2005), and reduced sensitivity to biological motion (Blake *et al.*, 2003; Freitag *et al.*, 2008; see also Milne, Swettenham & Campbell, 2005 for a review). Perception of biological motion, which involves recognition of human motion reduced to a point-light display (PLD), has been shown to develop in early infancy (Fox & McDaniel, 1982) and is the focus of the current study.

Blake *et al.* (2003) reported that children with autism were less able to perceive biological motion than typically developing children when asked to identify human point-light walker from scrambled dots with the same degree of movement. The authors linked this impairment to severity of autism. Using fMRI, Herrington *et al.* (2007) measured brain activation in individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) while observing biological motion stimuli. The authors reported reduced activation relative to control participants in inferior, middle and superior temporal regions, including V5/MT. Atypical neural activation was also reported in Freitag and colleagues' (2008) study of 15 adolescences with autism who had IQ within a normal range.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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

Several studies, however, have shown that individuals with autism are able to name simple actions such as kicking and digging depicted by PLD (Hubert *et al.*, 2007; Moore *et al.*, 1997; Parron, *et al.*, 2008). In these studies, exposure time was longer (5 seconds) than in the Blake *et al.*, (2003) (1 second), and verbal responses were the dependent variable. Participants were impaired relative to controls at naming emotions depicted by point-light movement. The authors argued that the impairment in biological motion perception is specific to displays depicting emotion. Their evidence suggests that participants with autism can name simple biological motion displays if given enough time, but this does not rule out the possibility that they are less *sensitive* to biological motion stimuli.

There is also evidence that children with autism are impaired on other motion perception tasks. A number of studies have reported that some individuals with autism are less sensitive to coherent motion and/or to texture-defined motion stimuli (Bertone, Mottrom, Jelenic & Faubert, 2003; Milne *et al.*, 2002; Pellicano *et al.*, 2005; Spencer & O'Brien, 2006; Spencer *et al.*, 2000). The existence of deficits in more than one type of motion task has led to the suggestion that there may be a single underlying cause accounting for a motion perception deficit. For example, a number of authors have argued that a general vulnerability of the dorsal cortical processing stream underlies atypical performance on motion perception tasks (Blake *et al.* 2003; Milne *et al.*, 2002; Spencer *et al.*, 2000), whilst Bertone and colleagues (2005) have suggested that a general abnormality in neurointegrative mechanisms within visual cortex results in a deficit in feature integration of complex stimuli (i.e. stimuli which require processing beyond the level of V1; see also Grice *et al.*, 2001) which would include biological motion, global motion and texture defined motion.

1
2
3 One way forward, then, is to test a group of children with autism on several motion
4 perception tasks to establish the pattern of performance. A dissociated pattern of
5 performance has been reported in children with Williams Syndrome (WS). Reiss and
6 colleagues reported that individuals with WS are impaired in their ability to perceive
7 form-from-motion but not biological motion (Reiss, Hoffman & Landau, 2005). The
8 authors propose that the *relatively* typical development of biological motion
9 perception in WS could be explained by their tendency to be highly interested in
10 social stimuli.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 In the current experiments, we tested a group of children with autism on several
26 different motion perception tasks and on a static contour integration task (Kovacs,
27 Polat, Norcia, Pennefather & Chandna, 2000). In the first experiment we attempted to
28 replicate Blake *et al.*'s (2003) finding by presenting children with brief displays of
29 point-light biological motion and point-light scrambled motion, using a signal
30 detection measure of discrimination ability. Also, similarly to Blake *et al.* (2003),
31 correlation between severity of autism and performance was measured using
32 Childhood Autism Rating Scale (CARS) (Schopler, Reichler & Renner, 1986). In the
33 second experiment we used a quasi-psychophysical procedure similar to previous
34 studies (Friere, Lewis, Maurer & Blake, 2006; Jordan, Reiss, Hoffman & Landau,
35 2002; Reiss *et al.*, 2005). The motion stimuli were embedded in noise and signal-to-
36 noise ratio was gradually increased and decreased using a staircase procedure to
37 establish the threshold at which the stimuli could be reliably perceived. Thresholds for
38 perception of 1) biological motion, 2) coherent motion, and 3) form-from-motion
39 were assessed in this way (Experiment 2).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thus, in experiments 1 and 2, we tested biological motion processing in two ways.
4
5 This allows more reliable inferences concerning sources of any deficit than if a single
6
7 test were used. For example, in Experiment 1 it may be possible to distinguish a real
8
9 from a scrambled PLD on the basis of local detail. However, a threshold test
10
11 (Experiment 2) is unlikely to be affected by this, since dynamic noise limits the ability
12
13 to discriminate biological motion from local correspondences. Finally, in Experiment
14
15 3, we tested form perception from a static display, using the contour integration task
16
17 described by Kovacs and colleagues (Kovacs, Kozma, Feher & Benedek, 1999). This
18
19 uses sinusoidal luminance patterns, or Gabor displays. The basic processes involved
20
21 in discriminating Gabor displays from noise are likely to reflect local integration
22
23 activity in occipital area V1. These are thought to be developing typically in autism
24
25 (Bertone *et al.*, 2003; Kemner *et al.*, 2007).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Based on the studies mentioned here, we predicted that biological motion would be
35
36 impaired in the autism group, while our predictions concerning thresholds for other
37
38 motion tasks (coherent motion and form from motion) are open. We predicted that
39
40 thresholds for the detection of visual form from Gabor patches would be similar in the
41
42 autism and control groups.
43
44
45
46
47

48 *The use of cross sectional developmental trajectories*

49
50 The majority of studies examining perceptual abilities in children with autism have
51
52 used cross-sectional designs, matching children from the disorder group with TD
53
54 controls based on chronological or mental age. If children with autism perform
55
56 significantly worse than the control group, they are often described as *impaired* (and
57
58 we have used this terminology, too). However, such studies give little sense of how
59
60

1
2
3 task performance develops with age, or other developmental markers that are
4 particularly important when studying a developmental disorder such as autism.
5
6 Although cross-sectional studies cannot replace longitudinal studies, they can be used
7
8 to *indicate* developmental change, since they allow trajectories to be mapped from
9
10 individuals at different developmental stages (Thomas, Annaz, Scerif, Ansari, Jarrold
11
12 & Karmiloff-Smith, 2009). The cross-sectional method we used begins by
13
14 constructing a trajectory for each task across TD individuals at different ages. The
15
16 trajectory of the autism group is then compared to this reference in a number of ways.
17
18 A trajectory that links changes in performance to chronological age establishes
19
20 whether the autism group shows any impairment. Trajectories linking performance to
21
22 measures of mental age indicate whether the behavioural deficit is in line with the
23
24 developmental state of other aspects of the cognitive system. In the current study we
25
26 used this method to assess the development of motion perception in children with
27
28 autism aged 5 to 12 years.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Method**

40 *Participants*

41
42 Twenty three children with autism and 34 typically developing children participated
43
44 in the current study. See Table 1 for group details. All the children in the group with
45
46 autism met established criteria for autism, as specified in DSM-IV (American
47
48 Psychiatric Association, 2000), with diagnosis confirmed with ADOS (Lord, Rutter,
49
50 DiLavore, & Risi, 1999). None of the children with autism had received any other
51
52 diagnosis. All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. The
53
54 experimental protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee, University College
55
56 London, and both parental informed consent and the child's assent were obtained
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 before participation. In order to obtain verbal and non-verbal mental age scores,
4
5 children from both groups were assessed on a number of standardised tests including
6
7 the British Picture Vocabulary Scale II (Dunn, Dunn, Whetton & Burley, 1997) and
8
9 Pattern Construction subtest from the British Ability Scale II (Elliott, Smith &
10
11 McCulloch 1997). There was no difference between the groups on CA and PC
12
13 ($p>.05$), but there was a significant group difference on BPVS ($F(1,55) = 5.55, p =$
14
15 0.023). Also, severity of autism scores using CARS scale is reported in Table 1. There
16
17 was no correlation between scores obtained on CARS and chronological age ($p>.05$).
18
19 As a further check on the possibility that severity of the disorder varied across the
20
21 sample, one-way ANOVA comparing younger (5-8 years) and older (8.1-12.2 years)
22
23 for CARS scores revealed no differences in severity of the disorder between the age
24
25 groups ($F(1,21)=23.74, p=.114$).
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 -----Table 1 about here-----
33

34 *Apparatus*

35
36 Stimuli were presented on a HP laptop with a 15-inch flat-panel LCD screen (1024 x
37
38 768 pixel resolution; 60 Hz frame rate). Custom software, using Microsoft Visual
39
40 Basic, was used to control the display and responses. Viewing distance was
41
42 approximately 40cm.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Experiment 1: Perception of Biological Motion (normal vs. scrambled)

50 *Stimuli*

51
52 Point-light displays (Johansson, 1973) were created using a Markerless motion-
53
54 capture method (Shipley & Brumberg, 2003) and were composed of 13 signal dots
55
56 attached to the joints of an invisible human figure (head, 2 shoulders, 2 elbows, 2
57
58 hands, 2 hips, 2 knees and 2 feet). The figure was seen in profile (approximately 7.8°
59
60

1
2
3 visual angle in height) and remained in the centre of the panel as if walking on the
4 spot. Four further figures were created (running, throwing, kicking and star-jumping)
5 resulting in a set of five PLD animations (see Figure 1A). Corresponding out-of-phase
6 scrambled stimuli were created for each of the five actions by taking the trajectory of
7 each dot and playing them temporally out of phase with each other (hence controlling
8 for display density and overall movement). Each animation was presented as white
9 dots on a black panel ($17.1^\circ \times 17.1^\circ$ visual angle). The duration of each trial was 1
10 second, followed by an inter-stimuli fixation cross.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Procedure*

26
27 The task began with 10 practice trials (5 PLD and 5 scrambled trials, presented
28 randomly). The first 5 trials were presented on the screen until a response was made
29 and the second 5 trials were presented for 1 second duration. In the practice session,
30 each child was told that during the game he/she would sometimes see dots that
31 “moved like a person” and sometimes dots that would “moved in a funny way and not
32 really like a person”. The keyboard of the computer was covered with black card so
33 that only the z and m keys were visible. These keys were covered by Y and N stickers
34 respectively. Participants were told to press “Y” if the dots were moving like a person
35 and to press “N” if they were not. Once the child was familiar with the procedure, the
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
40 experimental trials (each with a duration of 1 second) were then presented in
random order with constraints such that no more than two of the same action or same
phase could appear consecutively. The experimenter controlled the progression of the
task by clicking a button to initiate each subsequent trial

Experiment 2: Sensitivity to Motion Tasks

1
2
3 These tasks examined whether children with autism have altered sensitivity to detect
4 different types of motion. Three tasks were developed based on a procedure used by
5 Reiss *et al.* (2005): biological motion, form-from-motion and motion coherence. See
6 examples of stimuli in Figure 1 (B-D).
7
8
9
10
11

12 13 14 15 *General Procedure*

16
17 Participants completed all motion tasks in separate blocks presented in
18 counterbalanced order. Each child was tested separately in a quiet room. For each
19 task, participants were asked to indicate which panel contained the target stimuli, by
20 pressing a button underneath the relevant panel. Perceptual thresholds were
21 established using a 2-down/1-up adaptive staircase rule on each of the motion tasks.
22
23 Three noise dots were added to the target and adjacent distractor panel after every two
24 consecutive successful trials. However, if the child responded incorrectly on a trial
25 then six noise dots were subtracted. The task continued until 7 reversals had taken
26 place (i.e. 7 correct followed by incorrect trials). The average signal to noise ratio
27 (signal/signal + noise) of the 7 reversals was calculated to establish the threshold.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Stimuli*

45 46 Biological Motion Task

47
48 This task was designed to establish thresholds for the detection of PLD in noise. In
49 this task, two displays were presented side-by-side. One contained a display of a PLD
50 walking on the spot, in profile view. The other display comprised matched but
51 scrambled elements as described above. The first trial contained only signal elements
52 (PLD alone). Groups of three distractor dots were added or removed on subsequent
53 trials depending on accuracy of response. Participants pressed a button which
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 corresponded to a panel where they could see “*dots that look like a person walking*”.
4
5
6 The staircase procedure described above was applied to determine the threshold.
7
8
9

10 Motion Coherence Task

11
12 This task was designed to establish motion coherence thresholds for each respondent.
13
14 Two black panels were displayed on the screen, each containing randomly positioned
15
16 signal elements. In one of the panels, signal elements moved together in the same
17
18 direction ($3.21^\circ/\text{s}$) while, in the other panel, noise elements moved randomly to new
19
20 locations within the panel. Respondents were required to identify the panel
21
22 comprising the coherent display. Within each display, each signal element had a
23
24 lifespan of one frame (limited lifetime technique: Newsome & Pare, 1988) in order to
25
26 ensure that one particular element could not be followed through a trial. Participants
27
28 were asked to detect which set of dots were moving in the same way “*like swimming*
29
30 *fish*”. Two consecutive correct responses led to the addition of 3 noise elements to
31
32 both panels and an incorrect response led to the removal of 6 noise elements.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Form-from-Motion Task

42
43 This task was designed to establish form-from-motion thresholds for each respondent.
44
45 In each of two black panels signal elements were arranged into a rectangular figure
46
47 and surrounded by background noise elements. The figure and background elements
48
49 moved coherently in opposite directions ($3.21^\circ/\text{s}$). Noise elements (with random
50
51 motion) were present in both the figure and the background. In one panel the figure
52
53 was horizontal and in the other the figure was vertical. The task was to identify the
54
55 panel containing the vertical rectangle. Participants were told that there was a
56
57 rectangle hidden inside each panel on the screen. A cardboard rectangle of similar size
58
59
60

1
2
3 and shape was presented to the child to ensure that they understood what shape they
4
5 were looking for. The cardboard shape was then rotated to a vertical position and the
6
7 participant was directed to look for the “*rectangle that is standing up on its end*” and
8
9 to press the button underneath that panel. The overall density of dots was constant
10
11 throughout the task and difficulty was manipulated by converting signal elements to
12
13 noise elements. Two consecutive correct responses led to the conversion of 3 signal
14
15 elements into noise elements and an incorrect answer changed 6 noise elements back
16
17 to signal elements.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Experiment 3: Static Contour Integration Task

26 *Stimuli*

27
28 The stimuli comprised colinearly aligned Gabor signals (contour) displayed against
29
30 randomly oriented and positioned Gabor signals (noise), as created by Kovacs &
31
32 Julesz (1993). Spacing of contour and noise elements were controlled independently.
33
34 At low signal-to-noise ratios, background elements intruded between contour
35
36 elements, but orientational alignment was avoided. A different random shape and
37
38 background were computed for each card. The difficulty level of each card was
39
40 determined by the relative density of noise elements and expressed as a ratio of
41
42 average noise spacing over contour spacing (D). Absolute contour spacing is
43
44 expressed in Gabor wavelength units (l). The strength of spatial interactions
45
46 subserving contour integration in an individual is indicated by the value of D at their
47
48 threshold. An example of the contour-integration stimuli is shown in Figure 1 (see
49
50 Kovacs *et al.*, 1999; Kovacs *et al.*, 2000 for details).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 -----Figure 1 about here-----
59
60

Procedure

Initially, each participant was asked to draw a circle to ascertain that he/she could recognize a circle when asked. If this was done correctly, the participant was presented with one of the two sets of cards on A4 cards at approximately 40 cm distance. The participant's task was to identify the location of the contour by tracing its path with their finger. Each child was presented with one practice trial to ensure that s/he understood task procedure. The cards were presented in increasing order of difficulty and children were given a 6 seconds limit to given an answer. *D* varied between 0.5 and 1.2 in steps of 0.05, resulting in 15 cards in the set. A simple staircase procedure was used in which threshold was identified by the last correctly identified card.

Results

The data were analysed as follows: (i) We first examined developmental trajectories for each group for each task. Each developmental trajectory was modeled by a linear function relating individuals' *d*'-prime (*d*') scores (Experiment 1) or thresholds (Experiments 2 and 3) to chronological age; (ii) if both groups showed a reliable linear relationship between the dependent variable and age, this was followed by a direct comparison between the groups (using cross sectional ANCOVA with CA or MA as covariant) to determine whether the performance of the children with autism differs in terms of onset (the level of performance at the point at which measurement began) and rate of development; (iii) finally, performance values were plotted against mental ages from the British Picture Vocabulary Scale II (BPVS) and Pattern Construction subtest from the British Ability Scale II (PC) tasks to explore whether performance was in line with a given standardized measure (see Thomas *et al.*, 2009,

1
2
3 for a similar approach). d' values (Experiment 1) measure perceptual sensitivity
4 independent of bias, in forced choice paradigms (Macmillan & Creelman, 1991). d'
5
6 value of 0.05 suggests low (chance level) sensitivity.
7
8
9

10 11 12 Experiment 1: Identification of Biological Motion (normal vs. scrambled) 13

14
15 d' values were calculated for each child. The average d' values for the TD and autism
16 groups were 2.2 and 1.0 respectively. Figure 2a shows d' scores for every participant
17 from both groups. Initial linear regressions revealed that d' values increased reliably
18 from both groups. Initial linear regressions revealed that d' values increased reliably
19 with chronological age in the TD children [$F(1,33) = 29.25, p < 0.001$] but not in the
20 autism group [$F(1,22) = 0.05, p = 0.83$]. The lack of a reliable relationship between d'
21 and chronological age in the autism group is ambiguous. It may either mean that there
22 is no systematic relationship between these variables, that is, their performance could
23 be either random with respect to age, or d' could be constant with age. However, in
24 neither case can age predict variability in d' .
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Next, we compared the trajectories for performance at onset (i.e. at the earliest age
39 that both groups were tested, 60 months) and the rate of change in performance
40 relative to CA. There was no overall effect of group [$F(1,53) = 0.55, p = 0.46, \eta_p^2 =$
41 0.10] indicating that the groups did not differ in performance at onset, reflecting
42 overlap in performance at the earliest age tested. However, the Group by CA
43 interaction [$F(1,53) = 15.81, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.23$] indicated that the groups differed in
44 the rate of increase in performance with age. d' increased with age in the TD group
45 but not in the group with autism.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 - Figure 2 a, b, c about here -
58
59
60

1
2
3 We then examined whether there was a reliable relationship between performance on
4 the task and mental age measures to see whether the behavioural deficit is in line with
5 the developmental state of other aspects of the cognitive system (see Figure 2b and c).
6
7
8 the developmental state of other aspects of the cognitive system (see Figure 2b and c).
9
10 As expected, in the TD children (since mental age is in line with CA) d' increased
11 systematically with verbal mental age (VMA) ($F(1,33) = 15.94, p < 0.001$) and non-
12 verbal mental age (NVMA) ($F(1,33) = 22.26, p < 0.001$). In contrast, the performance
13 of children with autism was flat and d' remained constant with increasing verbal
14 mental age [$F(1,22) = 0.20, p = 0.66$] and non-verbal mental age [$F(1,22) = 0.26, p =$
15 0.62].
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 A comparison of the VMA trajectories also revealed no difference between the groups
27 at onset [$F(1,53) = 0.07, p = 0.80, \eta_p^2 = 0.11$] and a significant Group by VMA
28 interaction [$F(1,53) = 4.61, p = 0.04, \eta_p^2 = 0.32$] indicating that the groups differed in
29 the rate of development relative to VMA on this task. Similarly, a comparison of the
30 NVMA trajectories revealed no significant group difference [$F(1,53) = 0.01, p = 0.93,$
31 $\eta_p^2 = 0.10$] indicating that both groups did not differ at onset, and a significant Group
32 by NVMA interaction [$F(1,53) = 15.81, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.23$] again demonstrating
33 that the groups differed in the rate of development relative to NVMA.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Experiment 2: Perceptual sensitivity to motion embedded in noise

48
49 Coherence thresholds for each child were computed as the mean of the threshold
50 levels corresponding to the participant's last five staircase reversals in a given motion
51 task.
52
53
54
55

56 A) Detection of biological motion

57
58 Initial linear regressions revealed that thresholds decreased reliably with CA in the
59 TD children [$F(1,33) = 19.82, p < 0.001$]. In contrast, threshold remained constant with
60

1
2
3 increasing CA in the children with autism [$F(1,22) = 1.86, p = 0.19$]. As depicted in
4
5
6 Figure 3a, comparison of both trajectories showed no overall effect of group [$F(1,53)$
7
8 = 0.75, $p = 0.39, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$], indicating that the groups did not differ in performance at
9
10 onset. However, there was a significant Group by CA interaction ($F(1,53) = 4.88, p =$
11
12 0.03, $\eta_p^2 = 0.08$) indicating that TD children's thresholds fell as they got older, while
13
14 this was not the case for children with autism.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Figure 3 (b & c) shows the thresholds for each individual plotted against VMA and
21
22 NVMA on each motion task. For the TD children linear regressions revealed that
23
24 threshold decreased with increasing verbal ($F(1,33) = 14.43, p < 0.001$) and non-
25
26 verbal mental age ($F(1,33) = 5.91, p = 0.02$). In contrast, the performance of children
27
28 in the autism group was constant with verbal ($F(1,22) = 2.41, p = 0.14$) and non-verbal
29
30 mental ages ($F(1,22) = 2.84, p = 0.11$).
31
32
33

34
35
36 - Figure 3 a, b, c about here -
37
38

39
40 A direct comparison of the VMA trajectories revealed no effect of group [$F(1,53) =$
41
42 0.68, $p = 0.42, \eta_p^2 = 0.13$] indicating no difference between the groups at the earliest
43
44 VMA tested, and no significant Group by VMA interaction [$F(1,53) = 2.44, p = 0.13,$
45
46 $\eta_p^2 = 0.21$], indicating that the groups did not differ significantly in the rate of
47
48 development relative to VMA on this task. Interestingly, the TD group showed a
49
50 greater variability in performance compared to the autism group, and the group by
51
52 performance interactions (comparisons of rate of development) may have fallen short
53
54 of significance because of the unequal variance in the two groups. Similarly,
55
56 comparison of the NVMA trajectories revealed no difference between the groups in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 threshold at the earliest NVMA tested [$F(1,53) = 3.52, p=0.07, \eta_p^2 = 0.33$], and no
4
5 significant Group by NVMA interaction [$F(1,53) = 2.89, p = 0.09, \eta_p^2 = 0.18$].
6
7
8
9

10 B) Sensitivity to motion coherence

11
12 As depicted in Figure 4a, linear regressions of thresholds decreased reliably with CA
13 in the TD group ($F(1,33) = 8.52, p=0.006$). In contrast, there was no reliable
14 relationship between threshold and CA in the autism group ($F(1,22) = 0.01, p = 0.77$).
15 Due to a lack of systematic relationship between age and the performance scores in
16 the autism group, the developmental trajectory could not be constructed. We therefore
17 carried out a t-test which revealed a significant difference between the groups ($t(55) =$
18 $3.53, p<0.001$).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Figure 4b & c shows thresholds plotted against verbal and non-verbal mental ages.
31 For the TD children linear regressions revealed that threshold decreased with
32 increasing verbal ($F(1,33) = 5.39, p = 0.03$) and non-verbal mental ages ($F(1,33) =$
33 $8.05, p = 0.01$). However, children with autism showed a non-systematic relationship
34 between threshold and verbal ($F(1,22) = 0.85, p = 0.37$) and non-verbal mental ages
35 ($F(1,22) = 3.77, p = 0.07$).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 - Figure 4 a, b, c about here -
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

52 C) Sensitivity to form-from-motion

53 Figure 5a shows that linear regressions of threshold scores decreased reliably with age
54 in the TD group [$F(1,33) = 7.61, p=0.01$]. In contrast, there was no reliable
55 relationship between threshold and CA in the autism group [$F(1,23) = 2.74, p = 0.11$].
56 Again, t-test was performed and showed a significant difference between the groups

1
2
3 (t(55) = 4.80, p<0.001). Furthermore, for the TD children threshold values decreased
4 with increasing verbal (F(1,33) = 8.70, p = 0.01) and non-verbal mental age (F(1,33)
5 = 14.06, p = 0.001). The autism group also showed a reliable decrease in threshold
6 with increasing verbal [F(1,22) = 0.19, p = 0.04] and non-verbal mental ages (F(1,22)
7 = 15.2, p = 0.001). A comparison of the NVMA trajectories revealed a significant
8 effect of group (F(1,53) = 29.57, p <0.001) indicating that at the lowest NVMA, the
9 autism group started with thresholds lower than the TD group predicted by NVMA.
10 There was no significant Group by NVMA interaction (F(1,55) = 2.06, p = 0.16)
11 indicating that the groups did not differ significantly in the rate of development
12 relative to NVMA on this task. A similar pattern was found when comparing the
13 groups' trajectories of performance relative to VMA. The autism group showed
14 delayed onset (F(1,55) = 14.29, p = 0.001), and there was no difference in the rate of
15 development relative to VMA (F(1,55) = 2.88, p = 0.09). See Figure 5b & c.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

- Figure 5a, b, c about here -

39 Cross-task comparison

40
41
42 In a further analysis we compared the relative levels of performance across the three
43 motion tasks. Because of the inherent problem in comparing raw performance scores
44 across different tasks, we standardized ASD scores in relation to normative functions
45 for the TD group. First individual data points from the TD sample were used to derive
46 normative functions for the development of performance on each task with
47 chronological and mental age. These functions were then used to derive normative z
48 scores for the ASD group which indicate the degree to which performance differs
49 from TD developmental trajectory. Such z-scores were then used to compare
50 performance across the tasks for the ASD group (see, Jarrold, Baddley, & Philips,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2007 for similar approach). Figure 6 (a and b) depicts performance on each task using z-score standardization. One way ANOVA with three task factors (biological motion, form-from-motion and motion coherence) revealed a significant main effect of task on the CA ($F(1,22)=5.28$; $p = 0.031$) and mental ages standardizations [BPVS: $F(1,22)=7.12$; $p = 0.014$; PC: $F(1,22)=9.63$; $p = 0.005$]. Further analyses revealed a significantly poorer performance (higher z-scores) relative to the TD group, on the biological motion task in comparison to the other two tasks ($p < .05$) and no difference between the form-from-motion and motion coherence tasks ($p > .05$) on either CA or MA standardizations.

- Figure 6 a & b about here -

A Pearson correlation, on the data for the children with autism, addressed the relationship between performance on the three motion perception tasks. The correlation between motion coherence and form-from-motion was found to be significant ($r = .49$, $p < 0.05$), while the correlation between biological motion and either motion coherence or form-from-motion were statistically non-significant ($r = .16$, $p = .46$; $r = .15$, $p = .50$, respectively). The relationship between performance on the motion coherence and form-from-motion remained statistically significant even after chronological age and verbal mental age were taken into account ($r = .51$, $p < 0.05$; $r = .41$, $p < 0.05$, respectively), but was not statistically significant when non-verbal mental age was partialled out ($r = .35$, $p = .11$).

Lastly, a more descriptive approach was taken to inspect individual data points on all motion threshold task which revealed that the thresholds for some children with autism were within the TD children's developmental trajectory (95% confidence

1
2
3 interval), and others had higher thresholds outside this range. As shown in Table 2,
4
5 children with high thresholds on one task can be within the normal range on another,
6
7 thus revealing considerable heterogeneity of individual performance across the tasks.
8
9 We also computed the correlation between severity of autism, as indexed by CARS
10
11 scores, and performance scores on the tasks. No correlations reached significance,
12
13 however, note that form-from-motion scores approached significance level ($r = .401$,
14
15
16
17
18 $p = .058$).

19
20
21 ----Table 2 about here---

22 23 Experiment 3: Sensitivity to contour integration

24
25 As depicted in Figure 7, both groups performed at a similar level on the contour
26
27 integration task and there was a reliable increase in performance with age in both
28
29 groups (TD: $F(1,33) = 9.6$, $p = 0.01$; autism: $F(1,22) = 10.16$, $p = 0.004$). There were
30
31 no differences between the groups in onset ($F(1,56) = 0.27$; $p = 0.61$) or in rate of
32
33 development (increasing threshold with CA) ($F(1,53) = 1.22$, $p = 0.27$).

34
35
36
37 - Figure 7 about here -

38
39 For the TD group threshold decreased with increasing verbal ($F(1,33) = 8.70$, $p =$
40
41 0.01) and non-verbal mental age ($F(1,33) = 14.06$, $p = 0.001$). For the autism group
42
43 the relationship between threshold and mental age approached significance [VMA:
44
45 $F(1,22) = 3.75$, $p = 0.06$; NVMA: $F(1,22) = 3.8$, $p = 0.06$]. Further analysis showed
46
47 no difference between the groups at onset, relative to mental age [VMA: $F(1,53) =$
48
49 1.65 , $p = 0.20$; NVMA: $F(1,53) = 1.17$, $p = 0.29$], and no difference in rate of
50
51 development according to mental age [VMA: $F(1,53) = 0.12$, $p = 0.73$; NVMA:
52
53
54
55
56
57 $F(1,53) = 0.18$, $p = 0.68$].
58
59
60

Discussion

Several recent studies have suggested that the perception of biological motion and coherent global motion may be atypical in individuals with autism relative to MA-matched-controls (Blake *et al.*, 2003; Milne *et al.*, 2002, Pellicano *et al.*, 2005 Spencer *et al.*, 2000). However, it is not clear how universal these abnormalities are nor whether a specific type of motion perception is more commonly affected in autism. It is also not known whether impairment on one motion task necessarily implies impairments on others, suggesting a common cause or a developmental association. In this study, we tested a group of children with autism and a group of typically developing children on a range of different motion processing tasks (biological motion, motion coherence, and form-from-motion) and one static contour integration task. We took a developmental approach, testing children across the age range from 5 to 12 years and constructing developmental trajectories in order to directly compare the children with autism with a typically developing group on these specific perceptual developments. Finally, we examined whether motion sensitivity on any of the tasks correlated with severity of symptoms in autism.

In the first experiment, children saw brief displays of either biological motion or scrambled motion, using a procedure similar to Blake *et al.* (2003). We found that the ability to distinguish biological motion from scrambled motion increased linearly relative to increasing CA, verbal and non-verbal mental age in the TD children, over this age range. This finding is consistent with data reported by Friere *et al.* (2006), which also demonstrated that sensitivity to biological motion continues to develop into middle childhood in the normal case. It also suggests that the task we used is sensitive to developmental change in this chronological age range.

1
2
3 In comparison, sensitivity to biological motion remained constant relative to CA,
4 verbal and non-verbal mental age in the children with autism. There was little
5 variation in scores for the autism group with d' values being tightly clustered around
6 the mean value. This does not represent floor performance as d' values were above
7 0.05, and with a mean = 1.0 for the autism group and a mean = 2.3 for the TD group,
8 thus comparable to those found in Blake *et al.*'s (2003) study (Figure 3, page 155,
9 shows a d' of approximately 1.2 in the autism group and 2.5 in controls). In contrast
10 to Blake *et al.* (2003), we did not find that mental age was related to performance on
11 biological motion task. It is therefore unlikely that children with autism were simply
12 misunderstanding the instructions or that more general spatial skills account for their
13 performance. Finally, since there was so little variability in thresholds across the
14 autism group, it was not surprising that we found no correlation between performance
15 and symptom severity as measured by CARS. This result contrasts with Blake *et al.*
16 (2003) where symptom severity was related to sensitivity to biological motion.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In the second experiment psychophysical thresholds for motion and form tasks were
40 established for each child and this enabled a comparison of performance on different
41 motion tasks. Analysis of the typically developing children's data showed that
42 sensitivity reliably improved with age on the biological motion, motion coherence and
43 form-from-motion tasks. This is consistent with previous data suggesting that
44 perceptual sensitivity on these motion tasks improves into middle childhood (Friere *et*
45 *al.*, 2006). In the autism group by contrast, thresholds for the detection of biological
46 motion remained constant with increasing chronological age and increasing mental
47 age, mirroring the findings from Experiment 1. Again, the fact that children with
48 autism were scoring above floor level implies that their flat trajectory may reflect a
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 functional rather than a measurement limitation. The autism group also showed no
4
5 reliable relationship between motion coherence threshold and chronological age or
6
7 mental age.
8
9

10 It is worth noting that our qualitative observation (Table 2) was in line with Milne and
11
12 colleagues study (2002), showing a number of children with autism had thresholds
13
14 within the normal range performance. However, this descriptive report requires to be
15
16 validated with large populations in order to discuss the findings in terms of subgroups
17
18 of autism disorders. In contrast to the other motion tasks, mental age did reliably
19
20 predict performance on the form-from-motion task. When we compared the
21
22 trajectories, we found that the *rate* of development relative to mental age (VMA and
23
24 NVMA) in the autism group was similar to that of the typically developing children.
25
26 We also found that the threshold at onset (the level of performance at the youngest
27
28 age we tested, CA or MA) was higher in the autism group compared to typically
29
30 developing children, suggesting that the children with autism are *delayed* rather than
31
32 atypical relative to their mental age on the development of their ability to perceive
33
34 form-from-motion.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 When we examined the relative levels of performance across the three tasks we found
44
45 that performance on the biological motion task differed most from the TD trajectory,
46
47 significantly more than the motion coherence and form-from-motion task. There was
48
49 also a significant correlation between performance on motion coherence and form-
50
51 from-motion tasks, even with age and verbal mental age was taken into account;
52
53 although this finding was non-significant when non-verbal mental age was partialled
54
55 out. Importantly, performance on the biological motion task was unrelated to the other
56
57 two tasks. Individual data showing those children with autism with thresholds within
58
59
60

1
2
3 the 95% confidence interval of the TD developmental trajectory for each of the three
4
5 tasks shows how performance varied considerably on the motion coherence and form-
6
7 from-motion task, but not on the biological motion task.
8
9

10
11
12 The pattern we have observed suggests that the perception of biological motion may
13
14 be specifically affected in autism, developing atypically regardless of perceptual
15
16 abilities on other motion tasks. Could the pattern of atypical development and low
17
18 sensitivity to biological motion found in almost all the children with autism be due to
19
20 some general task constraint, for example sustained attention or maintaining task
21
22 objective? This seems unlikely since the task demands of all three motion tasks in
23
24 experiment 2 were designed to be as similar as possible. Cross tasks comparisons
25
26 revealed a significant disparity between the biological motion task and the motion
27
28 coherence or form-from-motion tasks. Furthermore, performance on the contour
29
30 integration task was normal in the autism group, despite this task also involving the
31
32 identification of a target embedded in noise.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In the third experiment there was a reliable relationship between age and performance
42
43 on the contour integration task for both the typically developing children and the
44
45 children with autism. The ability to perceive contours from Gabor patches was
46
47 developing typically in the children with autism, with a similar rate of development
48
49 and developmental onset to typically developing children. Previous findings using a
50
51 traditional cross-sectional matching design have also yielded no differences in
52
53 performance between children with autism and matched controls on contour
54
55 integration tasks (Del Viva, Iglizzi, Tancredi, & Brizzolara, 2006; Kemner *et al.*,
56
57
58
59
60 2007).

1
2
3 How consistent are our data with the current theoretical accounts of motion perception
4 impairments in autism? According to Bertone *et al.*'s (2003) complexity hypothesis, a
5
6 general abnormality in neurointegrative mechanisms in autism results in an
7
8 impairment in feature integration of complex stimuli (i.e. stimuli where integration
9
10 involves feedback mechanisms beyond the level of V1) which should include all our
11
12 motion tasks. Although not all children with autism have thresholds above what
13
14 would be expected for their chronological or mental age on the motion tasks, the
15
16 overall results are generally consistent with Bertone *et al.*'s complexity-specific
17
18 hypothesis as the thresholds for biological motion tasks - at least at older ages - and
19
20 both the motion coherence and form-from-motion conditions - across ages - were
21
22 higher in the autism group. Bertone *et al.* (2003, 2005a, b) also predict that perception
23
24 of simple (first order) stimuli (where feature integration can be achieved at the level
25
26 of V1) should be unimpaired in autism, and we indeed find support for this. The
27
28 stimuli used in our third experiment could be described as simple (first order) stimuli
29
30 as integration of Gabor elements to identify a contour can be achieved using lateral
31
32 connections in V1 (Kovacs *et al.*, 2000), and our findings demonstrate that the ability
33
34 to perceive contours using these stimuli is developing typically in autism.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Recently, Neri (2008) has suggested a two-stage processing model of biological
47
48 motion perception where the local signals are first integrated into features (individual
49
50 limbs) and then combined into whole PLD (Neri, 2008). Use of two different types of
51
52 biological motion tasks demonstrated that even this initial integration in features is
53
54 unlikely in autism. If featural processing could be used in recognition of biological
55
56 motion, then this would give an advantage to the autism group on experiment 1 but
57
58 not experiment 2 whereas we demonstrated poor performance on both these tasks. It
59
60

1
2
3 is also worth noting that in the tasks used in the current study, children were explicitly
4 directed to attend to biological motion stimuli. Differences between performance on
5 explicit tasks versus spontaneous behaviour are common in autism, and it's possible
6 that a task requiring spontaneous attention to biological motion could reveal an even
7 greater deficit in the autism group.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Finally, Reiss *et al.* (2005) and Jordan *et al.* (2002) have shown typical development
18 of biological motion perception alongside other motion perception impairments in
19 Williams Syndrome and argued that this could be explained by the tendency of these
20 individuals to be highly interested in social stimuli. The argument here would be that
21 looking more at social stimuli may stimulate the development of brain networks
22 responsible for perception of biological motion. In autism, by contrast, there is now a
23 large body of evidence showing that children with autism look less at people in early
24 development and it has been argued that a tendency to orient less to social stimuli lies
25 at the heart of the disorder (Annaz, *et al.*, submitted; Dawson *et al.*, 2002; Klin *et al.*,
26 2002; Swettenham *et al.*, 1998). What our data reveal for the first time is that
27 perception of biological motion does not develop further between 5 and 12 years of
28 age in autism, so that even during a period of development when one would normally
29 expect an increase in the behavioural experience of looking at people, the ability to
30 recognise or detect biological motion does not appear to be improve in almost all the
31 participants with autism. Although the data do suggest atypical processing of
32 biological motion with respect to age, verbal, and nonverbal function, until
33 longitudinal data are available, it is not possible to know whether the actual process of
34 development in these children is atypical.
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

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by an E.S.R.C. Grant (RES 000 23 1148) awarded to J. Swettenham, E. Milne and R. Campbell at the University College London. M. C. Thomas's contribution was supported by an M.R.C. Grant (G0300188) at Birkbeck, University of London. We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of staff and pupils at schools in London and Resources for Autism charity who participated in the research. We would like to thank three reviewers for their helpful comments on the previous drafts.

Review Copy Only

References

- Annaz, D., Milne, E., Campbell, R., Coleman, M., & Swettenham, J. (submitted).
Atypical orientation to social and non-social point light displays in autism.
- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Washington DC. American Psychiatric Association.
- Bertone, A., Mottron, L., Jelenic, P., & Faubert, J. (2003). Motion perception in autism: A complex issue. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, **15**, 218–225.
- Bertone, A., Mottron, L., & Faubert, J. (2005). Dissociating pathway- versus complexity-specific accounts of motion perception impairments in autism. - *Current Psychology of Cognition*, **23**, 75–83.
- Bertone, A., Mottron, L., Jelenic, P., & Faubert, J. (2005). Enhanced and diminished visuo-spatial information processing in autism depends on stimulus complexity. *Brain*, **128**, 2430–2441.
- Blake, R., Turner, L. M., Smoski, M. J., Pozdol, S. L., & Stone, W. L. (2003). Visual Recognition of Biological Motion is Impaired in Children with Autism. *Psychological Science*, **14**(2), 151 - 157.
- Dawson, G., Meltzoff, A. N., Osterling, J., Rinaldi, & Brown, E. (1998). Children with autism fail to orient to naturally occurring social stimuli. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, **28**, 479-485.
- Dawson, G., Munson, J., Estes, A., Osterling, J., McPartland, J., Toth, K., Carver, L., Abbot, R. (2002). Neurocognitive function and joint attention ability in young children with autism spectrum disorder. *Child Development*, **73**, 345-358.
- Del Viva, M. M., Iglizzi, R., Tancredi, R., & Brizzolara, D. (2006). Spatial and motion integration in children with autism. *Vision Research*, **46**, 1242–1252.
- Dunn, L., Dunn, L., Whetton, C. & Burley, J. (1997). *British Picture Vocabulary Scale II*, NEFR-Nelson: Windsor.
- Elliott, C. D., Smith, P., & McCulloch, K. (1997). *British Ability Scales II*. NFER-Nelson: Windsor.
- Fox, R., & McDaniel, C. (1982). The perception of biological motion by human infants. *Science*, **218**, 486-487.
- Friere, A., Lewis, T.L., Maurer, D., & Blake, R. (2006). The development of sensitivity to biological motion in noise. *Perception*, **35**, 647-657.
- Freitag, C. M., et al. (2008). Perception of biological motion in autism spectrum disorders. *Neuropsychologia*, **46**(5), 1480-94.

- 1
2
3 Grice, S. J., Spratling, M. W., Karmiloff-Smith, A., Halit, H., Csibra, G., de Haan,
4 M., et al. (2001). Disordered visual processing and oscillatory brain activity in
5 autism and Williams syndrome. *Neuroreport*, **12**(12), 2697-2700.
6
7
8
9 Happé, F., Ronald, A. & Plomin, R. (2006). Time to give up on a single explanation
10 for autism. *Nature Neuroscience*, **9**, 1218-1220.
11
12 Herrington, J. D., Baron-Cohen S., Wheelwright, S. J., Singh, K. D., Bullmore, E. T.,
13 Brammer, M., & Williams S. C. R. (2007). The role of MT+/V5 during
14 biological motion perception in Asperger Syndrome: An fMRI study.
15 *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, **1**(1), 14-27.
16
17
18
19 Hubert, B., Wicker, D. G., Moore, E., Monfardini, H., Duverger, D., Da Fonseca &
20 Deruelle, C. (2007). Brief report: Recognition of emotional and non-emotional
21 biological motion in individuals with autistic spectrum disorders. *Journal of*
22 *Autism and Developmental Disorders*, **37**, 1386–1392.
23
24
25
26 Jarrold, C., Baddeley, A. D., & Phillips, C. (2007). Long-term memory for verbal and
27 visual information in Down syndrome and Williams syndrome: Performance
28 on the doors and people test. *Cortex*, **43**, 233-247.
29
30
31
32 Johansson, G. (1973). Visual perception of biological motion and a model for its
33 analysis. *Perception & Psychophysics*, **14**, 201-212.
34
35
36 Jordan, H., Reiss, J. E., Hoffman, J., & Landau, B. (2002). Intact perception of
37 biological motion in the face of profound spatial deficits: Williams Syndrome.
38 *Psychological Science*, **13**(2), 162-166.
39
40
41
42 Kemner, C., Lamme, V. A. F., Kovacs, I., van Engeland, H. (2007). Integrity of
43 lateral and feedbackward connections in visual processing in children with
44 pervasive developmental disorder. *Neuropsychologia*, **45**, 1293–1298.
45
46
47
48 Klin, A., Jones, W., Schultz, R., Volkmar, F., & Cohen, D. (2002). Visual fixation
49 patterns during viewing of naturalistic social situations as predictive of social
50 competence in individuals with autism. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, **159**,
51 809-816.
52
53
54
55 Kovacs, I., & Julesz, B. (1993). A closed curve is much more than an incomplete one:
56 Effect of closure in figure-ground segmentation. *Proceedings of the National*
57 *Academy of Sciences*, **90**, 7495–7497.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 Kovacs, U., Polat, A. M., Norcia, P., Pennefather, M., & Chandna, A. (2000). A new
4 test of contour integration deficits in patients with a history of disrupted
5 binocular experience during visual development. *Vision Research*, **40**, 1775–
6 1783.
7
8
9
10 Macmillan, N. A., & Creelman, C. D. (1991). *Detection theory: A user's guide*. New
11 York: Cambridge University Press.
12
13 Milne, E., Swettenham, J., Hansen, P., Campbell, R., Jeffries, H., & Plaisted, K.
14 (2002). High motion coherence thresholds in children with autism. *Journal of*
15 *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, **43**, 255 - 263.
16
17
18 Milne, E., Swettenham, J., & Campbell, R. (2005). Motion perception and autistic
19 spectrum disorder: A review. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive-Current*
20 *Psychology of Cognition*, **23**, 3–33.
21
22
23 Moore, D. G., Hobson, R. P., & Lee, A. (1997). Components of person perception: an
24 investigation with autistic, non-autistic retarded and typically developing
25 children and adolescents. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, **15**,
26 401-423.
27
28
29
30 Neri, P. (in press). Wholes and subparts in visual processing of human agency.
31 *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
32
33
34 Newsome, W. T., & Paré, E. B. (1988). A selective impairment of motion perception
35 following lesions of the middle temporal visual area (MT). *Journal of*
36 *Neuroscience*, **8**, 2201-2211.
37
38
39
40 Parron, C. et al. (2008). Recognition of biological motion in children with autistic
41 spectrum disorders. *Autism*, **12**(3), pp. 261-274.
42
43
44 Pavlova, M., Krageloh-Mann, I., Sokolov, A., & Birbaumer. (2001). Recognition of
45 point-light biological motion displays by young children. *Perception*, **30**, 925-
46 933.
47
48
49
50 Pellicano, E., Gibson, L., Maybery, M., Durkin, K., & Badcock, D. R. (2005).
51 Abnormal global processing along the dorsal visual pathway in autism: A
52 possible mechanism for weak visuospatial coherence? *Neuropsychologia*, **43**,
53 1044–1053.
54
55
56
57 Plaisted, K., & Davies, G. (2005). Examining magnocellular processing in autism.
58 *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive-Current Psychology of Cognition*, **23**, 172-
59 179.
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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
- Reiss, A. L., Hoffman, J. E., & Landau, B. (2005). Motion processing specialization in Williams syndrome. *Vision Research*, **45**, 3379–3390.
- Schopler, E., Reichler, R. & Renner, B. R. (1986). *The Childhood Autism Scale (CARS) for diagnostic screening and classification of autism*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Shiple, T.F. & Brumberg, J.S. (2003). Markerless motion-capture for point-light displays. Technical Report, Temple University Vision Laboratory, Philadelphia, PA.
- Spencer J. V. & O'Brien J. M. D. (2006). Visual Form Processing Deficits in Autism. *Perception*, **35**(8), 1047-1055.
- Spencer, J., O'Brien, J. M. D., Riggs, K., Braddick, O. J., Atkinson, J., & Wattam-Bell, J. (2000). Dorsal Stream Deficit in Autism. *NeuroReport*, **11**, 2765-2767.
- Thomas, M. S. C., Annaz, D., Ansari, D., Serif, G., Jarrold, C., & Karmiloff-Smith, A. (2009). Using developmental trajectories to understand developmental disorders. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, **52**, 336-358.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Examples of stimuli A) biological motion perception task; B) biological motion detection task; C) motion coherence, and D) form-from-motion. For illustration purposes, signal elements, in examples B-D, are indicated in red while noise elements are coloured white. All elements appeared white signals on a black background and E) the 12-element Gabor defined contours embedded in backgrounds of different noise density with a ratio of background element spacing to contour element spacing (D) of 0.9.

Figure 2. Developmental trajectories for the autism and control group (expressed in d' values) on recognition of biological motion PLD task plotted according to: A) chronological age of the participants (CA in months); B) BPVS test age equivalent (age in months) and (C) Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in months). R^2 values indicate the proportion of variance explained by each trajectory.

Figure 3. Developmental trajectories for the autism and control group (expressed in *threshold* values) on the identification of biological motion PLD task plotted according to: A) chronological age of the participants (CA in months); B) BPVS test age equivalent (age in months) and (C) Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in months). R^2 values indicate the proportion of variance explained by each trajectory.

Figure 4. Developmental trajectories for the autism and control group (expressed in *threshold* values) on the motion coherence PLD task plotted according to: A) chronological age of the participants (CA in months); B) BPVS test age equivalent

1
2
3
4 (age in months) and (C) Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in
5
6 months). R^2 values indicate the proportion of variance explained by each trajectory.
7
8
9


10 Figure 5. Developmental trajectories for the autism and control group (expressed in
11 *threshold* values) on the form-from-motion PLD task plotted according to: A)
12
13 chronological age of the participants (CA in months); B) BPVS test age equivalent
14
15 (age in months) and (C) Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in
16
17 months). R^2 values indicate the proportion of variance explained by each trajectory.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Figure 6. Cross-task performance for the autism group expressed in z-scores plotted
25
26 according to: A) chronological age of the participants; B) BPVS test age equivalent
27
28 (age in months) and Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in months).
29
30
31
32


33 Figure 7. Gabor task thresholds. Developmental trajectories for the autism and control
34
35 group (expressed in D values) plotted according to: A) chronological age of the
36
37 participants (CA in months); B) BPVS test age equivalent (age in months) and (C)
38
39 Pattern Construction test age equivalent scores (age in months). R^2 values indicate the
40
41 proportion of variance explained by each trajectory.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1


A)




B)



C)




D)



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
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


E)




Review Copy Only

Figure 2

A)



B)



C)






Figure 3

A)



B)



C)






Figure 4

A)



B)



C)






Figure 5

A)



B)



C)





Figure 6

A)



B)






Figure 7

A)



B)



C)




Table captions

Table 1. Test results per group. TD = typically developing, ASD = Autism group, CA = chronological age, BPVS = British Picture Vocabulary Scale (Dunn, et al., 1996), PC = pattern construction subtest of the British Abilities Scale II (Elliot, et al., 1987), CARS = Childhood Autism Rating Scale (Schopler et al., 1997).

Table 2. Individual patterns of performance on each of the motion tasks for children in the autism group. Thresholds within the normal trajectory (95 confidence intervals) are depicted with + symbol and ↑ when performance was above normal trajectory (95 confidence intervals).

Table 1.

<i>Group (sample size)</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>CA (yrs: months)</i>	<i>BPVS-VMA (age equivalent yrs:months)</i>	<i>PC - NVMA (age equivalent yrs:months)</i>	<i>CARS</i>
TD (n=34)	Mean	8:3	8:5	8:3	---
	S.D.	2:3	2:3	2:1	---
	Range	4:6 – 12:3	4:11 – 13:0	5:7 – 13:9	---
ASD (n=23)	Mean	8:10	7:2 *	8:11	36
	S.D.	1:10	1:8	3:1	4.7
	Range	5:0 – 12:2	4:4 – 10:1	4:10 – 15:3	30