# Variability and face learning: A novel controlled stimuli set

# LEGRAND Raphaël\*<sup>a, b</sup>, LI Wenrui\*<sup>a</sup>, **DEVUE Christel**<sup>a</sup>

Psychology and Neuroscience of Cognition, University of Liège, Belgium <sup>b</sup> GIGA-CRC Human Imaging, University of Liège, Belgium \* Contributed equally to the work

# BACKGROUND

- "Within-person variability" is believed to promote the development of robust facial representations<sup>1</sup>.
- Recent studies distinguish between appearance variability (changes in facial • features) and **display** variability (changes in viewing conditions)<sup>3,4,6</sup>.
  - $\rightarrow$  Appearance variability is believed to affect the familiarization process, yielding different representations for "stable" versus "variable" faces<sup>4,6</sup>.
  - $\rightarrow$  However, most experimental materials do not distinguish between these two types of variability<sup>6,7</sup>.
- → We developed the first experimental database with a clear separation between appearance and display variability and present the first experiment to use it.



variability can be independently manipulated.

SSVV

Group 1

Each actress is filmed and photographed in **28 unique** appearance conditions

### **Actress pairing**

12 Caucasian actresses recruited. **Pretest**: Pairwise similarity and individual distinctiveness of internal features rated by 22 external judges on 7-point Likert scales. **Grouping**: <u>4 pairs</u> were formed, with equivalent distinctiveness and similarity. **Analysis:** t-tests confirmed no significant differences between pairs.

## Wig grouping

25 synthetic wigs collected. **Pretest**: Pairwise similarity and individual distinctiveness rated by 24 external judges on 7-point Likert scales. **Grouping**: <u>4 groups of 6 wigs</u>, with equivalent distinctiveness and similarity. **Analysis:** t-tests confirmed no significant differences between groups.



Over repeated exposure, a face can be presented with appearance and/or display variations.







Stimuli with cropped internal features were constructed for recognition tasks.



display variability





#### **Participants**

187 healthy participants recruited online (98<sub>F</sub>, 85<sub>M</sub>, 4<sub>O</sub>;  $M_{age} = 35.5$ ,  $SD_{age} = 8.57$ ).

 $\rightarrow$  Divided into four exposure groups.

#### **Results – Effect of exposure**

Sensitivity significantly improved with exposure ( $F_{(3, 183)} = 7.891$ , p < .001,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.115$ ). → Group 1 differed from groups 2, 3 and 4 (group 1 vs 4 :  $t_{(183)} = 4.021$ , p < 0.001, d = 0.83).

conditions and photographed in 9 display conditions

#### **Results – Effect of appearance**

Stable faces were recognized better than variable faces ( $F_{(1, 183)} = 13.942$ , p < .001,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.071$ ).

No significant interaction was observed.





2 variable (display + appearance variations)

+ Old/new recognition task using cropped images of the 8 actresses: 3 x 24 trials.

## DISCUSSION

## PERSPECTIVES

#### Procedure

These preliminary results demonstrate that our material supports face learning, likely benefiting from various facilitators embedded within the paradigm. However, refinements are needed to capture the finer details of the learning process.

Unexpectedly (though not unprecedented<sup>4,5</sup>), stable faces were better recognized across all exposure levels. While these results do not replicate the modulating effect of appearance variability<sup>4</sup>, they challenge current leading theories of face learning<sup>2</sup>.

Our findings suggest that a more nuanced framework is needed to explain the unexpected effects of variability.

- $\rightarrow$  Further investigations to determine the parameters under which the effect of within-person variability is expressed.
- $\rightarrow$  Test alterations to the paradigm's parameters to determine the conditions under which differentiation of representations based on appearance emerges.
- $\rightarrow$  Increase statistical power by adopting a within-subject design to examine intermediary steps of the familiarization process.

This experimental material addresses a gap in the current literature and offers

insights that unconstrained ecological stimuli appear to overlook.



#### <sup>1</sup> Bindemann, M., & Hole, G. J. (2020). Understanding face identification through within-person variability in appearance: Introduction to a virtual issue. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 73(12), NP1-NP8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021820959068 <sup>2</sup> Burton, M. A. (2013). Why has research in face recognition progressed so slowly? The importance of variability. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 66(8), 1467 1485. <sup>3</sup> Devue, C., Wride, A., & Grimshaw, G. M. (2019). New insights on real-world human face recognition. Journal of Experimental Psychology. General, 148(6), 994-1007. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000493

<sup>4</sup> Devue, C., & de Sena, S. (2023). The impact of stability in appearance on the development of facial representations. Cognition, 239, 105569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105569 <sup>5</sup> Moore, K. N., Nesmith, B. L., Zwemer, D. U., & Yu, C. (2024). Search efforts and face recognition: The role of expectations of encounter and within-person variability in prospective person memory. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 9(63). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-024-00590

<sup>6</sup> Reedy, M., & Devue, C. (2019). New perspective on face learning: Stability modulates resolution of facial representations in the optimal observer. [Manuscript in preparation]. <u>https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/6s8</u> <sup>7</sup> Ritchie, K. L., & Burton, A. M. (2017). Learning faces from variability. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 70(5), 897-905. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2015.1136656

Study preregistration: osf.io/v3zax



**Psychology & Neuroscience of Cognition**