

Angelo Majorana
 F. 86 Ratto Canistro
 Curator Jacon

Memorizing
 Special card house



62 x 62
 42
 4
 12
 4
 12

Noxe

Rumian

Gianni 17-79
 Venuti 17-79

On far
 mercoledì pon.
 giovedì pon. Zia
 venerdì pon.
 venerdì notte

Liscatura speciale per tutte le scritture

The use of experienced subjects

I soggetti esperti sanno che bisogna assumere un atteggiamento neutrale e descrivere quello che si vede. I soggetti ingenui spesso non sono affatto ingenui, ma li formano una loro teoria e rispondono secondo quella, cioè non descrivono, ma interpretano.
Nel nostro caso si trattava di vedere se certi strani risultati ottenuti da Tuck con soggetti ingenui apparivano anche con soggetti esperti. Però, a parte la trasparenza di certi casi, i risultati ottenuti con soggetti esperti e i risultati ottenuti con soggetti ingenui coincidono.

Figural conditions primary

Se $d = t'$ e $t = t'$ sono le condizioni necessarie perché una situazione display possa essere riprodotta con l'epinatista.

$d \neq d'$ e $t \neq t'$ non si fanno riprodurre con l'epinatista e descrivono una situazione di trasparenza non equilibrata.

Se per ipotesi un gruppo di soggetti descrive come equilibrata una situazione di trasparenza definita nel caso 2) allora una condizione è contraddittoria.

Per arrivare a queste contraddizioni si deve

cross would require a special paper

1. Right. I'll continue the theoretical part adding the deduction of the formula of transparency using the memories of perceived colors. There is an addition to the theoretical part where the use of lightness instead of reflectances is considered.

2. There is no difference between Beebe's formula and my own. I only maintained that until the formula had been formally deduced (what I did) the use of the formula was arbitrary. As for Masin's formula, it is not ~~3. I never sustained that the role empirical formula~~ Willems is a theoretically deduced, and I ~~that~~ consider suitable to ~~use~~ not to mix the two different sources of information. However, discussing Masin's formula and comparing it to ~~the~~

3. I never sustained that the role of figural conditions in transparency is minimal. I only asserted against Beebe ^{that figural conditions are not} ~~that it was~~ primary; I denied that figural information is the starting point of the perception of transparency.

However ~~this~~ I am accepting your observation about the necessity of using, in this case, naive subjects.

We'll do the necessary experiment. Only, we'll be able to do the experiment only when the University is open: during the holidays we do not are not able to find the necessary subjects.

~~a) I don't understand the purpose of your observations about~~

~~a)~~ We maintain that figural condition ~~a~~ can be
a) favourable to transparency (in which case, if chromatic conditions admit transparency, the perception of transparency is evident) b) neutral (in which ~~of~~ case, if chromatic conditions admit transparency, transparency can be perceived) c) excluding transparency (in which case transparency is never perceived)

conclude the 2: ratios of transference
equilibrium as visible perception a given
answer corresponding at $2^* = \frac{10-2}{2}$
 $2^* = 4$

It is clear that balanced transference - when
referred to physical and ordinal phenomena of frequency
is (a, p, q, d, s, t) has to be referred to the case of
the epistates $(a$ and t meaningful for use with the epistates
types. However

B. I studied, as Kanizsa did, the figural conditions of transparency and always asserted that transparency

cannot be perceived when figural conditions were against it. In a recent paper I studied the figural conditions that are against transparency and make it impossible to perceive it. Till now necessary conditions of transparency have been studied and there are two sort of them, chromatic and spatio-figural. What has been proved is that when a ^{necessary} figural condition fails, transparency cannot be perceived, and the same happens when chromatic conditions are against it. However, if the subject has an analytical attitude, optimal figural and chromatic conditions are not sufficient for ~~the~~ perceiving transparency.

Nota a p. 13

(see X)

Nota 7

Comunque la sottolineo che qui sono state usate condizioni figurali neutrali. Infatti ~~come per le condizioni cromatiche~~ ~~anche~~ ~~da~~ ~~nostra~~ ~~studie~~ (Miller) it results that there are ~~figural~~ ^{necessary} conditions which ~~it~~ ^{has to be stressed that we} ~~never~~ ^{intended to minimize}

~~We never denied~~ The importance of figural conditions. ~~Here we used neutral figural conditions, but there are several~~ ^{figural} ~~necessary~~ conditions (Miller 1975, 1985). Which, if absent, one of the necessary ^{figural} conditions is absent, perception of transparency is impossible also if chromatic conditions are favourable.

Our ~~main~~ intention was only to show that figural cues were not ~~necessary~~ in order to perceive transparency.

However, in this case it would have been better to use ~~also~~ ^{a group of} naive subjects; ~~but the difference is not of~~

✓ crucial because also naive subjects have to be pre-trained when used for transparency experiments, in order to teach them the ~~difficult~~ task.

see Beck, p. 409

but probably the difference with the above results would not be crucial.

(1) Beck's Note p 10 (note 5)

The above ^{explanations} justification is, at our opinion, ~~right~~ ^{only} sufficient to justify the use of expert subjects in ~~this~~ ^{our} research. But there are other reasons ~~with~~ ^{those} speaking for the use of expert subjects in ~~every~~ ^{those} experiments in ~~about~~ perception. "Naive" subjects are by no means naive because, as they are asked to give a phenomenological description, they have ~~or~~ ^{construct} their own opinion about the phenomenon, ^{which is studied} and, not being sufficiently trained, they ~~interpret~~ ^{interpret} instead of describing. ~~get to the completion of regular testing~~

Phenomenological description is a difficult task and only trained subjects are able to resist to ~~resist~~ ^{temptation} to ~~interpret~~ ^{say} what they think instead of saying what they see, or in general perceive.

Value: note a p. 10 x x

XX 5



x where phenomenological description is ~~basic~~ requested

However the concept of balanced transparency, clearly
defined when referred to physical measures, ^(reflectances) could be
interpreted differently if referred to perceptual measures,
that is to estimations of lightness.

Agreement with a ref 9

However the concept of balanced transparency could be referred
not to physical measures (reflectances) but to perceptual measures,
that is to estimations of subjects lightness.
The point to consider is,

Page 9

Transparency

However the concept of balanced transparency could be referred not to physical measures (reflectances) but perceptual measures, that is estimations of light intensities.

However not all the difficulties have been overcome by the preceding considerations, because it is not uncommon to find cases of transparency, perceptually balanced which in the equations (3) and (4) failed to result among the limits 0 and 1. [It is clear that in these cases the notion of balanced transparency has to be ~~we cannot be content with the notion of balanced transparency but it has to be~~ we have to go back to the conditions suggesting this concept. And these are $a=d'$ and $t=t'$, namely the conditions allowing the reproduction of the case with the episcotister.]

In fact, according to the original theory there are not cases of balanced transparency. But this does not solve the problem of the existence of cases where transparency is perceptually balanced.

→ We have to remind that the theory is based on physical measures: a, b, p, q, t are reflectances and d is the measure of transparency. But there are also the corresponding perceptual measures, which can be obtained by ~~estimating~~ ^{estimating} light intensities instead of measuring reflectances. The impression of balanced transparency could be referred, as a perceptual impression, to the above perceptual estimations.

The first ^{one who} ~~to~~ considered the possibility of calculating perceptual transparency starting from the perceptual estimations instead of reflectances ^{was Beck.} The next step should have been the ~~deduction~~ ^{deduction} of a new theory. (But) Beck simply used the equations (3) ~~deduced with~~ ^{deduced with} ~~form~~ which had been deduced for physical measures, with perceptual measures. (!) This was an arbitrary procedure, but the result was an excellent prediction of perceived transparency. The reason of this success was explained when the senior author of this paper has been able to deduce the equations for calculating the measure of perceived transparency: the equations were formally identical to the equations for physical measures (1-9) / (a-9) for partial transparency.

transparency, so Beck's happy intuition was confirmed by the Theory.

However the Theory ~~not~~ not only predicts the measure of partial transparency (the case of Beck's prediction) but also complete & balanced transparency. And here our results seem to differ ^{quite different} ~~quite different~~ from Beck's and also (see Beck and al p. 420-421 and, the present paper, Discussion, ~~for discussion point~~ ^{point is} discussion in the present paper.

Our conclusion is that, notwithstanding the formal equality ^{of the} equations, ~~we have to face~~ ^{there are} two different theories, one valid when ~~we~~ we are working with reflectances, and another when we are working with estimations of lightness.

I of the regions of the figure

(^o) giving however theoretical justifications

As already said in the introductory part of this paper, as the equations for predicting ^{of} transparency starting from lightness estimations ~~instead~~ appeared to be formally equal to the d and t equations, the procedure used by Beck et al. in Exp. 3 appears to be perfectly acceptable. Of course the next step to be made ~~by~~ was to apply the formulas of complete balance ^{for} transparency ^{starting with} lightness estimations instead of reflectances. This step has been done independently by Beck and ~~et~~ by DaPos, Casdoun and Zinno.

WITH

$$\begin{aligned}
 p &= da + (1-a)b \\
 &= da + b - ab \\
 p - b &= a(a - b)
 \end{aligned}$$

but judging

mette sul sporcato.
Basta però il problema insoluto di
eventual-casi di trasparenza perettiva
mente equilibrata. - a b g b r o n o

ment e qualche altro.
Noi sappiamo però che a 69 btermo
sull'ellittico non esiste più
e cioè pure una minima fisica e, cioè
la minima rimanente. E ritorna però
le corrispondenti in altre persone e
quindi l'impressione di trasparenze
e quella ~~corrispondente~~ ~~fattore~~ di
ben inferiore, in quanto impressione, a
questi tipi rimasti.

Il problema delle miscele percettive
è stato molto importante da Thue, che
ha pensato di poter arrivare alle
stesse equazioni risolte per le miscele fisiche.

cioè delle 2 felleone, nel caso speciale
della trasparenza parziale. L'uso arbi-
trario delle misure percettive al posto
delle misure fisiche è stato confer-
mato dai fatti. Il minor dubbio di
questi articoli ha allora ridotto
formalmente le equazioni della
trasparenza con misure percettive
ottenendo delle equazioni forma-
lmente uguali alle equazioni
usate per le misure fisiche, confer-
mando così la felice intuizione di
Beck.

^{per passare}
Beck and al. never explained
if they were ~~escaping~~ using the
physical formulas (3) and (4) as the
perceptual ones, with α^* and t^* , ~~that~~
~~is~~ which are only apparently
equal