
Stimulus specific variability in color working memory with delayed estimation

Gi-Yeul Bae*, Maria Olkkonen[#], Sarah R. Allred[%], Colin Wilson[^], & Jonathan I. Flombaum*

**Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, Johns Hopkins University*

[#]Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania

[%]Department of Psychology, Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey

[^]Department of Cognitive Science, Johns Hopkins University

Address for correspondence:

Gi-Yeul Bae or Jonathan Flombaum

Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences

Johns Hopkins University

Ames Hall / 3400 N. Charles Street

Baltimore, MD 21218

Running Head: Stimulus specific variability in color working memory

Key words: visual working memory, delayed estimation, color

Word count: 9,942; Abstract (241); 13 Figures.

Draft: In Press. *JoV*. 2.28.14

Abstract

Working memory for color has been the central focus in an ongoing debate concerning the structure and limits of visual working memory. Within this area, the delayed estimation task has played a key role. An implicit assumption in color working memory research generally, and delayed estimation in particular, is that the fidelity of memory does not depend on color value (and, relatedly, that experimental colors have been sampled homogeneously with respect to discriminability). This assumption is reflected in the common practice of collapsing across trials with different target colors when estimating memory precision and other model parameters. Here we investigated whether or not this assumption is secure. To do so, we conducted delayed estimation experiments following standard practice with a memory load of one. We discovered that different target colors evoked response distributions that differed widely in dispersion, and that these stimulus-specific response properties were correlated across observers. Subsequent experiments demonstrated that stimulus-specific responses persist under higher memory loads, and that at least part of the specificity arises in perception and is eventually propagated to working memory. Post-hoc stimulus measurement revealed that rendered stimuli differed from nominal stimuli in both chromaticity and luminance. We discuss the implications of these deviations for both our results and those from other working memory studies.

Introduction

Color working memory has been the central focus in an ongoing and vigorous debate concerning the structure and limits of visual working memory. Initially, these limits were hypothesized to be discrete in nature, restricting the individual number of objects a person could store at once (Cowan, 2001; Luck & Vogel, 1997). More recently, the focus of much research has shifted to the quality of visual working memory—the precision with which an observer can store and report the specific value of an object feature. This shift in focus emerged to a large extent with the introduction of the delayed estimation paradigm (Wilken & Ma, 2004; Zhang & Luck, 2008). In this paradigm, an observer attempts to store the features of some number of objects, and is then asked to identify the feature value of a probed item on a continuous scale. Because of the intuitive nature of continuous differences between colors, color working memory has enjoyed the lion’s share of research with this paradigm (Figure 1; e.g., Anderson & Awh, 2012; Bays, Catalao, & Husain, 2009; Bays, Wu, & Husain, 2011; Emrich & Ferber, 2011; Fougny & Alvarez, 2011; Fougny, Asplund, & Marois, 2010; Fougny, Suchow, & Alvarez, 2012; Gold et al., 2010; van den Berg, Shin, Chou, George, & Ma, 2012; Wilken & Ma, 2004; Zhang & Luck, 2011; 2009; 2008). While the debate concerning the limits of color working memory continues, there appears to be wide-ranging consensus that the working memory representation of color is noisy or probabilistic—that is, varying in fidelity—and that some of this variability is imposed by the structure of visual working memory.

[Figure 1]

Figure 1. Schematic display of the delayed estimation procedure (with a memory load of one). Note that the display background, which is shown as white here, was a neutral gray in the experiments reported below, and its color has varied in the published literature.

An implicit assumption underlying this research has been that perceptual and memory fidelity are independent of particular stimulus values. This assumption is most clear in the method by which delayed-estimation responses have been modeled. Typically, a mixture model is used to characterize responses as arising either from a noisy representation of a probed item or from unbiased guessing (possibly with a third component reflecting misbinding/misremembering of color position, e.g. Bays et al. 2009; alternative models remove the guessing component altogether and sometimes include other sources of variability such as motor imprecision, e.g., van den Berg et al., 2012). Because a single set of model parameters is estimated from all responses (for a given memory load), the implication is that all color values are represented with the same fidelity on average (e.g., Bays et al, 2009; Zhang & Luck, 2008; van den Berg et al., 2012).

The assumption of value-independent fidelity is predicated on a more practical assumption: namely, that any value-*dependent* effects have been controlled for by sampling stimuli from a perceptually homogeneous set of colors. In fact, this assumption motivates the use of color and delayed estimation in many studies because,

as Zhang & Luck (2011) put it, in these experiments “precision can be unambiguously operationalized (p. 1434)”. In particular, researchers have most often used the CIELAB color space to sample values around a center point (defined by L^* , a^* , b^* values) with a fixed radius. This choice is presumably motivated by the assumption that the CIELAB space is perceptually uniform, with equal physical distances in the space corresponding to equal perceptual distances. However, there are at least three general reasons to doubt the validity of this assumption.

First, the nature of color perception could introduce stimulus-specific effects. Although CIELAB—the most commonly used space in studies of delayed estimation—was developed to be a perceptually uniform color space, this is known to be only an approximation (e.g., Brainard, 2003; Fairchild, 1998; Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982). Furthermore, there are substantial individual differences in color perception between observers judged to be color-normal by standard assessment techniques (Webster, Miyahara, Malkoc, & Raker, 2000a, 2000b). Because two colors judged as equally discriminable by one color normal observer may not be judged so by another observer, no physically defined color space can be perceptually uniform across all observers. It is for this reason that studies seeking to link discrimination and color appearance measure discrimination thresholds directly rather than inferring them from standard color spaces (e.g., Bachy, Dias, Alleysson, & Bonnardel, 2012; Danilova & Mollon, 2012; Witzel & Gegenfurtner, 2013). Importantly, these studies have identified different JNDs (Just Noticeable Differences) for different colors.

Second, the technical difficulty of rendering colors accurately could introduce stimulus-specific effects. This is because stimuli on emissive displays are specified in units that are device specific (such as RGB values), rather than in physical units (such as energy per wavelength). Because there is considerable variation in the hardware and software that govern stimulus display, two monitors requesting identical RGB values will likely produce different color signals, and thus different CIELAB coordinates. Fortunately, there are standard calibration techniques that enable the reliable production of stimuli specified in a variety of color spaces. However, such calibration techniques have not been widely employed in the working memory literature. Some working memory studies report engaging in aspects of display calibration such as gamma correction (Zhang & Luck, 2008), but we were unable to find a single working memory paper that described utilizing the full calibration procedure that is standard in the literature on color perception (Allen, Beilock, & Shevell, 2012; Olkkonen & Allred, 2014; Witzel & Gegenfurtner, 2013; Xiao, Hurst, McIntyre, & Brainard, 2012).

Third, memory itself could introduce stimulus-specific variability in precision. There is a literature on color memory that is largely distinct from the working memory literature. In this literature, it has been reported that memory for colors is shifted in systematic yet complex ways relative to presented colors (e.g., Collins, 1931; Burnham & Clark, 1954; 1955; Nilsson & Nelson, 1981; Prinzmetal, Amiri, Allen, & Edwards, 1988; Jin & Shevell, 1996; Ling & Hurlbert, 2008; Nemes, Parry, Whitaker, & McKeefry, 2012).

For these reasons, we investigated whether memory fidelity for color is independent of stimulus value

in delayed estimation. To do so, we employed two typical versions of the delayed estimation task and two commonly used color spaces for stimulus sampling, using procedures standard in the working memory literature (van den Berg et al. 2012; Wilken & Ma, 2004; Zhang & Luck, 2008). In Experiment 1, contrary to the implicit assumption in color working memory research, we found that variability in memory was systematically dependent on color. In Experiments 2-4, we investigated the extent to which this dependence on stimulus generalized to perception and other memory loads. Post-hoc measurements of color stimuli revealed significant deviations between intended and displayed stimuli. We explore the causes and likely effects of these deviations and discuss the reasons why such deviations are likely endemic in delayed estimation studies using color as the stimulus of interest.

Experiment 1: Color-specific variability with a memory load of one

The goal of this experiment was to determine empirically whether response variability in a standard delayed-estimation task is stimulus-dependent. Specifically, we sought to estimate response variability within and across observers for each of 180 colors in two of the sets of color samples typically utilized in delayed estimation experiments. We did so in a straightforward fashion: Using a minimal memory load of one, we collected measurements for all target colors from each observer. One group of observers each performed the experiment with colors nominally defined in CIELAB space and HSV space.

Method

Observers. In exchange for course credit, three Johns Hopkins University undergraduates participated in the experiment with stimuli constructed with the CIELAB color space. A different group of three observers participated with stimuli constructed with the HSV color space. All observers had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity and reported no known deficits in color perception. The Johns Hopkins University IRB approved the protocol for this experiment.

Apparatus. The experiment took place in a dark, sound-attenuated room. There was no light source except for a computer monitor. All stimuli were presented on a CRT monitor at a viewing distance of 60 cm such that the display subtended approximately 28.64° by 19.09° of visual angle.

Stimuli and Procedure. For the CIELAB stimuli we followed the methods of Zhang and Luck (2008) and others. We specified a nominal set of 180 evenly spaced colors from CIELAB color space centered on $L^*=70$, $a^*=20$, $b^*=38$, and with a radius of 60 (Anderson & Awh, 2012; Gold et al., 2009; Zhang & Luck, 2009; Zhang & Luck, 2011). These CIELAB coordinates were then converted into 180 RGB values via a color conversion algorithm (Image processing toolbox, Matlab). To do so, we used the ICC standard white point, with an xyY value of [0.35, 0.36, 1] (i.e., D50; Y value is normalized). For the HSV wheel, 180 equally spaced hues were

sampled with the intensities of saturation and value fixed at 80%.

Each trial began with a white fixation cross ($0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$) displayed in the center of a gray screen. After 500 ms, a colored square ($2^\circ \times 2^\circ$) appeared at one of 8 possible positions (4.5° from fixation). The square's color was one of the 180 stimuli. The square remained present for 500 ms, and observers were instructed to commit the color of the square to memory. After a 900 ms blank delay, a test display appeared with a black frame occupying the location of the square. A color wheel was drawn (8.2° radius and 2° thick) surrounding the space in which memory objects could appear. The color wheel consisted of all 180 stimuli, arranged so that each stimulus occupied 2° . The wheel was randomly rotated on each trial to avoid spatial encoding of the stimulus value. Observers were asked to click the target color on the color wheel as precisely as possible. After the observer's response, a black line superimposed on the wheel indicated the clicked position. Each observer completed 5 blocks of 360 trials, totaling 1800 trials. Within a block, each of the 180 colors values appeared twice in an order that was randomized by observer, producing 10 total measurements per color for each observer.

Stimulus measurement: Working memory studies generally use the same procedures described above: a stimulus set is specified in CIELAB, and device-specific RGB values are determined using an industry standard white point. However, because the hardware and software of laboratory displays vary, there may be substantial differences between intended and presented colors. Color perception research standardly employs monitor calibration to ensure that device-specific commands render stimuli that match the physical characteristics of the requested stimuli (for a discussion of display calibration, see Brainard, Pelli, & Robson, 2002). We did not perform monitor calibration in our study, nor are such calibration practices common in the working memory literature.

To assess the effects of incomplete calibration and color rendering, we made post-hoc measurements of our stimuli using a PR-655 spectro-radiometer. The measurements were converted to CIE XYZ and CIELAB spaces using colorimetry routines in Psychophysics Toolbox (Brainard, 1997). The measured xyY values of our 180 stimuli (hereafter referred to as *rendered* stimuli) are reported in Appendix A, as are the intended (hereafter *nominal*) CIELAB values. In addition, we report the CIELAB values of the 180 stimuli when the background of the monitor during the experiment is used as the white point in the conversion between xyY coordinates and CIELAB coordinates. We do so because it is standard practice in color perception studies to take the color of the monitor background to be the white point in color conversions (see, for example, Brainard, 1998; Giesel & Gegenfurtner, 2010; Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982).

[Figure 2]

Figure 2. Comparison between intended and measured color values. a. Distortions in a^* and b^* dimensions. Black circle represents a^* and b^* coordinates for intended color values. Colored outline represents measured color values. Gray dot in the middle represents the background color. Note that rendered colors were not circularly arranged, and were not equally distant from the background. b. Distortions in L^* value. Plotted here is

a^* vs L^* for measured (colored shape) colors. Rendered colors had different L^* values, violating the isoluminance assumption. c. Measured xy values (colored shape) and nominal xy values (black shape). Nominal xy values were calculated from nominal CIELAB values using the measured background xyY of the monitor as the white-point in the conversion. The triangle in the figure represents the gamut of the monitor used in the study. Colors outside the triangle cannot be rendered correctly on the monitor, and some of the nominal colors lay outside this gamut. d. Measured color values in xyY dimensions. Again, rendered colors were not isoluminant. Note: Although rendered colors deviated from nominal colors, the post-hoc radiometer measurements demonstrate that the xy coordinates of all rendered stimuli were measurably different from each other.

As can be seen in Figure 2, there were large deviations between nominal and rendered stimuli. Several features are of note. First, rendered stimuli were not circularly arranged in terms of their a^* and b^* coordinates in CIELAB space (Figure 2a). This can occur for several reasons, but one common reason is that a particular device cannot physically display a requested value. In Figure 2c, for example, we plot the gamut of the monitor on the xy plane of the CIE xyY space as determined by post-hoc measurements with the radiometer. Any point outside the solid triangle cannot be produced by the monitor; clearly, some of the nominal colors fell outside this gamut. These colors were automatically mapped to others that do lie within the gamut, resulting in a mismatch between nominal and rendered colors and luminances. The mismatch between requested and actual luminance is evident in Figure 2b, which shows the L^* values of rendered colors. The sum of these effects can be seen by plotting rendered colors in xyY space (Figure 2d). The rendered values varied systematically in both luminance (Y value) and chromaticity (x and y values).

Because the rendered values, measured post-hoc, deviated so substantially from nominal values, and because standard analysis techniques depend heavily on the assumption that stimuli vary only in hue (that is, that they are on a circle of constant L^* in CIELAB space), we were faced with a difficult decision about how to report and interpret our data. On the one hand, our stimuli clearly did not differ from each other only in hue (and thus, angular distance). However, the entire analysis process as detailed below, and in the color working memory literature generally, rests on the assumption that stimuli can be described fully in terms of their angular distance from one other. Because of this, we proceed by analyzing data as though we had rendered stimuli correctly. We then carefully note the likely implications of rendering inaccuracies, which may be present in color working memory research quite generally, for the interpretation of our results

Despite this “worst-case” scenario of large deviations between rendered and nominal stimuli, we believe our data to be useful for at least two reasons. Most importantly, for reasons we outline later, we believe that the conclusions we draw survive these deviations and make an important contribution to the literature. In addition, since we followed standard stimulus practices in the delayed estimation literature, it is likely that many other working memory studies fall prey to similar inaccuracies. Indeed, the authors of several influential reports were generous enough to discuss their methods with us in detail, confirming the absence of monitor calibration,

the absence of nominal and rendered stimulus comparison, and the use of a default white point instead of a measured white point. Moreover, since we used the nominal CIELAB samples employed by several related reports, and many of the stimuli fell outside our CRT monitor gamut, it is likely that at least some stimuli were out of gamut in those studies as well.

Analysis. The raw data generated in these experiments were distributions of response positions elicited by each target stimulus. We characterized the spread of these response distributions in terms of angular precision (inverse variance), with interest in whether some stimuli elicited more concentrated response distributions than others. In keeping with the literature in this area, we also quantified response precision with a model-based measure. With only a single memory item, these two methods are very similar (see Figures 3 and 4b). But the working memory literature is typically interested in memory for several items (see our Experiment 3), and the analysis of multiple-item data is thought to require a model in which representational precision combines with other sources of variability (e.g., lapse trials).

[Figure 3]

Figure 3. Reciprocal of circular SD^2 of target-response differences for each color value in CIELAB (top panel) and HSV color spaces (bottom panel). Note that the x-axis of the CIELAB plot is hue angle centered on the intended color wheel (i.e., centered on $a^*b^* = [20,38]$, not on the origin of CIELAB).

To characterize these results in terms typical of previous studies, we fit a mixture model comprised of a von Mises and a uniform distribution (Zhang & Luck, 2008). The von Mises distribution is a circular analog of the standard normal distribution. The model that we fit included two free parameters: the proportion of target-based (as opposed to lapse) responses (P_m , $0 \leq P_m \leq 1$), and the concentration (κ , $0 \leq \kappa$) parameters of the von Mises distribution (equivalent to $1/SD^2$ of the circular normal):

$$p(Y | X) = P_m \cdot \text{von Mises}(Y; \mu, \kappa) + (1 - P_m) \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \quad (1)$$

Here, Y denotes a response made to a particular stimulus X . The first term in the equation denotes the probability density of a specific response given the parameters (mean and precision) of the von Mises distribution, multiplied by the mixture coefficient P_m . The von Mises precision parameter κ is typically interpreted as the precision of a memory representation, since larger values of κ generate narrower distributions (i.e., κ is the inverse of the distribution's variance). The parameter μ , denoting the mean of the von Mises density, was set to the target value (X) in the fitting. The second term in the equation refers to the density of the response according to random guessing (i.e., a uniform density on the circle), weighted by $(1 - P_m)$. The P_m parameter gives the probability of responses that are based on working memory, while $(1 - P_m)$ is the probability of random guesses. We expected guessing rates to be very low in our model fits given the minimal memory load (i.e., P_m was expected to be close to 1). All model fitting was performed by maximum likelihood inference.

Parameters were initialized to multiple starting values in an attempt to avoid local maxima.

With respect to the methods employed by Zhang & Luck (2008) and subsequent work, the only deviation in this study involved fitting the model to the responses elicited by each stimulus separately, rather than aggregating responses across all stimuli. The model was also fit separately to each individual observer's data. In sum, we fit the model 180 times for each observer, allowing us to identify differences in the von Mises precision (κ) values of the response distributions elicited by different color stimuli.

Results and Discussion

If working memory performance were independent of color value, as is widely assumed in the working memory literature, precision should be comparable for all color values employed. Contrary to this assumption, we found that response precision varied with stimulus value. This is evident in both the direct estimate of precision as $1/SD$ (Figure 3) and in the values of precision estimated from the model (Figure 4a). For each observer (Figure 4a), the fitted precision values obtained for each stimulus clearly varied with hue. This remained true when we collapsed across observers (thus including 30 observations for each individual color). These fitted precision values varied widely from the precision obtained by the typical procedure of fitting the model to all of the colors together (dashed line in Figure 4b).

[Figure 4]

Figure 4. Estimated κ values fit by color and observer for each of the two color spaces (a), and estimated κ values fit by color, collapsed across observers. Solid black curves reflect spline smoothing, showing a pattern of κ variability by color, and dotted black lines show estimated κ when the model was fit to all responses.

Most importantly, stimulus-specific variations in estimated precision show similar patterns across observers, suggesting that our findings are due to stimulus properties rather than random fluctuations. To quantify inter-observer similarity, we calculated correlations between the estimated stimulus-specific κ values for the three participants in each condition. Correlations across all pairs of observers were significant for both the CIELAB and HSV wheel, as shown in Figure 5 ($t(178) > 3.0$, $p < .01$ for all correlations). The correlations across observers suggest that some target stimuli systematically elicited wider response distributions than others.

[Figure 5]

Figure 5. Correlation of stimulus-specific κ estimates across observers. CIELAB color space shown in the top row, and HSV color space in the bottom row.

One might worry that the response precision estimate for each stimulus is unreliable, due to the relatively small number of observations (10 for each color) included in each stimulus- and participant- specific model fit. Crucially, if model fits had excessive variance, then *relative* differences among estimates would not be expected to correlate across observers. To make this point quantitatively, we applied a Monte Carlo permutation test

(Higgins, 2004: chapter 5). Specifically, for each pair of observers we calculated a null distribution of correlations as follows. Holding the order of the von Mises precision values for one observer fixed, the precision values for the other observer were randomly permuted 10,000 times; a correlation coefficient was calculated for each permutation. The resulting distribution of coefficients indicates that the empirical correlations between observers are highly unlikely to have arisen by chance ($p < .001$): none of the 10,000 simulations yielded a correlation as large as those observed, and none of the simulated correlations were both significant and in the right (positive) direction.

To further investigate the reliability of our precision estimates, we performed a simulation in which our stimulus-specific model was fit to data generated according to the null hypothesis that the true response precision is independent of color. For each of three simulated observers and each of the 180 stimuli, we generated ten random responses according to the null hypothesis. Each response was obtained from a von Mises distribution with a κ value that was estimated by collapsing across all stimuli in Experiment 1 (indicated by the black dotted line in Figure 4b). Note that estimating precision from aggregated data is the standard way of fitting the mixture model of equation (1). We then computed stimulus-specific fits to the responses of each of the simulated observers, and calculated pairwise correlations of estimated κ values as above. This entire process was repeated 1,000 times.

If the correlations between observers in our experiments arise simply as a by-product of random noise, this simulation should produce correlations similar in magnitude to those of Figure 5. But only one of the simulated across-observer precision correlations was larger in magnitude than the smallest of the correlations found in our experimental data. Thus the probability of obtaining correlations as strong as those found empirically, if the null hypothesis were true, is estimated to be smaller than 1/3000 ($p < .001$).

Given both the strong correlations among observers and the simulation results, it seems unlikely that the stimulus-specific variations in precision are an artifact of unreliable estimates. However, the accuracy of the estimates is uncertain because of the large deviations between rendered and nominal stimuli. In later sections we return to this question. For now we note that, regardless of the ultimate cause, stimulus-specific variation in precision is likely to be widespread in color working memory studies, as we used rendering techniques that are standard in the working memory literature.

We also explored alternative options for analyzing the data, including drawing a new circle in CIELAB space that had minimum distance in color space to the rendered stimuli. This analysis also showed considerable stimulus-specific variability in κ , though the pattern of variation differed from that we found using the nominal stimuli. Importantly, however, the observer-by-observer correlations for κ across colors remained significant (observer 1 vs. observer 2, $r^2=0.49$; observer 2 vs. observer 3, $r^2=0.35$; observer 1 vs. observer 3, $r^2=0.31$, $p < 0.001$ for all correlations), again suggesting stimulus-specific variability. Here we focus only on the analysis of the

nominal stimuli. Given the device-specificity of the rendering process and the fact that other working memory studies also likely suffer from rendering errors, we emphasize that the important result is not the particular pattern of stimulus-specific variability, but the fact that stimulus-specific variability exists and is correlated between observers.

Possible effects of response method and exposure duration

While much of the relevant literature utilizes procedures like those described here, two important experimental variables that differ across studies are the time of exposure to memory displays and the method for selecting a response. We used 500 ms exposures and a color-wheel response method in the experiments just described. But we also sought to determine whether our findings hold for other exposure durations and a different way of making responses. A new group of two observers was tested in a nearly identical experiment with the CIELAB color space, with two key differences. (1) Memory samples were displayed for only 100 ms, and (2) we used a scrolling method for collecting responses (Figure 6; as in van den Berg et al., 2012). At test, the response was made with a single square rather than a wheel. The response square initially appeared in a randomly chosen color. Observers used two keys to scroll through the available colors in either angular direction, and pressed a button when the displayed color matched their memory of the target.

After fitting the model of equation (1) in the same way described above, we found a significant correlation between color-specific precision estimates from this experiment and the previous one ($t(178)=4.46$, $r=.35$, $p<.001$) (Figure 7). These results demonstrate that systematic color-specific variability arises for reasons independent of the exposure duration and response method.

[Figure 6]

Figure 6. Delayed estimation with the scrolling method.

[Figure 7]

Figure 7. (a) Color-by-color κ estimates in the scrolling experiment. (b) Color-by-color correlation between κ estimates obtained in the color wheel and scrolling experiments (collapsed across observers).

Summary

Experiment 1 identified stimulus-dependent response effects in a working memory experiment with standard methods. This undermines the assumption of uniform response variability across colors.

Experiment 2: Estimation without delay

Experiment 1 showed that the response distributions in a standard delayed estimation task contained stimulus-dependent variability. Next, we investigated the source of this variability. Since there were differences between nominal and rendered colors, it is likely that there was perceptual inhomogeneity in the stimuli. To investigate the relationship between precision in memory and precision in perception, we replicated Experiment 1, but without a memory delay. Stimuli appeared simultaneously with the response color wheel, and the task was simply to identify the color of a cued item by clicking on the wheel.

Methods

Observers. A new group of 14 Johns Hopkins University undergraduates participated in exchange for course credit. Each observer had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity. The protocol for this experiment was approved by the Johns Hopkins University IRB.

Apparatus & stimuli. The apparatus and stimuli were identical to Experiment 1.

Procedure. This experiment was identical to Experiment 1, with the following exceptions. The color target and response wheel were presented simultaneously. The condition with the HSV color space included set sizes of 1, 2, 4, or 6 objects in a display, distributed randomly over the course of a session; 12 observers completed 60 trials for each set size (240 trials total) in this space. In the CIELAB condition, two observers completed 1800 trials each, 10 trials for each color presented singly. In the HSV condition, where multiple objects could be presented, one square included a bold black frame identifying it as the item on which the response should be based.

Analysis. A stimulus-specific mixture model (including precision as a free parameter for each color) was fit to the results of Experiment 2, collapsing across the responses of all observers in each color space. Although the HSV experiment employed multiple set sizes, we did not expect any specific effect of set size because no delay was introduced and the display remained on the screen until the response. For these reasons, we collapsed the HSV data across set size in the subsequent analyses. (Multiple set sizes were tested for unrelated reasons pertaining to other ongoing research).

Results and Discussion

Overall, responses were significantly more precise in this experiment than in Experiment 1 (With-delay vs. Without-delay: CIELAB mean κ : 44.10 vs. 66.10, $t(179) = -7.17, p < .001$; HSV mean κ : 52.21 vs. 64.34, $t(179) = -2.49, p = .017$). This is consistent with findings using calibrated stimuli that discrimination thresholds tend to increase with the addition of a delay (Nilsson & Nelson, 1981; Nemes, Perry, & McKeefry, 2010; Olkkonen and Allred, 2014).

Importantly, estimated precision continued to vary by stimulus, even in the absence of an explicit memory demand (Figure 8a). Estimated precision without a delay was significantly correlated with the estimates

obtained with the delay in Experiment 1: CIELAB κ : $r=.37$, $t(178) = 5.29$, $p<.001$; HSV κ : $r=.49$, $t(178) = 7.57$, $p<.001$ (Figure 6b).

[Figure 8]

Figure 8. (a) Estimated κ values for CIELAB and HSV color wheels in Experiment 2, and (b) κ correlations between Experiments 1 and 2.

Summary

The main finding in this experiment is that stimulus-dependent variability is present even in the absence of a memory delay, and that this variability is correlated with what that found in the with-delay experiment. Minimally, these results suggest that at least some of the stimulus-dependent variability observed in working memory is already present in perceptual color-estimation. Because of the differences between nominal and rendered colors, we cannot be certain of the extent to which this particular pattern of variability would persist even with stimuli rendered properly on a CIELAB circle. Note, however, that color discrimination is known to be inhomogeneous across color space even with careful display calibration, suggesting that at least some of the inhomogeneity found here may not be due to lack of calibration or other rendering issues (Bachy, Dias, Alleysson, & Bonnardel 2012; Danilova & Mollin, 2012; Witzel & Gegenfurtner, 2013). Determining to what extent the stimulus-dependent variability in working memory is present in perceptual estimation, and to what extent it arises from memory processes, is an important question for future research.

Experiment 3: Color-by-color fits for varying memory loads

The canonical effect in research on visual working memory is the degradation of performance with increasing memory load, a pattern thought to reveal the limited storage capacity of the system (Cowan, 2001; Luck & Vogel, 1997; Sperling, 1960). With delayed estimation, visual working memory quality—and that of color in particular—has been shown to decline with increasing memory load (though a debate continues about whether it declines further beyond a load of about three or four objects; Anderson & Awh, 2012; Bays et al. 2009; van den Berg et al. 2012). Given the importance of this issue, we sought to examine whether stimulus-dependent differences in response variability persist with increasing memory loads. If they do not, this would surely not settle any debates in working memory research. But we thought it would be important to at least determine whether effects of memory load wash away all stimulus-driven effects. If they do, then the stimulus-dependent variability we identified in Experiments 1 and 2 need not be of central concern to the working memory community. Similarly, if the memory load effect is substantially larger than the stimulus-dependent variability, then it is not functionally important to resolve the methodological problems that led to the differences between nominal and rendered stimuli in our lab (and likely other working memory labs).

A new group of observers participated in a typical delayed estimation experiment with memory load varying on each trial. Again, we fit a mixture model to response distributions by stimulus. If this experiment also produced stimulus-dependent variability in precision estimates, and this variability is correlated with that found in Experiment 1, this would suggest that the effects of memory load do not completely eliminate stimulus-driven effects.

Crucially, although the stimuli for Experiment 3 were nominally the same as those in Experiment 1, they were presented on a different monitor. They were generated using the same procedure as in Experiment 1, and the monitor was not calibrated. Thus, the rendered stimuli in Experiment 3 likely differ both from the nominal values and also from the rendered stimuli in Experiments 1 and 2. If any stimulus-dependent variability in Experiment 3 remains correlated with that in Experiment 1, this would suggest that the stimulus-specific effects are large enough to survive failures to appropriately calibrate the display.

Method

Observers. A new group of 24 Johns Hopkins University undergraduates participated in exchange for course credit. Each observer had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity. The protocol for this experiment was approved by the Johns Hopkins University IRB.

Apparatus & stimuli. Stimuli were presented on an iMac computer with an LCD monitor. The stimuli were generated using the same procedures as in Experiment 1. However, since the stimuli were displayed on a different monitor, and this monitor was not calibrated, the stimuli likely differed both from the nominal stimuli and those rendered in Experiment 1. These stimuli were not measured post-hoc.

Procedure. Experiment 3 was identical to Experiment 1 except as noted below. This experiment utilized the CIELAB color space from Experiment 1. The experiment included memory loads of 1, 2, 4, and 6 distributed randomly over the course of a session. For half of the observers, colors were sampled randomly on each trial. For the other half, they were sampled with the restriction that no two colors were allowed to be closer than 20° (e.g., Fougne, Asplund & Marois, 2010). Each observer completed 60 trials for each memory load (240 trials total).

Analysis. As in Experiments 1 and 2, a stimulus-specific mixture model was fit to the results. There were no obvious differences in parameters when the stimuli in a trial were sampled with restrictions and without, so data from the two conditions were collapsed for all subsequent analyses. Because the number of trials for each target stimulus was not equal, a smoothing algorithm was applied to the estimated stimulus-specific precision (κ) values for each memory load; estimates were smoothed by a moving average of ± 1 adjacent values weighted by the number of observations for each stimulus.

Results and Discussion

The correlations between stimulus-specific precision estimates in Experiments 1 and 3 are shown in Figure 9. Overall, when collapsing across memory load, the stimulus-specific effects on precision in Experiments 1 and

3 were correlated. In addition, each memory load in Experiment 3 was independently correlated with the single memory load in Experiment 1 ($t(178) > 4.53, p < .01$ for all correlations). The stimulus dependency of precision estimates survived the effect of higher memory loads.

To be certain that these results are not due to artifacts from data analysis (e.g., our smoothing procedure), correlations were applied over the data with randomly permuted stimuli as in Experiment 1. The Monte Carlo simulations confirmed that the correlations we observed are unlikely to have arisen by chance (0 out of 10,000 empirical correlations were significant in the right direction). Thus properties of individual stimulus values produce large variability in subsequent memory responses, and these differences between stimuli persist as memory load increases.

[Figure 9]

Figure 9. Correlations between color-specific κ values obtained in Experiment 1 ($N = 3$) and Experiment 3 ($N = 24$; CIELAB color wheel). Panel (a) shows correlations between the two experiments, collapsing across all memory loads in Experiment 3. The graphs in panel (b) show correlations between each individual memory load in Experiment 1 and Experiment 3.

Summary

Overall, this experiment makes it clear that the stimulus-dependent effects identified in Experiment 1 persist as memory load increases (at least within the range most typically studied in related experiments). In addition, several specific aspects of the results are worth emphasizing. First, there is a strong inter-experiment correlation between stimulus-specific estimates with a memory load of 1. Because two different, non-calibrated displays were used in the two experiments, it is very likely that the rendered stimuli in the two experiments were somewhat different from each other. Despite this, the stimulus-specific correlation between experiments survived. This suggests both that the stimulus-specific effects are not particular to one display, and that they are large enough to be seen despite inaccuracies in color rendering. In light of this, it seems likely that previous working memory experiments have also obtained systematic but unmeasured variation in color precision.

Second, we note that although stimulus-specific precision estimates were still significantly correlated at higher memory loads of 4 and 6, these correlations were considerably weaker. This could mean that stimulus-specific effects are less important at higher memory loads, but it could also be an artifact of the model. This model has an inherent correlation between the von Mises part (i.e., the estimates of precision, κ) and the uniform part (i.e. guessing, $1-P_m$) of the equations (see also Suchow et al., 2013). If the estimate of guessing rate is low, then the precision estimate must also be lower to accommodate extreme responses; conversely, if a higher guessing rate is estimated, then the von Mises component will have high 'responsibility' for accurate responses only, leading to larger precision estimates. High rates of guessing at higher memory loads could lead the mixture model to overestimate precision for stimuli that tend to elicit noisy responses. Indeed, the specific stimuli that

deviated most from the expected correlations seem to be those that were imprecise with a memory load of 1; we suspect that the response precision associated with these stimuli at higher memory loads was overestimated. (Note that non-target responses would be expected to have the same effect on precision as guesses with respect to estimates of precision; cf. Bays, Catalao, & Husain, 2009.)

Experiment 4: A relationship between labeled color regions and response precision

Experiments 1-3 demonstrated that the response distributions elicited by some stimuli were more variable than those elicited by other stimuli. Experiment 2, in particular, demonstrated that stimulus-specific effects in a perception experiment correlated with those in the memory experiments. This suggests that the memory effects of color are likely mediated by the perceptual representation of color. To investigate whether this pattern of variability is common to different perceptual tasks, we conducted a color labeling experiment. Observers were shown the same rendered colors that served as the response wheel in Experiments 1 and 2, and they were asked to identify the best example of each of seven color terms. If the observers are consistent in their responses, and if their responses are systematically related to the stimulus-specific precision estimates, it could shed some insight on the origin of the variability. Furthermore, in light of the deviations between nominal and rendered stimuli, a sensible relationship between color-labeling and stimulus effects would provide additional reassurance that the effects we measured survive the inaccuracies of color rendering.

Method

Observers. A new group of 8 Johns Hopkins University undergraduates participated in exchange for course credit. Each had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity. The protocol for this experiment was approved by the Johns Hopkins University IRB.

Apparatus & stimuli. Apparatus and stimuli were identical to Experiment 1.

Procedure. At the start of a trial, the 180 stimuli rendered in Experiment 1 were presented in the center of the screen organized around a wheel. To the right of the wheel the 7 color terms ‘Orange, Yellow, Lime, Green, Blue, Purple, and Pink’ were vertically presented in a random order. We did not use the basic color terms (Berlin & Kay, 1969) because we did not expect this set of color samples to be labeled by all and only basic terms. Recall that the stimulus set was constructed with constraints unrelated to color terminology. Specifically, we excluded ‘Red’ and ‘Brown’ because of the high luminance values of the sampled colors. And we included ‘Lime’ because of the relatively wide spectrum of samples that appeared green to us.

Observers were asked to find the best example of each of these 7 colors by clicking on the color wheel. The color wheel stayed on the screen until an observer made 7 responses. The color wheel was rotated randomly on each trial, and each observer completed 20 trials.

Results and Discussion

Combining data from 8 observers yielded 160 responses for each color term. Histograms of the results are given in Figure 11a. Response distributions for each term appeared approximately normal. In other words, certain stimuli were noisy attractors for the color labels, with responses for a given label diminishing rapidly with distance from the corresponding attractor. We emphasize that our intent was not to identify definite category boundaries or focal points. More sophisticated methods are available for this purpose and could be employed in future research (e.g., Witzel & Gegenfurtner, 2013), and they would be more appropriate with a set of color samples designed for this purpose and faithfully rendered. Instead, we merely sought to determine whether observers shared even loose intuitions about how to label this stimulus set, and whether the labeling structure was related to the stimulus-specific precision effects observed in Experiments 1-3.

[Figure 10]

Figure 10. Results of Experiment 4. Panel (a) shows the histogram of responses given as the best example of each of seven color terms, along with seven von Mises distributions fit to these responses. Overlap points between the distributions designate operational boundaries between regions on the wheel. Panel (b) shows the relationship between the size of each identified region (in terms of the number of individual colors) and the average κ value obtained for the colors in that region in Experiment 1.

Towards this end, inspection of the histograms in Figure 10a reveals several important features. First, the fact that response distributions are relatively clustered indicates that observers shared intuitions about labels for the color stimuli. Second, the amount of variability in selection of the best instance of a label differs across color space, as seen by the varying width of the peaks in Figure 10a. For example, observers were more consistent in their labeling of purple than lime. The variability could be within-observer, between-observers, or both. Third, it appeared that there was a relationship between a label's consistency in Experiment 4 and the response precision elicited by those colors in the other experiments. For example, the stimuli labeled as the best exemplars of purple also elicited response distributions with the highest precision in Experiments 1 and 2.

To explore this observation quantitatively, we fit seven von Mises distributions to the histograms in Figure 10a, comparing likelihood values to identify operational boundaries in this spatial arrangement of the rendered colors. This in turn afforded a measure of a label's spread: namely, the number of individual colors between boundaries (Orange: 40; Yellow: 20; Lime: 18; Green: 23; Blue: 19; Purple: 15; Pink: 45). To relate these findings to the response precision associated with these colors, we averaged together the κ values obtained in Experiment 1 for all of the stimuli falling within each of the seven bounded regions. There was a significant negative correlation between the number of stimuli in a region and the average precision of stimuli within that region ($t(5) = -2.87$, $r = -.79$, $p = .035$; Figure 10b).

We emphasize again that these data were not collected for the purpose of understanding color

categorization. Rather, they provide some traction in understanding the stimulus-specific effects in perception (Expt 2, Figure 8) that are propagated to working memory (Expt 1, Figure 4). Empirically, we have demonstrated that stimuli falling in labeled regions that are narrow tend to produce narrower response distributions. This is of general interest, but it is particularly important in the context of the present experiments because it provides added verification that the stimulus-specific variability observed in perception and memory is not solely an artifact of the deviation between nominal and rendered stimuli.

General Discussion

This study sought to investigate assumptions built into an influential and rapidly growing literature that utilizes the delayed estimation paradigm with color to draw conclusions about the structure and limits of visual working memory (Anderson & Awh, 2012; Bays et al., 2009; 2011; Emrich & Ferber, 2011; Fougne & Alvarez, 2011; Fougne, et al., 2010; 2012; Gold et al., 2010; van den Berg et al., 2012; Wilken & Ma, 2004; Zhang & Luck, 2011; 2009; 2008). The assumptions are that the colors rendered in the relevant experiments have been sampled from a circle in CIELAB color space, that they are perceptually homogenous, that they have equal lightness values, and that they tend to elicit equally variable response distributions—assumptions that motivate value-independent analysis of response distribution properties.

In Experiments 1-3, we identified effects that undermine these assumptions. First, we found stimulus-specific response variability that correlated across unique observers (Experiment 1). This stimulus-specific variability was present even in an experiment without an explicit memory demand (Experiment 2), and persisted with larger memory loads (Experiment 3). Experiment 4 demonstrated that some of this stimulus-specific variability likely arose during interaction with the stimulus set at test.

Importantly, we determined post-hoc that the colors rendered in Experiments 1,2, and 4 were different from the nominal colors specified, differing in lightness and non-uniformly distributed in CIELAB space. In this regard, our methods reflect a kind of ‘worst-case’ scenario with respect to stimulus display. We did not apply the calibration procedures that ensure faithful rendering of color stimuli. We emphasize that although calibration procedures are standard in studies of color perception (Allen, Beilock, & Shevell, 2012; Olkkonen & Allred, 2014; Witzel & Gegenfurtner, 2013; Xiao, Hurst, McIntyre, & Brainard, 2012), calibration procedures have not been implemented in delayed estimation reports (see e.g. Suchow et al., 2013, which provides a tutorial for conducting such experiments and analyses, without mention of calibration or color rendering validation). Indeed, we could not identify even one study that reported implementing a full calibration procedure (such as that described in Brainard, Robson and Pelli, 2002). Neither could we find reports that confirmed the properties of color stimuli using post-hoc radiometer measurements.

Taken together, our results undermine the assumption, endemic in the delayed-estimation literature, that

colored stimuli are represented homogeneously in memory. This is not a minor issue: stimulus homogeneity is central to the parameter fits used to make inferences about the structure of working memory and to compare alternative memory models.

The assumption of stimulus homogeneity is perhaps most clear in two recent studies, which argued that visual working memory varies stochastically on a moment-to-moment, trial-by-trial, or even item-by-item basis (Fougnie et al., 2012; van den Berg et al., 2012). These inferences are predicated on the assumption that there is no systematic reason for response distributions to vary trial-by-trial—in particular, no reason for the precision of the distribution to vary according to the trial-specific stimulus. Specifically, one previous model of working memory proposed that memory precision varies from moment to moment in a way that can be described as sampling from a gamma distribution (van den Berg et al., 2012). However, our stimulus-specific precision estimates obtained in Experiment 1 and 2 produced perfect gamma distributions (Figure 11 a and b). An important future direction would be investigating how much variability in working memory precision should be attributed to trial-by-trial variability, after stimulus-specific variability in perception and working memory has been taken into account.

[Figure 11]

Figure 11. Distribution of estimated precisions (κ) obtained in Experiment 1 and Experiment 2. (a) Histogram of κ values for all colors estimated in with-delay experiment (Experiment 1, CIELAB). The black curve represents the best fit gamma distribution. The smaller graphs show von Mises densities for three example colors. (b) The same graph with the data from the without-delay experiment (Experiment 2).

Similar points extend to what is perhaps the central debate in this area: whether or not there is a discrete capacity limit in addition to a more continuous precision limit on memory for smaller memory loads. This debate has often hinged on whether the estimate of memory precision plateaus at larger memory loads, and on whether guessing rates increase in a way that suggests frequent guesses when memory load exceeds some fixed quantity. But these parameter values are obtained as the best fits of models that assume that responses to a memory target (as opposed to guesses) are drawn from a distribution whose characteristics are independent of the target color. Similarly, some studies have suggested that observers make responses that are not random, but which also are not drawn from a target representation. Instead, responses may be based on a non-target display item (Bays et al., 2009; Emrich & Ferber, 2012). Correctly estimating the probability of such non-target responses depends on accurate expectations about the response distributions for specific target and non-target colors.

Conclusion

We draw two broad conclusions from our results. The first is prescriptive: replications and extensions of

previous work should be conducted with CIELAB specified color stimuli that are rendered faithfully following standardized calibration procedures (Brainard, Pelli, & Robson, 2002; Gegenfurtner & Kiper, 2003).

Second, it seems likely that the assumption of perceptual and memory homogeneity among stimuli in studies of color working memory is unwarranted. Our results indicate clearly that stimulus-specific variation in precision exists, even though the deviations between nominal and rendered stimuli do not allow us to definitively establish the cause of those stimulus-specific effects. More broadly, our results motivate examination of implicit homogeneity assumptions for other stimulus classes. For example, in the case of orientation a variety of phenomena suggest differences in the fidelity of the representation of oblique and cardinal values (Wolfe, Klempen, & Shulman, 1999; Girshick, Landy, & Simoncelli, 2011), differences that have not been incorporated into the modeling of delayed orientation estimation experiments (Fougnie & Alvarez, 2011; Keshvari, van den Berg, & Ma, 2013; van den Berg et al., 2012).

Ultimately, we suggest that a complete understanding of the structure of visual working memory and its capacity limits will require a stimulus-specific understanding of both perceptual and memory representations. For this reason, despite the caution provided here, color remains a good candidate for a stimulus class with which to investigate working memory. A great deal is known about color perception, including its neurophysiological basis, the computations that support color adaptation and constancy, and its relationship to higher-level reasoning and language (for reviews of color vision see e.g., Gegenfurtner & Kiper, 2003; Solomon & Lennie, 2007). This creates a unique opportunity for combining expertise across areas to relate visual working memory to visual perception and cognition more broadly.

Author Note

We thank George Alvarez, Tim Brady, Daryl Fougnie, and Weiwei Zhang for sharing details of their experimental procedures with us.

References

- Allen, E. C., Beilock, S. L., & Shevell, S. K. (2012). Individual differences in simultaneous color constancy are related to working memory. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 29, A52–9.
- Anderson, D. E. & Awh, E. (2012). The plateau in mnemonic resolution across large set sizes indicates discrete resource limits in visual working memory. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 74, 891-910.
- Bachy, R., Dias, J., Alleysson, D., & Bonnardel, V. (2012). Hue discrimination, unique hues and naming. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 29, A60–8.
- Bays, P. M., Catalo, R. F. G., & Husain, M. (2009). The precision of visual working memory is set by allocation of a shared resource. *Journal of Vision*, 9, 1-11.
- Bays, P. M., Wu, E. Y., & Husain, M. (2011). Storage and binding of object features in visual working memory. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 1622-1631.
- Berlin, B., & Kay, P. (1969). *Basic Color Terms. : their Universality and Evolution*. University of California Press,
- Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10, 433-436.
- Brainard, D. H. (1998). Color constancy in the nearly natural image II. Achromatic loci. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 17, 307–325.
- Brainard, D. H. (2003). *Color appearance and color difference specification*. In S. K. Shevell (Ed.), *The Science of Color* (pp. 191–216). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Brainard, D. H., Pelli, D. G., & Robson, T. (2002). Display characterization. *Encyclopedia of Imaging Science and Technology*. John Willey and Sons, Inc.
- Burnham, R. W., & Clark, J. R. (1954). A color memory test. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 44, 658–659.
- Burnham, R. W., & Clark, J. R. (1955). A test of hue memory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 39, 164–172.
- Collins, M. (1931). Some observations on immediate colour memory. *British Journal of Psychology*, 22, 344–351.
- Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24, 87-114.
- Danilova, M. V., & Mollon, J. D.(2012). Foveal color perception: Minimal thresholds at a boundary between perceptual categories. *Vision Research*, 62, 162-172.
- Emrich, S. M., & Ferber, S. (2012). Competition increases binding errors in visual working memory. *Journal of Vision*, 12(4):12, 1-16.
- Fairchild, M. D. (1998). *Color appearance models*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fougnie, D., & Alvarez, G. A. (2011). Object features fail independently in visual working memory: Evidence for a probabilistic feature-store model. *Journal of Vision*, 11(12):3, 1-12.
- Fougnie, D., Asplund, C. L., & Marois, R. (2010). What are the units of storage in visual working memory? *Journal of Vision*, 10(12):27, 1-11.

- Fougnie, D., Suchow, J. W., & Alvarez, G. A. (2012). Variability in the quality of visual working memory, *Nature Communications*, doi: 10.1038/ncomms2237
- Gegenfurtner, K. R. & Kiper, D. C. (2003). Color vision. *Neuroscience*, 26, 181-206.
- Giesel, M., & Gegenfurtner, K. R. (2010). Color appearance of real objects varying in material, hue, and shape. *Journal of Vision*, 10, 1–21.
- Girshick, A. R., Landy, M. S., Simoncelli, E. P. (2011). Cardinal rules: visual orientation perception reflects knowledge of environmental statistics. *Nature Neuroscience*, 14, 926-934.
- Gold, J. M., Hahn, B., Zhang, W., Robinson, B. M., Kappenman, E. S., Beck, V. M., & Luck, S. J. (2010). Reduced capacity but shared precision and maintenance of working memory representations in schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 67, 570-577.
- Higgins, J. J. (2004). *An Introduction to Modern Nonparametric Statistics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Jin, E. W., & Shevell, S. K. (1996). Color memory and color constancy. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 13, 1981–1991.
- Keshvari, S., van den Berg, R., & Ma, W. (2013). No evidence for an item limit in change detection. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 9(2): e1002927. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002927
- Ling, Y., & Hurlbert, A. (2008). Role of color memory in successive color constancy. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 25, 1215–1226.
- Luck, S. J., & Vogel, E. K. (1997). The capacity of visual working memory for features and conjunctions. *Nature*, 390, 279-281.
- Nemes, V. A., Parry, N. R., Whitaker, D., & McKeefry, D. J. (2012). The retention and disruption of color information in human short-term visual memory. *Journal of Vision*, 12(1):26, 1-14.
- Nilsson, T. H., & Nelson, T. M. (1981). Delayed mono-chromatic hue matches indicate characteristics of visual memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 7, 141–150.
- Olkkonen, M., & Allred, S. R. (2014). Short-term memory affects color perception in context. *PLoS one*, 9:e8648, 1-11.
- Prinzmetal, W., Amiri, H., Allen, K., & Edwards, T. (1998). Phenomenology of attention: 1. Color, location, orientation, and spatial frequency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 24, 261-282.
- Solomon, S. G., & Lennie, P. (2007). The machinery of colour vision. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8, 276-286.
- Sperling, G. (1960). The information available in brief visual presentations. *Psychological monographs: General and applied*, 74, 1-29.
- Suchow, J. W., Brady, T. F., Fougnie, D., & Alvarez, G. A. (2013). Modeling visual working memory with the MemToolbox. *Journal of Vision*, 13(10):9, 1–8.

- van den Berg, R., Shin, H., Chou, W., George, R., & Ma, W. J. (2012). Variability in encoding precision accounts for visual short-term memory limitations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*, 8780-8785.
- Webster, M. A., Miyahara, E., Malkoc, G., & Raker, V. E. (2000). Variations in normal color vision. I. Cone-opponent axes. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, *17*, 1535-1544.
- Webster, M. A., Miyahara, E., Malkoc, G., & Raker, V. E. (2000). Variations in normal color vision. II. Unique hues. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, *17*, 1545-1555.
- Wilken, P. & Ma, W. J. (2004). A detection theory of change detection. *Journal of Vision*, *4*, 1120-1135.
- Witzel, C., & Gegenfurtner, K. R. (2013). Categorical sensitivity to color differences. *Journal of Vision*, *13*(7):1, 1-33.
- Wolfe, J. M., Klempen, N. L., & Shulman, E. P. (1999). Which end is up? Two representations of orientation in visual search. *Vision research*, *39*, 2075-2086.
- Wyszecki, G., & Stiles, W. S. (1982). *Color science: Concepts and methods, quantitative data and formulae* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Xiao, B., Hurst, B., MacIntyre, L., & Brainard, D. H. (2012). The color constancy of three-dimensional objects. *Journal of Vision*, *12*(4):6, 1-15.
- Zhang, W. & Luck, S. J. (2008). Discrete fixed-resolution representations in visual working memory. *Nature*, *453*, 233-235.
- Zhang, W. & Luck, S.J. (2009). Sudden death and gradual decay in visual working memory. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 423-428.
- Zhang, W. & Luck, S. J. (2011). The number and quality of representations in working memory. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 1431-1441.

Appendix A

CIELAB values and corresponding CIE xyY values for stimulus color values used in experiments. xyY values were obtained by measuring light emission spectrum using a spectra-radiometer (PR-655 SpectraScan, PhotoResearch). Unit of Y is cd/m².

Color	Intended CIELAB coordinates			Rendered CIELAB coordinates			Measured xyY coordinates		
	L*	a*	b*	L*	a*	b*	x	y	Y
1	70	80.000	38.000	62.693	71.42 4	27.18 8	0.518	0.311	23.917
2	70	79.963	40.094	62.605	71.27 4	29.22 2	0.528	0.314	23.229
3	70	79.854	42.185	62.541	71.06 6	31.29 7	0.535	0.319	23.192
4	70	79.671	44.272	62.503	70.79 9	33.41 0	0.542	0.324	23.052
5	70	79.416	46.350	62.491	70.47 4	35.55 7	0.548	0.328	22.955
6	70	79.088	48.419	62.503	70.09 2	37.73 7	0.554	0.332	22.909
7	70	78.689	50.475	62.539	69.65 3	39.94 4	0.559	0.337	22.938
8	70	78.218	52.515	62.601	69.15 8	42.17 6	0.566	0.340	22.818
9	70	77.676	54.538	62.686	68.61 0	44.42 8	0.570	0.345	22.970
10	70	77.063	56.541	62.794	68.01 0	46.69 6	0.574	0.349	22.948
11	70	76.382	58.521	62.925	67.36 0	48.97 7	0.578	0.354	23.137
12	70	75.631	60.476	63.078	66.66 1	51.26 4	0.581	0.358	23.255
13	70	74.813	62.404	63.253	65.91 6	53.55 4	0.584	0.361	23.296
14	70	73.928	64.302	63.447	65.12 9	55.84 1	0.585	0.364	23.449
15	70	72.977	66.168	63.661	64.30 0	58.12 1	0.587	0.367	23.501
16	70	71.962	68.000	63.893	63.43 3	60.38 7	0.588	0.370	23.753
17	70	70.883	69.795	64.170	62.61 2	61.01 5	0.588	0.373	23.994
18	70	69.742	71.552	64.469	61.77 5	61.25 1	0.587	0.375	24.253
19	70	68.541	73.267	64.780	60.90 4	61.49 7	0.587	0.377	24.406
20	70	67.281	74.940	65.103	60.00 1	61.75 2	0.585	0.379	24.697
21	70	65.963	76.567	65.437	59.07 1	62.01 6	0.583	0.381	24.957
22	70	64.589	78.148	65.781	58.11 6	62.28 8	0.580	0.382	25.316
23	70	63.160	79.680	66.134	57.13 9	62.56 7	0.579	0.384	25.638
24	70	61.680	81.160	66.496	56.14 62.85		0.576	0.386	25.987

25	70	60.148	82.589	66.864	55.13	63.14	0.573	0.388	26.291
26	70	58.567	83.963	67.239	54.10	63.43	0.571	0.389	26.632
27	70	56.940	85.281	67.619	53.06	63.73	0.569	0.391	27.009
28	70	55.267	86.541	68.004	52.02	64.04	0.566	0.394	27.419
29	70	53.552	87.742	68.392	50.97	64.34	0.563	0.395	27.815
30	70	51.795	88.883	68.783	49.91	64.65	0.561	0.397	28.113
31	70	50.000	89.962	69.177	48.85	64.96	0.559	0.399	28.573
32	70	48.168	90.977	69.571	47.80	65.27	0.556	0.401	29.016
33	70	46.302	91.928	69.966	46.75	65.58	0.553	0.403	29.329
34	70	44.404	92.813	70.326	45.62	65.85	0.551	0.405	29.829
35	70	42.476	93.631	70.335	43.76	65.67	0.548	0.407	30.294
36	70	40.521	94.382	70.344	41.86	65.50	0.546	0.409	30.800
37	70	38.541	95.063	70.351	39.94	65.32	0.544	0.410	30.968
38	70	36.538	95.676	70.359	37.99	65.15	0.541	0.412	31.559
39	70	34.515	96.218	70.366	36.03	64.97	0.537	0.416	31.378
40	70	32.475	96.689	70.372	34.05	64.80	0.533	0.418	31.454
41	70	30.419	97.088	70.378	32.05	64.62	0.530	0.422	31.129
42	70	28.350	97.416	70.383	30.03	64.45	0.524	0.425	31.022
43	70	26.272	97.671	70.388	28.01	64.27	0.519	0.430	31.089
44	70	24.185	97.854	70.392	25.98	64.10	0.514	0.434	31.015
45	70	22.094	97.963	70.396	23.94	63.93	0.510	0.436	30.760
46	70	20.000	98.000	70.399	21.90	63.76	0.504	0.441	30.784
47	70	17.906	97.963	70.402	19.86	63.60	0.500	0.444	30.655
48	70	15.815	97.854	70.404	17.82	63.43	0.494	0.448	30.668
49	70	13.728	97.671	70.406	15.78	63.27	0.490	0.451	30.439
50	70	11.650	97.416	70.407	13.75	63.11	0.484	0.456	30.526
51	70	9.581	97.088	70.408	11.73	62.95	0.479	0.460	30.480
52	70	7.525	96.689	70.408	9.721	62.79	0.475	0.463	30.230
53	70	5.485	96.218	70.408	7.721	62.64	0.469	0.468	30.318

						5			
						62.49			
54	70	3.462	95.676	70.407	5.736	5	0.463	0.472	29.992
						62.34			
55	70	1.459	95.063	70.405	3.768	7	0.458	0.476	29.817
						62.20			
56	70	-0.521	94.382	70.403	1.818	2	0.454	0.479	29.971
						62.06			
57	70	-2.476	93.631	70.400	-0.111	0	0.449	0.483	29.728
						61.92			
58	70	-4.404	92.813	70.397	-2.018	0	0.441	0.489	30.346
						61.78			
59	70	-6.302	91.928	70.393	-3.900	3	0.436	0.494	30.302
						61.64			
60	70	-8.168	90.977	70.387	-5.756	9	0.431	0.497	30.121
						61.51			
61	70	-10.000	89.962	70.381	-7.585	8	0.426	0.500	30.021
						61.38			
62	70	-11.795	88.883	70.375	-9.384	9	0.420	0.506	29.929
						-			
					11.15	61.26			
63	70	-13.552	87.742	70.367	2	3	0.415	0.509	29.917
						-			
					12.88	61.13			
64	70	-15.267	86.541	70.358	8	9	0.411	0.512	29.588
						-			
					14.59	61.01			
65	70	-16.940	85.281	70.348	0	8	0.405	0.517	29.483
						-			
					16.25	60.89			
66	70	-18.567	83.963	70.337	8	9	0.400	0.520	29.442
						-			
					17.89	60.78			
67	70	-20.148	82.589	70.324	0	3	0.395	0.524	29.516
						-			
					19.48	60.66			
68	70	-21.680	81.160	70.311	5	9	0.390	0.528	29.297
						-			
					21.04	60.55			
69	70	-23.160	79.680	70.296	2	7	0.386	0.531	29.123
						-			
					22.56	60.44			
70	70	-24.589	78.148	70.280	0	7	0.382	0.533	29.161
						-			
					24.03	60.33			
71	70	-25.963	76.567	70.262	9	9	0.378	0.537	29.154
						-			
					25.47	60.23			
72	70	-27.281	74.940	70.242	7	2	0.374	0.540	28.812
						-			
					26.87	60.12			
73	70	-28.541	73.267	70.221	4	7	0.369	0.544	29.010
						-			
					28.23	60.02			
74	70	-29.742	71.552	70.198	0	4	0.365	0.547	29.076
						-			
					29.54	59.92			
75	70	-30.883	69.795	70.174	3	3	0.362	0.549	28.925

					-					
76	70	-31.962	68.000	70.147	30.81 4	59.82 2	0.358	0.552	28.911	
					-					
77	70	-32.977	66.168	70.119	32.04 2	59.72 3	0.354	0.555	28.712	
					-					
78	70	-33.928	64.302	70.088	33.22 7	59.62 5	0.351	0.557	28.974	
					-					
79	70	-34.813	62.404	70.056	34.36 7	59.52 7	0.347	0.558	28.821	
					-					
80	70	-35.631	60.476	70.021	35.46 4	59.43 1	0.344	0.558	28.722	
					-					
81	70	-36.382	58.521	70.000	36.38 2	58.52 1	0.339	0.557	29.004	
					-					
82	70	-37.063	56.541	70.000	37.06 3	56.54 1	0.334	0.555	28.750	
					-					
83	70	-37.676	54.538	70.000	37.67 6	54.53 8	0.330	0.551	28.663	
					-					
84	70	-38.218	52.515	70.000	38.21 8	52.51 5	0.326	0.547	28.965	
					-					
85	70	-38.689	50.475	70.000	38.68 9	50.47 5	0.321	0.542	29.055	
					-					
86	70	-39.088	48.419	70.000	39.08 9	48.41 9	0.317	0.537	28.913	
					-					
87	70	-39.416	46.350	70.000	39.41 6	46.35 0	0.312	0.530	28.751	
					-					
88	70	-39.671	44.272	70.000	39.67 1	44.27 2	0.307	0.521	28.857	
					-					
89	70	-39.854	42.185	70.000	39.85 4	42.18 5	0.303	0.514	28.798	
					-					
90	70	-39.963	40.094	70.000	39.96 3	40.09 4	0.298	0.508	29.134	
					-					
91	70	-40.000	38.000	70.000	40.00 0	38.00 0	0.293	0.497	29.186	
					-					
92	70	-39.963	35.906	70.000	39.96 3	35.90 6	0.289	0.488	29.205	
					-					
93	70	-39.854	33.815	70.000	39.85 4	33.81 5	0.285	0.479	29.304	
					-					
94	70	-39.671	31.728	70.000	39.67 1	31.72 8	0.281	0.469	29.384	
95	70	-39.416	29.650	70.000	-	29.65	0.277	0.460	29.394	

					39.41					
					6	0				
					-					
96	70	-39.088	27.581	70.000	39.08	27.58	0.273	0.448	29.137	
					9	1				
					-					
97	70	-38.689	25.525	70.000	38.68	25.52	0.270	0.438	29.330	
					9	5				
					-					
98	70	-38.218	23.485	70.000	38.21	23.48	0.266	0.428	29.331	
					8	5				
					-					
99	70	-37.676	21.462	70.000	37.67	21.46	0.262	0.418	29.482	
					6	2				
					-					
100	70	-37.063	19.459	70.000	37.06	19.45	0.259	0.408	29.649	
					3	9				
					-					
101	70	-36.382	17.479	70.000	36.38	17.47	0.257	0.401	29.698	
					2	9				
					-					
102	70	-35.631	15.524	70.000	35.63	15.52	0.254	0.389	29.588	
					1	4				
					-					
103	70	-34.813	13.596	70.000	34.81	13.59	0.251	0.379	29.639	
					3	6				
					-					
104	70	-33.928	11.698	70.000	33.92	11.69	0.249	0.372	29.937	
					8	8				
					-					
105	70	-32.977	9.832	70.000	32.97	9.832	0.247	0.361	29.638	
					7					
					-					
106	70	-31.962	8.000	70.000	31.96	8.000	0.245	0.353	29.795	
					2					
					-					
107	70	-30.883	6.205	70.000	30.88	6.205	0.243	0.346	30.062	
					3					
					-					
108	70	-29.742	4.448	70.000	29.74	4.448	0.241	0.336	29.855	
					2					
					-					
109	70	-28.541	2.733	70.000	28.54	2.733	0.240	0.330	30.120	
					1					
					-					
110	70	-27.281	1.060	70.000	27.28	1.060	0.239	0.322	30.023	
					1					
					-					
111	70	-25.963	-0.567	70.000	25.96	-0.567	0.237	0.314	30.341	
					3					
					-					
112	70	-24.589	-2.148	70.000	24.58	-2.148	0.236	0.306	30.461	
					9					
					-					
113	70	-23.160	-3.680	70.000	23.16	-3.680	0.235	0.298	30.388	
					0					
114	70	-21.680	-5.160	70.000	-	-5.160	0.234	0.293	30.643	
					21.68					


					0				
					-				
					20.14				
115	70	-20.148	-6.589	70.000	8	-6.589	0.235	0.288	30.611
					-				
					18.56				
116	70	-18.567	-7.963	70.000	7	-7.963	0.234	0.281	30.589
					-				
					16.94				
117	70	-16.940	-9.281	70.000	0	-9.281	0.234	0.278	30.932
					-				
					15.26	10.54			
118	70	-15.267	-10.541	70.000	7	1	0.234	0.271	30.985
					-				
					13.55	11.74			
119	70	-13.552	-11.742	70.000	2	2	0.235	0.267	30.890
					-				
					11.79	12.88			
120	70	-11.795	-12.883	70.000	5	3	0.236	0.262	30.955
					-				
					10.00	13.96			
121	70	-10.000	-13.962	70.000	0	2	0.236	0.258	31.013
					-				
					14.97				
122	70	-8.168	-14.977	70.000	-8.168	7	0.237	0.254	31.128
					-				
					15.92				
123	70	-6.302	-15.928	70.000	-6.302	8	0.239	0.250	31.112
					-				
					16.81				
124	70	-4.404	-16.813	70.000	-4.404	3	0.240	0.248	31.150
					-				
					17.63				
125	70	-2.476	-17.631	70.000	-2.476	1	0.242	0.244	31.318
					-				
					18.38				
126	70	-0.521	-18.382	70.000	-0.521	2	0.243	0.242	31.338
					-				
					19.06				
127	70	1.459	-19.063	70.000	1.459	3	0.245	0.239	31.575
					-				
					19.67				
128	70	3.462	-19.676	70.000	3.462	6	0.247	0.235	31.295
					-				
					20.21				
129	70	5.485	-20.218	70.000	5.485	8	0.249	0.233	31.540
					-				
					20.68				
130	70	7.525	-20.689	70.000	7.525	9	0.252	0.230	31.533
					-				
					21.08				
131	70	9.581	-21.088	70.000	9.581	9	0.254	0.229	31.686
					-				
					11.65	21.41			
132	70	11.650	-21.416	70.000	0	6	0.258	0.228	31.798
					-				
					13.72	21.67			
133	70	13.728	-21.671	70.000	8	1	0.261	0.226	31.699





						-			
134	70	15.815	-21.854	70.000	15.81 5	21.85 4	0.264	0.226	31.814
						-			
135	70	17.906	-21.963	70.000	17.90 6	21.96 3	0.268	0.225	32.178
						-			
136	70	20.000	-22.000	70.000	20.00 0	22.00 0	0.270	0.223	32.179
						-			
137	70	22.094	-21.963	70.000	22.09 4	21.96 3	0.274	0.223	32.531
						-			
138	70	24.185	-21.854	70.000	24.18 5	21.85 4	0.278	0.223	32.236
						-			
139	70	26.272	-21.671	70.000	26.27 2	21.67 1	0.282	0.222	32.348
						-			
140	70	28.350	-21.416	70.000	28.35 0	21.41 6	0.287	0.222	32.621
						-			
141	70	30.419	-21.088	70.000	30.41 9	21.08 9	0.292	0.223	32.669
						-			
142	70	32.475	-20.689	70.000	32.47 5	20.68 9	0.295	0.221	32.596
						-			
143	70	34.515	-20.218	70.000	34.51 5	20.21 8	0.301	0.223	32.921
						-			
144	70	36.538	-19.676	70.000	36.53 8	19.67 6	0.305	0.223	32.854
						-			
145	70	38.541	-19.063	70.000	38.54 1	19.06 3	0.311	0.224	32.944
						-			
146	70	40.521	-18.382	70.000	40.52 1	18.38 2	0.315	0.224	33.003
						-			
147	70	42.476	-17.631	70.000	42.47 6	17.63 1	0.321	0.225	33.193
						-			
148	70	44.404	-16.813	70.000	44.40 4	16.81 3	0.327	0.227	33.344
						-			
149	70	46.302	-15.928	70.000	46.30 2	15.92 8	0.333	0.228	33.543
						-			
150	70	48.168	-14.977	70.000	48.16 8	14.97 7	0.339	0.230	33.561
						-			
151	70	50.000	-13.962	70.000	50.00 0	13.96 2	0.345	0.232	33.509
						-			
152	70	51.795	-12.883	70.000	51.79 5	12.88 3	0.352	0.234	33.769
153	70	53.552	-11.742	70.000	53.55	-	0.355	0.234	33.458

					2	11.74			
					2	2			
					-	-			
					55.26	10.54			
154	70	55.267	-10.541	70.000	7	1	0.360	0.236	32.979
					56.94				
155	70	56.940	-9.281	70.000	0	-9.281	0.363	0.236	32.415
					58.56				
156	70	58.567	-7.963	70.000	7	-7.963	0.366	0.237	31.910
					60.14				
157	70	60.148	-6.589	70.000	8	-6.589	0.370	0.237	31.386
					61.68				
158	70	61.680	-5.160	70.000	0	-5.160	0.374	0.239	30.824
					62.60				
159	70	63.160	-3.680	69.651	6	-4.234	0.378	0.240	30.336
					63.35				
160	70	64.589	-2.148	69.204	3	-3.409	0.384	0.241	29.642
					64.08				
161	70	65.963	-0.567	68.763	1	-2.525	0.389	0.243	29.187
					64.78				
162	70	67.281	1.060	68.327	9	-1.583	0.392	0.244	28.945
					65.47				
163	70	68.541	2.733	67.898	5	-0.583	0.399	0.248	28.406
					66.13				
164	70	69.742	4.448	67.477	6	0.476	0.405	0.250	27.815
					66.77				
165	70	70.883	6.205	67.065	0	1.594	0.411	0.252	27.362
					67.37				
166	70	71.962	8.000	66.664	6	2.771	0.417	0.254	26.965
					67.94				
167	70	72.977	9.832	66.275	9	4.006	0.423	0.257	26.599
					68.49				
168	70	73.928	11.698	65.900	0	5.299	0.431	0.260	26.149
					68.99				
169	70	74.813	13.596	65.538	4	6.651	0.437	0.264	25.817
					69.45				
170	70	75.631	15.524	65.192	9	8.061	0.443	0.266	25.472
					69.88				
171	70	76.382	17.479	64.862	3	9.528	0.451	0.271	25.190
					70.26	11.05			
172	70	77.063	19.459	64.550	5	2	0.458	0.273	24.838
					70.60	12.63			
173	70	77.676	21.462	64.257	0	3	0.465	0.277	24.622
					70.88	14.27			
174	70	78.218	23.485	63.984	8	0	0.473	0.281	24.300
					71.12	15.96			
175	70	78.689	25.525	63.731	7	1	0.481	0.285	24.069
					71.31	17.70			
176	70	79.088	27.581	63.500	4	6	0.487	0.289	23.889
					71.44	19.50			
177	70	79.416	29.650	63.291	8	4	0.496	0.293	23.756
					71.52	21.35			
178	70	79.671	31.728	63.106	7	3	0.502	0.297	23.534
					71.55	23.25			
179	70	79.854	33.815	62.944	0	1	0.510	0.302	23.316
					71.51	25.19			
180	70	79.963	35.906	62.806	6	6	0.518	0.307	23.217
Back-	10	0	0	100	0	0	0.286	0.294	37.530


ground	0		
--------	---	--	--

Delayed estimation procedure








CIELAB Colors




HSV Colors







Obs. 2 vs Obs. 1




Obs. 3 vs Obs. 1




Obs. 3 vs Obs. 2




Obs. 5 vs Obs. 4




Obs. 6 vs Obs. 4




Obs. 6 vs Obs. 5




Delayed estimation with scrolling





a Precision estimates in delayed estimation with scrolling method





b Correlation between κ estimates obtained in the color wheel and the scrolling method




a Precision estimates in the without-delay experiment







b Correlation between κ estimates obtained in with-delay (Experiment 1) and without-delay (Experiment 2)







b Correlation between κ estimates of each memory load in Experiment 3 and memory load one in Experiment 1




a Histogram of responses given in Experiment 4




b Relationship between each area and average κ



a Distribution of K values estimated from with-delay experiment (Experiment 1)



b Distribution of K values estimated from without-delay experiment (Experiment 2)



K = 10.58







K = 24.26

K = 51.35

K = 19.65

K = 36.15

K = 80.95



Measurements (rad)

Measurements (rad)

Measurements (rad)

Measurements (rad)

Measurements (rad)

Measurements (rad)