


## Discovering and Modeling Mechanisms



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Review - 1

A mechanism consists of parts (entities) and their operations (activities) organized to realize a phenomenon

- Engineers and designers construct mechanisms from pre-existing parts
- Scientists must reverse engineer mechanisms —discover the parts, their operations, and organization

Discovering parts and operations requires decomposing mechanisms

2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Clicker Question

The goal in decomposing a mechanism is

To carve the mechanism up into parts

To render the mechanism inoperable by removing its parts

To identify the parts and operations in the mechanism

To figure out how the mechanism is organized

3

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

# Organization

For a mechanism to work properly, its parts must be appropriately organized in space and its operations organized in time

For a cell to make proteins, different RNAs generated by copying parts of DNA must all be organized in the right way



4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---


## Temporal Organization: From Sequential to Feedback

Since we work in time, we tend to think of operations organized in sequence

But feedback is a powerful design principle

- Negative feedback:
  - to keep a process within limits
  - to generate oscillations

- Positive feedback:
  - to maintain an active system




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Clicker Question

Feedback relations (positive and negative) between parts and operations serve to

Make it easier to identify the parts and operations of a mechanism

Violate the principle that causations is directional

Render the whole system into an entity at a higher level of organization

Always render a mechanism unstable

6

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Organization Makes Higher-Level Entities

- Organization plays a critical role in coordinating the component parts and their operations so as to perform an activity
- Organization also creates systems that have an identity and act as a unit in the world
- Often scientific inquiry spans multiple levels of organization
  - The level at which a mechanism as a whole interacts with other entities
  - The level of the component parts and their operations
  - The level of the subcomponents and their operations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Reductionism versus Holism

- Tension:
  - Emphasizing components focuses on the decomposition of the system into separate components (reductionism)
  - Emphasizing organization focuses on the integration of the components into a whole system (holism)
- Often conflict between holists (vitalists) and reductionists
  - Holists charge that what the parts and operations reductionist identifies can't produce the phenomenon
  - Reductionists charge that holists fails to provide explanations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Mechanistic explanations: Both reductionist and holist

To understand a mechanism you must be both a holist and a reductionist

Look both

- Upwards to higher levels of organization at which the mechanism is an organized systems that performs its activity and thereby interacts with other entities

and

- Downwards to lower levels of organization in which parts perform their operations in interaction with other parts

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Discovering How Mechanisms Work

- What are organized in mechanisms are parts (entities) performing operations (activities or causal processes)
- When it is possible, the most effective way to understand parts and their operations is to experiment
- Experimentation involves intervention and manipulation of a possible cause to determine what effect it has—and CONFOUNDS remain the worry!
- The only differences from our earlier discussion are
  - This is being done within the context of a organized system
  - The goal is to understand how the parts contribute to the working of the mechanism

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

## First step: Getting the Phenomenon Right

Pick a card and think real hard about it. Don't forget it.



Whoops. I thought you were cheating and tried to shoot you. But I got your card instead.



Check it out—did I take out your card



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Correctly characterizing perception

One view: Perception is like photography—creating a picture for a homunculus to view

This fits our phenomenal awareness, but that may be a false lead—

- As you just saw
- Remember change blindness

Alternative: Perception involves extraction of information in format useable by down-line systems

There may be no place where all the information comes together

We may not in fact even perceive much of the scene we are looking at

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Intervening to discover how a mechanism works

The operations of the components of a mechanism result in causal interactions between components

Just as with simple causal interactions between an independent and dependent variable

Correlated activity suggests causal linkages

But the best evidence for causation comes from manipulating and so controlling changes

- Manipulating the input to the mechanism and determining the effects
- Manipulating components of the mechanism and determining their effects

13

## The Mechanism


Your task—figure out how this mechanism produces the phenomenon of seeing (only one of the phenomena for which it is responsible)



## Figuring out how it works

Three basic strategies for figuring out what the components of a mechanism do

- Recording from an individual component while the mechanism is operating  
*and inferring from the conditions in which it is active what operation it (or components prior to it in the pathway) might be involved in*



## Figuring out how it works


Inhibition, lesion, or ablation studies:  
Lesioning or ablating a component

*and inferring from the deficit in the behavior of the whole what operation the*

*component likely contributed to*

Excitation or stimulation studies: stimulating a component

*and inferring from its effect on the whole system what operation it likely contributed to*



## Clicker Question

If you removed a part from your MP3 player and it no longer produces sound, you can infer

- A. The part you removed was itself causally responsible for generating sound
- B. The part you removed probably had no direct role in generating sound
- C. The part you removed probably figured in the process of generating sound
- D. The part you removed probably performed a lot of other operations as well

## Start with Lesions


Until the 1940s, there was no way to record the activity of individual neurons in the brain

Crude stimulation (with the electrodes of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) activated very wide areas, and so not sufficiently specific

That left ablation or lesion as initially the tool of choice

# Occipital Lobe

OCCIPITAL LOBE



Bartolomeo Panizza, 1855

Proposed occipital lobe as locus of vision based on patients who experienced blindness after strokes (experiments of nature)

Hermann Munk, 1870s

Unilateral removal of the occipital lobe in dogs resulted in partial blindness  
Bilateral removal resulted in total blindness

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Getting More Detailed

Tatsuji Inouye, a young Japanese ophthalmologist, was assigned to assess visual loss in Japanese soldiers who had suffered brain injury so as to determine how large their pensions would be, but he decided to make the job more interesting and map deficits in particular parts of the visual field onto the area damaged

The Russians had developed a new high-velocity rifle, (Mosin–Nagant Model 91), that fired a 7.62-mm hard-jacketed bullet. This bullet pierced the skull without shattering, leaving tidy entrance and exit wounds

This made it possible to trace the trajectory and determine just what parts of the occipital lobe was damaged



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

# Retinotopic map of the visual field

Inouye correlated the parts of the visual field in which his patients were blind with areas of brain damage, and mapped the visual field onto the visual cortex



Gordon Holmes (1918) constructed a similar map based on studies of soldiers injured during World War I.

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

## Much Later—Tootell's Recording Studies Confirm Retinotopy



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

## So Visual Cortex is Needed—but What does it do?

- Lesions can show that an part of the mechanism seems to be necessary for it to perform a specific phenomenon
  - But are not able to show more specifically what the damaged part does in normal situations
- A powerful *complement* is to record from the component while it is in operation to see what elicits its activity
- Made possible by the development of electrodes wired to amplifiers and speakers



---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

## Single-cell recording



---

---

---

---

---

---

---


---





## Hubel and Wiesel's complex cells

Some cells Hubel and Wiesel tested responded to bars of light anywhere in the receptive field of the cell  
or  
If they were moving in a preferred direction across the field




---

---

---

---

---


---

---


---

## How do Simple and Complex Cells do it?

Hubel and Wiesel proposed simple model wiring diagrams to show how simple and complex cells could perform their different tasks



Simple cells: Fire if enough LGN cells with centers on the bar are active



Complex cells: Fire if one or another simple cell detecting a bar is active (or if several become active in sequence)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Clicker Question

What can lesion studies show that recording studies cannot?

- A. That the part in question actually performed the operation in question
- B. That the part in question might be sufficient for performing the operation
- C. That the part in question might be necessary for performing the operation
- D. That the part in question actually performs a wide range of operations

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Beyond edge detection

The cells Hubel and Wiesel found are all located in one part of the occipital lobe known as the striate cortex, Brodmann's area 17, or V1 (visual area 1).

Detecting edges is important to seeing, but it isn't the whole story, as Hubel and Wiesel recognized:

"Specialized as the cells of 17 are, compared with rods and cones they must, nevertheless, still represent a very elementary stage in the handling of complex forms, occupied as they are with a relatively simple region-by-region analysis of retinal contours. How this information is used at later stages in the visual path is far from clear, and represents one of the most tantalizing problems for the future" (Hubel and Wiesel, 1968, p. 242).



---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

# Additional areas in extrastriate cortex

V2—adjoining V1: cells respond to illusory contours



V4—further forward from V1 and V2—cells responded to color: Zeki "in every case the units have been colour coded, responding vigorously to one wavelength and grudgingly, or not at all, to other wavelengths or to white light at different intensities"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# The Woman Who Couldn't See Motion



- When Gisela Leibold tried to pour coffee, she could see the cup's color, shape, and position, and could tip the pot
  - But what she saw was like a frozen waterfall
  - She couldn't see anything moving
  - Just a sequence of still life paintings
- Result of a stroke she had suffered that affected area known as MT

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

## Cells that process motion

The phenomenon of perceived motion:

Two stimuli, moving in different directions, will sometimes be seen as one stimulus moving in a combined direction



V1 cells respond only to actual motion, not perceived motion

So they do not compute perceived motion

But cells in area V5 (MT) do respond to perceived motion

34

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

## Adding microstimulation



William Newsome trained monkeys to indicate the direction of motion they perceived correlated motion in ambiguous displays

Recording from MT cells showed that the responses of those cells predicted the animal's behavior

Microstimulation of those cells biases the behavioral response

This combination of recording and stimulation studies (when combined with the lesion results) offers powerful evidence about what these components are doing

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Clicker Question

Making a mechanism produce the phenomenon of interest by stimulating a part of it serves to establish

- A. That the part is sufficient for the mechanism to perform the phenomenon of interest
- B. That the part is necessary for the mechanism to perform the phenomenon of interest
- C. That the part can initiate a causal process resulting in the phenomenon of interest
- D. That if one lesioned the part, the phenomenon would be destroyed

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Understanding Motion Perception

- Lesion deficit pointed to MT as a likely motion area
- Single cell recording provided further evidence that the area was involved in detecting motion—perceived, not just actual motion
- The ability to stimulate the area and enhance the effect further confirmed the result
  
- All three methods brought to bear to figure out this mechanism

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

## Object Recognition in Inferotemporal Cortex

Recording from single cells in Inferotemporal Cortex, Charles Gross found cells that responded to specific shapes: e.g., hands.



---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

## New tools for recording activity

Introduction of PET and fMRI in the 1980s and 1990s provided a way to record (indirectly via blood flow) activity in brain areas of humans while engaging in actual tasks

Nancy Kanwisher identified an area (in the fusiform gyrus) that responds particularly to faces



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Prosopagnosia: Face Blindness

A self report:

- When I look at a face, I see the same thing that I suspect you do. My vision works fine (other than some autistic difficulties that aren't relevant to this discussion). My brain sees a face much like any other object. The problem I have is in associating that face with a particular person I know.
- "I recognize people by three primary methods - general body size/shape, hair, and the sound of their voice. These three methods are not nearly as effective as the normal way of recognizing people - by recognizing a face. Thus, I often mistake someone I don't know for someone that I do know or I fail to recognize someone I know. For instance, I have been unable to recognize my father on multiple occasions, since his body size and shape are not very distinctive, nor does he have long or distinctive hair."

## Clicker Question

Given the evidence that the fusiform face area is active when people view faces and that face blindness results when it is damaged, why might other researchers still resist treating the area as a *face* area

- A. The area might have nothing to do with recognizing faces
- B. The operation performed in the area may not be limited to faces
- C. The area might not be a sufficient cause of recognizing faces
- D. Researchers have not yet done a stimulation study to determine if stimulation results in reports of faces

## But is it a "face" area?

There is little doubt that the area Kanwisher identified responds particularly well to faces

But like any recording study, we don't yet know what else it might respond to

- Some evidence that it responds to objects for which detecting individual identity is important






## The visual mechanism only partly understood

We know of more components in the visual system than we know what they do

The mechanism is only partly understood

As we learn about other component, revisions in the current account will be required



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Each technique is limited

Each approach—recording, lesioning, and stimulating—requires inference *and inference is fallible*

- Just showing that a component is active given a specific stimulus does not tell you
  - Specifically what about the stimulus it is responding to
  - What it is doing in response to that feature
- Just showing that lesioning a component interrupts an activity does not tell you
  - That it alone was responsible for the activity
  - What it contributed to the activity
- Just showing that stimulating a component increases the performance of the activity
  - Does not tell you how it figured in generating the activity

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Need to orchestrate multiple techniques

- There is no foolproof strategy for figuring out how a mechanism works
- The best results stem from combining different strategies to determine what the components of a system are and what they do

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Where we have been in this class

- Logic: structure of arguments for confirmation and falsification
- Observation: variables and their measurement
- Correlation: predictions based on correlations and statistically significant differences within samples
- Causation: experimental and non-experimental evidence, and strategies for controlling confounds
- Mechanisms: discovering how component parts, operations, and their organization yield a system that exhibits the phenomenon of interest

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Final Thought—Or a First Thought Repeated

Reasoning and making decisions, whether about  
Perception  
Correlation  
Causation  
Mechanism  
is fallible

We can (and should) strive to come closer to the truth and  
rely on the best information available now

But we must also recognize that tomorrow  
something might be discovered that makes us  
revise our best conclusions of today

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---