

PROBING PERCEPTUAL CONSTANCY IN LARGE VISION LANGUAGE MODELS

Haoran Sun, Suyang Yu, Yijiang Li, Qingying Gao, Haiyun Lyu, Hokin Deng, Dezhi Luo

Johns Hopkins University, University of California, San Diego

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carnegie Mellon University

University of Michigan

ihzedoul@umich.edu

ABSTRACT

Perceptual constancy is the ability to maintain stable perceptions of objects despite changes in sensory input, such as variations in distance, angle, or lighting. This ability is crucial for recognizing visual information in a dynamic world, making it essential for Vision-Language Models (VLMs). However, whether VLMs are currently and theoretically capable of mastering this ability remains under-explored. In this study, we evaluated 33 VLMs using 253 experiments across three domains: color, size, and shape constancy. The experiments included single-image and video adaptations of classic cognitive tasks, along with novel tasks in in-the-wild conditions, to evaluate the models’ recognition of object properties under varying conditions. We found significant variability in VLM performance, with models performance in shape constancy clearly dissociated from that of color and size constancy.

1 INTRODUCTION

Perceptual constancy is the ability to perceive the properties of environmental objects as stable despite variations in external conditions. While this phenomenon exists across multiple sensory modalities, including auditory and tactile perception, it is particularly well-studied in vision. The human visual system demonstrates remarkable constancy, maintaining stable object perception despite changes in distance, viewing angle, lighting, or environmental context (Epstein, 1977; Walsh and Kulikowski, 1998). This stability allows humans to recognize objects quickly and accurately, even in complex and dynamic scenes, ensuring seamless interaction with the surrounding world.

The study of perceptual constancy dates back to the 19th century, with early theories proposing that it emerges from the brain’s inference process—where stable perception is achieved by integrating empirical knowledge and environmental cues (Von Helmholtz, 1867). Neuroscientific research has since demonstrated that visual information is processed hierarchically, from the retina to the visual cortex (e.g., V1, V4, IT cortex), to maintain perceptual stability across changing conditions (DiCarlo et al., 2012). For example, neurons in the IT cortex consistently encode color regardless of illumination, suggesting that different levels of the visual system progressively compensate for environmental variations to preserve object properties (Tanaka, 1996). This intricate mechanism enables humans to navigate dynamic environments, recognize objects across varying perspectives, and make accurate judgments in complex real-world scenarios. Similarly, instilling AI models with human-like perceptual constancy is crucial for developing robust vision-language models (VLMs) that can perform reliably under diverse and unpredictable conditions. Given the rapid progress of VLMs, perceptual constancy therefore appears to be a key benchmark for assessing their cognitive capabilities and identifying their limitations.

Perceptual constancy is essential for overcoming visual ambiguities in everyday life. Color constancy allows us to recognize objects consistently despite changes in lighting—a critical ability for autonomous systems in varying illumination conditions, such as self-driving cars interpreting traffic signals at different times of day (Land and McCann, 1971). Size constancy ensures that objects appear the same size regardless of distance, facilitating spatial awareness and depth perception. This is particularly important for AI applications in robotics, where accurate size perception is necessary



Figure 1: **Sample Tasks from the Three Evaluation Dimensions of ConstancyBench.** Sample model performance from GPT-4o is presented, along with answer explanations.

for grasping and object manipulation (Carlson, 2010). Shape constancy enables stable object recognition across different viewpoints, supporting real-world tasks such as facial recognition, medical imaging, and augmented reality applications (Sternberg, 2006). Without these constancy mechanisms, AI systems may struggle with perceptual inconsistencies, leading to unreliable in-the-wild performance that lacks adaptability and precision.

To systematically assess the perceptual constancy capabilities of VLMs, we introduced ConstancyBench, a dataset comprising 253 cognitive experiments. These experiments specifically examine the three primary dimensions of perceptual constancy: color, size, and shape. By testing VLMs on these fundamental perceptual tasks, we aim to uncover the extent to which current models exhibit perceptual stability and where they fall short. Understanding these limitations is essential for advancing AI's ability to process visual information in a way that aligns more closely with human perception, ultimately enabling more reliable and adaptable AI systems in real-world applications.

2 METHODS

2.1 COGNITIVE EXPERIMENT

This study evaluates the perceptual constancy capabilities of VLMs using three types of perceptual inputs: images, videos (MOV), and GIFs. Perceptual constancy refers to the human ability to perceive object properties consistently across varying environmental conditions, focusing on three key domains: color, size, and shape constancy. These three aspects were selected to capture the fundamental principles of constancy in visual perception, enabling stable object recognition despite changes in lighting, distance, and viewing angle. Below, we provided explanations for each domain.

2.1.1 COLOR CONSTANCY

Color constancy is an important feature of the human visual system. It allows us to perceive the color of objects consistently under different light conditions. A common example is a white wall appearing in different shades under different lighting conditions. However, the human visual system still perceives it as white rather than the wall's actual color has changed. This occurs because the visual system can separate an object's true color from the influence of lighting condition, thereby maintaining stable color perception (Jameson and Hurvich, 1989). Evaluating color constancy can

reveal whether VLMs can truly understand an object’s intrinsic color rather than merely relying on color patterns in the training data.

2.1.2 SIZE CONSTANCY

Size constancy refers to the perception of an object’s size as stable, even when its retinal image changes due to variations in distance (Sperandio and Chouinard, 2015). For example, a distant car appears just as large as a nearby one, despite the difference in retinal projection. This stability is crucial for spatial awareness, depth perception, and navigation. Assessing this phenomenon in VLMs can determine whether they truly grasp the spatial properties of objects in the dynamic environment.

2.1.3 SHAPE CONSTANCY

Shape constancy allows us to recognize objects as having the same shape, even when viewed from different angles (Rock, 1973). A round plate, for example, may project an elliptical image when seen obliquely, yet we still perceive it as circular. This perceptual stability relies on depth cues, prior experience, and contextual information. Shape constancy is fundamental to object recognition and spatial reasoning, allowing for accurate identification across perspectives. Research suggests humans achieve this by comparing novel views to stored shape representations (Tarr, 1995). Evaluating shape constancy in VLMs can reveal whether they truly understand an object’s three-dimensional form or rely on fixed representations contingent to certain viewpoints.

2.2 MODEL SELECTION AND EXPERIMENT

We evaluated three categories of VLMs. To ensure a fair comparison, all VLMs are evaluated on their ability to reason over images and texts under a zero-shot generation task. A complete list of models is reported in the results section as shown in Figure 2. Model size data are curated at the same time. The models are categorized as follows:

1. **Open-source VLMs with Multi-Image Reasoning:** Includes models with different sizes and other variants such as CogVLM Series (Hong et al., 2024), Qwen series, such as Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023), Qwen-2 (Wang et al., 2024), and Blip2 (Li et al., 2023), LLaVA-Next (Liu et al., 2024), which are capable of reasoning over interleaved multiple images and texts.
2. **Closed-source VLMs with Multi-Image Reasoning:** Includes proprietary models such as GPT series (OpenAI) (GPT-4v, GPT-4-turbo, GPT-4o-mini), Gemini Series (Gemini), and Claude Series (Claude). These models also support reasoning across interleaved images and texts,
3. **Open-source VLMs with single-Image Reasoning:** Includes models designed to process a single image alongside continuous text. InstructBlip Series (Dai et al., 2023), LLaVA Series (Liu et al., 2023a) (Liu et al., 2023b)

In total, we processed 33 models for evaluation. Model performances in perceptual constancy tasks are presented here along with human baseline (Figure 2). In order to analyze the reasoning abilities of VLMs, we ask the models to explain their answers after they have given the answers.

2.3 HUMAN BASELINE

We recruited a total of 7 participants, all of whom were college students proficient in English. Participants were instructed to skip any question that was ambiguously phrased or too complex to answer within 90 seconds. A question was marked as failed if the participant did not provide an answer. For each question, at least 80% of participants needed to answer correctly; otherwise, we modified the question, and new annotators completed the revised version. The human baseline result for each question was normalized based on the number of participants who provided an answer.




Figure 2: Model Performance on ConstancyBench As Compared to Human Performance

3 RESULTS

3.1 GENERAL RESULTS

Overall, our study highlights a significant performance gap between humans and VLMs across the three evaluation dimensions. As shown in Figure 2, humans consistently outperform VLMs on all tasks. However, a few high-performing models (e.g., GPT-4v) achieve accuracy levels relatively close to human performance. These findings suggest that while current VLMs still face substantial limitations in replicating human-like perceptual constancy, some aspects of this capability may have begun to emerge.

3.2 DOMAIN-WISE COMPARISONS

Figure 3 breaks down performance across perceptual tasks, showing stable human accuracy with minimal fluctuation, while VLM performance varies significantly. VLMs perform best on the shape constancy task and worst on color constancy. Model accuracy in the color dimension follows a bimodal distribution, clustering around 40%-50% and 70%-80%, indicating large fluctuations. In the size dimension, accuracy varies less, with most values between 50%-80% and fewer models achieving 90% or higher. The shape dimension exhibits a smoother, nearly normal distribution, with most accuracies ranging from 60%-80%. ANOVA results confirm significant overall differences in VLM perceptual constancy across color, shape, and size ($F = 10.0596, p = 0.000108$).

Further examining the interdependency between evaluation dimensions, the Tukey HSD test (Figure 4) revealed significant differences in model performance between color and shape constancy ($p = 0.0001$) and between shape and size constancy ($p = 0.0059$). In contrast, humans exhibited no significant differences across any pairwise comparisons. These results suggest that while humans likely rely on a domain-general mechanism for perceptual constancy, VLMs may process these dimensions differently, exhibiting varying levels of performance depending on the task. This disparity could indicate that current VLMs may lack an integrated, human-like perceptual framework, instead leveraging task-specific heuristics that lead to inconsistent performance across different constancy dimensions.




Figure 3: **Overall and Dimension-Wise Accuracy: Humans vs. Models.** A. For overall accuracy across tasks, human participants outperform models significantly ($p < 0.0001$). B. Human participants consistently outperform models in each dimension (all categories $p < 0.001$).




Figure 4: **Pairwise Comparisons of Human and Model Performance Across Evaluation Dimensions (Tukey HSD).** A. Human performance revealed no statistically significant pairwise differences across dimensions (all p -values > 0.10). B. Model performance showed significant differences between shape constancy and the other two domains (both $p < 0.006$), while the pairwise difference between color and size constancy was not significant ($p = 0.4724$).

3.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MODEL PERFORMANCE AND MODEL SIZE

A widely held belief in the machine learning community is that increasing a model’s scale—measured by the number of parameters—leads to systematic improvements in reasoning abilities (Sutton, 2019; Kaplan et al., 2020), a principle known as the scaling law. However, this assumption remains an empirical observation rather than a theoretically proven rule. To assess whether the scaling law applies to perceptual constancy, we examined the relationship between model performance on perceptual constancy tasks and model size (Figure 5). Our analysis revealed significant positive correlations between model size and performance in color constancy ($y = 0.0996x + 0.4716$, $p = 0.0384$, $R^2 = 0.1604$) and size constancy ($y = 0.0986x + 0.5041$, $p = 0.0013$, $R^2 = 0.3438$). These results suggest that larger models tend to perform better on these two constancy tasks, potentially benefiting from improved feature extraction, higher-level reasoning, or greater exposure to diverse training data. In contrast, shape constancy exhibited no significant relationship with model size ($y = 0.0483x + 0.6582$, $p = 0.1496$, $R^2 = 0.0812$). This weak correlation suggests that increasing model scale alone may not be sufficient to improve shape constancy. How-




Figure 5: **The Relationship Between Model Performance and Model Size** The four plots illustrate how model size, as measured by numbers of parameter in the models’ neural networks (log scale), affects the accuracy overall as well as across the three evaluation dimensions

ever, combined with the observation that virtually all models achieve above-chance performance in shape constancy—with top-performing models reaching near-human accuracy—it appears that, unlike color and size constancy, VLMs may have already surpassed a critical milestone in this dimension. This discrepancy points to potential differences in the underlying mechanisms governing different aspects of perceptual constancy in VLMs.

4 DISCUSSIONS

Here, we introduced ConstancyBench, a comprehensive evaluation framework for assessing VLMs’ performance on perceptual constancy tasks across three key dimensions: color, size, and shape constancy. Our findings indicate that while model performance still lags behind human capabilities, VLMs have already demonstrated significant reasoning abilities in shape constancy. The consistently high performance across models of different sizes, with only minor variance in relation to scaling, suggests that the mechanisms underlying shape constancy have already emerged as stable representations contingent on the model’s architecture. In contrast, model performance in color and size constancy lags further behind human performance compared to shape constancy. However, we

observed a significant positive correlation between model size and accuracy in these dimensions, suggesting that while these abilities are not yet fully developed in VLMs, there is considerable potential for improvement within the current framework.

The cognitive basis of perceptual constancy in humans remains an active area of research. While it may be premature to offer a definitive mechanistic explanation, recent insights from both cognitive science and artificial intelligence research provide valuable perspectives on the dissociation between VLMs’ performance across different constancy dimensions observed here. A long-standing view holds that shape constancy depends on the ability to see the same object from multiple perspectives (Pizlo, 1994; Tarr, 1995). However, recent studies have shown that VLMs exhibit significant limitations in perspective-taking over identical object arrangements (Gao et al., 2024), with models of all sizes consistently performing below chance. The strong performance in shape constancy observed in our study, together with these findings, challenges the traditional viewpoint-based explanation of shape constancy in VLMs.

An alternative hierarchical account of shape constancy may better explain these results (Bradley, 2008; Buccella, 2021; Buccella and Chemero, 2022). According to this view, shape constancy exists at two levels: minimal shape constancy, which involves accumulating perceptual representations of an object under varying conditions, and robust shape constancy, which requires a single, unified representation that enables holistic perception of objects (Green, forthcoming). While robust shape constancy depends on model-based reasoning, which underlies perspective-taking, minimal shape constancy does not. It has been argued that standard shape constancy tasks—such as the rotating tables task (bottom left case in Figure 1)—probe only minimal rather than robust shape constancy. Thus, the high shape constancy performance observed in our study may indicate that VLMs have achieved minimal shape constancy by accumulating perceptual data across different conditions, without necessarily acquiring higher-order model-based reasoning (Gao et al., 2024). This provides empirical support for a hierarchical structure of perceptual constancy.

Furthermore, the differences between shape constancy and the other two dimensions—color and size constancy—may stem from the greater information-gathering demands required to process object representations across varying conditions. Color constancy, for instance, is often assessed under contrastive conditions, and reasoning about purposeful manipulations of color properties may fall beyond the capabilities of smaller models. Similarly, size constancy requires an understanding of spatial relationships and object arrangements (e.g., near vs. far objects), which may give larger models an advantage. These findings suggest that scaling has allowed VLMs to develop some resilience to perceptual challenges despite still fall behind the exceptional human-level performance in these tasks (Tanaka, 1996; Gegenfurtner et al., 2024).

REFERENCES

- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023.
- Peter Bradley. Constancy, categories and bayes: A new approach to representational theories of color constancy. *Philosophical Psychology*, 21(5):601–627, 2008.
- Alessandra Buccella. The problem of perceptual invariance. *Synthese*, 199(5):13883–13905, 2021.
- Alessandra Buccella and Anthony Chemero. Reconsidering perceptual constancy. *Philosophical Psychology*, 35(7):1057–1071, 2022.
- Neil Carlson. *Psychology: The Science of Behavior*. Pearson Canada Inc., Toronto, ON, Canada, 4th canadian edition, 2010. ISBN 978-0-205-64524-4.
- claude. Claude models - anthropic. <https://docs.anthropic.com/en/docs/welcome#models>.
- Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023.

- James J. DiCarlo, Davide Zoccolan, and Nicole C. Rust. How does the brain solve visual object recognition? *Neuron*, 73(3):415–434, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2012.01.010.
- William Epstein. *Stability and Constancy in Visual Perception: Mechanisms and Processes*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1977.
- Qingying Gao, Yijiang Li, Haiyun Lyu, Haoran Sun, Dezhi Luo, and Hokin Deng. Vision language models see what you want but not what you see. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00324*, 2024.
- Karl R Gegenfurtner, David Weiss, and Marina Bloj. Color constancy in real-world settings. *Journal of Vision*, 24(2):12–12, 2024.
- Gemini. Gemini models— gemini api— google ai for developers. <https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs/models/gemini>.
- EJ Green. A pluralist perspective on shape constancy. forthcoming.
- Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Ming Ding, Wenmeng Yu, Qingsong Lv, Yan Wang, Yean Cheng, Shiyu Huang, Junhui Ji, Zhao Xue, et al. CogVLM2: Visual language models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16500*, 2024.
- D. Jameson and L. M. Hurvich. Essay concerning color constancy. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40:1–22, 1989. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.40.1.1.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- Edwin Land and John McCann. Lightness and retinex theory. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 61:1–11, 01 1971. doi: 10.1364/JOSA.61.000001.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *ICML*, 2023.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023a.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023b.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, January 2024. URL <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>.
- OpenAI. Models - openai api. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o>.
- Zygmunt Pizlo. A theory of shape constancy based on perspective invariants. *Vision Research*, 34(12):1637–1658, 1994.
- Irvin Rock. *Orientation and Form*. Academic Press, New York, 1973. ISBN 978-0125912501. Digitized on 2008-10-30.
- Irene Sperandio and Philippe A. Chouinard. The mechanisms of size constancy. *Multisensory Research*, 28(3-4):253–283, 2015. doi: 10.1163/22134808-00002483.
- Robert Sternberg. *Cognitive Psychology*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, Belmont, CA, 2006. ISBN 978-0-495-50629-4.
- Richard Sutton. The bitter lesson. *Incomplete Ideas (blog)*, 13(1):38, 2019.
- Keiji Tanaka. Inferotemporal cortex and object vision. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 19:109–139, 1996. ISSN 0147-006X. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ne.19.030196.000545. URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ne.19.030196.000545>.

Michael J. Tarr. Rotating objects to recognize them: A case study on the role of viewpoint dependency in the recognition of three-dimensional objects. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2:55–82, 1995. doi: 10.3758/BF03214412. URL <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03214412>.

Hermann Von Helmholtz. *Handbuch der physiologischen Optik*, volume 9. Voss, 1867.


Vincent Walsh and Janusz Kulikowski. *Perceptual Constancy: Why Things Look as They Do*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model's perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024.

A APPENDIX

A.1 ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES

A




In the picture, has the actual color of the bridge itself changed?
Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.

Correct Answer: No

GPT4o: No. The actual color of the bridge itself has not changed the difference in appearance between the two photos is primarily due to the lighting conditions the top image is taken at night with artificial lighting illuminating the bridge and surrounding area, giving the bridge a warm, glowing appearance the bottom image is taken during the day with natural daylight, which shows the bridge in its true color without the effects of artificial lighting.

B



In the picture, has the actual color of the building itself changed?
Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.

Correct Answer: No

GPT4o: No. The actual color of the building itself has not changed the difference in appearance is due to the time of day and the lighting conditions in the top image, the building is shown during daylight hours, which provides natural lighting in the bottom image, the building is illuminated at night with artificial lights, which enhance and highlight certain architectural features, giving it a different visual effect the building's actual color remains the same; it is the lighting conditions that create the variation in appearance.

C




In the picture, has the actual color of the building itself changed?
Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.


Correct Answer: No

GPT4o: No. The actual color of the building itself has not changed the two images show the same building at different times of day and under different lighting conditions in the top image, the building is shown during daylight, which presents its natural colors in the bottom image, the building is illuminated at night with artificial lighting, which gives it a warmer, golden appearance the change in color is due to the lighting, not a change in the building's actual colors


Figure 6: **Additional Sample Tasks: Color Constancy.**

A  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: White,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C


GPT4o: C blue. In the image provided, the rubik's cube's middle square on the visible face is blue this is the face with predominantly yellow stickers, and the middle square is distinctly blue

B  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: Purple,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C


GPT4o: C blue. The central square in the front face of the rubik's cube, which is visible in the image, is blue

C  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: Red,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C


GPT4o: C blue. The image provided shows a rubik's cube with several visible faces the middle square on the front face of the cube is distinctly blue

D  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: Green,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C

GPT4o: A green. The middle square of the rubik's cube shown in the image is color green this can be determined by observing the central square on the visible face of the cube


E  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: Red,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C


GPT4o: C Blue. The middle square on the visible side of the rubik's cube in the image is blue


F  What color is the middle square of the Rubik's Cube? Please select from the following choices:
A: Red,
B: Yellow,
C: Blue
Correct Answer: C


GPT4o: None. The color of the middle square of the rubik's cube is purple thus, none of the given options (a red, b yellow, c blue) are correct. The middle square of the visible face on the rubik's cube is purple


Figure 7: Additional Sample Tasks: Color Constancy.

A  In the picture, does the actual width of the road get narrower from near to far? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No. the actual width of the road does not get narrower from near to far the road appears to get narrower due to the effect of perspective, which causes objects to seem smaller as they get further away from the viewer this visual effect is typical in photographs or any scenes with a defined vanishing point the road itself remains the same width throughout

B  In the picture, do the actual sizes of the wooden posts on both sides of the pier get smaller from near to far? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No. the actual sizes of the wooden posts on both sides of the pier do not get smaller from near to far in the picture, it only appears that the posts are getting smaller due to the perspective effect as objects go farther away from the viewer, they appear smaller even if their actual size remains unchanged this is a common optical illusion in photography and real-life views, where parallel lines seem to converge at a vanishing point in the distance

C  Is this tunnel getting narrower? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No. this tunnel is not getting narrower the illusion is created by the perspective of the photograph as the tunnel extends into the distance, objects further away from the camera appear smaller due to the rules of linear perspective this makes the far end of the tunnel appear narrower than the entrance even though the tunnel's actual dimensions do not change the effect is enhanced by the parallel lines of lights and the road markings converging towards the vanishing point

D  In the picture, is the actual width of the pier consistent from near to far? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: Yes
GPT4o: No. The actual width of the pier remains consistent from near to far the apparent decrease in width is due to perspective as objects extend into the distance, they appear smaller and narrower, creating an illusion that they are converging this is a common visual effect in photography and human vision called perspective foreshortening the physical width of the pier itself does not change, but our perception of it does

E  Has the actual width of the suspension bridge deck in the picture changed?
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No. The actual width of the suspension bridge deck has not changed the bridge appears narrower as it extends into the distance due to the effect of perspective in the photograph perspective causes objects that are farther away to appear smaller than those that are closer to the viewer, creating an illusion that the width is decreasing as you look further along the bridge






F  In the picture, does the actual width of the train tracks get narrower from near to far? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No. The actual width of the train tracks does not get narrower from near to far the apparent narrowing of the train tracks in the image is an example of perspective, a visual phenomenon where parallel lines appear to converge as they recede into the distance this effect occurs because of the way three-dimensional objects are projected onto a two-dimensional surface (the image), creating the illusion that train tracks get closer together as they extend further away from the viewer


Figure 8: Additional Sample Tasks: Size Constancy.

A  In the picture, are the actual sizes of the two tanks the same? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: Yes
GPT4o: No, the actual sizes of the two tanks are the same the apparent difference in size is due to the perspective from which the photograph is taken the tank in the foreground appears larger because it is closer to the camera, while the tank in the background appears smaller because it is farther away this is a common visual effect known as perspective distortion

B  Are the actual sizes of the two missiles in the picture the same? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: Yes
GPT4o: No, the actual sizes of the two missiles in the picture are the same the difference in their apparent sizes is due to perspective; the missile in the background appears smaller because it is farther away from the viewpoint this change in distance causes the missile closer to the camera to appear larger, but in reality, they are the same size

C  Which bomber is larger in actual size? Please select from the following choices:
A. The one in front;
B. The one in the back;
C. They are the same size;
Correct Answer: C
GPT4o: C, they are the same size, the image shows two aircraft that appear to be the same model, likely the rockwell b-1 lancer, a supersonic variable-sweep wing, heavy bomber used by the united states air force the apparent size difference is due to perspective; the aircraft in the foreground appears larger because it is closer to the camera than the aircraft in the background both aircraft are the same size in reality

D  Is the actual size of the missile in the front larger than the size of the missile in the back? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: NO, the actual size of the missile in the front is not larger than the size of the missile in the back the two missiles shown in the image are identical in size they appear to be the same model (df-5b) loaded on similar transport vehicles they might appear slightly different in size due to the perspective of the photograph, but they are actually the same size

E  Is the actual size of the 055 missile destroyer in the front larger than the 055 missile destroyer in the back? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: Yes, the actual size of the 055 missile destroyer in the front is likely larger than the 055 missile destroyer in the back, but not because of their design both missile destroyers are type 055 class and should be identical in design and dimensions the reason the one in the front appears larger in the image is likely due to perspective and camera angle the front ship is closer to the camera, which makes it appear larger than the identical ship situated further back






F  Is the actual size of the tank in the front larger than the actual sizes of the two tanks behind it? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: NO, the actual size of the tank in the front is not larger than the actual sizes of the two tanks behind it the tanks appear to be the same model and likely have the same dimensions the difference in apparent size is due to perspective; the tank in the front is closer to the camera, making it appear larger than the tanks further away this effect is known as foreshortening, where objects that are closer to the viewer appear larger than those further away, even if they are of the same actual size


Figure 9: Additional Sample Tasks: Size Constancy.

A  Is the actual shape of the tabletop in the picture a parallelogram? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No, the actual shape of the tabletop in the picture is not a parallelogram it is a rectangle the tabletop in the image has four right-angle corners, characteristic of a rectangle, rather than having slanted sides as a parallelogram would the perspective in the image might make it seem otherwise, but the actual shape is a rectangle

B  Is the actual shape of the top surface of the object in the picture a circle? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: Yes
GPT4o: Yes, the actual shape of the top surface of the object in the picture is a circle the object is a cylinder, and in a cylinder, the top (and bottom) surfaces are circular even though the viewing angle might make the top surface appear slightly elliptical due to perspective, the true shape of the top surface is a circle

C  Is the actual shape of each face of the object different? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: No
GPT4o: No, the actual shape of each face of the object is not different each face of the object is a square, making it a cube a cube has six faces, each of which is a square with equal sides and angles although the faces may appear different in size and proportion due to perspective and lighting, they are all actually identical squares

D  In the picture, is the actual shape of the door a rectangle or a trapezoid? Please select from the following choices:
A. rectangle;
B. trapezoid;
Correct Answer: A
GPT4o: A, the actual shape of the door is a rectangle the reason it appears to be a trapezoid in the image is due to the perspective from which the photo was taken the door is partially open, and the angle of the photograph distorts the rectangular shape, causing it to look like a trapezoid however, in reality, doors are typically rectangular

E  Are the actual sizes of the three clocks the same? Please answer with Yes or No and provide an explanation.
Correct Answer: Yes
GPT4o: No, the actual sizes of the three clocks are not the same although the heights of the clocks in the picture appear to be different, this discrepancy seems to be a result of the differing angles and perspectives from which the clocks are viewed, rather than their actual physical size, all three clocks are indeed the same size, but they appear different due to their angles and perspectives, note that perspective can make items appear larger or smaller compared to others when viewed from different angles, but it doesn't change their actual size


F  Which circle is the largest in actual size? Please select from the following choices:
A. The left one;
B. The middle one;
C. The right one;
D. They are all the same size;
Correct Answer: D
GPT4o: D, despite appearances, the circles in all three images are the same size the differences in the perceived sizes are due to the perspective from which each square with the hole (circle) is viewed the first square is viewed head-on, making the circle appear its true size the middle one and the right one are viewed at increasing angles, which causes the circles to appear smaller even though their actual sizes remain unchanged this is an example of how perspective can influence our perception of size

Figure 10: Additional Sample Tasks: Shape Constancy.