



Delft University of Technology

The interplay between material qualities and lighting

Zhang, Fan; de Ridder, Huib; van Egmond, Rene; Pont, Sylvia

DOI

[10.1167/17.10.228](https://doi.org/10.1167/17.10.228)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of vision

Citation (APA)

Zhang, F., de Ridder, H., van Egmond, R., & Pont, S. (2017). The interplay between material qualities and lighting. *Journal of vision*, 17(10), 1-1. <https://doi.org/10.1167/17.10.228>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright


Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.


Introduction

- In a previous study (SPIE2015, JOV2016) we developed a novel material probe, MatMix 1.0, which implemented four canonical surface scattering modes as the basis in optical mixing.
- The four surface scattering modes, namely diffuse scattering, asperity scattering, forward scattering and mesofacet scattering, were represented by covering a same-shaped 3D object with “matte”, “velvety”, “specular”, and “glittery” finishes, respectively.
- All four birds were photographed in so-called ambient, focus and brilliance lighting, three canonical modes that are commonly used in lighting design.
- In the current study we want to answer two questions, which are:
 - is the naming of the four materials we used appropriate?
 - can perceived quality be brought out by certain illuminations?
- 9 inexperienced observers participated in a rating task in English.



Method & Results

- Task: Judge 9 test material quality terms: “matte”, “velvety”, “specular”, “glittery”, “hard”, “soft”, “rough”, “smooth”, and “glossy”.
- Step 1: Yes or No question - judge if the term is applicable to the stimulus image.
- Step 2: Rating - If applicable, rate the term on a scale of 1 to 7.
- The frequency of answering “Yes” per term are shown here, each square in the subplots corresponds to a test stimulus in the 3 lightings by 4 materials matrix.
- Distribution for rating values for each test quality term per test stimulus are shown as bar charts in the right.




Acknowledgements

This work has been funded by the EU FP7 Marie Curie Initial Training Networks (ITN) project PRISM, Perceptual Representation of Illumination, Shape and Material (PITN-GA-2012-316746).

Reference

- [1] Zhang F., de Ridder H., Pont S. (2015). The influence of lighting on visual perception of material qualities. Proceedings of SPIE, 9394, 93940Q, doi:10.1117/12.2085021.
[2] Zhang, F., de Ridder, H., Fleming, R. W., & Pont, S. (2016). MatMix 1.0: Using optical mixing to probe visual material perception. Journal of Vision, 16(6), 11. doi:10.1167/16.6.11



Discussion

- Among the four names we used, “matte” was the only quality term found applicable to all materials; “velvety”, “specular” and “glittery” specifically applied to those respective materials.
- For “Specular” and “glossy” we found similar judgements.
- Brilliance light brought out “glitteriness”, “specularity”, “glossiness”, and “smoothness” the best; while focus light brought out “velvety”, “soft” and “rough” to some extent.
- The key image features might be the triggers to the perception of certain material qualities, and these features could be optimised by varying the illuminations accordingly.

