

1 **Left gaze bias in humans, rhesus monkeys and domestic dogs**

2

3 Kun Guo¹, Kerstin Meints¹, Charlotte Hall^{1,2}, Sophie Hall^{1,2}, Daniel Mills²

4 ¹Department of Psychology. ²Department of Biological Sciences,

5 University of Lincoln, UK

6

7

8

9

10 Corresponding author:

11 Prof. Daniel Mills

12 Department of Biological Sciences

13 University of Lincoln

14 Lincoln LN2 2LG, UK,

15 e-mail: dmills@lincoln.ac.uk

16 Tel: +44-1522-895356

17 Fax: +44-1522-886026

18

1 **Abstract**

2 While viewing faces, human adults often demonstrate a natural gaze bias towards
3 the left visual field, that is, the right side of the viewee’s face is often inspected first and for
4 longer periods. Using a preferential looking paradigm, we demonstrate that this bias is
5 neither uniquely human nor limited to primates, and provide evidence to help elucidate its
6 biological function within a broader social cognitive framework. We observed that 6-
7 month-old infants showed a wider tendency for left gaze preference towards objects and
8 faces of different species and orientation, while in adults the bias appears only towards
9 upright human faces. Rhesus monkeys showed a left gaze bias towards upright human and
10 monkey faces, but not towards inverted faces. Domestic dogs, however, only demonstrated
11 a left gaze bias towards human faces, but not towards monkey or dog faces, nor to
12 inanimate object images. Our findings suggest that face- and species-sensitive gaze
13 asymmetry is more widespread in the animal kingdom than previously recognised, is not
14 constrained by attentional or scanning bias, and could be shaped by experience to develop
15 adaptive behavioural significance.

16

17 **Keywords:** gaze asymmetry, face perception, lateralisation, development, phylogeny,
18 infants, monkeys, dogs

19

20 **Introduction**

21 Facial communication plays a crucial role in the social cognition of humans and
22 several species of non-human animals. Although faces are more or less symmetrical,
23 human face perception (i.e. judgement of gender, age, expression, likeness and
24 attractiveness) mostly relies on facial information contained in the right side of the owners’
25 face (left side of the viewed face from viewer’s perspective) (e.g. Gilbert and Bakan 1973;

1 Grega et al 1988; Burt and Perrett 1997). For instance, when asked to judge the facial
2 expression of a briefly presented chimeric face image, in which the left and right side of the
3 viewed face differ on facial expression, human viewers tend to base their decision more
4 frequently on the expression contained within the right side of the owner's face, i.e. the left
5 hemiface for the viewer. This left perceptual bias in face perception is often accompanied
6 and enhanced by a left gaze bias (LGB), defined by the higher probability of first gaze and
7 a higher proportion of viewing time directed at the left hemiface, when actively exploring
8 face images (Mertens et al. 1993; Philips and David 1997; Butler et al. 2005; Bulter and
9 Harvey 2006). In other words, the left hemiface is often inspected first and/or for longer
10 periods.

11 Although human visuospatial attention bias is to the left visual field (Rhodes 1986;
12 Vaid and Singh 1989; Nicholls and Roberts 2002; Niemeier et al. 2007) and in some
13 cultures, a long practised left-to-right directional scanning bias (most notably, reading)
14 (Gilbert and Bakan 1973; Vaid and Singh 1989; Heath et al. 2005) may contribute to this
15 gaze asymmetry, it is often argued that a right hemisphere advantage in face processing
16 (receiving visual input from left visual field) is the likely cause of LGB (Burt and Perrett
17 1997; Butler et al. 2005; Leonards and Scott-Samuel 2005). As a consequence, if a face is
18 initially presented within a viewer's central visual field, the left hemiface is projected to the
19 face-sensitive right hemisphere, where its saliency is more readily evaluated, causing an
20 increase in the viewer's attention as necessary. A recent study of judging the gender of
21 chimeric faces showed that on trials where participants based their decision on the gender
22 cues contained in the left side of the chimeric face, they fixated more often and longer on
23 the left hemiface (Bulter et al. 2005), further suggesting that LGB is closely associated with
24 the perceptual processing of facial information, and could be part of eye scanning patterns
25 associated with face exploration.

1 However, it remains unclear how this face-related LGB develops in human and
2 whether it is restricted to human or could evolve (homologously or analogously) in other
3 species living in complex social environments. To address these questions, we
4 systematically investigated gaze asymmetries in two comparative studies investigating gaze
5 direction in human infants and adults and also in rhesus monkeys and domestic dogs while
6 exploring various images of faces and objects.

7

8 **Experiment 1: LGB in human infants and adults: developmental study**

9 It has been suggested that human face processing involves a face-specific cognitive
10 and neural mechanism (McKone et al. 2006; see also Tarr and Cheng 2003) which is
11 species- and orientation-sensitive. Specifically, human adults differentiate faces of their
12 own species (or even own race) better than faces of other species (or other races). However,
13 this superior recognition performance deteriorates once the face is turned up-side down,
14 and such a face inversion effect, one hallmark differentiating face processing from object
15 processing, is more evident for own species, i.e. stronger for human than monkey faces
16 (Diamond and Carey 1986; Tanaka et al. 2004; Bukach et al. 2006; McKone et al. 2006;
17 Mondloch et al. 2006). It is likely that this sensitivity towards conspecific faces with
18 upright orientation is closely associated with or even shaped by our extensive experience of
19 identifying upright conspecific faces, probably through the process of perceptual narrowing
20 (Pascalis et al. 2001, 2002; Grossmann and Johnson 2007). For instance, 6-month-old
21 human infants perform equally well at discriminating individual human or monkey faces,
22 but 9-month-olds start to show better performance for recognizing human faces (Pascalis et
23 al. 2002).

24 If the LGB is closely associated with the processing of facial information, it could
25 also be expected to show not only sensitivity to the orientation and species of the viewed

1 face, but also differences during development. We examined these questions systematically
2 in this study by comparing gaze asymmetries in human infants and adults while free
3 viewing various face and object images with normal and inverted orientation. As face
4 inversion alters global facial configuration but does not change image symmetry along
5 vertical axis nor the local image properties of individual facial features (i.e. local contrast),
6 inverted faces not only serve as ideal control images for upright faces, but also contribute
7 to efforts to address the neural mechanisms underling LGB if different patterns of gaze
8 asymmetries are elicited in response to upright and inverted faces.

9

10 **Method**

11 Nineteen 6-month-old infants (11 boys and 8 girls, 4.9 – 7.7 months old with mean
12 of 6.22 ± 0.22 (mean \pm SEM)) and 19 adults (11 males and 8 females, 19-39 years old with
13 mean of 20.84 ± 1.13) participated in the study. All children were born full-term and were
14 in good health. Ethical approval had been granted and all procedures complied with British
15 Psychological Society Ethical guidance.

16 Visual stimuli included 20 face images with neutral facial expression (5 upright and
17 5 inverted human faces, 5 upright and 5 inverted monkey faces) and 10 symmetrical
18 inanimate object images (see image examples in Fig. 1). The common object images were
19 sampled from our daily environment, and could be categorically familiar to the infants as
20 indicated by the parents. The gray scale digitized images were gamma-corrected and back-
21 projected once at eye-level on the center of a projection screen with a resolution of
22 600×600 pixels. No two images of the same category were presented consecutively. At a
23 viewing distance of 70cm the image subtended a visual angle of $72 \times 72^\circ$.

24 The intermodal preferential looking paradigm (Meints et al. 1999) was employed to
25 measure gaze preference. During the experiments the infants were seated on their parent's

1 lap in a quiet, dim-lit test room, and binocularly viewed the display. The parents were
2 asked to close their eyes during the experiment and to listen to instructions played over
3 headphones which reminded them to sit quietly and to keep the infant seated in a central
4 position. The trial was started with a flashing red fixation point (FP, 8° in diameter)
5 presented on the centre of the screen. The infant's head and eye positions were on-line
6 monitored by the researcher through CCTV. Once the infant's gaze was oriented towards
7 the FP, a single image was presented for 5 seconds. The onset of the image presentation
8 was accompanied by a female auditory instruction "look" delivered through a loudspeaker
9 positioned centrally above the displayed images.

10 During the experiment, the researcher was not visible. The overall order of all trials
11 shown to a given infant was pseudo-randomised. Inter-trial intervals varied with the
12 infant's attention on the task with a minimum duration of 0.5 second. A new trial was not
13 launched until infants had centred their gaze either spontaneously or when attracted by the
14 flashing FP. All of the tested infants successfully completed all the trials (30 in total). The
15 same procedure, but without a parent, was employed for the testing of human adults.

16 The participant's eye position and head movements were recorded by two miniature
17 cameras, and then digitized with a sampling frequency of 60 Hz. The data image was replayed
18 off-line frame by frame for accurate analysis by two researchers independently. The direction
19 of participant's gaze was classified as 'left', 'right' and 'central' looking accordingly. The
20 researchers were blind to the test images for each trial when performing off-line data analysis,
21 and inter-judge reliability measures between two researchers yielded correlations of 0.96 for
22 infants' data, and 0.95 for adults' data.

23 .

24 **Results**

1 To address when and how the LGB develops in humans, we compared the gaze
2 preferences of 19 6-month-old human infants and 19 adults while free viewing human and
3 monkey faces (both upright and inverted) and symmetric familiar object images. The
4 images of different categories appeared to attract about the same amount of viewing time
5 within the group of infants (Table 1). On average, human infants spent 64-69% (ANOVA,
6 $F_{(4,94)}=0.46$, $P=0.76$) of the 5-second image presentation time viewing different classes of
7 face and object images. By contrast human adults spent 96-98% (ANOVA, $F_{(4,94)}=0.68$,
8 $P=0.60$) of the time viewing the different images classes.

9 We then examined whether the left hemi-image attracted a higher probability of
10 first gaze direction after image presentation, and a higher proportion of viewing time
11 during image presentation. Paired one-tailed t-tests were used for each image category after
12 an ANOVA test to determine a significant general main effect of left-right bias across all
13 image categories. We also calculated *Prep* and effect sizes (*d*) to estimate the probability of
14 replicating the effect (Killeen 2005). Human infants showed a consistent general LGB
15 while exploring the images (ANOVA, first gaze direction: $F_{(1,189)}=27.15$, $P=5.11E-7$, Fig.
16 1A; viewing time: $F_{(1,189)}=35.38$, $P=1.38E-8$, Fig.1B). Specifically, the left side of upright
17 human and monkey faces were inspected first (>63% of probability, $t(18)=1.96$ and 2.68 ,
18 $p=0.03$ and 0.007 , $Prep=0.9$ and 0.99 , $d=0.83$ and 1.05) and longer (>59% of image
19 viewing time, $t(18)=1.74$ and 2.89 , $p=0.05$ and 0.005 , $Prep=0.94$ and 0.99 , $d=0.79$ and
20 1.33) as were the left sides of object images (first gaze direction: $t(18)=1.97$, $p=0.03$,
21 $Prep=0.96$, $d=0.91$; viewing time: $t(18)=1.75$, $p=0.048$, $Prep=0.95$, $d=0.81$), suggesting a
22 non-face-specific gaze asymmetry. Furthermore, the left side of inverted monkey faces also
23 attracted longer viewing time ($t(18)=2.51$, $p=0.01$, $Prep=0.94$; $d=0.96$), suggesting that the
24 gaze asymmetry in 6-month-olds is not sensitive to face orientation in species other than
25 their own.

1 Human adults also demonstrated general main effect of LGB for image exploration
2 (ANOVA, first gaze direction: $F_{(1,189)}=88.04$, $P=2.8E-17$, Fig. 1C; viewing time:
3 $F_{(1,189)}=11.82$, $P=7.27E-4$, Fig.1D). However, when taking individual image category into
4 account, a more restricted pattern of LGB was revealed: the adults showed a clear LGB
5 only towards faces, not objects. Although the left sides of both upright and inverted human
6 or monkey faces were inspected first ($t(18)=2.35-5.71$, $p=0.00001-0.02$, $Prep=0.94-0.99$),
7 only the left side of human upright faces was inspected for a longer period ($t(18)=2.28$,
8 $p=0.02$, $Prep=0.93$; $d=0.93$), suggesting that in adults, the LGB is face-specific and also
9 sensitive to face orientation and species. Overall, infant results displayed a larger data
10 variance than the adult population. This is not uncommon in infant studies and
11 demonstrates the variability in development and lack of refinement of the process in this
12 population compared to an identically sized adult population.

13

14 **Discussion**

15 Our differing observations in human infants and adults suggest that the specific
16 LGB towards faces is an acquired behaviour, possibly through the process of “perceptual
17 narrowing”. It has been proposed that the development of face perception is a modality-
18 specific and experience-dependent process of gradual specialisation (de Haan et al. 2002;
19 Grossmann and Johnson 2007). For instance, 6-month-old infants are equally good at
20 recognising individual monkey and human faces, but 9-month-olds show a marked
21 advantage in recognizing human faces (Pascalis et al. 2002), indicating a narrowing or
22 specialising of perceptual ability in face perception. Similarly, young infants show a
23 general, inherent LGB for all visual images, which later transforms itself into a more
24 specific LGB for human faces only. Studies of perceptual asymmetries in face processing
25 have previously shown that by the age of 5 years, children demonstrate a face-specific left

1 perceptual bias (Failla et al. 2003) and that its magnitude increases from 6 to 10-years of
2 age (Chiang et al. 2000).

3 The different patterns of gaze asymmetry when viewing different image categories
4 in human adults also shed some light onto possible neural mechanism underling this LGB
5 phenomenon. The LGB was most evident for upright faces, less evident for inverted faces
6 and totally absent for object images, suggesting that the visuospatial attention bias towards
7 the left visual field (Rhodes 1986; Nicholls and Roberts 2002; Niemeier et al. 2007) and
8 our extensively-practised left-to-right directional scanning bias (Gilbert and Bakan 1973;
9 Vaid and Singh 1989; Heath et al. 2005) cannot fully account for the observed face-specific
10 LGB. The well documented human right-hemispheric advantage for face processing, on the
11 other hand, offers a consistent explanation. Various brain imaging studies have revealed a
12 strong right-hemispheric bias in processing upright faces, delayed and reduced right-
13 hemisphere response in processing inverted faces, and bilateral responses in processing
14 object images (e.g. Rossion et al. 2003; Yovel and Kanwisher 2005; Bukach et al. 2006;
15 Grossmann and Johnson 2007). Our observed systematic change of LGB pattern towards
16 different image categories seems to be consistent with reported changes of the distribution
17 of cortical responses, providing further support for cortical lateralisation in human face
18 processing.

19 The ability to detect/recognize facial cues (i.e. facial expression, gaze direction) and
20 to respond accordingly also plays a crucial role in social communication of non-human
21 primates and other social species (e.g. Emery 2000; Parr et al. 2000; Hare and Tomasello
22 2005), but the broader biological context of this phenomenon has been largely ignored until
23 now. It has been suggested that functional brain lateralisation in perception and cognition is
24 not a uniquely human attribute, but exists in other non-human social species which could
25 be shaped by the selection pressure of living in complex social environments and

1 performing intensive social communication during the evolution, at least at population
2 level (e.g. Vallortigara and Rogers 2005). As in humans, the dominant role of the right
3 hemisphere in social cognition as well as in individual recognition mediated by visual cues
4 has been observed in other social species such as fish (Sovrano et al. 1999), domestic
5 chicks (Vallortigara 1992; Vllortigara and Andrew 1991, 1994), quails (Zucca and Sovrano
6 2008), sheep (Kendrick 2006), monkeys (Hamilton and Vermeire 1988; Hauser 1993;
7 Vermeire and Hamilton 1998) and chimpanzees (Morris and Hopkins 1993).

8 We hypothesise that if the LGB is mediated by a right hemisphere bias in face
9 processing and if it is of broader adaptive value to social species, then it may also occur
10 among non-human species adapted to living in complex social environments. This
11 possibility is examined in our second study in which we investigated gaze asymmetries in
12 rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) and domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) while exploring
13 various face and object images. Macaques were chosen because of their relatively close
14 evolutionary relationship to humans, and their naturally complex social environment;
15 whereas dogs were chosen because they are more distantly related, but given their close
16 social association with humans and enculturation, they might also benefit from such a
17 capacity of LGB, if it is indeed associated with social cognition.

18

19 **Experiment 2: LGB in rhesus monkeys and domestic dogs: phylogenetic study**

20 To address the question of whether a face-specific LGB is restricted to human or to
21 primate species, or whether it is perhaps found more extensively among species living in
22 complex social environments, we examined the responses of rhesus monkeys (*Macaca*
23 *mulatta*) and domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*). As rhesus monkeys rely heavily on facial
24 cues for social communication (Rosenfeld and van Hoesen 1979; Mendelson et al. 1982;
25 Parr et al. 2000) and possess a similar oculomotor strategy and cortical mechanism for face

1 perception as humans (Rossion and Gauthier 2002; Guo et al. 2003; Guo 2007), we
2 hypothesised that laboratory-raised monkeys might be good non-human candidates for the
3 demonstration of a LGB while viewing faces of conspecifics and humans. Domestic dogs,
4 on the other hand, have been domesticated for at least 10,000 years and possibly much
5 longer (Vilà et al. 1997). They have shown greater attachment (Topál et al. 2005) and
6 attention bias (Miklósi et al. 2003; Virányi et al. 2008) towards people compared to their
7 close relative, the wolf. Their sensitivity to human cues exceeds that of non-human
8 primates in certain tasks such as following human gaze directional cues, and it is
9 hypothesised that they may have evolved a special predisposition for communicating with
10 humans (Hare et al. 2002; Miklósi et al. 2003; Hare and Tomasello 2005). Pet dogs are
11 additionally encultured into the human environment and so such biases may be further
12 adapted in this subpopulation. Consequently, pet dogs were chosen as a non-primate social
13 species that might benefit from any adaptive advantage associated with a LGB towards
14 human faces and possibly other dog faces, but not necessarily towards faces from other
15 species or objects.

16

17 **Method**

18 **Recording from rhesus monkeys**

19 Three male adult rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*, 4.5-6.0 kg) were tested in this
20 study at the Department of Psychology, University of Newcastle upon Tyne. Initially, the
21 monkeys were trained to fixate on a FP on a computer screen for several seconds in a
22 dimming fixation detection task (Guo and Benson 1998). For the purpose of eye movement
23 recordings, a scleral eye coil and head restraint were then implanted under aseptic
24 conditions. Throughout the period of the recordings, the animal's weight and general health
25 were monitored daily. Ethical approval had been granted and all procedures complied with

1 the “Principles of laboratory animal care” (NIH publication no. 86-23, revised 1985) and
2 UK Home Office regulations.

3 Visual stimuli were generated using a VSG 2/3W graphics system (Cambridge
4 Research Systems) and displayed on a high frequency non-interlaced gamma-corrected
5 color monitor (110 Hz, Sony GDM-F500T9) with the resolution of 1024×768 pixels. At a
6 viewing distance of 57 cm the monitor subtended a visual angle of 40×30°. The mean
7 luminance of uniform grey background was kept at 6.0 cd/m².

8 Twenty monkey and 20 human face images with neutral facial expressions were
9 used as stimuli (see image examples in Fig. 2). The gray scale digitized images were
10 gamma-corrected and displayed once in a random order at the center of the screen with a
11 resolution of 512×512 pixels (20×20° visual angle).

12 During the experiments the monkeys were seated in a purpose-built primate chair
13 with their head restrained, and they viewed the display binocularly. To calibrate eye
14 movement signals, a small red FP (0.2° diameter, 7.8 cd/m² luminance) was displayed
15 randomly at one of twenty-five positions (5×5 matrix) across the monitor. The distance
16 between adjacent FP positions was 5°. The monkey was trained to follow the FP and
17 maintain fixation for 1 second. After the calibration procedure, the trial was started with a
18 FP displayed on the center of monitor, and the monkey’s eye positions were on-line
19 monitored by the custom-made software. If the monkey maintained fixation for 1 second,
20 the FP disappeared and a single face image was presented for 10 seconds. During the
21 presentation, three monkeys passively viewed monkey face images, and two of them also
22 viewed human face images. No reinforcement was given during this procedure, neither
23 were the animals trained on any other task with these stimuli, which could have potentially
24 affected their behavior. It was considered that with their lack of training, and in the absence
25 of instrumental responding, their behavior should be as natural as possible.

1 Horizontal and vertical eye positions were measured using an 18-inch cubic scleral
2 search coil assembly with 6 min arc sensitivity (CNC Engineering). Eye movement signals
3 were amplified by a CNC system and sampled at 500 Hz through the analogue inputs of
4 CED1401 plus digital interface (Cambridge Electronic Design). The data were then
5 analysed off-line using software developed in Matlab. The software computed horizontal
6 and vertical eye displacement signals as a function of time to determine eye velocity and
7 position. Fixation locations were then extracted from the raw eye tracking data using
8 velocity (less than 0.2° eye displacement at a velocity of less than 20°/s) and duration
9 (greater than 50 ms) criteria (Guo et al. 2003, 2006).

10 **Recording from pet dogs**

11 Seventeen adult domestic pet dogs (*Canis familiaris*, 2-7 years old, 3 Labrador, 3
12 Border Collie, 3 Lurcher, 2 Jack Russell, 1 Border Terrier, 1 Leonberger, 1 Schnauzer, 1
13 Staffordshire Terrier, 1 Spanish Water Dog, 1 Golden Cocker Spaniel) were recruited from
14 university staff and students for this experiment. University ethical approval had been
15 granted and all procedures complied with ethical guidance of the International Society for
16 Applied Ethology.

17 Visual stimuli were generated using customized presentation software and back-
18 projected on the center of a projection screen. At a viewing distance of 41 cm the screen
19 subtended a visual angle of 100×163°. 30 face images with neutral facial expressions and
20 10 symmetrical inanimate object images were used as stimuli (see image examples in Fig.
21 2). The face images included 5 upright and 5 inverted human faces, 5 upright and 5
22 inverted monkey faces, 5 upright and 5 inverted dog faces. The common object images
23 were sampled from the daily environment, and could be categorically familiar to the dogs
24 as indicated by the owners. The gray scale digitized images were gamma-corrected and
25 displayed once in a random order at the center of the screen with a resolution of 600×600

1 pixels ($87 \times 87^\circ$ visual angle). No two images of the same category were presented
2 consecutively. To reduce degree of left-right image asymmetry commonly associated with
3 dog faces (i.e. facial color/hair pattern), we created left-mirror left composite chimeric
4 images for 8 dog faces and 8 object images used in this experiment. This manipulation is
5 widely adopted in studies of left perceptual bias and left gaze bias in face processing, and
6 has generated consistent observation similar as those generated by natural face images
7 across different laboratories, for human participants (e.g. Mertens et al. 1993; Butler et al.
8 2005; Leonards and Scott-Samuel 2005).

9 The preferential-looking procedure was adapted to test dog's gaze preference
10 (Meints et al. 1999). During the experiment the dog was seated in a quiet, dim-lit test room
11 and binocularly viewed the display which was 41 cm away. A researcher stood behind the
12 dog and did not interfere with the dog or coerce it to watch the screen. The dog owner was
13 instructed to keep quiet and stay outside of the test room. A CCTV camera (SONY SSC-
14 M388CE, resolution: 380 horizontal) placed in front of the dog was used to monitor and
15 record the dog's eye and head movements. The trial was started with a flashing red FP (10°
16 in diameter) presented in the centre of the screen at the dog's eye level. The dog's head and
17 eye positions were on-line monitored by the researcher through CCTV. Once the dog's
18 gaze was oriented towards the FP a single image was presented for 5 seconds. During the
19 presentation, the dog passively viewed face and object images. No reinforcement was given
20 during this procedure, neither were the dogs trained on any other task with these stimuli. A
21 short break was provided after every 10 trials if necessary. All of the dogs successfully
22 tested completed at least 65% of the trials ($82 \pm 2\%$).

23 The dog's eye and head movements were recorded and then digitised with a sampling
24 frequency of 60 Hz. The image was replayed off-line frame by frame for accurate analysis by
25 two researchers independently, and the direction of the dog's gaze was classified as 'left',

1 'right' and 'central' looking accordingly. The researchers were blind to the test images for each
2 trial when performing off-line data analysis, and inter-judge reliability measures yielded
3 correlations of 0.98 between two researchers.

4

5 **Results**

6 We very precisely recorded monkeys' gaze patterns with implanted scleral search
7 coils, but the invasive nature of this recording methodology restricts the number of
8 monkeys that can be ethically used in such studies (e.g. Guo et al. 2003, 2006). Therefore
9 the analysis was carried out after pooling the data from three monkeys (i.e. t-test was
10 performed over the trials rather than subjects). As we did not intend to quantitatively
11 compare the magnitude of LGB across different species in this study, such an approach can
12 help to qualitatively establish whether the face-related LGB exists in non-human primates.

13 No statistical difference was observed in the cumulative viewing time across the
14 entire set of human and monkey faces with different orientations (Table 1). The monkeys
15 on average spent 44-52% of image presentation time viewing different categories of face
16 images (ANOVA, $F_{(3,132)}=1.52$, $P=0.21$). ANOVA tests of main effect of left-right bias
17 across all images revealed a general LGB associated with face exploration (first gaze
18 direction: $F_{(1,261)}=8.47$, $P=0.004$, Fig. 2A; viewing time: $F_{(1,261)}=12.51$, $P=1.0E-6$, Fig.2B).
19 Specifically, the left side of upright monkey and human faces had a significantly higher
20 probability of being the first saccade destination (77% and 65% for monkey and human
21 faces; paired one-tailed t-test, $t(59)=4.84$ and 1.96 , $p=4.81E-6$ and 0.03 , $Prep=0.99$ and
22 0.91) than the right hemiface, and attracted more fixations (61% and 60% of total fixations
23 per image for monkey and human faces; $t(59)=4.37$ and 4.01 , $p=2.52E-5$ and $1.3E-4$,
24 $Prep=0.99$ and 0.98). Once the faces were inverted, although image symmetry was constant

1 along the vertical axis, the left and right hemiface appeared to be equally salient
2 ($t(17)=0.17-0.46, p=0.33-0.43$).

3 The highly sensitive technique used in laboratory monkeys was not appropriate for
4 pet dogs and so the preferential looking paradigm was used to compare the gaze
5 preferences of 17 owner-volunteered dogs while viewing human, dog and monkey faces,
6 and symmetrical object images. On average, the dogs spent 43-47% of the 5-second image
7 presentation time inspecting different types of face and object images (Table1), and no
8 significant difference in viewing time was observed across these image categories
9 (ANOVA, $F_{(6,118)}=0.51, P=0.80$).

10 Analysis of gaze preference showed a significant main effect of general LGB for
11 image viewing (first gaze direction: $F_{(1,237)}=20.59, P=9.28E-6$; viewing time: $F_{(1,237)}=14.95,$
12 $P=1.45E-4$). Paired one-tailed t-test further revealed that the left side of both upright and
13 inverted human faces had a higher probability of being the first inspected region by the
14 dogs (65% and 67% for upright and inverted human faces; $t(16)=2.99$ and $3.18, p=0.004$
15 and $0.003, Prep=0.97$ and 0.97 ; Fig. 2C). There was no significant difference in the
16 probability of first inspection between the two sides of dog faces, monkey faces and object
17 images ($t(16)=0.27-1.12, p=0.14-0.40$). An analysis of the averaged proportion of viewing
18 time towards each side of the images within a trial showed that only the left side of upright
19 human faces attracted significantly longer inspection (62% of total viewing time;
20 $t(16)=2.67, p=0.008, Prep=0.95$; Fig 2D). The dogs spent a similar amount of looking time
21 at both sides of the images while viewing inverted human faces, both upright and inverted
22 dog or monkey faces, and object images ($t(16)=0.52-1.69, p=0.06-0.30$).

23

24 **Discussion**

1 Our observations show that gaze asymmetry is not restricted to humans, and could
2 have broader adaptive significance. Laboratory-raised monkeys showed a LGB towards
3 faces of conspecifics and humans while pet dogs only demonstrated a LGB towards human
4 faces, but not monkey or dog faces, nor towards object images. We suggest that these
5 specific results are compatible with the animals' normal communicative strategies given
6 monkeys' reliance on social cues and dogs' unique evolutionary and ontogenetic history.
7 All dogs in this study were well socialised to both people and other dogs. We therefore
8 argue that the bias towards human faces alone cannot be explained simply in terms of lack
9 of exposure to conspecifics, but that it may have a more fundamental phylogenetic origin.
10 The ability to extract information from human faces and respond appropriately could have
11 had a selective advantage during the process of domestication, especially as the emotional
12 content of these faces may be of immediate adaptive behavioural significance. Indeed,
13 recent studies have shown that the owner's right hemiface (left hemiface from viewer's
14 perspective) can express a range of emotional expressions more accurately, and more
15 importantly, can express specifically the negative expression of, evoked anger, more
16 intensely (e.g. Indersmitten and Gur 2003). As the LGB directs the viewer's attention to
17 this side of face image, it could help the viewer detect and recognize biologically important
18 information more quickly and precisely in faces of functional significance.

19 The maintenance of the bias by dogs towards inverted human faces may also be
20 specifically important for this species. Dogs will frequently roll over and look up at human
21 faces in initial social exchanges as an appeasement gesture and the ability to read the
22 human face in this context may be important to establish if appeasement has succeeded. If
23 LGB has its origins in right hemisphere specialisation for facial processing, it would be
24 surprising if the behaviour could be reversed when the dog is viewing a face upside down,
25 although this would allow preferential inspection of the right side of the viewee's face.

1 Dogs may not show a bias towards monkey faces because of their unfamiliarity or
2 irrelevance compared to human faces, although the differentiating criteria remain to be
3 established. However, a failure to show LGB towards dog faces might reflect a reduced
4 dependence on facial processing in the initial assessment of conspecifics in this species,
5 with greater facial asymmetry in this species and non-facial greeting including olfactory
6 cues and visual cues of body postures perhaps being of greater significance.

7

8 **General discussion**

9 With the presentation of object images and faces of different species with upright
10 and inverted orientation, in this comparative study we systematically examined the face-
11 related LGB, defined by the higher probability of first gaze and a higher proportion of
12 viewing time directed at the left hemiface, in human infants, human adults, rhesus monkeys
13 and domestic dogs. While human infants showed a more general bias towards the left side
14 of a visual image (mostly for upright images), adults demonstrated a very specific LGB
15 towards upright human faces only. Laboratory-reared monkeys showed selective LGB
16 towards upright human and monkey faces, while pet dogs only attended to the left side of
17 human faces. Taken together, our results suggest that the face-specific LGB is not apparent
18 in human infants, but develops over time; also, our evidence shows that the LGB is not a
19 human-specific phenomenon, but seems to have broader adaptive value to social species.

20 Interestingly, both human adults and dogs demonstrated a LGB towards a broader
21 range of face types at the earliest stage of face viewing (human and monkey faces with
22 different orientations for human observers, upright and inverted human faces for dogs; Fig.
23 1C and 2C), adding further support to the hypothesis that the initial gaze bias for faces is
24 automatic and internally-driven (Leonards and Scott-Samuel 2005), probably initiated by
25 the gist configuration of face stimuli. After initial analysis, the LGB could be refined

1 towards more efficient processing of biologically relevant faces (in our case, upright human
2 faces for both adult human participants and pet dogs, Fig. 1D and 2D), and would be less
3 evident for irrelevant faces or inverted faces as face inversion would alter global
4 configuration of facial features and reduce efficiency and accuracy of face processing
5 (Valentine 1988; Rossion and Gauthier 2002). A recent correlation study in humans also
6 suggests that only an overall leftward face scanning bias (i.e. total number of left hemiface
7 fixation within a trial), rather than initial gaze bias, can be correlated with perceptual
8 processing of facial cues (Bulter et al. 2005).

9 In our study, we did not observe a consistent gaze bias towards object images in
10 human adults and dogs, or towards inverted faces in monkeys. This observation rules out
11 general preferential attention towards the left visual field and extensively-practised left-to-
12 right scanning bias in humans as specific explanations for the LGB phenomenon. A recent
13 recording of human saccadic eye movements in face processing also demonstrated that the
14 initial gaze bias is the most evident while exploring upright faces, and is less or not evident
15 while exploring inverted faces and symmetric non-face object or landscape images
16 (Leonards and Scott-Samuel 2005). Taken together, the face- and orientation-sensitive
17 LGB we observed here is most likely due to a lateralised right hemisphere bias for face
18 processing which has been revealed by studies of brain imaging and patients with focal
19 brain lesions (e.g. Farah and Aguirre 1999; Bukach et al. 2006; Grossmann and Johnson
20 2007).

21 Unlike humans and monkeys, relatively little is known about cerebral lateralization
22 in dogs from neuroimaging approach. However, some behaviour studies on paw preference
23 (Tan 1987; Wells 2003; Quaranta et al. 2004; Branson and Rogers 2006; Poyser et al.
24 2006) and tail-wagging response (Quaranta et al. 2007) have suggested a functional brain
25 asymmetry in dogs which may even correlate with their immune system function (Quaranta

1 et al. 2006, 2008). The right hemisphere also has greater mass, and this appears to be
2 independent of laterality in certain forms of motor behaviour (Tan and Çalşikan 1987),
3 which would be consistent with laterality in certain perceptual processes. Our observation
4 of LGB towards human faces provides new evidence to support this hypothesis, with brain
5 lateralization apparent in face processing in dogs. Furthermore, this prominent gaze
6 asymmetry could be a useful non-invasive tool in the wider study of some aspects of social
7 cognition (e.g. facial signalling) in those species who exhibit a bias.

8 As the recognition of facial expression is a crucial part of social cognition, right
9 hemisphere dominance in emotional processing, such as in detecting facial movements (i.e.
10 lip smacking; Ferrari et al. 2003; Leslie et al. 2004) and judging negative emotions (i.e. fear
11 and anger; Asthana and Mandall 2001; Indersmitten and Gur 2003), may also steer the
12 initiation of gaze asymmetry towards faces. Overall, it seems likely that the affective and
13 semantic information contained in those faces with adaptive behavioural significance for
14 the species concerned, are the most likely determinants of face-related LGB. In other
15 words, the LGB may not just be initiated by the gist configuration of the faces in an
16 automatic fashion, but is actively engaged in the processing of relevant facial cues.
17 Consequently, the amplitude of LGB could well be affected by different type of facial
18 information. This issue is currently under investigation by our group.

19

20 **References**

21

22 Asthana HS, Mandal MK (2001) Visual field bias in the judgment of facial expression of
23 emotion. *J Gen Psychol* 128:21-29

24

25 Branson NJ, Rogers LJ (2006) Relationship between paw preference strength and noise
26 phobia in *Canis familiaris*. *J Comp Psychol* 120: 176-183

27

28 Bukach CM, Gauthier I, Tarr M (2006) Beyond faces and modularity: the power of an
29 expertise framework. *Trends Cogn Sci* 10:159-166

30

1 Burt DM, Perrett DI (1997) Perceptual asymmetries in judgements of facial attractiveness,
2 age, gender, speech and expression. *Neuropsychologia* 35:685-693
3
4 Butler S, Gilchrist ID, Burt DM, Perrett DI, Jones E, Harvey M (2005) Are the perceptual
5 biases found in chimeric face processing reflected in eye-movement patterns?
6 *Neuropsychologia* 43:52-59
7
8 Bulter SH, Harvey M (2006) Perceptual biases in chimeric face processing: eye-movement
9 patterns cannot explain it all. *Brain Res* 1124:96-99
10
11 Chiang CH, Ballantyne AO, Trauner DA (2000) Development of perceptual asymmetry for
12 free viewing of chimeric stimuli. *Brain Cognit* 44:415-425
13
14 de Haan M, Pascalis O, Johnson MH (2002) Specialization of neural mechanisms
15 underlying face recognition in human infants. *J Cognit Neurosci* 14:199-209
16
17 Diamond R, Carey S (1986) Why faces are and are not special: An effect of expertise. *J*
18 *Exp Psychol Gen* 115:107-117
19
20 Emery NJ (2000) The eyes have it: the neuroethology, function and evolution of social
21 gaze. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 24:581-604
22
23 Failla CV, Sheppard DM, Bradshaw JL (2003) Age and responding-hand related changes
24 in performance of neurologically normal subjects on the line-bisection and chimeric-faces
25 tasks. *Brain Cognit* 52:353-363
26
27 Farah MJ, Aguirre GK (1999) Imaging visual recognition: PET and fMRI studies of the
28 functional anatomy of human visual recognition. *Trends Cogn Sci* 3:179-186
29
30 Ferrari PF, Gallese V, Rizzolatti G, Fogassi L (2003) Mirror neurons responding to the
31 observation of ingestive and communicative mouth actions in the monkey ventral premotor
32 cortex. *Eur J Neurosci* 17:1703-1714
33
34 Gilbert C, Bakan P (1973) Visual asymmetry in perception of faces. *Neuropsychologia*
35 11:355-362
36
37 Grega DM, Sackeim HA, Sanchez E, Cohen BH, Hough S (1988) Perceiver bias in the
38 processing of human faces: Neuropsychological mechanisms. *Cortex* 24:91-117
39
40 Grossmann T, Johnson MH (2007) The development of the social brain in infancy. *Eur J*
41 *Neurosci* 25:909-919
42
43 Guo K, Benson PJ (1998) Involuntary eye movements in response to first- and second-
44 order motion. *Neuroreport* 9:3543-3548
45
46 Guo K, Robertson RG, Mahmoodi S, Tadmor Y, Young MP (2003) How do monkeys view
47 faces? – A study of eye movements. *Exp Brain Res* 150:363-374
48
49 Guo K, Mahmoodi S, Robertson RG, Young MP (2006) Longer fixation duration while
50 viewing face images. *Exp Brain Res* 171:91-98

1
2 Guo K (2007) Initial fixation placement in face images is driven by top-down guidance.
3 *Exp Brain Res* 181:673-677
4
5 Hamilton CR, Vermeire BA (1988) Complementary hemispheric-specialization in
6 monkeys. *Science* 242:1691-1694
7
8 Hare B, Brown M, Williamson C, Tomasello M (2002) The domestication of social
9 cognition in dogs. *Science* 298: 1634-1636
10
11 Hare B, Tomasello M (2005) Human-like social skills in dogs. *Trends Cogn Sci* 9:439-444
12
13 Hauser MD (1993) Right hemisphere dominance for the production for the production of
14 facial expression in monkeys. *Science* 261:475-477
15
16 Heath RL, Rouhana A, Ghanem DA (2005) Asymmetric bias in perception of facial affect
17 among Roman and Arabic script readers. *Laterality* 10:51-64
18
19 Indersmitten T, Gur RC (2003) Emotion processing in chimeric faces: hemispheric
20 asymmetries in expression and recognition of emotions. *J Neurosci* 23:3820-3825
21
22 Kendrick KM (2006) Brain asymmetries for face recognition and emotion control in sheep.
23 *Cortex* 42:96-98
24
25 Killeen PR (2005) An alternative to null-hypothesis significance tests. *Psychol Sci* 16:345–
26 353
27
28 Leonards U, Scott-Samuel NE (2005) Idiosyncratic initiation of saccadic face exploration
29 in humans. *Vision Res* 45:2677-2684
30
31 Leslie KR, Johnson-Frey SH, Grafton ST (2004) Functional imaging of the face and hand
32 imitation: towards a motor theory of empathy. *Neuroimage* 21:601-607
33
34 McKone E, Kanwisher N, Duchaine BC (2006) Can generic expertise explain special
35 processing for faces? *Trends Cogn Sci* 11:8-15
36
37 Mendelson MJ, Haith MM, Goldman-Rakic PS (1982) Face scanning and responsiveness
38 to social cues in infant rhesus monkeys. *Dev Psychol* 18:222–228
39
40 Meints K, Plunkett K, Harris PL (1999) When does an ostrich become a bird? The role of
41 typicality in early word comprehension. *Dev Psychol* 35:1072-1078
42
43 Mertens I, Siegmund H, Grusser OJ (1993) Gaze motor asymmetries in the perception of
44 faces during a memory task. *Neuropsychologia* 31:989-998
45
46 Miklósi A, Kubinyi E, Topál J, Gácsi M, Virányi Z, Csányi V (2003) A simple reason for a
47 big difference: Wolves do not look back at humans, but dogs do. *Curr Biol* 13:763-766
48
49 Mondloch CJ, Maurer D, Ahola S (2006) Becoming a face expert. *Psychol Sci* 17:930-934
50

1 Morris RD, Hopkins WD (1993) Perception of human chimeric faces by chimpanzees:
2 evidence for a right hemisphere advantage. *Brain Cognit* 21:111-122
3
4 Nicholls MER, Roberts GR (2002) Can free-viewing perceptual asymmetries be explained
5 by scanning, pre-motor or attentional biases? *Cortex* 38:113-136
6
7 Niemeier M, Stojanoski B, Greco A (2007) Influence of time and spatial frequency on the
8 perceptual bias: evidence for competition between hemispheres. *Neuropsychologia*
9 45:1029-1040
10
11 Parr LA, Winslow JT, Hopkins WD (2000) Recognizing facial cues: individual
12 discrimination by chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes and rhesus monkeys (Macaca mulatta). *J*
13 *Comp Psychol* 114:1-14
14
15 Pascalis O, Demont E, de Haan M, Campbell R (2001) Recognition of faces of different
16 species: a developmental study between 5 and 8 years of age. *Infant Child Dev*10:39-45
17
18 Pascalis O, de Haan M, Nelson CA (2002) Is face processing species-specific during the
19 first year of life? *Science* 14:199-209
20
21 Philips ML, David AS (1997) Viewing strategies for simple and chimeric faces: An
22 investigation of perceptual bias in normal and schizophrenic patients using visual scan
23 paths. *Brain Cognit* 32:225-238
24
25 Poyser F, Caldwell C, Cobb M (2006) Dog paw preference shows liability and sex
26 differences. *Behav Processes* 73:216-221
27
28 Quaranta A, Siniscalchi M, Frate A, Vallortigara G (2004) Paw preference in dogs:
29 relations between lateralised behaviour and immunity. *Behav Brain Res* 153:521-525
30
31 Quaranta A, Siniscalchi M, Frate A, Iacoviello R, Buonavoglia C, Vallortigara G (2006)
32 Lateralised behaviour and immune response in dogs: Relations between paw preference
33 and interferon- γ , interleukin-10 and IgG antibodies production. *Behav Brain Res* 166:236-
34 240
35
36 Quaranta A, Siniscalchi M, Vallortigara G (2007) Asymmetric tail-wagging responses by
37 dogs to different emotive stimuli. *Curr Bio* 17:R199-R201
38
39 Quaranta A, Siniscalchi M, Albrizio M, Volpe S, Buonavoglia C, Vallortigara G (2008)
40 Influence of behavioural lateralization on interleukin-2 and interleukin-6 gene expression
41 in dogs before and after immunization with rabies vaccine. *Behav Brain Res* 186:256-260
42
43 Rhodes G (1986) Perceptual asymmetries in face recognition. *Brain Cognit* 4:197-218
44
45 Rosenfeld SA, Van Hoesen GW (1979) Face recognition in the rhesus monkey.
46 *Neuropsychologia* 17:503-509
47
48 Rossion B, Gauthier I (2002) How does the brain process upright and inverted faces?
49 *Behav Cognit Neurosci Rev* 1:63-75
50

- 1 Rossion B, Joyce CA, Cottrell GW, Tarr MJ (2003) Early lateralization and orientation
2 tuning for face, word, and object processing in the visual cortex. *NeuroImage* 20:1609-
3 1624
4
- 5 Sovrano VA, Rainoldi C, Bisazza A, Vallortigara G (1999) Roots of brain specializations:
6 preferential left-eye use during mirror-image inspection in six species of teleost fish. *Behav*
7 *Brain Res* 106:175-180
8
- 9 Tan U (1987) Paw preferences in dogs. *Int J Neurosci* 32:825-829
10
- 11 Tan U, Calsikan S (1987) Allometry and asymmetry in the dog brain: the right hemisphere
12 is heavier regardless of paw preference. *Int J Neurosci* 35:189-194
13
- 14 Tanaka J, Kiefer M, Bukach CM (2004) A holistic account of the own-race effect in face
15 recognition: evidence from a cross-cultural study. *Cognition* 93:1-9
16
- 17 Tarr MJ, Cheng YD (2003) Learning to see faces and objects. *Trends Cogn Sci* 7:23-30
- 18 Topál J, Gácsi M, Miklósi Á, Virányi Z, Kubinyi E, Csányi V (2005) Attachment to
19 humans: a comparative study on hand-reared wolves and differently socialized dog
20 puppies. *Anim Behav* 70:1367-1375
- 21 Vaid J, Singh M (1989) Asymmetries in the perception of facial affect: Is there an
22 influence of reading habits? *Neuropsychologia* 27:1277-1287
23
- 24 Valentine T (1988) Upside-down faces: a review of the effects of inversion upon face
25 recognition. *Br J Psychol* 79: 471-491
26
- 27 Vallortigara G (1992) Right hemisphere advantage for social recognition in the chick.
28 *Neuropsychologia* 30:761-768
29
- 30 Vallortigara G, Andrew RJ (1991) Lateralization of response by chicks to change in a
31 model partner. *Anim Behav* 41:187-194
32
- 33 Vallortigara G, Andrew RJ (1994) Differential involvement of right and left hemisphere in
34 individual recognition in the domestic chick. *Behav Processes* 33:41-58
35
- 36 Vallortigara G, Rogers LJ (2005) Survival with an asymmetrical brain: Advantages and
37 disadvantages of cerebral lateralization. *Behav Brain Sci* 28: 575-589
38
- 39 Vermeire BA, Hamilton CR (1998) Inversion effect for faces in split-brain monkeys.
40 *Neuropsychologia* 36:1003–1014
41
- 42 Vilà C, Savolainen P, Maldonado JE, Amorim IR, Rice JE, Honeycutt RL, Crandall KA,
43 Lundeberg J, Wayne RK (1997) Multiple and ancient origins of the domestic dog. *Science*
44 276:1687–1689
45
- 46 Virányi Z, Gácsi M, Kubinyi E, Topál J, Belényi B, Ujfalussy D, Miklósi A (2008)
47 Comprehension of human pointing gestures in young human-reared wolves (*Canis lupus*)
48 and dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Anim Cogn* 11:373-387

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Wells DL (2003) Lateralised behaviour in the domestic dog, *Canis familiaris*. *Behav Processes* 61:27-35

Yovel G, Kanwisher N (2005) The neural basis of the behavioral face-inversion effect. *Curr Biol* 15:2256-2262

Zucca P, Sovrano VA (2008) Animal lateralization and social recognition: Quails use their left visual hemifield when approaching a companion and their right visual hemifield when approaching a stranger. *Cortex* 44:13-20

Legends

Figure 1: (A) and (C), the probability of initial fixation directed at left and right side of presented images for 6-month-old human infants and adults. (B) and (D), the averaged proportion of viewing time within a trial on the left and right side of presented images for human infants and adults. Error bars indicate standard error of mean (* p<0.05, ** p<0.01).

Figure 2: (A) and (C), the probability of initial fixation directed at left and right side of presented images for monkeys and dogs. (B) and (D), the averaged proportion of viewing time within a trial on the left and right side of presented images for monkeys and dogs. Error bars indicate standard error of mean (* p<0.05, ** p<0.01).

1 Table 1

2

3

4

5

6

7 **Table 1** Cumulative image viewing time as percentage of total trial time (%). Values
8 presented in the table are mean±SEM.

9


	Human infants	Human adults	Monkeys	Dogs
Upright human face	68.71±2.88	97.99±0.74	51.08±2.80	47.19±2.75
Inverted human face	68.24±3.15	96.18±1.16	43.87±3.53	47.35±2.18
Upright monkey face	66.34±3.30	97.20±0.97	51.50±2.28	46.26±3.18
Inverted monkey face	63.87±3.32	96.52±0.85	44.19±3.25	45.18±2.80
Upright dog face				43.68±1.84
Inverted dog face				43.02±2.94
Object images	65.10±2.28	97.69±0.86		43.55±1.54

10

1
2
3
4

Figure 1

5



6
7

8

1 Figure 2

2
3
4
5
6

7

8
9

