



**HAL**  
open science

## It takes one to know one: Do human and nonhuman primates share similar face processing?

Olivier Pascalis, Fabrice Damon, Kun Guo, David Méary

► **To cite this version:**

Olivier Pascalis, Fabrice Damon, Kun Guo, David Méary. It takes one to know one: Do human and nonhuman primates share similar face processing?. *Comparative Cognition*, Springer Singapore, pp.55-66, 2021, 978-981-16-2027-0 (print) ; 978-981-16-2028-7 (online). 10.1007/978-981-16-2028-7\_4 . hal-03364983

**HAL Id: hal-03364983**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03364983v1>**

Submitted on 5 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# **It takes one to know one: Do human and nonhuman primates share similar face processing?**

Abstract

The ability to identify individuals within the group, and to interpret their expressions and intentions is essential for many social animals. Face recognition in human and non human primate stems from a conjunction of evolutionary inheritance and experience via exposure to faces present in the environment. Individuation is clearly a vital mechanism for any social species. By uncovering similarities across primate face systems, comparative studies allow us to understand the evolution of face processing capabilities in humans. Some researchers have argued that primates, including humans, may possess an innate face processing system that is predisposed to respond to conspecifics. The argument is supported by a study showing that monkeys raised without experience of other own-species monkeys will still prefer to look at faces of conspecifics (Fujita, 1990). However, this proposal does not fit well with findings from the human infant literature (Pascalis et al., 2002) or with new data on monkeys raised without seeing faces (Sugita, 2008) which both suggest that face processing is highly shaped by experience at an early age. We will argue that humans and nonhuman primates possess an evolved system for processing faces that become specialized as a consequence of predominant exposure to faces from a single species. According to this interpretation, a limitation of the face processing expertise to own species should be observed.

Key words: Face, non human primates, human, development

Olivier Pascalis<sup>1</sup>, Fabrice Damon<sup>2</sup>, Kun Guo<sup>3</sup>, David Méary<sup>1</sup>

1- Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, LPNC, 38000 Grenoble, France

2- Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, AgroSup Dijon, CNRS, INRAE, Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, Dijon, France

3- School of Psychology, University of Lincoln, Lincoln, UK

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the French "Investissements d'Avenir" program, project ISITE-BFC (contract ANR-15-IDEX-0003) to F.D.

The ability to identify individuals within the group, and to interpret their expressions and intentions is essential for many social animals. In humans, it is well established that face processing abilities underpin such functions, and

comparative studies suggest a common evolutionary route for this important ability (Leopold & Rhodes, 2010). Non-human primates have often been used as a model of human face processing. Fujita (e.g., 1987) has been interested in non-human primate models for many years, and has continued to publish influential work on this topic. In this chapter we will document some similarities in face recognition but also differences that make this cognitive system well adapted for each species.

Faces are omnipresent in our environment, and are crucial for our everyday social life. It has been suggested that face recognition might somehow be «special» (Farah, 1996) compared to recognition of other objects. Indeed, faces provide an early channel of communication, operating prior to the onset of language between infant and caretaker. It has been shown that infants preferentially orient to faces during the first week of life (Goren, Sarty, & Wu, 1975; Johnson, Dziurawiec, Ellis, & Morton, 1991; Valenza, Simion, Macchi Cassia, & Umiltà, 1996). By the time they reach adulthood they can be considered as face experts. Diamond and Carey (1986) suggested that we learn to process faces differently than other visual stimuli. Information on a face can be construed as hierarchically organized with the facedness information at the top (e.g., faces vs. objects), followed by species information (e.g., human vs. monkey), then by subordinate information such as gender and race, and at the lowest level of individual identity information; individuating information in turn can be further divided into featural information (e.g., the shape or size of the eyes), configural information (e.g., the distance between the eyes), and holistic information (the face gestalt that binds featural and configural information into an unbreakable whole)(Leder & Bruce, 2000). Despite the role of early visual experience on the development of configural and holistic processing, some researchers speculate that both are adult-like at a later age relative to featural face processing. This speculation was first proposed in the late 1970s with the introduction of the controversial encoding switch hypothesis (Carey &

Diamond, 1977; Diamond & Carey, 1977). The encoding switch hypothesis proposes that young children encode faces in a piecemeal fashion (i.e., individual facial features) whereas older children – beginning at around the age of 10 – encode the spatial relations between individual facial features. This hypothesis was based on findings regarding the effects of paraphernalia and inverting faces on children’s recognition. This configural processing is responsible for the striking *inversion effect* (Yin, 1969): inverted faces are less rapidly and accurately processed than upright faces (for reviews see Rakover, 2013; Rossion, 2008). Carey and Diamond (1977) used inversion as a measure of children’s use of spatial relations among features (i.e., involved in both configural and holistic processing). They found that the recognition of faces in 10-year-olds was disproportionately more impaired by inversion than was the recognition of houses, whereas 6- and 8-year-olds showed similar impairment for both categories. Recent data are however suggesting that from a young age, infants are sensitive to configuration (Anzures et al. 2019). Diamond and Carey (1986) showed that this processing mode is a consequence of experience, and can be extended to other categories in which subjects are expert.

### **How do other species process faces?**

A variety of nonhuman social species possesses remarkable face discrimination abilities. Tibbetts (2002) reported that wasps, primarily reliant on chemical signatures for communication and identification of conspecifics, are also capable of hierarchical categorization (e.g., “worker”) based on facial visual patterns only. Dyer, Neumeyer, and Chittka (2005) found that honeybees can learn the picture of a human face and recognize it when it is paired with a novel face (for similar findings with wasps see also Avarguès-Weber, D’Amaro, Metzler, Garcia, & Dyer, 2017). This result is consistent with what we already know about the visual ability of bees. However, Pascalis, Kelly, and Caldara

(2006) pointed out that in the study by Dyer et al. (2005), recognition could have been performed on the basis of very simple pattern processing, and might not be related to face processing at all. Thus, for now there is no compelling evidence of human-like face processing in insects. Recently, sheep (*Ovis aries*) have been found to present advanced face-recognition skills, including the ability to recognize and discriminate individual human faces (Knolle, Goncalves, & Morton, 2017). However, the claim that sheep also possess human-like face processing seems too strong (for a discussion see Kendrick, 2019; Peirce, 2019; Towler et al., 2019). Sheep and human performances were, for instance, not compared on equivalent tasks, as face-recognition tasks typically require that humans learn new face identities in few seconds and in one trial whereas sheep are trained during several consecutive days and throughout many trials (Towler et al., 2019). In addition, the strong advantage in processing familiar over unfamiliar faces thought of as a key feature of human face processing (Young & Burton, 2018) has not been found in sheep, suggesting qualitatively different mechanisms between two species (Towler et al., 2019). It worth noting however that sheep are obviously better to process sheep faces than human faces – as humans are to process own- vs. other-species faces – hence, for a true comparison to be made, both human and sheep faces should be used in future comparative studies (Kendrick, 2019) to determine to what extent the face recognition mechanisms overlap between the species.

The situation is quite different for nonhuman primates, and comparative studies on face recognition in various primate species have burgeoned during the last 20 years. The adult face processing system of nonhuman primates shares several similarities with that of humans: eye scanning, region of interest, individual recognition of face pictures, sensitivity to face inversion (see Pascalis, Petit, Kim, & Campbell, 1999 for a review). Humphrey (1974) used a habituation task to show that rhesus monkeys can distinguish different individuals from their own species – but this performance did not extend to

individuals from other, nonprimate species. Using a classic habituation paradigm, Dahl, Logothetis, and Hoffman (2007) found that individual recognition by macaques was better for conspecific faces than for other-species faces, and that, like humans, macaques show holistic processing. Gothard, Brooks, and Peterson (2009) found the same result, and their detailed analysis of the eye scanning of the faces showed that whereas monkeys use both configural and feature-based processing to recognize the faces of conspecifics, they use primarily feature-based strategies to recognize human faces. These studies suggest the use of different strategies while processing other-species faces. Another study by Dahl, Wallraven, Bülthoff, and Logothetis (2009) compared scanning strategies by humans and macaques when looking at conspecific or heterospecific faces. Both species displayed the same pattern of scanning for their own- versus other-species faces: more attention was directed to the eye region for their own species than for other species. Findings of better performance in face recognition tasks with own- versus other-species faces extend to other primates species (e.g., brown capuchin monkeys and Tonkean macaques, Dufour, Pascalis, & Petit, 2006; chimpanzees, Martin-Malivel & Okada, 2007; cotton-top tamarins, Neiworth, Hassett, and Sylvester, 2007; Japanese monkeys, Sugita, 2008).

Although both humans and macaques can learn to individuate conspecifics by faces, the former outperform the latter in individual recognition of own-species faces (Rossion & Taubert, 2019), and macaques need extensive operant conditioning to achieve even modest recognition performance. As noted by Parr (2011), studies using macaques have reported mixed evidence regarding the extent of human-like face processing (e.g., inversion effect, configural processing, etc.), with results varying depending on the methods used, perhaps suggesting that humans and monkeys have evolved different face processing strategies. By contrast, compared to macaques, chimpanzees have been found to present face processing mechanisms more homologous with those of humans

(Parr, 2011; Taubert, Weldon, & Parr, 2017; Wilson & Tomonaga, 2018, but see Griffin, 2020). Although the macaque-chimpanzee difference may be related to the latter's greater phylogenetical proximity to humans, it may also be related to species-specific social structures: chimpanzees and humans share a "fission-fusion" social organization (Parr, 2011), whereas macaque monkeys live in more stable social groups with more or less strict, often linear dominance hierarchies. In fission-fusion society, group composition is dynamic and subject to frequent fracture and growth over time; hence, robust face processing mechanisms are highly advantageous, and there is a strong social pressure to recognize the faces of conspecifics. Strikingly, it has been reported that spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*), a New World species with a fission-fusion social structure, also presents more human-like face processing abilities than macaque monkeys (i.e., holistic processing for high-experienced face categories, Taubert, 2010; Taubert & Parr, 2009), further suggesting that socioecological pressures might contribute to the emergence of a specialized face processing system.

Beyond these differences, visual biases for own-species seem to be especially common across primates species (Scott & Fava, 2013), including humans (Heron-Delaney, Wirth, & Pascalis, 2011). Fujita (1987), using an operant lever-pressing task, explored the extent to which different species showed conspecific preference, by comparing portrait preference in five macaques species (*Macaca fuscata*, *M. mulatta*, *M. radiata*, *M. nemestrina* and *M. arctoides*). Each monkey was trained to press a lever to show a picture on a screen. The picture remained on-screen for as long as the subject held the lever down. Using this simple method it was possible to assess the time spent looking at a picture of a conspecific compared to one showing a different species. In this task, it is assumed that habituation will occur more quickly (i.e., reduced looking time) with a picture of a heterospecific, which is less attractive for the subject. Fujita found that monkeys showed conspecific preference, with the exception of

the stumptailed macaque *M. arctoides* (but see Demaria & Thierry, 1988). Most of the subjects discriminated conspecifics in pictures, and preferred to look at their own species than macaques of a different species (Fujita, 1993; Fujita and Watanabe, 1995). Overall, Fujita's studies demonstrated that preference for pictures of own species is common across multiple macaque species (Fujita, 1987, 1990, 1993a). Preferences were diluted when either the head, or head and tail, were removed from the picture (Fujita, 1993b), suggesting that the head is a crucial cue driving the preference. Similarly, the face was found to be important in conspecific discrimination by longtailed macaques (Dittrich, 1994), although it should be noted that this last study used line drawings, not halftone images of real faces.

Although own-species preference seems to be widespread in primates, its origin may differ between species. For instance, own-species preference can be spontaneously present at birth, or emerge from social experience with conspecifics during infancy. Cross-fostering studies can be especially informative to disambiguate this issue. Fujita showed that Japanese monkeys raised by rhesus macaque mother presented a preference for rhesus macaque faces (Fujita, 1990, 1993a), while Japanese monkeys raised by their mother presented own-species preferences. By contrast, rhesus macaques showed own-species preferences regardless of their early social experience. Fujita concluded that rhesus have a hard-wired preference for their own species, whereas Japanese macaques have a more flexible preference that is influenced by experience. Related findings were reported in great apes, as adult chimpanzees that had been reared by humans preferred pictures of human faces over chimpanzee faces (Tanaka, 2003, 2007). These biases may, in turn, influence face discrimination processes, as human-reared chimpanzees were found to be better at processing human faces than chimpanzee faces, compared to a group of



chimpanzees who grew up in their own species group (Martin-Malivel & Okada, 2007).

From a theoretical point of view, preferences for own-species faces may have emerged from some ancient general perceptual bias shared among primates (Damon, Mottier, Méary, & Pascalis, 2017; Rhodes, 2006). This development might be linked to the ease of processing (i.e., perceptual fluency, Whittlesea & Leboe, 2003), thus facilitating the development of familiarity preferences. Such frameworks extend beyond mere face processing mechanisms, and have been proposed as relevant for a general theory of object representation and recognition (Wallis, 2013; Wallis, Siebeck, Swann, Blanz, & Bühlhoff, 2008). Interestingly, Fujita provided indirect evidence for such shared perceptual mechanisms between human and nonhuman primates, in reporting preferences for regular and symmetrical patterns in capuchin and squirrel monkeys (Anderson, Kuwahata, Kuroshima, Leighty, & Fujita, 2005). These findings indicated that monkeys prefer visual stimuli that humans find aesthetically pleasing, as visual symmetry is perceived as attractive in a variety of domains (Little, 2014). Furthermore, when it comes to faces, ratings of rhesus macaque face attractiveness by human judges can predict implicit visual preferences in rhesus macaques (Damon et al., 2019).

However, mate selection mechanisms probably operate in addition to general perceptual biases for symmetry, as the effect of face attractiveness turned out to be species-specific. When two faces from the same species but differing in attractiveness were presented side-by-side, humans showed a visual preference for human faces (but not macaque faces) rated as attractive, and macaques displayed a visual preference for macaque faces (but not human faces) rated as attractive. Findings of similar preferences in human and nonhuman primates have also been reported for curved contours (humans and chimpanzees: Munar, Gomez-Puerto, Call, & Nadal, 2015), and for prototypicality (human

and macaque infants: Damon, Méary, et al., 2017), further highlighting shared underlying face/object processing mechanisms. Interestingly, face familiarity further shows differential impact on face preference in humans and rhesus macaques (Méary, Li, Li, Guo, & Pascalis, 2014). When two faces of different species/races were presented side-by-side, Caucasian humans demonstrated clear visual preference for Caucasian faces over Asian faces (own-race bias), and human faces (regardless of races) over nonhuman primate (e.g., chimpanzee, Barbary and rhesus macaque) faces (own-species bias). Rhesus macaques also showed visual preference for nonhuman primate faces over human faces regardless of race, but by contrast displayed preference for chimpanzee or Barbary macaque faces over own-species faces. This pattern suggests that face preference in macaques, unlike humans, is modulated by factors beyond familiarity, such as species.

### **How does face processing change early in life?**

A developmental approach may help in determining what the common processes in different species are before experience influences the face processing system, if the developmental trend is similar across primates, and how flexible the system is for handling other-species faces. Faces represent a highly attractive stimulus for infant primates, including humans (Goren et al., 1975), pigtailed macaques (*Macaca nemestrina*, Lutz, Lockard, Gunderson, & Grant, 1998), gibbons (*Hylobates agilis*, Myowa-Yamakoshi & Tomonaga, 2001), rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*, Kuwahata, Adachi, Fujita, Tomonaga, & Matsuzawa, 2004), and chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*, Tomonaga et al., 2004). Some researchers have argued that primates may possess an innate face processing system that is predisposed to respond to conspecifics (e.g., Sackett, 1966). Two-month-old pigtailed macaques already demonstrate a strong preference for their own species (Kim et al., 1999). The argument is also supported by several studies demonstrating that rhesus macaques raised without

any experience of monkeys still prefer to look at faces of conspecifics than other species (Fujita, 1987, 1993a). This is not true for Japanese macaques, however; as mentioned above, rhesus monkeys may have a hard-wired preference for their own species, while Japanese macaques have a more malleable preference, influenced by experience.

An influential study by Sugita (2008) illustrated the critical role of experience in the development of face processing in macaques. Infant Japanese macaques separated from their parents at birth and reared by humans in a faceless environment for a minimal period of 6 – 24 months, showed a preference for both monkey and human faces over objects, but no preference for either category of faces when tested in a visual preference task. Furthermore, they were able to recognize both monkey and human faces. Following the face deprivation period, half of the monkeys were introduced to macaques, and the other half to humans. When tested following a minimum of one month of exposure to faces, monkeys exposed to human faces displayed a preference for human faces over objects, and also for human over monkey faces. They displayed no preference between monkey faces and objects. Consistent with this pattern of results, monkeys exposed to monkey faces preferred monkey faces over objects and over human faces, but showed no preference when human faces and objects were presented simultaneously. Furthermore, when tested for recognition, monkeys were only able to recognize faces from the category to which they were exposed. These results highlight the crucial role visual experience can play in the specialization of the face system toward own-species faces. Japanese macaques are not displaying hard-wired preference for their own species, but an experience-dependent preference.

As mentioned above, Japanese macaque monkeys looked more at faces than objects regardless of species, even though they were deprived of face exposure. This suggests that a broad face detection mechanism was still

functional despite the lack of exposure to faces, as if initial perceptual sensitivities for faces were preserved, and waiting for refinement through individualized experiences (i.e., experience-expectant processes, Nelson, 2003). Are rhesus different from Japanese macaques as suggested by Fujita? Recent studies with nursery-reared infant rhesus macaques (with no exposure to adult macaque faces and limited face exposure in general) showed a “coarse to fine” pattern of face detection (Simpson et al., 2017). Three-week-old rhesus infants with very limited face exposure showed a bias for both own- and other-species faces over objects. Three-, and 6-month-olds, after peer exposure, also showed a similar bias for faces over objects, but also looked faster toward conspecific faces compared to heterospecific faces. Taken together, these results slightly qualify Fujita’s earlier findings suggesting hard-wired preference for own-species faces in rhesus macaques, and indicate that the face processing system of rhesus monkeys undergoes a transition from experience-expectant to experience-dependent mechanisms. This developmental trajectory is not limited to nonhuman primates, but seems to extend to humans as well.

Nelson (2001) hypothesized that in humans the representation of faces at birth is broad and that it develops according to the type of facial input received, tuning toward the predominant faces in the environment. To test whether experience tunes face processing, Pascalis, de Haan, and Nelson (2002) investigated the ability of 6- and 9-month-old infants to recognize faces from their own species and another species (rhesus macaques) using a standard recognition paradigm. Infants at both ages showed individual recognition with human faces, looking longer at a new face compared to a previously seen face. However, when tested with the monkey faces, only the 6-month-old group showed evidence of individual recognition. By contrast, 9-month-olds were unable to recognize which monkey face they had seen before. These findings suggest that the face system becomes ‘tuned’ to human faces between 6- and 9-

months of age (Pascalis et al., 2002). In a follow-up study, Pascalis et al. (2005) investigated the impact of experience with other-species faces on the development of face processing in relation to this species. They provided 6-month-olds' parents with a book containing a selection of monkey faces, which they were instructed to show to their infant following a fixed schedule. Tests showed that this exposure was sufficient to preserve recognition capabilities for monkey faces when the infants returned for testing at 9 months of age. Training experienced near the end of the tuning period appears to be effective for maintaining the ability to discriminate between individuals of other species. Thus, it is possible to alter the development of a cognitive system (for face processing) by providing training and learning via pictorial stimuli. However, it is still unclear how much training is necessary to produce other-species face processing skills at 9 months and for how long long-term training might affect the face system (for a review see Maurer & Werker, 2014).

Overall, the studies reviewed here illustrate that the similarity of the face processing systems of human and nonhuman primates is best found in their plasticity. The experience-expectant/dependent mechanisms progressively adjust the infant primate to its environment, refining the face processing system as the infant accrues experience with the facial characteristics of the individuals from its social group (Pascalis et al., 2014). Despite the indisputable importance of faces in many primate species, however, it is probably too far-fetched to conclude that cognitive and neural face processing mechanisms are continuous across all primates (Rossion & Taubert, 2019). Some face-processing mechanisms appeared to be shared among primate species whereas others have turned out to be species-specific, possibly reflecting solutions to evolutionary challenges imposed by particular ecological niches. However, these mechanisms always share a similar purpose: to subserve social cognition.



## References

- Anderson, J. R., Kuwahata, H., Kuroshima, H., Leighty, K. A., & Fujita, K. (2005). Are monkeys aesthetists? Rensch (1957) revisited. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Animal Behavior Processes*, *31*, 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0097-7403.31.1.71>
- Anzures, G., Quinn, P.C., Pascalis, O., Slater, A. & Lee, K. (2019) Development of face processing ability in childhood. In Zelazo, Ph. (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Developmental Psychology*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199958450.013.0012\_update\_001
- Avarguès-Weber, A., D’Amaro, D., Metzler, M., Garcia, J. E., & Dyer, A. G. (2017). Recognition of human face images by the free flying wasp *Vespula vulgaris*. *Animal Behavior and Cognition*, *4*, 314–323. <https://doi.org/10.26451/abc.04.03.09.2017>
- Carey, S., & Diamond, R. (1977). From piecemeal to configurational representation of faces. *Science*, *195*, 312–314.
- Dahl, C. D., Logothetis, N. K., & Hoffman, K. L. (2007). Individuation and holistic processing of faces in rhesus monkeys. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *274*, 2069–2076. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0477>
- Dahl, C. D., Wallraven, C., Bühlhoff, H. H., & Logothetis, N. K. (2009). Humans and macaques employ similar face-processing strategies. *Current Biology*, *19*, 509–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.01.061>
- Damon, F., Li, Z., Yan, Y., Li, W., Guo, K., Quinn, P. C., ... Méary, D. (2019). Preference for attractive faces is species-specific. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, *133*, 262–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/com0000148>
- Damon, F., Méary, D., Quinn, P. C., Lee, K., Simpson, E. A., Paukner, A., ...

- Pascalis, O. (2017). Preference for facial averageness: Evidence for a common mechanism in human and macaque infants. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 46303. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep46303>
- Damon, F., Mottier, H., Méary, D., & Pascalis, O. (2017). A review of attractiveness preferences in infancy: From faces to objects. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology*, 3(4), 321–336. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-017-0071-2>
- Demaria, C., & Thierry, B. (1988). Responses to animal stimulus photographs in stump-tailed macaques (*Macaca arctoides*). *Primates*, 29, 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02381125>
- Diamond, R., & Carey, S. (1977). Developmental changes in the representation of faces. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 23, 1–22.
- Diamond, R., & Carey, S. (1986). Why faces are and are not special: an effect of expertise. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 115, 107–117.
- Dufour, V., Pascalis, O., & Petit, O. (2006). Face processing limitation to own species in primates: A comparative study in brown capuchins, Tonkean macaques and humans. *Behavioural Processes*, 73, 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2006.04.006>
- Dyer, A. G., Neumeyer, C., & Chittka, L. (2005). Honeybee (*Apis mellifera*) vision can discriminate between and recognise images of human faces. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 208(24), 4709–4714. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.01929>
- Farah, M. J. (1996). Is face recognition ‘special’? Evidence from neuropsychology. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 76(1–2), 181–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328\(95\)00198-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-4328(95)00198-0)
- Fujita, K. (1987). Species recognition by five macaque monkeys. *Primates*, 28,



353–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02381018>

Fujita, K. (1990). Species preference by infant macaques with controlled social experience. *International Journal of Primatology*, *11*, 553–573.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02197057>

Fujita, K. (1993a). Development of visual preference for closely related species by infant and juvenile macaques with restricted social experience. *Primates*, *34*, 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02381385>

Fujita, K. (1993b). Role of some physical characteristics in species recognition by pigtail monkeys. *Primates*, *34*(2), 133–140.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02381384>

Fujita, K., & Watanabe, K. (1995). Visual preference for closely related species by Sulawesi macaques. *American Journal of Primatology*, *37*(3), 253–261.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.1350370307>

Goren, C. C., Sarty, M., & Wu, P. Y. K. (1975). Visual following and pattern discrimination of face-like stimuli by newborn infants. *Pediatrics*, *56*, 544–549.

Gothard, K. M., Brooks, K. N., & Peterson, M. A. (2009). Multiple perceptual strategies used by macaque monkeys for face recognition. *Animal Cognition*, *12*, 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-008-0179-7>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-008-0179-7>

Griffin, J. W. (2020). Quantifying the face inversion effect in nonhuman primates: a phylogenetic meta-analysis. *Animal Cognition*, *23*(2), 237–249.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-019-01340-8>

Heron-Delaney, M., Wirth, S., & Pascalis, O. (2011). Infants' knowledge of their own species. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B: Biological Sciences*, *366*, 1753–1763.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0371>

- Humphrey, N. K. (1974). Species and individuals in the perceptual world of monkeys. *Perception*, 3, 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p030105>
- Johnson, M. H., Dziurawiec, S., Ellis, H., & Morton, J. (1991). Newborns' preferential tracking of face-like stimuli and its subsequent decline. *Cognition*, 40, 1–19.
- Kendrick, K. M. (2019). Response to 'Sheep recognize familiar and unfamiliar human faces from two-dimensional images''. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(5), 182187. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.182187>
- Kim, J.H., Gunderson, V.M., and Swartz, K.S. (1999). Humans all look alike: Cross-species face recognition in infant pigtailed macaque monkeys. Biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, April 15 – 18, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Knolle, F., Goncalves, R. P., & Morton, A. J. (2017). Sheep recognize familiar and unfamiliar human faces from two-dimensional images. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(11). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.171228>
- Kuwahata, H., Adachi, I., Fujita, K., Tomonaga, M., & Matsuzawa, T. (2004). Development of schematic face preference in macaque monkeys. *Behavioural Processes*, 66, 17–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2003.11.002>
- Leder, H., & Bruce, V. (2000). When inverted faces are recognized: the role of configural information in face recognition. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology. A, Human Experimental Psychology*, 53, 513–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713755889>
- Leopold, D. A., & Rhodes, G. (2010). A comparative view of face perception. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 124, 233–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019460.A>

- Little, A. C. (2014). Domain specificity in human symmetry preferences: Symmetry is most pleasant when looking at human faces. *Symmetry*, *6*, 222–233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sym6020222>
- Lutz, C. K., Lockard, J. S., Gunderson, V. M., & Grant, K. S. (1998). Infant monkeys' visual responses to drawings of normal and distorted faces. *American Journal of Primatology*, *44*, 169–174. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2345\(1998\)44:2<169::AID-AJP7>3.0.CO;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2345(1998)44:2<169::AID-AJP7>3.0.CO;2-U)
- Martin-Malivel, J., & Okada, K. (2007). Human and chimpanzee face recognition in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Role of exposure and impact on categorical perception. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *121*(6), 1145–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044>
- Maurer, D., & Werker, J. F. (2014). Perceptual narrowing during infancy: A comparison of language and faces. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *56*, 154–178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.21177>.121.6.1145
- Méary, D., Li, Z., Li, W., Guo, K., & Pascalis, O. (2014). Seeing two faces together: Preference formation in humans and rhesus macaques. *Animal Cognition*, *17*, 1107–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-014-0742-3>
- Munar, E., Gomez-Puerto, G., Call, J., & Nadal, M. (2015). Common visual preference for curved contours in humans and great apes. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141106>
- Myowa-Yamakoshi, M., & Tomonaga, M. (2001). Development of face recognition in an infant gibbon (*Hylobates agilis*). *Infant Behavior and Development*, *24*, 215–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(01\)00076-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(01)00076-5)
- Neiworth, J. J., Hassett, J. M., & Sylvester, C. J. (2007). Face processing in humans and new world monkeys: The influence of experiential and

- ecological factors. *Animal Cognition*, *10*, 125–134.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-006-0045-4>
- Nelson, C. A. (2001). The development and neural bases of face recognition. *Infant and Child Development*, *10*, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.239>
- Nelson, C. A. (2003). The development of face recognition reflects an experience- expectant and activity- dependent process. In O. Pascalis & A. Slater (Eds.) *The development of face processing in infancy and early childhood: Current perspectives* (pp. 79–97). New York, NY: Nova Science
- Parr, L. A. (2011). The evolution of face processing in primates. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *366*, 1764–1777. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0358>
- Pascalis, O., Kelly, D. J., & Caldara, R. (2006). What can bees really tell us about the face processing system in humans? *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *209*(16), 3266–3266. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.02411>
- Pascalis, O., de Haan, M., & Nelson, C. A. (2002). Is face processing species-specific during the first year of life ? *Science*, *296*, 1321–1323.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1070223>
- Pascalis, O., Loevenbruck, H., Quinn, P. C., Kandel, S., Tanaka, J. W., & Lee, K. (2014). On the links among face processing, language processing, and narrowing during development. *Child Development Perspectives*, *8*, 65–70.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12064>
- Pascalis, O., Petit, O., Kim, J. H., & Campbell, R. (1999). Picture perception in primates: the case of face perception. *Current Psychology of Cognition*, *18*, 889–922.
- Pascalis, O., Scott, L. S., Kelly, D. J., Shannon, R. W., Nicholson, E., Coleman, M., & Nelson, C. A. (2005). Plasticity of face processing in infancy.

*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 5297–5300. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0406627102>

Peirce, J. W. (2019). Do sheep really recognize faces? Evidence from previous studies. Response to “Sheep recognize familiar and unfamiliar human faces from two-dimensional images.” *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(7), 4–6. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.182157>

Rakover, S. S. (2013). Explaining the face-inversion effect: The face-scheme incompatibility (FSI) model. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 20, 665–692. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-013-0388-1>

Rhodes, G. (2006). The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 199–226. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190208>

Rossion, B. (2008). Picture-plane inversion leads to qualitative changes of face perception. *Acta Psychologica*, 128, 274–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2008.02.003>

Rossion, B., & Taubert, J. (2019). What can we learn about human individual face recognition from experimental studies in monkeys? *Vision Research*, 157(October 2017), 142–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2018.03.012>

Sackett, G. P. (1966). Monkeys reared in isolation with pictures as visual input: Evidence for an innate releasing mechanism. *Science*, 154(3755), 1468–1473. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.154.3755.1468>

Scott, L. S., & Fava, E. (2013). The own-species face bias: A review of developmental and comparative data. *Visual Cognition*, 21, 1364–1391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2013.821431>

Simpson, E. A., Jakobsen, K. V, Damon, F., Suomi, S. J., Ferrari, P. F., & Paukner, A. (2017). Face detection and the development of own-species bias

- in infant macaques. *Child Development*, 88, 103–113.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12565>
- Sugita, Y. (2008). Face perception in monkeys reared with no exposure to faces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 394–398.  
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706079105>
- Tanaka, M. (2003). Visual preference by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) for photos of primates measured by a free-choice-order task: Implication for influence of social experience. *Primates*, 44(2), 157–166.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-002-0022-8>
- Tanaka, M. (2007). Development of the visual preference of chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) for photographs of primates: Effect of social experience. *Primates*, 48, 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-007-0044-3>
- Taubert, J. (2010). Evidence of human-like, holistic face processing in spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 124, 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017704>
- Taubert, J., & Parr, L. A. (2009). Visual expertise does not predict the composite effect across species: A comparison between spider (*Ateles geoffroyi*) and rhesus (*Macaca mulatta*) monkeys. *Brain and Cognition*, 71, 187–195.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2009.09.002>
- Taubert, J., Weldon, K. B., & Parr, L. A. (2017). Robust representations of individual faces in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) but not monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Animal Cognition*, 20(2), 321–329.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-016-1054-6>
- Tibbetts, E. A. (2002). Visual signals of individual identity in the wasp *Polistes fuscatus*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1499), 1423–1428. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2031>

- Tomonaga, M., Tanaka, M., Matsuzawa, T., Myowa-Yamakoshi, M., Kosugi, D., Mizuno, Y., ... Bard, K. A. (2004). Development of social cognition in infant chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Face recognition, smiling, gaze, and the lack of triadic interactions. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *46*, 227–235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5584.2004.00254.x>
- Towler, A., Kemp, R. I., Bruce, V., Burton, A. M., Dunn, J. D., & White, D. (2019). Are face recognition abilities in humans and sheep really “comparable”? *Royal Society Open Science*, *6*(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.180772>
- Valenza, E., Simion, F., Macchi Cassia, V., & Umiltà, C. (1996). Face preference at birth. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *22*, 892–903.
- Wallis, G. (2013). Toward a unified model of face and object recognition in the human visual system. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00497>
- Wallis, G., Siebeck, U. E., Swann, K., Blanz, V., & Bühlhoff, H. H. (2008). The prototype effect revisited: Evidence for an abstract feature model of face recognition. *Journal of Vision*, *8*(3), 20.1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1167/8.3.20>
- Whittlesea, B. W. A., & Leboe, J. P. (2003). Two fluency heuristics (and how to tell them apart). *Journal of Memory and Language*, *49*, 62–79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X\(03\)00009-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X(03)00009-3)
- Wilson, D. A., & Tomonaga, M. (2018). Visual discrimination of primate species based on faces in chimpanzees. *Primates*, *59*(3), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-018-0649-8>
- Yin, R. K. (1969). Looking at upside-down faces. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *81*, 141–145. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027474>

Young, A. W., & Burton, A. M. (2018). Are we face experts? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(2), 100–110.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.11.007>