Sensitivity to face animacy and inversion in childhood: Evidence from EEG data

Laurie Bayet¹, Alyson Saville², Benjamin Balas²

¹ Department of Psychology and Center for Behavioral Neuroscience, American University,
Washington DC, USA

² Department of Psychology, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, USA

Correspondence to: L.B. bayet@american.edu, and B.B. benjamin.balas@ndsu.edu

Running head: Face animacy and inversion in childhood

Manuscript length: 36 pages, and 5 figures

Manuscript word count: 9538 (including references, abstract, captions, and title page)

Abstract word count: 198

Keywords: animacy; face recognition; ERPs; experience; children; MVPA

Abstract:

Adults exhibit behavioral deficits in processing inanimate, artificial faces compared to real human faces, with implications for using artificial faces in research and designing artificial social agents. However, the developmental trajectory of inanimate face perception is unknown. Here, we used electroencephalography to investigate inanimate faces processing in cross-sectional groups of 5-10-year-old children and adults. A face inversion manipulation was used to test whether face animacy processing relies on expert face processing strategies. 5-7-year-olds (N=18), 8-10-year-olds (N=18), and adults (N=16) watched pictures of real or doll faces presented in an upright or inverted orientation. Analyses of event-related potentials revealed larger N170 amplitudes in response to doll faces, irrespective of age group or face orientation. Thus, the N170 is sensitive to face animacy by 5-7 years of age, but such sensitivity may not reflect high-level, expert face processing. Multivariate pattern analyses of the EEG signal additionally assessed whether animacy information could be reliably extracted during face processing. Face orientation information was evident in children and adults, but there was no indication that face animacy information could be reliably extracted at any age. Together, these results suggest that 5-10-year-old children exhibit some sensitivity to face animacy that is comparable to adults.

As social robots and computer-generated faces become commonplace, there is a growing need to understand how individuals perceive artificial human faces. Artificial appearance compromises several aspects of face processing. Compared to animate human faces, inanimate (artificial) faces are remembered more poorly (Balas & Pacella, 2015; Crookes et al., 2015) and discriminated less efficiently (Crookes et al., 2015). Artificial appearance impacts the perception of face gender (Balas, 2013) and trustworthiness (Balas & Pacella, 2017), and inhibits the attribution of psychological attributes (Looser & Wheatley, 2010) in a manner that is sensitive to facial expression (Bowling & Banissy, 2017; Krumhuber, Lai, Rosin, & Hugenberg, 2018), face inversion (Krumhuber et al., 2018), and group affiliation (Hackel, Looser, & Van Bavel, 2014). Even high-quality computer-generated faces can be reliably distinguished from real faces (Farid & Bravo, 2012), suggesting exquisite sensitivity to artificial appearance, even without “uncanniness” (MacDorman, Green, Ho, & Koch, 2009).

As face processing abilities are tuned by visual experience, a relative lack of exposure to inanimate faces may induce behavioral face processing deficits. Reduced exposure to particular face categories (e.g. defined by race or age) leads to difficulties in discrimination, naming, or assessing other aspects of faces effectively (Lewkowicz & Ghazanfar, 2006; Pascalis & Bachevalier, 1998; Pascalis, de Haan, & Nelson, 2002; Rhodes & Anastasi, 2012). A widely-studied example is the other-race effect (Kelly et al., 2009, 2007), by which face recognition deficits follow from diminished exposure to minority-race faces, including deficits in face discrimination (Walker & Tanaka, 2003), memory (Meissner & Brigham, 2001), or identification (Byatt & Rhodes, 2004). Out-group effects on face perception are typically accounted for by a common computational framework, (Balas, 2012; Byatt & Rhodes, 2004; Caldara & Abdi, 2006; Furl, Phillips, & O’Toole, 2002; Hancock, Burton, & Bruce, 1996; Moghaddam, Jebara, &

Pentland, 2000; O'Toole, Abdi, Deffenbacher, & Valentin, 1993; Valentine, 1991; Valentine & Endo, 1992; Valentine, Lewis, & Hills, 2016), stipulating that face recognition becomes tuned to facial appearance by experience (Sugita, 2008), leading minority faces to be excluded from optimal face processing. Inanimate faces typically differ from real (animate) faces not only in shape but also in texture, which may affect face processing independently of a lack of exposure. For example, an animate texture cues may be necessary for faces to be processed expertly in the absence of task demands (Meinhardt-injac, Persike, & Meinhardt, 2013); because textures cues are thought to contribute to aspects of face processing (Burton, Schweinberger, Jenkins, & Kaufmann, 2015; Kaufmann & Schweinberger, 2008), a lack of face texture cues in inanimate faces may lead to suboptimal processing of such faces.

Though face tuning changes dramatically during infancy (Kelly et al., 2009, 2007; Pascalis et al., 2002; Pascalis & Kelly, 2009), the other-race effect is reversible in early childhood (Anzures et al., 2012; Heron-Delaney et al., 2011; Sangrigoli, Pallier, Argenti, Ventureyra, & de Schonen, 2005) suggesting that face processing mechanisms are not fixed at this point (but see de Heering, Rossion, & Maurer, 2012). Even when experience is stable during childhood, children's use of different visual features for race categorization changes between 5-10 years of age (Balas, Peissig, & Moulson, 2015), suggesting continued tuning of face representations. Experience-based tuning of face processing is thus ongoing during childhood, warranting an examination of how inanimate face processing may diverge from animate face processing developmentally in this period.

Electroencephalography has the potential to shed light on the development of neural sensitivity to face animacy, as it resolves serial processing steps with millisecond resolution (e.g. Latinus & Taylor, 2006; Rossion, 2014) and is appropriate for very young participants (Csibra,

Kushnerenko, & Grossmann, 2008). Event-related potentials (ERPs) exhibit differential sensitivity to low-, mid-, and high-level visual processing, with low-level stimulus differences typically evident at the P100 component (Ganis, Smith, & Schendan, 2012; Rossion, 2014). Controlling for low-level stimuli differences, sensitivity to race (Stahl, Wiese, & Schweinberger, 2008; Wiese, 2012), age (Wiese, 2012; Wiese, Schweinberger, & Hansen, 2008), or species (Wiese, Stahl, & Schweinberger, 2009) can be observed at the face-specific N170 and later components (Stahl et al., 2008). Face inversion provides further information on the underlying mechanisms of face processing, because inversion selectively disrupts high-level, expert face processing (Jacques, D'Arripe, & Rossion, 2010; Maurer, Le Grand, & Mondloch, 2002; Yovel & Kanwisher, 2005). For example, inversion effects on the N170 are larger for own- than other-race faces (Caharel et al., 2011; Foreman, Vizioli, Rousselet, & Caldara, 2010), which reflects disruption of the early stages of high-level, expert face processing (but see Wiese et al., 2009). Face inversion can more generally be considered an experimental control, as high-level face category effects are not expected from inverted faces: therefore, differences between inverted face categories likely reflect low-level (e.g., contrast) or mid-level (e.g., texture) stimulus differences (Rossion, 2014). Thus, electroencephalography combined with an inversion manipulation provides an efficient means to uncover the time-course of animate versus inanimate face processing.

Previous investigations of neural sensitivity to face animacy in adults, however, have yielded mixed results. N170 sensitivity to species is affected by artificial appearance (Balas & Koldewyn, 2013), and effects of face animacy are evidenced in face processing networks by fMRI (Looser, Guntupalli, & Wheatley, 2013). However, clear effects of face animacy are not always evident at the N170 (Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, & Saville, 2017; Wheatley,

Weinberg, Looser, Moran, & Hajcak, 2011), but may emerge at later components (Wheatley et al., 2011). Specifically, Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., (2017) found no difference in the amplitude or latency of the P100 and N170 components in adult participants during passive viewing of inanimate (doll) versus animate (real human) faces. Why is animacy different from other face categories, and when is information about real vs. artificial appearance available in the extended face network?

Here, we examined the time-course and development of animate versus inanimate human face processing by recording ERPs from 5-10-year-old children and adults. We used face inversion to test the hypothesis that animacy would affect the N170 in interaction with face inversion. We expected to observe orientation but not animacy effects on the P100; testing for any effect of animacy on the P100 component allowed us to assess low-level stimulus confounds. We compare animate versus inanimate human face processing between middle childhood (5-10-years of age) and adulthood, to test the hypothesis that sensitivity to face animacy remains immature by that age. In addition, we compare 5-7 and 8-10 years of age to test the hypothesis that inanimate face processing may diverge from animate face processing during middle childhood, considering the documented developmental changes in face processing during that specific period (Balas et al., 2015).

We examined how neural sensitivity to animacy may change developmentally by combining two analytic approaches. First, we used traditional univariate, component-based ERP analyses to determine whether the P100 and N170 were sensitive to face animacy and orientation. Second, we used a multivariate “decoding” approach, by which we attempted to classify trials according to animacy or orientation across time points (Grootswagers, Wardle, & Carlson, 2017; Holdgraf et al., 2017), agnostic to when reliable animacy or orientation

information may be available during face processing (Grootswagers et al., 2017; Isik, Meyers, Leibo, & Poggio, 2014; Kriegeskorte & Bandettini, 2007). Univariate, component-based ERP analyses examine group and condition differences in activation over groups of channels and time-windows of interest. Multivariate “decoding” analyses focus on extracting information available over multi-channel patterns (Hebart & Baker, 2018). Together, these two complementary analysis techniques comprehensively examine the time-course of the neural sensitivity to face animacy and its development across middle childhood and beyond.

Materials and Methods

Participants

Our final sample included a total of 16 young adults (8 females, mean age 19.4 ± 1.2 years) and 36 children between the ages of 5-10-year-olds to participate in this study. Half of these children were 5-7-year-olds ($N=18$, 11 female, mean age 6.2 ± 0.8 years) and the other half were 8-10-year-olds ($N=18$, 10 female, mean age 8.5 ± 0.7 years). Previous ERP results from the first 15 (out of 16 total) young adult participants have been published in Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., (2017). All participants in both the adult and child sample self-reported being of White or Caucasian race. An additional 9 children and 4 adults were recruited, but either failed to complete the task ($N=3$ children), did not yield ERP data of sufficiently high-quality for further analysis ($N=6$ children and $N=1$ adults; e.g. excessive motion throughout recording session, unstable impedance values across the session, or fewer than 50% valid ERP trials in any condition after artifact rejection), or were excluded on the basis of left-handedness (3 adults). All participants had normal or corrected-to-normal visual acuity and right-hand dominance. Prior to the testing session, adult participants provided written informed consent, child participants’

parents or guardians provided written informed consent, and child participants older than 7 years of age provided written assent to participate. All recruitment and testing procedures were approved by the NDSU IRB, in accordance with the principles laid out in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Stimuli

Our stimulus set is identical to that described in Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., (2017), and we briefly describe the key features of these stimuli here. The stimulus set was comprised of 8 images of real and artificial (doll) faces (Figure 1; 4 real faces, 4 dolls) all of which depicted female faces. These faces were cropped to remove hair, but the external outline of the face was otherwise retained. The original images were 256x256 pixels in size and contained only grayscale information. Stimuli were normalized for mean luminance, global contrast, and approximate visual angle.

Figure 1. Face stimuli. Top row: doll faces. Bottom row: human faces. Stimuli were normalized for mean luminance and global contrast.

Procedure

We recorded continuous EEG from all participants in this experiment using 64-Channel Hydrocel Geodesic Sensor Nets by EGI, which were connected to an EGI 200 NetAmps Amplifier. Prior to the recording session, each participant was fitted for a sensor net according to head circumference, at which time we also marked the location of the vertex electrode using a red grease pencil. Each net was soaked in a KCl solution for 5 minutes before net application, at which time we established stable impedances below 25k Ω . Continuous EEG was referenced to the vertex electrode (Cz) during recording, and the sampling rate for all participants was set at 250Hz.

Participants completed the experiment seated in an electrically-isolated chamber. We positioned the display (a 1024x768 LCD monitor) at approximately 50 cm from the participant. At this distance, the stimuli subtended approximately 5-6 degrees of visual angle.

During the experiment, participants were presented with a single face on each trial which could be presented either in the upright orientation or inverted. Each stimulus was presented for 500 ms, preceded by a 500 ms fixation cross and followed by a variable inter-trial interval that was sampled from a uniform distribution defined over an interval from 500-1000 ms. Each stimulus was presented 10 times for a grand total of 160 experimental trials in the entire session (40 upright human faces, 40 inverted human faces, 40 upright doll faces, and 40 inverted doll faces). The stimuli presentation order was pseudo-randomized across participants in E-Prime 2.0, such that for each participant the full trial order was uniquely randomized. To ensure that participants were attending to the stimuli, participants were asked to carry out an oddball-detection task during the session such that they only provided behavioral responses to stimuli

depicting a cartoon mushroom that were presented on approximately 10% of the trials.

Performance in this task was monitored online by an experimenter, who remained in the room during the session. All display parameters and task routines were controlled by custom software written using EPrime v2.0 and accompanying extensions for NetStation v5.0.

EEG data preprocessing and analysis

We carried out a fixed set of pre-processing routines for each participant's EEG data, all of which were implemented in NetStation v5.0. First, we applied a low-pass filter with a cutoff frequency of 30Hz. Next, each participant's data was segmented by condition using stimulus onset triggers inserted into the continuous EEG data by E-Prime, with a pre-stimulus onset period of 100 ms and a post-onset period of 1000 ms, for a total segment length of 1100 ms. Next, we baseline corrected each segment by subtracting the average value measured during the pre-stimulus onset period from each segment and each sensor. The EEG was re-referenced to the average. Finally, we applied automatic artifact-detection procedures implemented in NetStation v5.0 to remove ocular artifacts and replace bad channels. Specifically, for each segment, a channel was marked bad if the difference between its maximum and minimum voltage in that segment exceeded 200 μ V. Horizontal and eye channels were additionally used to detect ocular artifacts in each segment using a 80 ms moving window (eye blink: min-max exceeding 140 μ V, eye movement: min-max exceeding 55 μ V). Finally, segments were rejected if more than 10 channels were identified as bad during that segment, and channels were rejected throughout the entire recording if they were found bad in 20% of segments or more. Artifact detection was also confirmed by independent examination of each subject's data to ensure that the higher signal-to-noise ratio typically obtained from child participants did not lead to overly aggressive rejection

of individual trials. Mean number of included trials for each condition and age group are presented in Table 1. To examine traditional ERP components, we continued by creating an average ERP for each participant by averaging together all segments within each stimulus category. However, for our decoding analysis, we withheld calculating this per-subject average so that we could attempt to classify individual trials. We elaborate on these two approaches below.

Table 1. Mean ($\pm$ SD) number of included trials per age group and condition.

	N	Upright Doll	Upright Human	Inverted Doll	Inverted Human
5-7 year-olds	18	24.28 $\pm$ 4.34	24.06 $\pm$ 4.87	23.33 $\pm$ 4.37	24.22 $\pm$ 4.72
8-10 year-olds	18	28.17 $\pm$ 5.53	28.83 $\pm$ 4.20	27.33 $\pm$ 4.67	28.06 $\pm$ 5.67
Adults	16	33.56 $\pm$ 4.99	32.81 $\pm$ 5.86	33.25 $\pm$ 5.62	33.00 $\pm$ 6.84

Channels and time-windows of interest for ERP analyses

Channels and time-windows of interest for ERP analysis were determined by examining the grand average waveforms collapsed across all stimulus conditions, separately for each age group (adults, 5-7-year-olds, and 8-10-year-olds). Thus, the procedure was blind to any effects of inversion and animacy. Channels of interest were determined based on which channels had the largest grand averaged ERP components of interest (P100 and N170, see Results). Time-windows of interest for each ERP component were determined based on the observed range of individual peak latencies in each age group, ensuring that ensured that all individual participants' peak ERP latencies were accurately captured. The procedure was conducted separately in each age group to accommodate potential differences in peak latencies across age groups.

Time-resolved decoding analyses

Time-resolved decoding analyses, which do not rely on averaging over channels of interest or time-windows, examine the information content of the ERP signal at each time post-onset. Specifically, classification accuracy for a given stimulus property rising above chance at a given time point post-onset is consistent with the notion that information corresponding to this property is available (i.e., can be reliably extracted) at the corresponding stage of processing the stimulus. To reduce the number of features used in these analyses (i.e. reduce variance), decoding analyses were restricted to posterior channels, inclusive of the specific channels used for the ERP analyses (see Figure 2 and ERP analyses below). Similarly, to limit the number of time-points, decoding analyses focused on the period from -50 to 500 ms post-stimulus onset. We then decoded animacy (doll versus real faces) and orientation (inverted versus upright faces) separately for each participant, based on the amplitudes in these channels at each time post-onset. For each participant and for each of these binary classifications (upright versus inverted faces classification on the one hand, or doll versus real faces classification on the other hand), trials from each of the two classes (either upright versus inverted, or doll versus real) were randomly re-ordered (permuted) and separated into 4 folds. For each class, trials from each of the 4 folds were separately averaged to yield 4 pseudo-trials for each of the two classes (Grootswagers et al., 2017; Isik et al., 2014). Averaging into pseudo-trials can improve signal-to-noise ratio for time-resolved classification (Grootswagers et al., 2017; Isik et al., 2014). The first 3 of these 4 pseudo-trials were used for training the classifiers, and the remaining pseudo-trial was used for testing (i.e., 4-folds cross-validation). Thus, chance level was 50% regardless of the effective number of trials of each class available in each fold. Training and testing was performed for each sample (time point) post-onset independently using linear SVMs implemented in libsvm v3.11

for Matlab (Chang & Lin, 2011), leading to time-series of classification accuracies. This entire procedure of permutation, separation into folds, and classification at each time-point, was repeated 200 times for each participant and classification type (upright versus inverted, doll versus real). Classification accuracies were averaged over these 200 instances, for each participant and classification type. Statistical significance of the resulting classification accuracy time-series was established using permutation tests (right-tail test against the chance level of 50%) with cluster-wise correction over time-points (cluster-defining threshold p -value = 0.05, α = 0.05).

Analysis software and code

EEG data acquisition and pre-processing were conducted in Netstation v5.0 as indicated above. Decoding analyses were conducted, and figures were created, using MATLAB v 8.2.0.701. The corresponding code is freely available online at [OSF repository].

Results

Component-Based ERP Analysis

We chose to examine both the P100 and the N170 to determine how these components may (or may not) be affected by face inversion and face animacy as a function of participant age. In the left hemisphere, we identified sensors 29, 30, and 32 as channels of interest for all participant groups, and in the right hemisphere we selected channels 43, 44, and 47. These locations over occipito-temporal regions of the scalp roughly coincide with locations TP9-TP10, P7-P8 (previously T5-T6), and P9-10 on the 10-20 system (Luu & Ferree, 2005) and are largely consistent with prior studies examining N170 responses in children and adults (Balas &

Stevenson, 2014; Balas, van Lamsweerde, Saville, & Schmidt, 2017). The time windows we selected to examine each component varied across age groups. In 5-7-year-olds we measured the P100's response properties within a time window between 80 ms and 160 ms post-stimulus onset and analyzed the N170 within a time window between 168 ms and 248 ms post-stimulus onset. In 8-10-year-olds, we analyzed the P100 using a time window between 96-160 ms post-stimulus onset and the N170 using a time window between 168-244 ms post-stimulus onset. In adults, we measured the P100's response properties within a time window between 100-160 ms post-stimulus onset and analyzed the N170 within a time window between 160-224 ms post-stimulus onset (Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., 2017). For each component, we measured both the mean amplitude and the latency-to-peak within these time windows. Average N170 amplitudes were not "corrected" (re-baselined) based on the preceding P100 amplitudes.

Because adults and children may differ more from one another than the 5-7-year-olds would differ from the 8-10-year-olds, we compared the three age groups in two distinct steps, testing first for developmental changes between childhood and adulthood, and then for developmental changes evident between the two children age groups. Thus, to examine broad differences between children and adults, we first submitted these values to a 2x2x2x2 mixed-design ANOVA with face orientation (upright vs. inverted), face animacy (real vs. doll), hemisphere (left vs. right) as within-subject factors and age group (all children vs. adults) as a between-subjects factor. To further examine finer developmental effects between 5-7 and 8-10 years of age, we then submitted these values to a 2x2x2x2 mixed-design ANOVA with face orientation (upright vs. inverted), face animacy (real vs. doll), hemisphere (left vs. right) as within-subject factors and age group (5-7 vs. 8-10 year-olds) as a between-subjects factor. The grand average ERP waveforms across all experimental conditions and as a function of age and hemisphere are

displayed in Figure 2. Individual participants' average P100 and N170 amplitude and latencies are presented in Figure 3, while individual participants' average waveforms as a function of experimental condition, age, and hemisphere are presented in Supplementary Figures 1-4.

Average effects of face orientation and face animacy on the ERP waveforms are presented as a function of age and hemisphere in Figure 4.

P100 amplitude

Analysis of the P100 amplitude comparing children and adults (Figure 3) revealed significant main effects of orientation ($F(1,49) = 7.88, p = 0.007$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.14$) and age group ($F(1,49) = 12.01, p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.23$). P100 amplitudes were larger (more positive) for inverted faces ($M = 5.28 \mu\text{v}$) relative to upright faces ($M = 4.33 \mu\text{v}$; 95% CI of the difference [$0.26 \mu\text{v}$, $1.61 \mu\text{v}$]), and in children ($M = 6.48 \mu\text{v}$) compared to adults ($M = 3.04 \mu\text{v}$; 95% CI of the difference [$1.42 \mu\text{v}$, $5.40 \mu\text{v}$]). No other main effects or interactions reached significance. Our analysis of the P100 amplitude comparing 5-7 and 8-10 year-olds revealed only a significant main effect of orientation ($F(1,33) = 6.72, p = 0.014$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.17$). Again, this effect was the result of systematically larger (more positive) amplitudes for inverted faces ($M = 7.044 \mu\text{v}$) relative to upright faces ($M = 5.90 \mu\text{v}$; 95% CI of the difference [$0.25 \mu\text{v}$, $2.06 \mu\text{v}$]). No other main effects or interactions reached significance.

RUNNING HEAD: Face animacy and inversion in childhood

Figure 2. Grand average ERP waveforms ($\pm$ s.e.m.) from the channels of interest in the left (A, C, E) and right (B, D, F) hemispheres in each age group.

P100 Latency

Analysis of the P100 latency-to-peak comparing children and adults (Figure 3) revealed a significant main effect of orientation ($F(1,49) = 10.89, p = 0.002$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.18$). P100 latencies were slower for inverted ($M = 131.40$ ms) than upright faces ($M = 127.25$ ms; 95% CI of the difference [1.62 ms, 6.86 ms]). No other main effects or interactions reached significance. Our analysis of the latency-to-peak of the P100 comparing 5-7 and 8-10 year-olds similarly revealed significant main effects of face orientation ($F(1,33) = 6.79, p = 0.014$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.17$) and hemisphere ($F(1,33) = 4.48, p = 0.042$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.12$). The former effect was the result of significantly slower latencies in response to inverted faces ($M = 131.4$ ms) relative to upright faces ($M = 126.9$ ms; 95% CI of the difference [0.93 ms - 7.52 ms]). The latter effect was the result of slower latencies in the left hemisphere ($M = 130.6$ ms) relative to the right hemisphere ($M = 127.5$ ms; 95% CI of the difference = [0.12 ms, 6.18 ms]). These main effects were qualified by a 3-way interaction between face orientation, hemisphere, and age group ($F(1,33) = 4.83, p = 0.035$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.13$). To examine the nature of this interaction, we carried out post-hoc paired-samples t -tests to compare upright vs. inverted latencies independently in each hemisphere for each age group. Briefly, this analysis revealed that while 5-7-year-old children exhibited a significant inversion effect over right hemisphere sensors ($p = 0.001$), but not left hemisphere sensors ($p = 0.97$), older children exhibited a significant inversion effect over left hemisphere sensors ($p = 0.046$), but not right hemisphere sensors.

N170 Amplitude

Analysis of the N170 amplitude comparing children and adults (Figure 3) revealed a large significant interactive effect of orientation and age group ($F(1,50) = 11.90, p = 0.001$, partial η^2

= 0.19) and a medium-sized, significant main effect of animacy ($F(1,50) = 4.52, p = 0.038$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.08$) as N170 amplitudes were larger (more negative) in response to doll ($M = -0.64 \mu v$) than real faces ($M = -0.20 \mu v$, 95% CI of the difference $[-1.06 \mu v, -0.05 \mu v]$). In addition, N170 amplitudes were larger (more negative) for inverted ($M = -0.64 \mu v$, 95% CI $[-2.44 \mu v, 1.18 \mu v]$) than upright faces ($M = 0.48 \mu v$, 95% CI $[-1.31 \mu v, 2.22 \mu v]$) in adults, and larger for upright ($M = -1.45 \mu v$, 95% CI $[-2.60 \mu v, -0.30 \mu v]$) than inverted faces ($M = -0.23 \mu v$; 95% CI $[-1.40 \mu v, 0.94 \mu v]$) in children. No other main effects or interactions reached significance, though we did also observe a marginally significant interaction between animacy and age group ($F(1,50)=3.60, p=0.063, \eta^2 = 0.067$). This trend appeared to be driven by larger animacy effects in children compared to adults; as the effect did not reach traditional thresholds of significance, we do not examine it further. Our analysis of the N170 mean amplitude comparing 5-7 and 8-10 year-olds similarly revealed significant main effects of face orientation ($F(1,34) = 8.45, p = 0.006, \eta^2 = 0.20$) and face animacy ($F(1,34) = 10.98, p = 0.002, \eta^2 = 0.24$). The former effect was driven by larger (more negative) amplitudes in response to upright faces ($M = -1.45 \mu v$) relative to inverted faces ($M = -0.28 \mu v$; 95% CI of the difference $[0.35 \mu v - 1.98 \mu v]$). Again, the latter effect was the result of larger (more negative) amplitudes in response to doll faces ($M = -1.38 \mu v$) relative to real faces ($M = -0.35 \mu v$; 95% CI of the difference $[0.40 \mu v, 1.65 \mu v]$). No other main effects or interactions reached significance.

N170 Latency

Finally, analysis of the N170 peak latency comparing children and adults (Figure 3) revealed a significant main effect of age group ($F(1,50) = 26.11, p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.34$), as latencies were slower in children ($M=202.50$ ms) than adults ($M=180.4$ ms, 95% CI of the difference =

[11.72 ms, 28.40 ms]). No other main effects or interactions reached significance. Similarly, our analysis of the N170 peak latency comparing 5-7 and 8-10 year-olds similarly revealed only a main effect of participant age ($F(1,34) = 8.77, p = 0.006$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.20$). This effect was driven by faster latencies in older children ($M = 196$ ms; 95% CI [190.5 ms, 202.3 ms]) relative to younger children ($M = 208.6$, 95% CI [202.6 ms, 214.5 ms]). No other main effects or interactions reached significance.

In summary, the analysis of ERPs (P100, N170) revealed a main effect of orientation on several aspects of the data (mean P100 amplitude, P100 latency, and N170 amplitude), although the direction of the effect of orientation on the N170 amplitude differed in children and adults. In addition, a main effect of animacy was found on the mean amplitude of the N170, in which doll faces evoked larger (more negative) N170 amplitudes than real faces, regardless of age group or the faces' orientation.

Figure 3. Individual and average P100 amplitude (A-B), P100 latency (C-D), N170 amplitude (E-F), and N170 latency (G-H) by condition in children (A, C, E, G) and adults (B, D, F, H), averaged over hemispheres.

Figure 4. Grand average ERP effects ($\pm$ s.e.m.) in channels of interest in the left and right hemispheres in all age groups.

Figure 5. (A-C) Average classification accuracy time-series ($\pm$ s.e.m.) for decoding face orientation (inverted vs. upright) and animacy (doll vs. real) by age group. (D-E) Average and individual classification accuracy time-series over time windows, by age group and classification type.

Time-series of decoding accuracies

We next examine the time-course of the representation of face orientation and animacy, as evidenced by time-resolved decoding (as opposed to differences in component latencies and amplitudes). Time-series of decoding accuracies exhibited similar temporal profiles in both children age groups compared to the adult group (Figure 5). Animacy (dolls versus real faces) could not be reliably decoded from the data at any point post-onset, in either group (no

significant cluster after cluster correction). In contrast, face orientation (inverted versus upright faces) could be decoded with about 60% accuracy in both children groups, significantly above chance in the 5-7 year-old group (significant cluster: 248-316 ms, $p < 0.05$) and marginally so in the 8-10 year-old group (marginally significant cluster: 272-316 ms, $0.05 < p < 0.1$). In adults, classification accuracy also rose above chance for orientation (significant clusters, $p < 0.05$; Figure 5), and marginally above chance for animacy (marginally significant cluster: 240-276 ms, $0.05 < p < 0.1$). Thus, face orientation information could be reliably decoded both in children and adults. Animacy could not be decoded in any children age group and could marginally be decoded in adults.

Comparison of average decoding accuracies between adults and children

We next examine whether classification accuracy significantly varied as a function of age group (adults vs. all children) and classification type (orientation vs. animacy). Pooling classification time-series from both children age-groups as well as the adult group yielded one significant cluster ($p < 0.05$) from 108–412 ms for the classification of orientation, but none for animacy. To test whether the observed classification accuracy significantly differed between age groups and classification type (orientation or animacy), mean classification accuracy over the 108–412 ms time-window (as identified above) for each classification type and participant were subjected to post-hoc mixed-effects analyses of variance with classification type as a within-subjects factor and age group (adults vs. all children) as a between-subjects factor.

This analysis revealed a main effect of classification type ($F(1,100) = 16.14$, $p = 0.001$, $\beta = -6.47$, 95% CI $[-9.66, -3.27]$, $d = -0.61$) with no significant effect of age group either as a main effect (adults vs. children; $F(1,100) = 1.62$, $p = 0.206$) or in interaction with classification type

($F(1,100) = 0.79, p = 0.377$). The main effect of classification type held when controlling for the total number of valid trials available for each of the two classified classes (main effect of classification type: $F(1,99) = 16.14, p = 0.001, \beta = -6.47, 95\% \text{ CI } [-9.66, -3.27], d = -0.60$; all other $ps > 0.05$), or the minimum and maximum number of trials available from the two classes (main effect of classification type: $F(1,98) = 16.81, p < 0.001, \beta = -6.27, 95\% \text{ CI } [-9.31, -3.24], d = -0.60$; all other $ps > 0.05$).

The minimum, maximum, and total number of trials available over each of the two classes did not significantly differ based on classification type or the interaction of classification type and age (all $ps > 0.6$), but did differ according to age group (all $ps < 0.05$) as adults tended to contribute more trials than children. Overall, it does not appear likely that the significantly accurate classification of orientation but not animacy reflects differences in the number of trials available for these two classifications. Classification accuracies for the classification of face orientation or animacy were comparable between children and adults when adjusting for trial numbers, despite animacy classification being marginally above chance in adults but not in children.

Comparison of average decoding accuracies between 5-7- and 8-10-year-old children

We next examine whether classification accuracy significantly varied as a function of children's age group (5-7 vs. 8-10-year-olds) and classification type (orientation vs. animacy). Pooling classification time-series from both children age-groups yielded a significant cluster ($p < 0.05$) from 244-336 ms for the classification of orientation, but none for animacy. Children's mean classification accuracies over the 244-336 ms time-windows (as identified above) for each classification type and participant were subjected to post-hoc mixed-effects analyses of variance

with classification type as a within-subjects factor and age group (5-7 vs. 8-10-year-olds) as a between-subjects factor.

This analysis revealed a main effect of classification type ($F(1,68) = 9.53, p = 0.003, \beta = -8.83, 95\% \text{ CI } [-14.54, -3.12], d = -0.64$) but no effect of child age either alone (5-7 vs. 8-10-year-olds; $F(1,68) = 0.02, p = 0.903$), or in interaction with classification type ($F(1,68) = 0.03, p = 0.862$). The results held when controlling for the total number of valid trials available for each of the two classified classes (main effect of classification type: $F(1,67) = 9.53, p = 0.003, \beta = -8.83, 95\% \text{ CI } [-14.55, -3.12], d = -0.64$; all other $ps > 0.05$), or the minimum and maximum number of trials available from the two classes (main effect of classification type: $F(1,66) = 9.31, p = 0.003, \beta = -8.87, 95\% \text{ CI } [-14.67, -3.07], d = -0.64$; all other $ps > 0.05$).

Thus, classification accuracy for face orientation in the 244-336 ms time-window did not significantly differ between the two children age groups, despite being significantly above chance in the 5-7-year-old group but only marginally above chance in the 8-10-year-old group. Again, the minimum, maximum, and total number of trials available over each of the two classes did not significantly differ based on classification type or the interaction of classification type and age (all $ps > 0.6$), but did differ according to children age group (all $ps < 0.05$) as 8-10-year-olds tended to contribute more trials than 5-7-year-olds.

Discussion

In the current study, we used EEG to assess the development of the sensitivity to face animacy in childhood. More specifically, we presented real or doll faces, upright or inverted, to adults and children of either 5-7 years or 8-10 years of age. We find multiple effects of facial orientation on the P100 and N170 ERP components, as previously reported in children (Itier & Taylor, 2004)

and adults (Rossion & Gauthier, 2002; Rossion et al., 2000). In addition, we observed a medium-sized effect of face animacy on the N170 amplitude across the three studied age groups (adults, 5-7-year-olds, and 8-10-year-olds), where the amplitude of the N170 was larger (more negative) for doll than real faces. Importantly, the sensitivity of the N170 to animacy was not affected by face inversion, suggesting that this effect may not depend on face-specific, expert configural processing that face inversion is known to disrupt (Cashon & Holt, 2015; Maurer et al., 2002; Yovel & Kanwisher, 2005).

The N170 amplitude, but not P1 amplitude, was exaggerated in response to artificial (doll) compared to real human faces irrespective of age group or the face's orientation (i.e., there was no significant animacy by age or animacy by orientation interaction). These findings suggest that a sensitivity of the N170 to facial animacy emerges developmentally as early as 5 years of age and exhibits a relative stability from childhood through adulthood. Such developmental trajectory is consistent with the developmental time-course of the sensitivity to other facial dimensions, such as race (Balas, Westerlund, Hung, & Nelson, 2011; Stahl et al., 2008; Wiese, Kaufmann, & Schweinberger, 2014). The robustness of the N170 sensitivity to face animacy with respect to inversion is more difficult to interpret, although it is in line with similar findings in adults (Balas & Pacella, 2015; Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., 2017). Several potential mechanisms may theoretically account for sensitivity of the N170 amplitude to the facial dimension of animacy. For example, relative lack of experience of children and adults with artificial compared to human faces could lead to an "out-group effect" for animacy that is reflected on the amplitude of the N170; Doll faces could be more efficiently detected as prototypical faces than real faces (e.g. due to the exaggerated facial features and impoverished superficial texture), leading to an exaggerated N170; Alternatively, modulation of N170 by face

animacy might be driven by another, confounded facial dimension, such as femininity (Balas, 2013). However, these three potential mechanisms are difficult to reconcile with the observed absence of an inversion by animacy effect, which would be expected if the sensitivity of the N170 to face animacy required face-specific, configural processing (but see e.g. Sekuler, Gaspar, Gold, & Bennett, 2004) typically understood to be disrupted by face inversion (Cashon & Holt, 2015; Maurer et al., 2002; Yovel & Kanwisher, 2005). Thus, another possibility is that the sensitivity of the N170 to face animacy as reported in the current study could be driven by low- to mid-level properties of the stimuli. Although the animate and inanimate faces used in the current study were matched for luminance and global contrast, other uncontrolled low- to mid-level properties might have systematically differed between these two categories. With this limitation in mind, it is particularly tempting to interpret the observed sensitivity of the N170 to face animacy as reflecting a sensitivity to texture, a mid-level property of visual stimuli that could both affect the amplitude of the N170 (but not P100) irrespective of face inversion and systematically differ between animate (or natural) and inanimate (or artificial) faces (Balas & Conlin, 2015; Long, Yu, & Konkle, 2017). Recent fMRI work in adults suggests that high-level vision areas might be more sensitive to shape or texture than the abstract dimension of animacy per se (Bracci, Kalfas, & Ope de Beeck, 2017; Long et al., 2017). Future research is needed to determine the extent to which the sensitivity of the N170 to face animacy evidenced in the current study reflects sensitivity to low-, mid-, or high-level visual properties that differentiated inanimate from animate faces in the current study. Regardless of the specific mechanism responsible, the current findings suggest that in 5-10-year-old children and adults the N170, but not P100, component exhibits some sensitivity to face animacy that is not disrupted by face inversion.

We found that the effect of animacy on the N170 amplitude was already present by 5-7 years of age, at the onset of middle childhood. A previous ERP analysis of the current adult sample failed to evidence an effect of face animacy on the N170 either as a main effect or in interaction with face orientation (Balas, van Lamsweerde, Auen, et al., 2017). It is conceivable that the effect of animacy on the N170 simply failed to reach significance in the adult group when it was considered in isolation. Alternatively, there might be a genuine but relatively small (i.e., too small to be reliably detected in the current study) decrease in the sensitivity of the N170 of animacy between childhood and adulthood, perhaps during the course of puberty and adolescence which are known to remodel social processing networks and thus might modify the processing of face animacy (Blakemore, 2008). Accordingly, we did find a marginally significant interaction between animacy and age group on the N170 amplitude, driven by larger animacy effects in children compared to adults. Future research examining the developmental trajectory of face animacy and artificial face processing in infants, children and adults over a range of behavioral and neuroimaging tasks will help disambiguating these two possibilities.

We additionally used time-resolved multivariate pattern analysis (“decoding”) of the EEG signal to examine whether and when, after stimulus onset, information about face orientation or animacy could be reliably extracted from the EEG signal in children and adults (Grootswagers et al., 2017; Holdgraf et al., 2017; Isik et al., 2014). We observed that information about face orientation could be reliably decoded (i.e. was possibly represented) within 500 ms post-onset at all ages (significant clusters were identified from about 250-350 ms in children, and both 100-200 ms and 320-380 ms in adults). Overall, decoding accuracy for the classification of face orientation was comparable across all age groups after adjusting for numbers of valid trials. In contrast, information about face animacy could not be significantly decoded from the data at any

age in children and could only marginally be decoded in adults (a marginally significant cluster emerged at about 240-275 ms), at least within 500 ms post-onset and at posterior channel locations. Average classification accuracy for animacy did not significantly differ between children and adults. In other words, there was no evidence that face animacy was reliably represented in children, and only limited evidence in adults, at least in the current task (mushroom oddball detection) which only necessitated minimal face processing. It is of course possible that more robust representations of face animacy would have been uncovered by a different neuroimaging method, or in a different task requiring deeper face processing or the explicit extraction of animacy, as reported by at least one fMRI study in adults using an odd-one-out face detection task (Looser et al., 2013). Activation-based (e.g. ERP) and information based (e.g. decoding) analyses differ in their methods, objectives, and interpretation (Hebart & Baker, 2018). Any of the methodological differences between ERP and decoding analyses (such as the difference in electrodes used) may account for the different results obtained from the ERP and decoding analyses, although importantly the electrodes used for decoding included those used for ERPs. These decoding results remain to be replicated, but are generally in line with the notion that robust sensitivity to face orientation is mostly in place by childhood (Cashon & Holt, 2015).

The present results must be interpreted in the light of the following limitations. One of the main limitations of this work lies in the relatively limited sample size ($N=18$ per children age group, and $N = 16$ adults). On a similar note, numbers of trials were relatively low, but adequate for decoding (about 40-80 trials per class when decoding face orientation or animacy separately within-subjects, using 18 channels as features with a linear SVM). This characteristic of the data, along with the typically low signal to noise ratio of EEG signals collected from developmental populations, could have limited the accuracy that could be achieved. However, these factors

cannot account for the observed difference in accuracy for decoding face orientation versus face animacy. A second limitation of the study is the use of doll faces, which are arguably familiar to many children, and a relatively limited stimulus set. Idiosyncrasies in the stimuli, or the specific status of dolls, could have contributed to the current results. Further research will determine whether the current results extend to all human versus artificial faces equally. A third limitation is the use of a cross-sectional design, which renders the results susceptible to cohort effects. As the use of technology has evolved over the last decades, adults and children of varying ages likely had different levels of exposure to artificial faces (e.g. artificial cartoon or game characters, robots, or avatars) in their lifetime. Finally, a fourth limitation lies in the absence of concurrent behavioral data, precluding us from relating the observed differences in N170 amplitude between inanimate and animate faces with behavioral deficits in processing inanimate faces.

In conclusion, we investigated the time-course of the neural sensitivity to face animacy in children, as a function of face inversion. We found that the amplitude of the N170 component, a well-described component related to face processing, was sensitive to face animacy in 5-10-year-old children. However, this sensitivity to animacy did not appear to necessitate or affect face-specific configural processing as indexed by the inversion effect. In addition, multivariate pattern analyses of the EEG signal did not yield any evidence that face animacy information was robustly represented during passive viewing in children, and only limited evidence in adults.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the NSF award BCS-1348627 to B. B., and a Philippe Foundation award to L. B.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, B. B.; Methodology, B. B.; Data Collection and Management, B. B. and A.S.; Data Analysis, B. B. and L.B.; Figures, L.B.; Writing – Original Draft, B. B. and L.B.; Writing – Reviewing & Editing, B. B. and L.B.

Data Accessibility

The primary, de-identified data supporting the reported analyses is available online at [OSF repository].

References

- Anzures, G., Wheeler, A., Quinn, P. C., Pascalis, O., Slater, A. M., Heron-Delaney, M., ... Lee, K. (2012). Brief daily exposures to Asian females reverses perceptual narrowing for Asian faces in Caucasian infants. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 112(4), 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2012.04.005>
- Balas, B. (2012). Bayesian face recognition and perceptual narrowing in face-space. *Developmental Science*, 15, 579–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01154.x>
- Balas, B. (2013). Biological sex determines whether faces look real. *Visual Cognition*, 21, 766–788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13506285.2013.823138>
- Balas, B., & Conlin, C. (2015). The visual N1 is sensitive to deviations from natural texture appearance. *PLoS ONE*, 10, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136471>
- Balas, B., & Koldewyn, K. (2013). Early visual ERP sensitivity to the species and animacy of faces. *Neuropsychologia*, 51, 2876–2881. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.09.014>
- Balas, B., & Pacella, J. (2015). Artificial faces are harder to remember. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.018>

- Balas, B., & Pacella, J. (2017). Trustworthiness perception is disrupted in artificial faces. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 240–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.045>
- Balas, B., Peissig, J., & Moulson, M. (2015). Children (but not adults) judge similarity in own- and other-race faces by the color of their skin. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 130, 56–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2014.09.009>
- Balas, B., & Stevenson, K. (2014). Children's neural response to contrast-negated faces is species specific. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 119, 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2013.10.010>
- Balas, B., van Lamsweerde, A. E., Auen, A., & Saville, A. (2017). The impact of face inversion on animacy categorization. *I-Perception*, 8, 204166951772365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041669517723653>
- Balas, B., van Lamsweerde, A. E., Saville, A., & Schmidt, J. (2017). School-age children's neural sensitivity to horizontal orientation energy in faces. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 59, 899–909. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.21546>
- Balas, B., Westerlund, A., Hung, K., & Nelson, C. A. (2011). Shape, color and the other-race effect in the infant brain. *Developmental Science*, 14, 892–900. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2011.01039.x>
- Blakemore, S.-J. (2008). The social brain in adolescence. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9, 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2353>
- Bowling, N. C., & Banissy, M. J. (2017). Emotion expression modulates perception of animacy from faces. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 71, 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.02.004>
- Bracci, S., Kalfas, I., & Ope de Beeck, H. (2017). The ventral visual pathway represents animal appearance over animacy, unlike human behavior and deep neural networks. *Biorxiv*, 1–27.
- Burton, A. M., Schweinberger, S. R., Jenkins, R., & Kaufmann, J. M. (2015). Arguments Against a Configural Processing Account of Familiar Face Recognition. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10, 482–496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615583129>
- Byatt, G., & Rhodes, G. (2004). Identification of own-race and other-race faces: Implications for the representation of race in face space. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 11, 735–741. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196628>
- Caharel, S., Montalan, B., Fromager, E., Bernard, C., Lalonde, R., & Mohamed, R. (2011). Other-race and inversion effects during the structural encoding stage of face processing in a race categorization task: An event-related brain potential study. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 79, 266–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2010.10.018>
- Caldara, R., & Abdi, H. (2006). Simulating the “other-race” effect with autoassociative neural networks: further evidence in favor of the face-space model. *Perception*, 35, 659–670. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5360>
- Cashon, C. H., & Holt, N. A. (2015). Developmental Origins of the Face Inversion Effect. In *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (Vol. 48, pp. 117–150). <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2014.11.008>

- Chang, C., & Lin, C. (2011). LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1961189.1961199>
- Crookes, K., Ewing, L., Gildenhuys, J. D., Kloth, N., Hayward, W. G., Oxner, M., ... Rhodes, G. (2015). How well do computer-generated faces tap face expertise? *PLoS ONE*, 10, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141353>
- Csibra, G., Kushnerenko, E., & Grossmann, T. (2008). Electrophysiological Methods in Studying Infant Cognitive Development. In *Handbook of Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 2nd Edition* (pp. 247–262).
- de Heering, A., Rossion, B., & Maurer, D. (2012). Developmental changes in face recognition during childhood: Evidence from upright and inverted faces. *Cognitive Development*, 27, 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2011.07.001>
- Farid, H., & Bravo, M. J. (2012). Perceptual discrimination of computer generated and photographic faces. *Digital Investigation*, 8, 226–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diin.2011.06.003>
- Foreman, K., Vizioli, L., Rousselet, G., & Caldara, R. (2010). Inverting faces elicits sensitivity to race on the N170 component: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Vision*, 9, 507–507. <https://doi.org/10.1167/9.8.507>
- Furl, N., Phillips, P. J., & O'Toole, A. J. (2002). Face recognition algorithms and the other-race effect: computational mechanisms for a developmental contact hypothesis. *Cognitive Science*, 26, 797–815. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2606_4
- Ganis, G., Smith, D., & Schendan, H. E. (2012). The N170, not the P1, indexes the earliest time for categorical perception of faces, regardless of interstimulus variance. *NeuroImage*, 62, 1563–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.05.043>
- Grootswagers, T., Wardle, S. G., & Carlson, T. A. (2017). Decoding dynamic brain patterns from evoked responses: A tutorial on multivariate pattern analysis applied to time-series neuroimaging data. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 29, 677–697. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Hackel, L. M., Looser, C. E., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). Group membership alters the threshold for mind perception: The role of social identity, collective identification, and intergroup threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 52, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.12.001>
- Hancock, P. J. B., Burton, A. M., & Bruce, V. (1996). Face processing: Human perception and principal components analysis. *Memory and Cognition*, 24, 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03197270>
- Hebart, M. N., & Baker, C. I. (2018). Deconstructing multivariate decoding for the study of brain function. *NeuroImage*, 180, 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.08.005>
- Heron-Delaney, M., Anzures, G., Herbert, J. S., Quinn, P. C., Slater, A. M., Tanaka, J. W., ... Pascalis, O. (2011). Perceptual training prevents the emergence of the other race effect during infancy. *PLOS ONE*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019858>

- Holdgraf, C. R., Rieger, J. W., Micheli, C., Martin, S., Knight, R. T., & Theunissen, F. E. (2017). Encoding and decoding models in cognitive electrophysiology. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *11*, 61. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FNSYS.2017.00061>
- Isik, L., Meyers, E. M., Leibo, J. Z., & Poggio, T. A. (2014). The dynamics of invariant object recognition in the human visual system. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *111*, 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00394.2013>
- Itier, R. J., & Taylor, M. J. (2004). Face recognition memory and configural processing: A developmental ERP study using upright, inverted, and contrast-reversed faces. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *16*, 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892904322926818>
- Jacques, C., D'Arripe, O., & Rossion, B. (2010). The time course of the face inversion effect. *Journal of Vision*, *7*, 619–619. <https://doi.org/10.1167/7.9.619>
- Kaufmann, J. M., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2008). Distortions in the brain ? ERP effects of caricaturing familiar and unfamiliar faces, *8*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2008.06.092>
- Kelly, D. J., Liu, S., Lee, K., Quinn, P. C., Pascalis, O., Slater, A. M., & Ge, L. (2009). Development of the other-race effect during infancy: Evidence toward universality? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *104*, 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2009.01.006>
- Kelly, D. J., Quinn, P. C., Slater, A. M., Lee, K., Ge, L., & Pascalis, O. (2007). The other-race effect develops during infancy evidence of perceptual narrowing. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 1084–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02029.x>.The
- Kriegeskorte, N., & Bandettini, P. A. (2007). Analyzing for information, not activation, to exploit high- resolution fMRI. *NeuroImage*, *38*, 649–662. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scisignal.2001449>.Engineering
- Krumhuber, E. G., Lai, Y. K., Rosin, P. L., & Hugenberg, K. (2018). When Facial Expressions Do and Do Not Signal Minds: The Role of Face Inversion, Expression Dynamism, and Emotion Type. *Emotion*, (September). <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000475>
- Latinus, M., & Taylor, M. J. (2006). Face processing stages: Impact of difficulty and the separation of effects. *Brain Research*, *1123*, 179–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2006.09.031>
- Lewkowicz, D. J., & Ghazanfar, A. A. (2006). The decline of cross-species intersensory perception in human infants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *103*(17), 6771–6774. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0602027103>
- Long, B., Yu, C.-P., & Konkle, T. (2017). A mid-level organization of the ventral stream. *BioRxiv*, 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1101/213934>
- Looser, C. E., Guntupalli, J. S., & Wheatley, T. (2013). Multivoxel patterns in face-sensitive temporal regions reveal an encoding schema based on detecting life in a face. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *8*, 799–805. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss078>
- Looser, C. E., & Wheatley, T. (2010). The Tipping Point of Animacy. *Psychological Science*, *21*(12), 1854–1862. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610388044>

- Luu, P., & Ferree, T. (2005). Determination of the HydroCel Geodesic Sensor Nets' Average electrode positions and their 10–10 international equivalents. *Inc, Technical Note*, 1–11.
- MacDorman, K. F., Green, R. D., Ho, C. C., & Koch, C. T. (2009). Too real for comfort? Uncanny responses to computer generated faces. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 695–710. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.12.026>
- Maurer, D., Le Grand, R., & Mondloch, C. J. (2002). The many faces of configural processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6, 255–260. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(02\)01903-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(02)01903-4)
- Meinhardt-injac, B., Persike, M., & Meinhardt, G. (2013). Holistic face processing is induced by shape and texture. *Perception*, 42, 716–732. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p7462>
- Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 7, 3–35. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8971.7.1.3>
- Moghaddam, B., Jebara, T., & Pentland, A. (2000). Bayesian face recognition. *Pattern Recognition*, 33, 1771–1782. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203\(99\)00179-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203(99)00179-X)
- O'Toole, A. J., Abdi, H., Deffenbacher, K. A., & Valentin, D. (1993). Low-dimensional representation of faces in higher dimensions of the face space. *Journal of the Optical Society of America A*, 10, 405. <https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSAA.10.000405>
- Pascalis, O., & Bachevalier, J. (1998). Face recognition in primates : a cross - species study. *Behavioural Processes*, 43, 87–96. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357\(97\)00090-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357(97)00090-9)
- 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., & Kelly, D. J. (2009). The origins of face processing in humans: Phylogeny and ontogeny. *Psychological Science*, 4, 200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01119.x>
- Rhodes, M. G., & Anastasi, J. S. (2012). The own-age bias in face recognition: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138, 146–174. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025750>
- Rossion, B. (2014). Understanding face perception by means of human electrophysiology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(6), 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.02.013>
- Rossion, B., & Gauthier, I. (2002). How does the brain process upright and inverted faces? *Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews*, 1, 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534582302001001004>
- Rossion, B., Gauthier, I., Tarr, M. J., Despland, P., Bruyer, R., Linotte, S., & Crommelinck, M. (2000). The N170 occipito-temporal component is delayed and enhanced to inverted faces but not to inverted objects: an electrophysiological account of face-specific processes in the human brain. *Neuroreport*, 11, 69–72. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-200001170-00014>
- Sangrigoli, S., Pallier, C., Argenti, A.-M., Ventureyra, V. a G., & de Schonen, S. (2005). Reversibility of the other-race effect in face recognition during childhood. *Psychological Science*, 16, 440–444. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01554.x>

- Sekuler, A. B., Gaspar, C. M., Gold, J. M., & Bennett, P. J. (2004). Inversion leads to quantitative, not qualitative, changes in face processing. *Current Biology*, *14*, 391–396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2004.02.028>
- Stahl, J., Wiese, H., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2008). Expertise and own-race bias in face processing: an event-related potential study. *Neuroreport*, *19*, 583–587. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e3282f97b4d>
- 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>
- Valentine, T. (1991). A unified account of the effects of distinctiveness, inversion, and race in face recognition. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A: Human Experimental Psychology*, *43*, 161–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14640749108400966>
- Valentine, T., & Endo, M. (1992). Towards an exemplar model of face processing: the effects of race and distinctiveness. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A: Human Experimental Psychology*, *44*, 671–703. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14640749208401305>
- Valentine, T., Lewis, M. B., & Hills, P. J. (2016). Face-space: A unifying concept in face recognition research. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *69*, 1996–2019.
- Walker, P. M., & Tanaka, J. W. (2003). An encoding advantage for own-race versus other-race faces. *Perception*, *32*, 1117–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5098>
- Wheatley, T., Weinberg, A., Looser, C., Moran, T., & Hajcak, G. (2011). Mind perception: Real but not artificial faces sustain neural activity beyond the N170/VPP. *PLoS ONE*, *6*(3), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0017960>
- Wiese, H. (2012). The role of age and ethnic group in face recognition memory: ERP evidence from a combined own-age and own-race bias study. *Biological Psychology*, *89*, 137–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.10.002>
- Wiese, H., Kaufmann, J. M., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2014). The neural signature of the own-race bias: Evidence from event-related potentials. *Cerebral Cortex*, *24*, 826–835. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs369>
- Wiese, H., Schweinberger, S. R., & Hansen, K. (2008). The age of the beholder: ERP evidence of an own-age bias in face memory. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(12), 2973–2985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.06.007>
- Wiese, H., Stahl, J., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2009). Configural processing of other-race faces is delayed but not decreased. *Biological Psychology*, *81*, 103–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2009.03.002>
- Yovel, G., & Kanwisher, N. (2005). The neural basis of the behavioral face-inversion effect. *Current Biology*, *15*, 2256–2262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.10.072>