

es suggest emotions [10,21,22] .

expression of emotion. Both the right hemisphere and valence hy-
g of emotio
the right

more significant im- from two lines of research. The
for expressions of posite (chimeric) faces in which half-
ft hemisphere [8-10] . The results are con-

to the left (LVF) or right visual field (RVF) and asked participants to perform certain tasks that may tap into various levels of emotion processing. If a certain affective expression is preferentially processed by a certain hemisphere, presenting the facial expression in the contralateral visual field should produce more efficient processing than presenting the expression in the ipsilateral visual field. The experimental tasks could require participants to compare or rate facial expressions in brief presentation^[19,20,26] or in morphed faces with faint emotion expressions under free-viewing conditions^[10,18,27], or to make speeded sample-matching of emotional expressions^[4,6,7,28].

Contradictory results regarding the laterality of happy expression, however, were also obtained in this divided visual field paradigm. For example, Reuter-Lorenz and Davidson^[19] asked participants to identify which side of a bilaterally presented pair of faces (one neutral and one affective) contained the affective face. Responses to happy faces presented in the RVF were faster than responses to happy faces presented in the LVF. A reversed pattern was observed for sad faces, consistent with the valence hypothesis. Jansari et al^[18] presented participants with a pair of faces from the same man, one with neutral expression and one with subtle emotion expressions gained through morphing the neutral face with a positive or negative expression. Participants' task was to choose the face in the pair that best corresponded to the stated emotion. It was found that the discrimination accuracy was higher when faces with positive expressions were presented on the right-hand side than when they were presented on the left-hand side, even though participants had sufficient time to inspect the faces freely. Conversely, the discrimination accuracy was higher when faces with negative expressions were presented on the left-hand side than when they were presented on the right-hand side. These findings suggest that positive expressions are processed in the left hemisphere while negative expressions are processed in the right

hemisphere, and this dissociation can be obtained under free-viewing conditions. Other studies using emotional rating^[26], speeded emotion matching^[28], or the same design as Jansari et al^[17,18] obtained data that partially support the valence hypothesis, with only women, but not men, showing the predicted laterality effect. Still others obtained contradictory evidence to the valence hypothesis. For example, Strauss and Moscovitch^[6] presented briefly a pair of faces to the LVF or RVF and asked participants to decide whether the two faces depicted the same emotion. The authors found a LVF advantage for all emotion in women participants.

A crucial difference between these studies may lie in whether a detailed or subjective evaluation of facial expressions is required by the experimental task^[26,27,29,30]. Subjective or prolonged evaluation may be carried out by the left hemisphere since this evaluative process may require rational reasoning, while initial or coarse identification may be carried out by the right hemisphere which is also predominantly responsible for face recognition. The purpose of this study was to provide further evidence, from a Chinese sample, that speeded identification of facial expressions, which presumably taps into the initial stage of processing, is carried out mainly by the right hemisphere.

We continued to employ the divided visual field paradigm in which affective and neutral faces were presented either to the left or right visual field. But rather than requiring participants to match or compare emotions of facial expressions, we asked them simply to make speeded emotion categorization (i.e., whether the expression on the face was happy or neutral) to facial expressions that were presented singularly (i.e., one emotion in one trial). Moreover, we made a number of changes to the typical experimental design. Firstly, we added a condition in which identical faces were presented bilaterally to both visual fields. This condition served as a baseline with which the laterality effect for the left or right visual field could be compared. If happy expression is identified pre-

dominantly by one hemisphere, then reaction times (RTs) to faces presented to this hemisphere should be similar to RTs to faces presented to both hemispheres (in bilateral presentation), and both of them should be shorter than RTs to faces presented to the other hemisphere. If, however, both hemispheres are important to the processing of happy expression, then RTs for bilateral presentation should be shorter than RTs for either of the single hemisphere presentation. In contrast to what Schweinberger, Baird, Blümler, Kaufmann, and Mohr^[31] claimed, our previous unpublished work showed that there is a bilateral gain in processing both negative and positive facial expressions. RTs in bilateral presentation were shorter than RTs in unilateral LVF or RVF presentation, and the latter did not differ from each other. These findings were taken as evidence for interhemispheric cooperation in processing affective facial expressions. This cooperation, however, could be strategically induced by the requirement of using both hands to respond simultaneously.

Therefore, the second modification in the present study was that two groups of right-handed participants were tested, one group using their left hand and another group using their right hand to make speeded emotion categorization. Because hand responses are controlled by the contralateral motor and supplementary motor cortices and within the same hemisphere there could be direct links between regions responsible for emotion processing and regions responsible for motor movements, the interaction between the visual field of stimulus presentation and hand response could provide important information concerning whether happy expression is identified by the left or right hemisphere. Suppose that happy expression is processed predominantly in the right hemisphere (Figure 1), as assumed by the right hemisphere hypothesis, happy expressions presented in the left visual field will project directly to this hemisphere (A and C) and happy expressions presented in the right visual field will have to be redirected from the left to the

right hemisphere before it can be identified (B and D). Then when the left hand is used to make responses (A and B), interhemispheric redirection for the RVF presentation would take time to accomplish, resulting in an RVF disadvantage in RTs; when the right hand is used to make responses (C and D), the left motor cortex has to be linked, possibly through the right motor cortex, to the right hemisphere processing emotion. Compared with LVF presentation, RVF presentation still has a disadvantage because of the interhemispheric redirection. A secondar

ba
nak
pes
emo

A

y w
ession
To pre
otual
who
ens

d
happy
ons.
d
er
ndards
se faci
in our
inpub

Fig. 1
spor
in
AS
i
by the right hemisph
p
s directly to the m
he
o
st of
w
mo
cortex
activi
B
visi
f
d
i
d

one
on
in
c
of in
ation one
on
participants
A
tested, 16
each
half
eki

va
onte
on of stim
ises were

) <1,
, suggesting
for both happy

had 752
ions prese
dition, oc
were ex

with the or
ormance
all the co

S

with no co

ises. Media

n calculated

of experime

ern of cult

d in s

inter

s for

ee

ants response
the affective
left, right, or both v
ected comparisons s
bilateral presentation (7
ast as responses to LVF
) , both of which were faster th
VF presentation (803ms) , with

The main effect of response
originally significant, $F(1,30) = 10.05$, $p < 0.05$, indicating that left hand responses (742ms) were generally faster than right hand responses (825ms). However, this effect interacted with expression, $F(1,30) = 4.66$, $p < 0.05$, indicating that the difference in response speed between left and right hand responses was mainly contributed by happy expressions (left hand, 656ms vs right hand, 856ms).

of response
in a
 $p < 0.05$
e

er

the

ificant

response

fast

effect of

(2,60)

0.001

interac

ises, happy

ented in the

happy expressions pre

a presentation showed

over LVF presentation. More

and responses were generally faster than

right hand responses, although this effect

0.001

0.001

0.001

0.001

研究

evaluation or comparison for affective states such as
 ed in Reuter-Lorenz and D'Esposito (1999) and
 [18], may require particular experimental
 subtle emotion conveyed by facial muscles.
 nding on the task, the system may be le
 ssing, identifying the facial
 ay be later, the system might h
 t the system on i
 ed. [1]

tradition, this
believe that
require
experience
In the
sports
smile
experience
vidual
Hence, it may be lat-
west hemisphere.

References

1. Prood J C, Zgaljardic D, Tabert M H, et al. Asymmetries in facial perception and expression in normal adults. In: (Ed.) , Handbook of Neuropsychology, 2001, Volume 16, Part 1, pp. 1-24.
2. Chakrabarti S, Baron-Cohen S. Face processing in autism: a theory of mind deficit? In: Baron-Cohen S, Golan O, Ashwin E, eds. *Autism: A Comprehensive Guide*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2009, pp. 1-15.
3. Dinstein I, Golan O, Ashwin E, et al. Face processing in autism: a theory of mind deficit? In: Baron-Cohen S, Golan O, Ashwin E, eds. *Autism: A Comprehensive Guide*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2009, pp. 1-15.
4. Leyfer O, Ashwin E, Golan O, et al. Face processing in autism: a theory of mind deficit? In: Baron-Cohen S, Golan O, Ashwin E, eds. *Autism: A Comprehensive Guide*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2009, pp. 1-15.
5. Marston A, Ashwin E, Golan O, et al. Face processing in autism: a theory of mind deficit? In: Baron-Cohen S, Golan O, Ashwin E, eds. *Autism: A Comprehensive Guide*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2009, pp. 1-15.

