



T1900202694

# **Behavioural Lateralization in the Marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*)**

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy of the University of New England

By

Michelle Hook-Costigan

(B.Sc. Hons.)

September, 1997

## DECLARATION

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Michelle Hook-Costigan.

Michelle Hook-Costigan

Date: 23/5/97

---

**PUBLICATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS ARISING FROM THE  
RESEARCH PRESENTED IN THIS THESIS**

**Refereed papers**

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. Eye preferences in common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*): Influence of age, stimulus and hand preference. *Laterality*, in press.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. Hand preferences in New World primates. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, in press.

**Published Abstracts**

Hodgkinson, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. (1994). Handedness, mouthedness and eye preference in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Handbook and Abstracts of the XVth Congress of the International Primatological Society*, 203.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. (1995). The lateralization of motor and sensory function in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Proceedings of the Australasian Society of Animal Behaviour*, 22, 15.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. (1996). Lateralization of emotional expression in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). *International Journal of Psychology*, 31(3&4), 546.2.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. (1996). Functional hemispheric lateralization in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Proceedings of the XVIth Congress of International Primatological Society/ XIXth Conference of American Society of Primatologists*, 306.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. and Rogers, L.J. (1996). Eye preference and arousal in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Proceedings of the International Society of Comparative Psychology*, 8, 26.

Hook-Costigan, M.A. (1997). Hemispheric specializations for the production of facial expressions and vocalizations in the common marmoset. *Proceedings of the Australasian Society of Animal Behaviour*, 24, 11.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere thanks to my supervisor Professor Lesley Rogers. Her invaluable support and guidance throughout my PhD candidature was very much appreciated. Professor Rogers has encouraged me to attend international and national conferences, providing me with the opportunity to discuss my experimental ideas with other researchers. She has also guided me through the process of publishing scientific papers, teaching me to critically assess my work and challenging my ideas and understanding. I would also like to thank Professor Rogers for encouraging my interest in the study of animal behaviour, and for imparting to me the sense of dedication and responsibility required in this field of research.

I must also thank past and present members of the Brain and Behaviour group at the University of New England for their friendship and helpful advice. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Amy Johnson, Dr. Tom Burne, Dr. Carl Parsons, Chao Deng, Rebecca Cameron, Andrew Robins, Jan Patterson and Dr. Jim Scanlon.

I am deeply appreciative of the encouragement and support of Michael Costigan throughout my PhD candidature, and for the support of Femme Costigan. I would also like to thank Professor Gisela Kaplan for her support and advice and Dr. Bronwyn McAllan for helping in the final stages of preparation of this thesis.

Technical assistance was provided when required, and I would like to thank Allan Rummery and David Creed for constructing some of the experimental apparatus.

Finally, I would like to thank Professor Rogers for providing me with the opportunity to work with the marmosets at the University of New England. The opportunity to observe and begin to understand the intricacies of the social dynamics and behaviour of this colony has been a challenging, but enjoyable, experience.

## SUMMARY

Lateralization of 21 common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*) belonging to the colony at the University of New England was determined on a range of tasks. Hand preferences were measured during feeding. The hand preferred by subjects to hold food and take it to the mouth (simple food holding) was scored. Hand preferences were also measured on tests of visuospatial reaching that varied in the postural and spatial demands that they placed on the subjects. Leading-limb preferences (hand and foot) were recorded for walking, leaping and landing. Two types of mouth function were examined: side-of-mouth preferences for chewing, on tests in which hand use was or was not required, and asymmetries of mouth opening in the production of a fear expression and species-specific vocalizations. The marmosets' eye preferences for viewing various stimuli were also determined. The presence or absence of hemispheric specialization, indicated by a group bias in the direction of lateralization, was determined for each function. Also, relationships between individual preferences displayed on the separate tasks were examined with a view to understanding factors influencing the development and evolution of lateralization.

Individuals displayed strong hand preferences for simple food holding. These preferences developed by 5-8 months of age and remained consistent throughout the duration of this study, until 22 months of age for most subjects. However, there was no evidence of a group bias for simple food holding and therefore no handedness. Instead, preferences were bimodally distributed. Individuals also showed hand preferences on all of the tests of visuospatial reaching but, as for simple food holding, there was no group bias. Despite the absence of handedness on all tasks, it was found that most marmosets used one hand for simple food holding and the other for visually guided reaching. Thus, differential specialization of the hemispheres was present at an individual level, one hemisphere controlling simple food holding and the other visuospatial reaching.

Preferences for simple food holding were related to side-of-mouth preferences in chewing. Most individuals displayed significant preferences to chew on one side of the mouth when hand-mouth coordination was required, but not when they chewed on a twig that could not be manipulated by the hands. Thus, hand preferences for simple food holding appear to lead to side-of-mouth preferences for chewing in marmosets. No group bias was found for the side-of-mouth preferences in chewing.

Task complexity influenced the strength of hand preferences. The hand preferences displayed on visuospatial reaching tasks that required subjects to adopt a suspended posture were significantly stronger than those found when subjects reached from a tripedal posture. Posture might also play a role in the development of hand preferences for simple food holding. For juvenile marmosets (5-8 months), a significant positive correlation was found between percentage left-hand preference for simple food holding and the percentage occurrence of feeding in a suspended posture. A significant negative correlation was found between percentage left-hand preference for simple food holding and the percentage occurrence of feeding in a tripedal posture. Whether posture influences hand preferences or vice versa cannot be discerned, but a number of possible explanations are discussed. Although some effects of gender were also found in the present study, this variable did not appear to effect limb or side-of-

mouth preferences as much as did early experience and posture.

Most subjects did not display leading-limb (hand and foot) preferences for walking, leaping or landing. Also, when leading-limb preferences were found, they were significantly weaker than preferences displayed for simple food holding, visuospatial reaching or side-of-mouth in chewing. Despite this, a significant positive correlation was found between hand preferences for visuospatial reaching and leading-hand preferences for landing. This suggests that there is a slight bias for the same hemisphere that controls visuospatial reaching, in individual marmosets, to control the leading-hand in landing. No group biases were found for a leading-hand or leading-foot in walking, leaping or landing.

Eye preferences were determined on a task requiring the subjects to look with one eye through a peephole at a variety of stimuli, including familiar food. Out of 21 marmosets, 20 displayed a strong right-eye preference for viewing familiar food. Age and practice did not influence eye preferences for viewing food. However, arousal did effect eye preferences: most subjects did not display eye preferences when they viewed a fear-inducing stimulus. It is reasoned that eye preferences in marmosets reflect asymmetries of perceptual processing. There were no relationships between eye preferences and hand or foot preferences, suggesting that eye preference is not simply a consequence of the postural demands of the task or limb preferences.

Although only 9-11 subjects could be assessed for asymmetries of mouth movement during the production of a fear expression and species-specific vocalizations, group level biases for the production of these communication signals were found. Marmosets displayed a larger left hemimouth during production of fear expressions and fear vocalizations and a larger right hemimouth in the production of a social contact vocalization. As each side of the face is controlled by the contralateral hemisphere in primates, these results suggest that marmosets have specialization of the right hemisphere for the production of fear responses and specialization of the left hemisphere for the production of a social contact vocalization. There were no relationships between asymmetries of mouth opening in the production of communication signals and side-of-mouth preferences in chewing, or between asymmetries of mouth opening and hand preferences.

There are two types of hemispheric lateralization in marmosets. The first type of lateralization is present at the individual level only. Hand preferences for simple food holding and visuospatial reaching are examples of this type of lateralization. The second type of lateralization occurs at the group level, with most subjects displaying the same direction of preference. Marmosets display a strong group bias for eyedness and group biases for the production of fear expressions and vocalizations.

Handedness was considered to be the evolutionary precursor of hemispheric specializations in primates (MacNeilage et al. 1987). However, group biases for eyedness and communication functions indicate that marmosets have hemispheric specialization, even though they do not have handedness. These results demonstrate the importance of examining a variety of functions before concluding whether hemispheric specializations are characteristic of a species.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Publications and communications arising from this thesis	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Summary	v
Table of contents	vii
List of definitions	xiii
List of figures	xiv
List of tables	xvii

### CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Hand preferences in nonhuman primates	1
Hand preferences in new world primates when reaching for and holding food	3
Marmosets ( <i>Callithrix jacchus</i> , <i>Callithrix penicillata</i> )	5
Tamarins ( <i>Saguinus oedipus</i> )	5
Squirrel monkeys ( <i>Saimiri sciureus</i> ), Spider monkeys ( <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i> ) and Muriquis ( <i>Brachyteles arachnoides</i> )	6
Capuchins ( <i>Cebus spp.</i> )	7
Visuospatial reaching preferences	9
1. Reaching for static objects	9
2. Reaching for a moving object	13
Hand preferences for haptic exploration and tactually guided reaching	15
Manipulative hand use and tool use preferences	17
Hand use in routine activities other than feeding	21
Comparisons with prosimians, old world species and apes	23
Handedness in New World primates	23
Effects of age on hand preferences	24
Effects of gender on hand preferences	25
Posture and hand preferences	26
Conclusions	27
Lateralization of other motor functions in nonhuman primates: Foot and side-of-mouth preferences	27
Conclusions	30
Visual lateralization: Eye preferences in nonhuman primates	31
Conclusions	34
Perceptual asymmetries for processing visual stimuli	35
Conclusions	37
Lateralization of visual and vocal communication processes	37
Conclusions	43
An overview of the present study	43

### CHAPTER 2: GENERAL METHODS

2.1 Introduction	46
2.2 Subjects	46

2.3 General husbandry and housing	48
General husbandry	48
Diet	52
Housing and environmental enrichment	53
Group housing	55
2.4 Tests of lateralization	57
Recording methods	60
2.5 Statistical analysis	62

### **CHAPTER 3: THE DEVELOPMENT OF HAND PREFERENCES FOR SIMPLE FOOD HOLDING**

3.1 Introduction	65
3.2 Methods	67
3.2.1 Development of unimanual hand use and hand preferences for simple food holding	67
Bimanual versus unimanual hand use	68
3.2.2 Development of feeding postures and their relation to hand use	70
3.2.3 The relationship between unimanual hand preferences and posture	70
3.2.4 The influence of gender, parental group and early experience on hand use	71
3.3 Results	72
3.3.1 Development of unimanual hand use and hand preferences for simple food holding	72
Bimanual versus unimanual hand use	72
Development of hand preferences	72
The distribution of unimanual hand preferences	74
Direction of hand preference and the development of unimanual and bimanual hand use	78
3.3.2 Development of feeding postures in relation to hand use	81
Longitudinal development of preferred feeding postures	81
The relationship between posture and unimanual versus bimanual hand use	82
Direction of hand preference and the occurrence of postures assumed in feeding	83
3.3.3 Relationships between unimanual hand preferences and feeding posture	86
Relationships between percentage left-hand use and feeding posture	86
Comparison of the strength of hand preferences in the different feeding postures	88
3.3.4 The influence of gender, family group and early experience on hand preferences	90
Gender and hand preferences	90
Family group	90
Effect of early experience on hand preferences	93
3.4 Discussion	94
The development and distribution of hand preferences	94
Comparisons with other nonhuman primate species	98



Relationships between feeding posture and hand preferences for simple food holding	100
3.5 Summary	105
 <b>CHAPTER 4: VISUOSPATIAL REACHING PREFERENCES AND SIDE-OF-MOUTH PREFERENCES DURING CHEWING</b>	
4.1 Introduction	107
 <b>PART 1: TESTS OF VISUOSPATIAL REACHING PREFERENCES</b>	
4.2 Methods	110
4.2.1 The distribution of hand preferences on the visuospatial reaching tasks	110
Simple visuospatial reaching task (bowl)	110
Visuospatial reaching task placing postural demands on the subjects (plate)	111
Increased visuospatial demand (string)	112
Visuospatial reaching for food on a rotating disc (rotating disc)	114
4.2.2 Testing for effects of task demands on visuospatial reaching preferences	115
4.2.3 Influence of gender, family group and early experience on hand preferences	115
4.2.4 Comparisons between visuospatial reaching preferences and hand preferences for simple food holding	116
4.3 Results	116
4.3.1 The distribution of hand preferences on the visuospatial reaching tasks	116
Simple visuospatial reaching task (bowl)	116
Visuospatial reaching task placing postural demands on the subjects (plate)	119
Increased visuospatial demand (string)	119
Visuospatial reaching for food on a rotating disc (rotating disc)	122
4.3.2 Testing for effects of task demands on visuospatial reaching preferences	123
The effects of practice on visuospatial reaching preferences	123
Effects of increased postural and visual demands on visuospatial reaching preferences	125
4.3.3 Influence of gender, family group and early experience on hand preferences	127
4.3.4 Comparisons between visuospatial reaching preferences and hand preferences for simple food holding	130
Shifters and nonshifters on the visuospatial reaching tasks	132
Comparison between the strength of the two types of hand preference	134
4.4 Discussion	135
The effects of task complexity and practice on individual hand preferences	135
The influence of gender, family group and early experience	138
Individual lateralization: A division of function between the hemispheres	139
 <b>PART 2: TESTS OF SIDE-OF-MOUTH PREFERENCES WHEN CHEWING</b>	
4.5 Methods	142
4.5.1 The distribution of side-of-mouth preferences for chewing	142
Side-of-mouth preferences for chewing when hand use was not required (twig)	142
Side-of-mouth preferences when hand use was required (bar)	144
4.5.2 Testing for effects of task demands on side-of-mouth preferences	145

4.5.3 Influence of gender, family group and early experience on side-of-mouth preferences	145
4.5.4 Comparisons between side-of-mouth preferences and hand preferences for simple food holding and for visuospatial reaching	145
4.6 Results	146
4.6.1 The distribution of side-of-mouth preferences for chewing	146
4.6.2 Testing for effects of task demands on side-of-mouth preferences	150
4.6.3 Influence of gender, family group and early experience on side-of-mouth preferences	151
4.6.4 Comparisons between side-of-mouth preferences and hand preferences for simple food holding and for visuospatial reaching	153
Comparison between the direction of hand preferences and side-of-mouth preferences	153
Comparison between the strength of hand preferences and side-of-mouth preferences	156
4.7 Discussion	156
Relationships between different types of motor control	158
4.8 Summary	159

## **CHAPTER 5: HAND AND FOOT PREFERENCES FOR INITIATING LOCOMOTION**

5.1 Introduction	161
5.2 Methods	163
5.2.1 Leading-hand and foot preferences for walking, leaping and landing	163
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in walking	166
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in leaping	166
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in landing	166
5.2.2 Effect of type of locomotory behaviour on lateral preferences	168
5.2.3 Influences of gender, family group and early experience on lateral preferences in locomotion	168
5.2.4 Comparisons between hand preferences for locomotory behaviours and hand preferences for simple food holding and visuospatial reaching	168
5.3 Results	169
5.3.1 Leading-hand and foot preferences for walking, leaping and landing	169
Unimanual/ bimanual hand use and Unipedal/bipedal foot use in leaping and landing	169
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in walking	172
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in leaping	176
Leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in landing	177
Hand preferences for simple food holding	181
5.3.2 Effect of type of locomotory behaviour on lateral preferences	182
Relationships between leading-limb (hand and foot) preferences	182
Comparison between the strength of limb (hand and foot ) preferences displayed for walking, leaping and landing	184
5.3.3 Influences of gender, family group and early experience on lateral preferences in locomotion	185

5.2.4 Comparisons between hand preferences for locomotory behaviours and hand preferences for simple food holding and visuospatial reaching	188
Leading-hand preferences for locomotory behaviours and hand preferences for simple food holding	188
Leading-hand preferences for locomotory behaviours and hand preferences for visuospatial reaching	188
Comparisons between the strength of preferences found for locomotory activities and those found for other motor functions	191
5.4 Discussion	191
5.5 Summary	199

## CHAPTER 6: EYE PREFERENCES

6.1 Introduction	201
6.2 Methods	204
6.2.1 Eye preference for viewing familiar food at various ages	206
6.2.2 Eye preferences tested by presenting various stimuli	206
6.2.3 Testing for any effect of the hand used by the experimenter	207
6.2.4 Relationships between eye and hand preferences	208
6.3 Results	208
6.3.1 Eye preference for viewing familiar food at various ages	208
6.3.2 Eye preferences tested by presenting various stimuli	210
6.3.3 Testing for any effect of the hand used by the experimenter	214
6.3.4 Relationships between eye and hand preferences	218
Eye preferences and hand preferences for simple food holding	218
Eye preferences and hand preferences for visually guided reaching	220
Eye preferences and leading-limb preferences in leaping and landing	221
6.4 Discussion	222
6.5 Summary	228

## CHAPTER 7: LATERALIZED MOUTH OPENING AND EYE MOVEMENTS IN THE PRODUCTION OF FACIAL EXPRESSIONS AND VOCALIZATIONS

7.1 Introduction	229
7.2 Methods	233
Determining a reliable method for collecting data for a large sample of faces	238
7.2.1 Asymmetries of the production of facial expressions and vocalizations: Analysis of an increased sample size of subjects and faces	241
7.2.2 Comparisons between lateralization for production of facial expressions and side-of-mouth preferences for chewing	242
7.3 Results	243
7.3.1 Asymmetries of the production of facial expressions and vocalizations: Analysis of an increased sample size of subjects and faces	243
Nonvocalizing fear expression	243
Tsik vocalization	243

Twitter vocalization	245
7.3.2 Comparisons between lateralization for production of facial expressions and side-of-mouth preferences for chewing	245
7.4 Discussion	248
7.5 Summary	253
 <b>CHAPTER 8: GENERAL DISCUSSION</b>	
Lateralization present at the individual level only	256
Hand preferences for simple food holding and visuospatial reaching	256
Hand and foot preferences during locomotory activities	263
Comparisons with other primate species	264
Lateralization present at the group level	266
Eye preferences in marmosets and asymmetries of perceptual processing	266
Asymmetries of production of facial expressions and vocalizations	270
References	272
Appendix A	300
Appendix B	315

## DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

<b>Bimodal distribution</b>	Approximately fifty percent of subjects display strong preferences for left-sided responses and fifty percent display strong preferences for right-sided responses.
<b>Eyedness</b>	A bias is present at the group level for left or right-eye preferences in a monocular viewing situation. Thus, most individuals within the group display the same direction of preference for monocular viewing.
<b>Handedness</b>	Most of the subjects within the group display the same direction of preference for one hand on a task. Handedness was measured for three types of manual function: simple food holding, visuospatial reaching and during the initiation of walking, leaping and landing.
<b>Footedness</b>	Most subjects within the group show the same direction of preference for one foot. Foot preferences were recorded in the initiation of walking, leaping and landing.
<b>Mouthedness</b>	Most subjects within the group display the same direction of preferences for chewing with one side of the mouth.
<b>Preference</b>	This refers to the lateral bias of an individual. Subjects could display a significant preferences or ambipreference (no bias for either left or right-sided responses). The significance of individual biases for use of one hand (side-of-mouth, foot, eye) was determined using a z-score test (Chapter 2, p. ). Significant lateralization was accepted if $p \leq 0.05$ .
<b>Shifters/ Nonshifters</b>	Shifters display opposite hand preferences for simple food holding compared to reaching from a suspended posture for food on a plate. Nonshifters display the same hand preferences on the two tasks.
<b>Simple food holding</b>	Holding food in one hand and then taking it to themouth (Chapter 3). Also referred to, by other authors, as a spontaneous behavioural act as it occurs without experimental manipulation (Rothe, 1973; Diamond and McGrew, 1994).
<b>Strength of preference</b>	This is the absolute preference (%) for one hand (side-of-mouth, foot, eye) displayed by an individual, irrespective of the direction of the preference (left, right or ambipreferent).
<b>Visuospatial reaching</b>	Hand use on tasks requiring the visual assessment of the spatial position of an object while reaching. Four visuospatial reaching tasks are used in this thesis and they will be referred to as bowl, plate, string, rotating disc (see Chapter 4).

## LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Weight gain of the parent and offspring marmosets with age	50
Figure 2.2	Cage design at the University of New England	54
Figure 2.3	Outline of cage compositions	56
Figure 3.1	Simple food holding	69
Figure 3.2	The development of unimanual, compared to bimanual, hand use and strength of unimanual hand preferences for simple food holding	73
Figure 3.3	Individuals' hand preferences for simple food holding from 0-2 to 22 months of age	75
Figure 3.4	Distribution of hand preferences for simple food holding from 0-2 to 60 months of age	76
Figure 3.5	Relationship between hand use for simple food holding in the infant and juvenile periods	77
Figure 3.6	The development of bimanual versus unimanual hand use and unimanual hand preferences for left-and right-hand preferent subjects	79
Figure 3.7	The percentage occurrence of the three postures in feeding throughout development	81
Figure 3.8	The percentage occurrence of the three postures during feeding for left and right-hand preferent subjects	84
Figure 3.9	The relationship between posture and unimanual hand use at 5-8 months	87
Figure 3.10	Comparison between the strength of hand preference for simple food holding in each of the postures	89
Figure 3.11	The distribution of hand preferences in the male and female subgroups	91
Figure 3.12	The effect of family group on the strength of hand preferences	92
Figure 3.13	The effect of early experience on the strength of preferences for simple food holding	94
Figure 4.1	Simple visuospatial reaching task	111
Figure 4.2	Visuospatial reaching task with increased postural demands	112
Figure 4.3	Increased visuospatial demands when reaching from a suspended posture	113
Figure 4.4	Visuospatial reaching for food on a rotating disc	114
Figure 4.5	Individuals' hand preferences on the simple visuospatial reaching task	117
Figure 4.6	The distribution of hand preferences for visuospatial reaching	120
Figure 4.7	Individuals' hand preferences when reaching from a suspended posture for a stationary object	121
Figure 4.8	Individuals' hand preferences when reaching from a suspended posture for a moving object	121
Figure 4.9	Individuals' hand preferences when reaching from a suspended posture for food on a rotating disc	122
Figure 4.10	Comparison between hand preferences in the first and last 50 incidences of visuospatial hand use	124
Figure 4.11	Comparison between the strength of hand preferences on the 4 tests of visuospatial hand use	126
Figure 4.12	Strength of preferences displayed by female and male subjects	127
Figure 4.13	Strength of hand preferences displayed by the offspring in the different family groups	128

Figure 4.14	Effects of early experience on hand preferences for visuospatial reaching	129
Figure 4.15	Comparison between % left-hand use for reaching into the bowl and for simple food holding	131
Figure 4.16	Side-of-mouth preferences when hand use was not required	143
Figure 4.17	Side-of-mouth preferences when hand use was required	144
Figure 4.18	Side-of-mouth preferences when hand use was not required	146
Figure 4.19	Distribution of side-of-mouth preferences on the two tests	147
Figure 4.20	Side-of-mouth preferences when hand-mouth coordination was required	148
Figure 4.21	Comparison between hand preferences for holding the bar and hand preferences for simple food holding at 15-18 months	149
Figure 4.22	The strength of side-of-mouth preferences for chewing the twig and chewing the bar	150
Figure 4.23	Comparison between the strength of preferences for chewing displayed by female and male subjects	151
Figure 4.24	Comparison between the strength of preferences for chewing displayed by offspring from the three family groups	152
Figure 4.25	Comparison between the strength of preferences for chewing displayed by subjects in the separate experience groups	153
Figure 4.26	Relationships between hand preferences for holding the food bar and side-of-mouth preferences for chewing	154
Figure 5.1	Apparatus used for recording leading limb preferences for walking, leaping and landing	164
Figure 5.2	Marmosets leaping and landing	167
Figure 5.3	Unimanual/bimanual hand use and unipedal/bipedal foot use in leaping and landing	170
Figure 5.4	Comparison between the percentage use of one or both limbs during leaping and landing	172
Figure 5.5	Limb preferences of the individual subjects during walking	173
Figure 5.6	Correlation between hand and foot preferences in walking	174
Figure 5.7	The distribution of leading-limb preferences	175
Figure 5.8	Leading-limb preferences of the individual subjects for leaping	176
Figure 5.9	Correlation between hand and foot preferences in leaping	178
Figure 5.10	Leading-limb preferences of the individual subjects for landing	179
Figure 5.11	Correlations between hand and foot preferences for landing	180
Figure 5.12	Comparison between hand preferences for simple food holding displayed on the tests of locomotory behaviours and those displayed on separate tests	181
Figure 5.13	Correlations between limb preferences found for the separate modes of locomotion	183
Figure 5.14	Comparisons between the strength of hand and foot preferences in walking, leaping and landing	184
Figure 5.15	Comparison between the strength of hand preferences displayed by female and male subjects	186
Figure 5.16	Comparison between the percentage left use displayed by subjects in family group 1 and family group 2	186
Figure 5.17	The effects of early experience on strength of foot preferences in initiating and terminating locomotion	187

Figure 5.18	Relationships between hand preferences for initiating and terminating locomotion and hand preferences for visuospatial reaching	190
Figure 5.19	The relationship between leading-hand and leading-foot preferences in walking and landing	196
Figure 6.1	Apparatus used to test eye preferences	205
Figure 6.2	Individuals' eye preferences for viewing banana at each age	209
Figure 6.3	The distribution of eye preferences for viewing banana	211
Figure 6.4	Measurements of arousal when viewing different stimuli	212
Figure 6.5	Distribution of eye preferences when viewing different stimuli	215
Figure 6.6	Eye preferences and the hand use of the experimenter	216
Figure 6.7	Comparison between the percent left-eye use in the first and last 50 incidences of monocular eye use	217
Figure 6.8	Relationship between hand and eye preferences at 10-12 months	219
Figure 6.9	Relationship between the strength of hand and eye preferences at 5-8 months	220
Figure 7.1	Fear expressions and tsik and twitter vocalizations of marmosets	234
Figure 7.2	Spectrographic representations of tsik and twitter vocalizations	235
Figure 7.3	Measurements of asymmetries in the production of facial expressions and vocalizations	237
Figure 7.4	Area of mouth opening during the production of a fear expression	238
Figure 7.5	Area of mouth opening during the production of a tsik vocalization	239
Figure 7.6	Area of mouth opening during the production of a twitter vocalization	240
Figure 7.7	Distribution of the percentage left biases in the production of fear expressions	244
Figure 7.8	Distribution of percentage left biases in the production of tsik vocalization	246
Figure 7.9	Distribution of percentage left biases in the production of twitter vocalization	247
Figure 8.1	Differential lateralizations for control of the hands (and the mouth) in individual marmosets	257
Figure 8.2		259
Figure 8.3	Hemispheric specializations in marmosets	267



## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1 Hand use for reaching for and holding food	4
Table 1.2 Visuospatial reaching for static objects	10
Table 1.3 Visuospatial reaching for moving objects	14
Table 1.4 Hand use in haptic exploration and tactually guided tasks	14
Table 1.5 Hand preferred during use of tools	18
Table 1.6 Other measures of hand preferences	18
Table 1.7 Hand preferred in routine activities other than feeding	22
Table 2.1 The age, sex and family group membership of marmosets at the University of New England	47
Table 2.2 Developmental stages of marmosets	51
Table 2.3 Diet of marmosets in the University of New England colony	52
Table 2.4 Caging and group design in testing	59
Table 2.5 Timetable and scoring criteria of experiments reported in this thesis	61
Table 4.1 The percentage of total reaches that were successful versus unsuccessful on the bowl task	118
Table 4.2 Description of shifter and nonshifter groups	133
Table 5.1 Hand and foot movements in leaping sequences	169
Table 5.2 Hand and foot movements in landing sequences	171
Table 8.1 Summary of results for marmosets	255