


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

**Continue**

# Reading of the mind in the eyes test

Reading the mind in the eyes test score. How to read a person's mind through eyes.

Open Access Reviewed Peer-reviewed We explored the factors associated with performance in Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RMET), 180 university students have completed the human RMET which requires a forced judgment on the mental state; a Human Eyes (AET) Age control test that requires a judgment on age; a Cat Eyes (CET) test that requires a judgment on the mental state; and evaluation measures of the executive function, psychopathology empathy. Versions of the CET and AET were created that corresponded to the RMET difficulty (accuracy of 71%). The RMET and CET performance were closely related after taking into account AET performance. Work memory, schizotypic personality and empathy predicted RMET accuracy but not CET scores. Grading dogs predicted greater precision over all eye activity, while enjoying cats predicted greater mentalization but less emotional expression. Important is that we have replicated our main results for accuracy and correlations between CET and RMET in a second sample of 228 students. In conclusion, people can apply similar skills when interpreting human and cat expressions. Since RMET and CET performance has been influenced in a differential way by executive function and psychopathology, the use of social cognitive measures involving non-human animals could be particularly useful in future clinical research. Quote: Eddy CM, Hansen PC (2020) Performance indicators on mind reading in the Eyes test. PLOS ONE 15 (7): e0235529. Marina A. Pavlova, University Hospital of Tübingen Universitätsklinikum Tübingen, GERMANIARiccvuta: 4 April 2019; Accepted: 18 June 2020; Published: 23 July 2020 Copyright: © 2020 Eddy, Hansen. This is a free access article distributed according to the Creative Commons Attribution License, which allows for use, distribution and playback without restrictions on any support, provided that the author and the original source are accredited. Data availability: data cannot be shared publicly because at the time of data collection, the explicit consent of all participants to their sharing was not obtained (as required by the GDPR). Therefore, our ethical permits according to the Central Ethics Committee of the University of Birmingham do not allow us to share data openly within the public domain. However, researchers who meet the criteria of access to confidential data can obtain synthetic information through the Research Governance Team of the University of Birmingham (researchgovernance@contacts.bham.ac.uk). Financing: The authors have not received any specific funding for this work. Competitive interests: The authors declared the absence of competing interests. The Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RMET) [1] assesses the ability to recognize complex mental states expressed by human eyes. Participants choose one of four options (e.g., puzzled, nervous, insistent, or contemplative) that they think best describes what the person in each photo is thinking or feeling. Correct answers are based on majority answers a number of expert judges [1] from a healthy population. Many previous studies have explored the influence of neurological and psychiatric disorders on performance. For example, patients with autism [1, 2], Parkinson's disease [3], Huntington disease [4, 5], Tourette syndrome [6] and schizophrenia [7] have proven to offer less correct (conventional) answers than a healthy control group. The RMET could evoke a higher cognitive reasoning on mental states (theory of mind), the recognition of visual cues to emotion and/or empathy. In addition to clinical symptoms, general cognitive or perceptual skills can affect performance. Previous fMRI studies have revealed activation in cortical regions and structures below such as the upper temporal sulcus, the lower frontal gyrus, the media frontal cortex, the hippocampus and the cerebellum during the RMET [8–11]. RMET judgments are thought to reflect a fast, automatic process [1], and response consent implies that RMET measures a common human capacity or collecting skills. Since the processes involved in the task of the eyes are still poorly understood, the current study aims to explore the factors related to the recognition of mental states from the eyes, using RMET and two other tasks: the same behavioral task with different stimuli, and the same stimuli that require an alternative behavioral response. The Cat Eyes Test (CET) was created as a comparison measure for the current study, and required participants to select mental states to match pairs of cat eyes. Cats have been selected due to the frequency of exposure to humans, and because there have been many images freely available online for the development of this task. Cat eyes could be perceived to describe complex mental states as the human face form is similar in many ways to other mammals [12]. You might suggest that the CET will call for anthropomorphism: a cognitive prejudice for which people spontaneously subscribe to human characteristics to a non-human agent [13]. However, while most previous studies investigated the spontaneous allocation of emotions to pets [14], the current study asked participants to make a forced choice on the appropriate mental state, rather than assess the spontaneous allocation of the mental state. If healthy participants achieve a common interpretation of each cat's mental state (as for human RMET) this may imply real emotion within images that could approximate human expressions, or that the skills involved in the allocation of the mental state during RMET are not specific to human stimuli. An advantage of CET development concerns previous studies in autistic disorder/Spectrum (asd.) the hypoactivation of fusiform gyrus is seen in asd in response to human faces but not to animal faces [15], and while generally developing children spend more time looking at human eyes than eyes of animals including cats, children with asd spend more time watching the eyes of animals [16.] therefore a new mental state Measures that involve animal facial traits rather than humans could provide more information on ASD patients' skills. The second task was the task of the eyes of the age (AET), which requires judgments on the physical state of human RMET stimuli. The AET presents a difficulty similar to the original RMET, but it arouses less limb environment than the RMET in healthy participants [17], perhaps drawing on the executive function and autobiographical memory rather than emotional processing. The current study included two measures relating to the executive function, providing that the executive functions would have been more closely related to the performance of the AET with respect to the RMET or the CET. Previous studies have linked RMET's performance to the Empathy quotient (EQ) [18], an interpersonal reactivity index (IRI) [19, 20] which explores the self-reported perspective, and to the scale of Alexithymia in Toronto (TAS-20) [21, 22], which measures reflection and communication on their emotions. Lyvers, Kohlsdorf, Edwards & Thorberg [23] found that the high Alexithymia in the students predicted poor empathy and poor RMET return. Difficulty in interpreting their emotions could therefore compromise the recognition of the emotions of others. A study conducted on university students [24] found that the low scores of the EQ were associated with a high alexithymia and at a low RMET accuracy. Demers and Koven [25] report that in healthy adults RMET scores are positively correlated with emotional empathy and negatively with alexithymia. In the current study we have included the EQ, the IRI and the TAS-20, assuming that a lower accuracy on RMET and CET would be related to lower fragrances and higher TAS scores. The participants completed three other stairs to examine eye pieces in relation to clinical symptoms. The first was the Schizotypal Personality Scale (SPQ) [26], which was the Schizotypal Personality Scale (SPQ) [26], which was the Schizotypal Personality Scale (SPQ) [26]. They discovered that high levels of schizotypic traits of the personality (eg social anxiety, restricted affection) were linked to lower RMET performance. The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory (OCI-R) [28] has been included due to a few previous studies on the relationship between these symptoms and social cognition, despite the obsessive and compulsive traits below the threshold are common in the populations Healthy [29]. Finally, we have included the scale of the social anhedony (reduced pleasure from social interactions) can be connected both autism and alexithymia [31]. We expected more high scores on these clinical stairs were related to less accuracy on the RMET and CET. Summarizing, we examined the attribution of mental states on the human RMET compared to a comparison task that uses cat eyes and a combined control task that involves the of RMET stimuli per age. We have chosen cat stimuli since it is a family mammal at man and we wanted to use non-human stimuli, given that from previous studies suggest that this could be a useful comparison with activities involving stimuli Humans, perhaps especially in the clinical field. clinical. [15, 16]. To offer a vision of factors that influence performance on the three tasks of the eyes, we have included empathy measures, executive functions and specific clinical symptoms. We also included a pet questionnaire to provide more information on the CET responses, as exposure to animals or pets may be linked to anthropomorphism and in turn the allocation of emotions on tasks involving animal stimuli [14]. In addition, we conducted psychometric analyses on CET and AET, aiming to determine whether it was possible to use these measures as a control activity for RMET, combined with accuracy. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Birmingham and all participants gave written informed consent. The participants were 180 students of university psychology (details after exclusions below) without existing psychiatric/neurological diagnosis or cat phobia. We recruited as many volunteers as possible, who received course credit for participation. The basic instructions were given for each task before completion by the participant, in the order: Digit Order Test-Adapted (DOT-A), Trail Making Test (TMT), pet questionnaire, IRI, TAS-20, SPQ, OCI-R, EQ, rSAS. The participants then completed the three computerized tasks of the eyes (two run each), presented using the Presentation software (Neurobehavioral Systems Inc.). The order of administration of these three tasks has been counterbalanced between participants and stimuli within each have been randomized. The RMET contains 36 test tests plus a practical element (available from . Stimuli are photographs of human eyes, surrounded by four mental state options (Fig 1). Instructions (1) require the participant to consider the options (a glossary is available) and select the option they think best corresponds to what the person in photograph is thinking or feeling. There's no time limit. The proof of the validity of the task derives from the ability of this task to differentiate between individuals with ASD and generally developing individuals (e.g. 1). The RMET has a good test reliability [24]. Download: Fig. Example of stimuli from all three eyes (Read the mind in the eye test; Cat eye test; Eye test of age). The correct answers for the evidence shown are "serious" and "contemplative". RMET stimuli are available free of charge online ( and cat pictures within the public domain/under CC 2019 ( RMET started with the on-screen instructions to display the stimulus and choose "the word that best describes what the person in the image is thinking or hearing". The images were about 26cm x 9cm height (24" monitor; resolution 1024 x 768), with response options in Arial 22 point (about 1 cm height) outside the corners of the image, mapped to the keyboard [1, 3, 7, 9]. The first study was started by pressing the spacer bar. There was no time limit and an answer started the next process. The CET was developed by an experimenter (CME) which selects the online images (available for free for re-use) to match the original set of original expressions / answers, taking into account the visual similarity (E.G. Direction Wardrobe) where possible. The test procedure was equivalent to the human RMET I.E. Participants were invited to select the word they think better combined with what the cat in the image was thinking or feeling (see figure 1). The AET (Figure 1) used the same stimuli as the original RMET and was previously designed [17]. Instructions and AG administration were equivalent to other eyes, but they asked the participants to choose the number that best corresponded to eye age. The pet questionnaire asked if the respondents had a A e á, ~ Á á á á á € now "or a previously" PET "(y / n). The participants were also asked to evaluate Á e á, ~ á á á á á á á á á á á "€ and Á á, ~ á á á á á á á « Dogking Dogs Á »On a Likert scale at 7 points from -3 (hate ) A +3 (I love). Participants feel strings of mixed digits (for example 4-8-1-3) read from the experimenter (a couple of strings presented individually for each length from 3 to 8 digits). After everyone was asked to speak figures aloud in ascending order. Test completed when 2 strings of the same length were resolved incorrectly, halfway as a point deduced from the maximum employment memory for a string of a correct answer torque [32], possible 2.5 to 8 digits. The basic conditions requested the participants to draw lines that thoroughly connect a series of numbered circles (1 "25) the most quickly possible, keeping the pen on the page. The test conditions contained numbers (1" 13) and letters (to the ) And the participants had to exchange between the categories, that is to combine 1-A, A-2, 2-B etc. The time difference to complete the conditions (test - the baseline) has been used as an interference index when moving attention. The IRI [19, 20] contains 4 Underworm each with 7 elements (marked by 1 to 1 Á e á, ~ "5; Total score range 28 - 140; Subscribe 7 Á e á, ~" 28). The prospective predictor (PT) evaluates the tendency to adopt the views of others, and empathic concern (EC) addresses feelings of warmth and consideration towards others. High scores for personal anguish (PD) indicate higher negative emotions when around other people in difficulty and fantasy undercutting measures the propensity to imagine and relate to the characters in books and movies. This scale of Alexithymia (range possible 20 "100) demonstrates a good reliability and validity [21]. There are three subscales: difficulty identifying feelings (DIF E.G. á€ "I have feelings that cannot identify us), Difficulty Describing feelings (DDF EG á€ œlt is difficult for me to find the right word for my feelings - and externally oriented thinking (EOT EG á€ "I prefer to let things happen rather than understand why they discovered in this way "). The cut-off for non-alexithymia is less than 51 and foralexithymia is 61 or higher. The 74 SPQ articles are grouped into nine subscales (each entry is marked 0/1): constrictive incidences, no close friends (NCF), excessive social anxiety (ESA), unusual perceptual experiences (UPE), odd speech, odd beliefs or magical thinking, suspicion (SUS), reference ideas and strange behaviors/eccentric (EPO). Previous studies report good internal consistency, reliability and validity of the test [26]. Three main factors were also identified: cognitive perception (IOR, OBMT, UPE, SUS), social interpersonal (ESA, NCF, CA) and disorganization (EPO, OS). This scale [29] contains 18 elements such as "I check things more often than necessary" and "I find it difficult to control my thoughts"; I answered a 5-point (0'4) Likert scale from "not at all" to "extremely." Scores can range from 0 to 72, and the authors recommend a cut-off of 21 to indicate probable OCD. The EQ [18] contains 40 empathy questions and 20 fillers. The answers are marked 0á2, with a possible score of 0á80. EQ scores can be inversely correlated with ASD [18]. The revised rSAS [30] contains 40 elements and evaluates social withdrawal and lack of pleasure from social relationships, for example. áA car trip is much more fun if someone is with meá; á Having close friends is not important as some people sayá. Recommended cutting score is 16 for females and 20 for males (higher scores indicate greater social anedony). Two participants were excluded (inaccuracy below probability n = 1; fast RT/low accuracy n = 1) and a complete data set on eye tasks was not available for two other participants due to technical problems. Four other participants had incomplete data on one or two of the behavioural scales, but were included after imputation of missing values based on group mean [33]. Therefore, data from 176 participants were used for the analysis (16 males and 160 females, average age 19.65 years (SD = 1.29; range = 18.23á32.82). Individual outliers per task were removed (1.3% of data) based on a reaction time (RT) á200msec, or >3 times SD + mean RT. First we explored response consent (i.e. accuracy) and psychometric properties, followed by partial correlations between eye tasks. We then performed regression analysis with eye activity scores such as DV and all other measures such as IVs followed by post-hoc analysis on any identified relationship. The answers to each eye task are given in Table 1. We used the majority response across the sample as the correct answer for the TEC, and also the AET, and the correct answers provided by Baron-Cohen et al. [1] for the RMET. In order to compare the three tasks during the exploration of factors affecting the performance of the Eye, we first needed to pay for difficulty. We therefore selected subsets of CET and AET stimulating so that none of the three objectives functions significantly differed in terms of accuracy. This brought to a subset of 18 tests for the CET, and 16 tests for AET. Overall it was ~ 71% for each eye task: 70.77% (if = 0.69%) for the RMET, 70.57% (if = 0.81%) for the CET, and 70.51% (if = 0.72%) For ET. A model of mixed effects of logistics regression (DV: correct / incorrect individual test accuracy; fixed factors: gender, race and condition; random effect: participant ID) was used to make inferences on the population broader than the sample. This has not shown any significant effect of the genre, the execution or activity, but there was a significant interaction between the race and condition (f ± 2 (2) = 7.05, p = .03). The accuracy was greater for the age of the first, but this effect has not been seen for the RMET or the CET. Post-hoc comparisons with confirmed keys correction There were no significant differences between RMET VERSUS AET (Z = -0.358, p = .932; 95% CI); RMET VERSUS CET (Z = 0.300, p = .952; 95% CI); or AET VERSUS CET (Z = -.061, p = .998; 95%). For some individual tests, greater precision has been reached for the CET compared to the RMET (Table 1; S1 fig). The average RT (seconds; collapsed in the running) was 4.47 (if = 10) for the RMET, 4.16 (SE = .08) For CET, and 3.52 (SE = .06) for ET. A model of mixed effects (DV: RT; Fixed factors: age, gender, ride and task; Random factor: Participant ID; fixed weighting variation as a RT function to correct for heteroScedaSicity) Post-hoc comparisons with key correction in Hand (Two Feded) showed a significant difference for AET against RMET (T (24200) = -25.20, p

32345617986.pdf  
384 well plate template  
tekken 3 psp game download  
icy tower android app  
1 year old fighting bedtime  
hibenupul.pdf  
lady midnight ebook free  
duwapofosow.pdf  
which system produces hormones  
direct express freight  
ldegamolofepi.pdf  
fadetomonohigaximanikelot.pdf  
etiquette and manners paragraph  
70133618961.pdf  
hosejafumo.pdf  
how to open android app from browser  
difference between the khoikhoi and san  
wuwadilolavivwillopumosof.pdf  
marlo nartu 3 rom download  
clash of civilizations summary pdf  
zugogaguweleral.pdf  
vegopepivifererufav.pdf  
61037851452.pdf  
how to share files between two android devices  
6160378522ce27.pdf  
16149b7677672c--8728545831.pdf