

Influence of handedness and bilateral eye dominance on ceiling

Elizabeth R. Shobe^{a,*}, Nicholas M. Ro^b, Jessica I. Fleck^a

^aThe Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Pomona, New Jersey, United States

^bRutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Accepted 27 August 2009

Available online 2 October 2009

Keywords:

Handedness

Ceiling

Eye dominance

Lateral

Hemisphere

Altenberg

Diagnosing

Bain

Cognition

Bilateral

ABSTRACT

We investigated the effects of induced in-eye hemispheric action (IHI) on ceiling dimensions (accuracy, delay, categorical decision, and originality) of the Altenberg Task. To measure eye dominance, we used the IHI task. IHI indicated bilateral differences in handedness, mixed-handedness, or right-handedness. Since IHI indicated lateralized central (cognitive) and bilateral timing conditions of a 30-second eye dominance task (EM). Results indicated significant ceiling effects for mixed-handedness, compared to right-handedness, for all

Fo e am le, Ch *j* man (2001) ob e ed ha lef -hande , a mo e mi ed-handed go han igh hande (B den & S eenh *j* , 1991; Ch *j* man, 1995; Hellige, 1993), e hibi ed g ea - e S oo in e fe ence and g ea e local global in e fe ence, hich *a* in e e ed *a* ec ing g ea e in e ac ion be een LH-ba ed e bal/local oc ing and RH-ba ed ch oma ic/global oc ing. F he , P o e , Ch *j* man, and Phane f (2005) ob e ed an ad an age fo mi ed-hande o e ong-hande on e iodic e- ie al *a* k , con e ging on h e iological e ea ch im lica ing bila e al a e u of ac i i fo enhanced e fo mance on e iodic memo *a* k (Pla el, Ba on, Dg g ange , Be na d, & E e ache, 2003; T l ing, Ka , C aik, Mq co i ch, & Ho le, 1994). Mi ed-hande a lo ha e an ad an age o e ong-hande fo o he memo *a* k ha o ld bene fom inc ea ed IHI (e.g. o ce memo), b e ho no ch ad an age on memo *a* k ha o ld no e i e IHI (e.g., face ecogni ion) (L le, McCabe, & Roedige , 2008). While ce a i i and deg ee of handedne ha no been di ec l e died (al ho gh he e a e e ome e die ha ha e e amined di ec ion of handedne and ce a i i), mi ed-handedne ha been a ocia ed i h g ea e magical idea ion (Ba ne & Co ballj , 2002), and a i e ha e a highe incidence of e in i ali and mi ed-handedne (P e i & Vellan e, 2007). F he , mi ed-hande gene a e mo e al e na e-ending o e cena iq (i.e., co n e fac al ho gh) han do ong-hande (Ja e , Ba , & Ch *j* man, 2008), and he f on al co e of bo h hemj he e con ib e o co n e fac al hinking *a* k (Gome Belda ain,

Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI) of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory, the mean $M = 77.5$ (range 50-100). Because the EHI is a continuous measure of handedness, a score of 80 and higher indicates right-handed and a score of 75 and lower indicates left-handed. The mean score of 30 indicates mixed-handed and 32 indicates left-handed (only left-handed score = -100).

2.2. Materials/apparatus

An adaptation of the Alena and Ullrich Test (Chamois-Premic, 2006) was used to measure ceiling. This adaptation consisted of 20 common items (e.g. pencil, hoe, football, etc. (Arendt & A). We used 15 items from the original Alena and Ullrich Test (Chamois-Premic et al., 1960) and 5 items from a common word bank (Snodgrass & Vandenberg, 1980). Each item was presented on a card of an $8.5'' \times 11''$ size of high contrast, printed in 16-point Times New Roman font. The common items were arranged in a horizontal line on each item. Pictures included in the items included in a booklet suitable for age had been included in the 16-point Times New Roman font. Pictures included in the remaining 15 items included in the booklet, also suitable for age containing the included items. To avoid an order effect, the items were randomized by age, ceiling, and item, and items were randomized in order in each.

Results on the Alena and Ullrich Test were coded on the difference between scores: (a) $M = 100$, indicating the total number of items included in the (eg. 100% of 'all' or 'all' items); (b) original items, indicating the number of items included by 0-5% of all items (3 items), 6-10% (2 items) or 11-15% (1 item) of all items in the sample; (c) amount of detail elaboration included for each item (on a 0-5 scale); (d) reliability of the mean

ceae ad an age, and hehe ceae i a diffeniall affec ed e-and q mani la ion, he e b̄ co e of he Al e na e U e T̄ enc , de ail, o iginali , ca ego ical d̄i inc i enḡ and a o ia enḡ), e e b̄mi ed o a 2 (Condi ion: con ol, bila e al EM) × 2 (Handedne : mi ed, e ong) × (2)(T̄ : e, q)mi ed fac o ial MANOVA. M l i a ia e e e ealed a igni can main effec fo Handedne (Willk' Λ = .779, F(5, 54) = 3.06, p = .017, (η² = .221) and T̄ (Willk' Λ = .735, F(5, 54) = 3.89, p = .004, (η² = .265) hen he de enden a iabl̄ a e linea l combined ac q̄ all ial. No main effec fo Condi ion (Willk' Λ = .959, F < 1), o in e ac ion of Handedne × T̄ (Willk' Λ = .907, F < 1), Handedne × Condi ion (Willk' Λ = .978, F < 1), T̄ × Condi ion (Willk' Λ = .947, F < 1), o Handedne × Condi ion × T̄ (Willk' Λ = .927, F < 1) e e o b̄ e ed fo he linea l combined b̄ co e. Uni a ia e ANOVA al o ealed no igni can diffen̄e fo T̄ fo he e b̄ co e, e gḡ ing ha he main effec in he m l i a ia e e e of e e. q - e o b̄ e ed o be an o e all ac ice effec ha i no e ec c o an of he indi id al b̄ co e.

3.3. Handedness findings for individual sub-scores of the Alternate Uses Test (post circle task)

The anal e e en ed in h̄ ec ion a e b̄ ed on a ic an̄, e o e o e all 15 ial of he Al e na e U e T̄ k fo each b̄ co e. Uni a ia e e indica e ha mi ed-hande ho ed g ea e enc (M = 3.09, SE = .19) han ong-hande (M = 2.44, SE = .18), F(1, 58) = 6.15, p = .016, (η² = .096); mi ed-hande (M = 2.45, SE = .142) ho ed g ea e ca ego ical d̄i inc i enḡ in hei an e han ong-hande (M = 1.67, SE = .13), F(1, 58) = 15.576, p < .001, (η² = .21); mi ed-hande (M = 2.70, SE = .16) had mo e a o ia e e o e han ong-hande (M = 1.84, SE = .15), F(1, 58) = 14.40, p < .001, (η² = .20); and mi ed-hande (M = 3.35, SE = .28) ho ed mo e o iginali han ong-hande (M = 1.84, SE = .27), F(1, 58) = 13.80, p < .001, (η² = .19). Mi ed-hande (M = 2.5, SE = .13) e e ma ginall highe han ong-hande (M = 2.1, SE = .18) on he de ail b̄ co e, F(1, 58) = 3.64, p = .06, (η² = .06). The e e l̄ o he h o h̄ i ha mi ed-handed indi id al o ld demon a e inc ead ceae i i on h̄ e indi id al co e han ong-hande.

Addi onall , a priori e e gḡ ha he highe ceae i i of mi ed-hande com a ed o ong-hande a d i en̄ olel b̄ diffen̄e in he con ol go , b̄ no he bila e al EM go . Com a i o b̄ een mi ed and ong hande in he con ol go (no bila e al EM) e ealed diffen̄e on all e b̄ co e of ceae i i enc , F(1, 28) = 4.2, p = .05, η² = .13 (M_{mi ed} = 3.05, SE = .24; M_{ong} = 2.3, SE = .26); de ail, F(1, 28) = 5.4, p = .03, η² = .16 (M_{mi ed} = 2.54, SE = .17; M_{ong} = 1.95, SE = .18); o iginali , F(1, 28) = 9.14, p = .005, η² = .25 (M_{mi ed} = 3.06, SE = .39; M_{ong} = 1.03, SE = .42); ca ego ical d̄i inc i enḡ , F(1, 28) = 9.46, p = .005, η² = .25 (M_{mi ed} = 2.4, SE = .20; M_{ong} = 1.5, SE = .21); and a o ia enḡ , F(1, 28) = 9.5, p = .005, η² = .25 (M_{mi ed} = 2.75, SE = .22; M_{ong} = 1.75, SE = .23).

The e diffen̄e be een ong and mi ed-hande d̄i a e ad fo he bila e al EM go fo enc (F < 1), de ail (F < 1), o iginali [F(1, 30) = 2.06, p = .16], ca ego ical d̄i inc i enḡ [F(1, 30) = 3.08, p = .09], and a o ia enḡ [F(1, 30) = 2.6, p = .11].

for categorical dependent variables, $F(1, 30) = 4.71, p = .04, \eta^2 = .14$ ($M_{bilateralEM} = 2.22, SE = .20; M_{control} = 1.56, SE = .23$). No condition differences were observed for either level of mild-handicapped ($F < 1$), the level of mild-handicapped ($F < 1$), or the level of severely-handicapped ($F \leq 1$).

Taken together, these results suggest that the bilateral EM manipulation affected original and categorical dependent variables equally only when the effect size is a medium to large level. At this point, we need to determine how long the EM effect held for severely-handicapped individuals. To answer this, we conducted a series of analyses of mean differences in the level of inclusion (Tial 1 3, Tial 4 6, Tial 7 9, Tial 10

ion. However, for the categorical dependent variable, only Trial 13 (e o ed abo e) eached igni cance, and Trial 46 e e ma ginall igni can, $F(1, 30) = 3.6, p = .06$. Trial 79 [$F(1, 30) = 2.4, p = .13$], 10-12 [$F(1, 30) = 2.5, p = .11$], and 13-15 ("la e ial, e o ed abo e) e e no igni can (see Fig. 3). This gge ha he effec of bila e al EM on o iginali of ong-hande ma la o 9 min befo e i di i a e. B, he effec of bila e al EM on ca ego ical di inc i ene la a lea 3 min and ma be o 6 min (see Fig. 2 and 3, and Table 2).

While igni can diffe ence be een con ol and bila e al EM condi ion of ong-hande e e onl ob e ed fo he o iginali (o ial 6-9) and ca ego ical di inc i ene (o ial 3) e e, addi onal anal e e ealed gene al do n a d linea end in he bila e al EM condi ion ac Q he e ial inc emen fo a o ia ene $F(1, 17) = 8.03, p = .01$, o iginali, $F(1, 17) = 8.2, p = .008$, and ca ego ical di inc i ene, $F(1, 3$

Bergalo, 2006) of the ed-bilateral EEG activity in the original-
 i- ϵ core on a mono- ϵ -ocia ϵ ϵ k. The a ϵ ϵ ϵ ed b
 Ra mniko a and colleg ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ ed ha he hemi he ϵ
 ma be in ol ed in diffe en ϵ ϵ ϵ ha con ib e o o iginali
 ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ a en ion, o king memo , and diff ϵ ϵ ϵ ac i a -
 ion of al e na e o d meaning and ela ion hi ϵ . In addi ion,
 he c ea i i con c of ca ego ical di inc i en ϵ ϵ ϵ ma ϵ ϵ o ke
 ad an age of ϵ ϵ ϵ a ion of he lef and igh hemi he ϵ . The
 LH i a ic la l ell ϵ i ed o ca ego ical o ϵ ϵ ϵ ing he ea he
 RH a ea o be a ic la l ell ϵ i ed o iden if ing m li le
 ca ego ical membe ϵ hi ϵ i ho he abili o di ing i h he
 mo ele an ca ego (Chia ello & Richa d , 1992; Chia ello
 e al., 1992; Ince & Ch j man, 2002). Th ϵ , ec i men of LH abili
 i i ϵ fo iden i ca ion of ϵ ϵ ϵ ca ego i ϵ and RH abili i ϵ fo
 m li le ca ego i ϵ ma gi e i e o a combined ad an age fo ca -
 ego ical di inc i en ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ . The nding of Bech e e a e al.
 (2004) ϵ ϵ ϵ ha he LH i in ol ed in ca ego ical di inc -
 i en ϵ ϵ (e med flexibility b hem). We ϵ ϵ ϵ ha o iginali
 and ca ego ical di inc i en ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ e e facili a ed b IHI
 beca ϵ e he in ol e bo h LH and RH o ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ , and ha IHI ill
 ha e facili a i e effec ϵ on an ϵ ϵ ϵ ha e i e bi-hemi he ic
 con ib ion . Thi ha ϵ ϵ o been o q ed and ϵ o ed b L le
 e al. (2008).

En ho gh o iginali and ca ego ical di inc i en ϵ ϵ do no
 a ea o el on he ϵ ϵ ϵ o ne al ϵ ϵ ϵ a ϵ , e a e
 no ϵ ϵ ϵ ing ha bila e al EM ϵ ϵ l in a id ϵ ead, no ϵ ϵ ϵ
 ci c ac i a ion of he ce eb al hemi he ϵ . Ra he , o nding
 ϵ ϵ en e idence o he con a beca ϵ e a o ia en ϵ ϵ ϵ enc ,
 and de ail, e e la gel naffec ed b he bila e al EM mani la -
 ion. Al ho gh io ϵ ϵ ea ch i e limi ed, h ϵ e h ee ϵ ϵ o ϵ
 ϵ ma be mo e effec i el o ϵ ϵ ed nila e all , i hin he
 LH o RH. Bo h e bal ϵ enc (Baldo, Sch a ϵ , Wilkin , &
 Donke , 2006) and a o ia en ϵ (To ance & Ho ng, 1980)
 ma be ela i el ϵ ic ed o LH o ϵ ϵ ϵ . Con e ϵ el , abili
 o e o i al de ail (K ϵ ϵ inge & Choi, 2009) and gene a e de -
 ailed i al image a ea o be mo e elian on RH o ϵ ϵ ϵ ϵ
 (G ϵ a ini e al., 2008; S ide ϵ ka a, Ta a no a, & Ko hed b,
 2006), and ma be analogo o he de ail me ϵ e in o ϵ d .
 If bila e al EM gene a ed no ϵ ϵ ci c ac i a ion of bo h hemi -
 ϵ he ϵ , o con ol go o ld ha e e hibi ed lo e ϵ ϵ co ϵ on
 each of h ϵ ϵ b ϵ co ϵ . O nding ai e he o ϵ ϵ ibili ha onl
 ca ego ical di inc i en ϵ ϵ and o iginali e e affec ed b he EM
 mani la ion beca ϵ e h ϵ e beha io ϵ can bene f om combined
 LH and RH o ϵ ϵ ϵ , he ea a o ia en ϵ , de ail, and ϵ enc
 ma be mo e elian on nila e al o ϵ ϵ ϵ .

In e ϵ ingl , i ha been o q ed ha bila e al EM ma en -
 able ge a e acc ϵ o RH o ϵ ϵ ϵ (Ch j man & P o e , in
 ϵ ϵ), and o o ϵ a ion of a ma ginal de ail ad an age
 (p = .06) fo bila e al EM a ici an ϵ do ϵ no nde mine hi q -
 ϵ ibili . B e al o ecogni e ha io ϵ ϵ ea ch on hemi he ic
 ϵ ϵ mme i ϵ fo gene a ing de ail d ing i al image i ϵ a ϵ e,
 h ϵ limi ing o ϵ ec la ion . E en ill, if he bila e al EM ϵ ϵ k e -
 ϵ l ed in a gene ali ed ac i a ion of bo h hemi he ϵ , hen
 ϵ ong-hand ϵ in o ϵ d ϵ ho ld ha e (1) ϵ ho n an im o e -
 ϵ men in he EM go o e he con ol fo ϵ enc , de ail, and
 a o ia en ϵ ; o (2) ma ched he mi ed-hand ϵ . In ead, he
 mi ed-hand ϵ o e fo med hem in he con ol and he bila e al
 EM go ϵ , and ϵ o e a e ea onabl con den ha he effec i
 ϵ ϵ ϵ eci c .

We al o ϵ ϵ ec ha he IHI of mi ed-hand ϵ i ali a i el
 diffe en f om he IHI facili a ed b bila e al EM beca ϵ e he
 mani la ion did no ai e all e ϵ b ϵ co ϵ of ϵ ong-hand ϵ
 o le ϵ e i alen i h mi ed-hand ϵ . While leng h e lana -
 ion of he mi ed-hand ϵ ad an age fo de ail, ϵ enc , and
 a o ia en ϵ a e be ond h ϵ co e of hi a e , one o ϵ ϵ ibili
 i ϵ im l ha he b ϵ ic ana omical diffe ence in h ϵ i e of he co -

ϵ callq m be een ϵ ong and mi ed-hand ϵ (D i ϵ en & Ra ,
 1995; Habib e al., 1991; Wi ϵ ϵ on & Gold mi h, 1991) do ϵ no
 change follo ing an EM ϵ k. The la ge co ϵ callq m ma gi e
 he mi ed-hand ϵ a mo e gene ali ed ad an age on he me ϵ ϵ
 ϵ e ϵ ϵ ed. We eadil ackno ledge, ho e e , ha he li e a e
 i e le e i h in con i en nding in o of a ela ion hi be -
 een handedn ϵ and callq al ϵ i e. The co ϵ callq m clea l
 facili a ϵ an fe of info ma ion be een he hemi he ϵ , b
 i ma al o ϵ e e o ed ce in e fe ence be een he hemi he ϵ .
 Recen o k b Welcome e al. (2009) ϵ ϵ ϵ ha in mi ed -
 handed mal ϵ a la ge co ϵ callq m ma facili a e in eg a ion,
 b in mi ed-handed female i ma minimi e in e fe ence. In
 o ϵ d , he a ici an ϵ e e la gel female, and ϵ o he
 mi ed-handed ad an age fo de ail, ϵ enc , and a o ia en ϵ
 ma ϵ ϵ ϵ minimi ed in e fe ence fo h ϵ e ϵ q ed nila e al
 o ϵ ϵ .

So, hen, he ϵ ion emai : Wha change do ϵ a bila e al EM
 ϵ kind ce in he b ain? Al ho gh he no ion of a cen ale ec i e
 in he mind ma i ϵ elf be o e a ed, e o o e ha bila e al e e
 mo emen ϵ e e o ac i a e he ne al ϵ ϵ a ϵ go e ning
 me acon ol o ϵ ϵ ϵ ha di ec ϵ ϵ eci c o ϵ ϵ ϵ ing (fo e -
 ie of me acon ol ϵ ee Hellige, 1995). Loh e al. (2006) al o ϵ ϵ
 ϵ ha me acon ol o ϵ ϵ ϵ a e he oo of IHI. The o k of
 Ko niq e al. (2006) ϵ ϵ ϵ he loc of hi me acon ol mech -
 ani m fo ce a i i ma be he an e io cing la e co e (ACC), b
 f e ne o imaging ϵ ea ch ma be nec ϵ a o de e mine he
 ela ion hi be een bila e al EM and he ACC.

Al ho gh e did no di ec l me ϵ e he effec of bila e al
 EM on hemi he ic ac i i , o nding add o a la gel con i -
 en ϵ e of beha io al and h ϵ iological nding f om a io ϵ lab -
 o a o i ϵ indica ing ha bila e al EM e e bila e al effec on
 hemi he ic o ϵ ϵ ing. P o e e ic o o a

the e bal LH i the ca e of bila e al ac i i . In addition o he bila e al a e p of ac i i e o ed b Folle and Pa k (2005) ho iñ ed ic e im li and allo ed fo a ial mani la ion of hq e ic e befo e gi ing a e bal e on e, a io c ea i i a k ha e been a ocia ed i hac i i in LH fon al and em e o- a ie al c e in ol ed in a ial e ce ion of objec (J ng-Beeman e al., 2004

Shemakina, N. V., & Dan'ko, S. G. (2004). Influence of the emotional reaction of a signal on the electroencephalographic correlation of cerebral activity. *Human Physiology*, 30, 145-151.