

Preliminary Validation of the Portuguese Edinburgh Handedness Inventory in an Adult Sample

Journal:	<i>Applied Neuropsychology: Adult</i>
Manuscript ID	HAPN-2016-0110.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Dec-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Espírito-Santo, Helena; Instituto Superior Miguel Torga Pires, Catarina; Instituto Superior Miguel Torga, Garcia, Inês; Instituto Superior Miguel Torga Daniel, Fernanda; Instituto Superior Miguel Torga; Centro de Estudos e Investigação em Saúde da Universidade de Coimbra Silva, Alexandre; Instituto Politécnico de Coimbra.; Centro de Estudos e Investigação em Saúde da Universidade de Coimbra Fazio, Rachel; CAMH,
Keywords:	Handedness, Hand Preference, Edinburgh Handedness Inventory, Psychometric Properties

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Preliminary Validation of the Portuguese Edinburgh Handedness Inventory in an Adult Sample

Abstract

Handedness remains relevant for neuropsychologists in an increasingly multicultural society. The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI) is persistently the most used inventory to evaluate handedness. Despite this, the cultural influences on EHI performance are poorly understood generally, and there is no information on how this instrument functions in a Portuguese population. The objective of this study was therefore to examine the sociodemographic influences on handedness in Portugal and establish psychometric properties of the EHI in a Portuguese sample. The sample consisted of 342 people (157 men and 185 women), aged between 18 and 65 years. All participants completed an informed consent form and a battery of neuropsychological tests. The mean EHI Laterality Quotient (LQ) was 63.52 ($SD = 38.00$). The results showed that from six sociodemographic variables (age, sex, education, area of residence, regions, and profession), only three showed significant influence on EHI scores. The reliability and temporal reliability of EHI were adequate. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the model was explained by a one-factor model. The present data give support for the notion that handedness measured by EHI is sensitive to cultural influences.

Keywords: Handedness; Hand Preference; Edinburgh Handedness Inventory; Psychometric Properties.

Introduction

Handedness is still a common consideration for neuropsychologists, who practice in increasingly culturally diverse settings. Handedness is a broad concept involving a variety of neural and behavioral processes (Barbieri & Gobbi, 2009; Strien, 2002). Both genetic and epigenetic factors (i.e., environmental and cultural) influence handedness (Pogetti, De Souza, Tudella & Teixeira, 2013; Souza & Teixeira, 2011). Specifically, by some estimates, genetic effects account for only about 24% of the variance in hand preference (Medland et al., 2009). Although it has not been determined exactly what percent is explained by the effects of culture, there are some indications it plays an important role. For example, Strien (2002) found in his study that the choice of hand for writing is influenced by culture; the cultural differences demonstrated in the survey by Perelle and Ehrman (1994) are also quite striking. Considering that there is a social pressure for using the right hand, the environment likely plays a primary role in establishing laterality (Souza & Teixeira, 2011).

Before delving further into these cultural phenomena, however, the methodological issue of the measurement of handedness and the effects of such must also be dealt with. It is well known that manual preference of humans is primarily classified into two distinct groups: having a dominant right hand (*right-handed*) or a dominant left hand (*left-handed*). However, in some cases, this dichotomy is accompanied by a third category: individuals who use both hands, whether this is indiscriminately or with set patterns of hand use for certain tasks (*ambiguous-handedness* and *mixed-handedness*) (Dragovic, Milenkovic, & Hammond, 2008). To evaluate handedness, the two methods most commonly used include observation of the use of the dominant hand and the application of inventories answered by the individual (Barbieri & Gobbi, 2009). The three most popular inventories (Strien, 2002) are by Crovitz and Zener (1962), Annett (1970), and Oldfield (1971). The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI; Oldfield, 1971) is the most used from the previous three (Fazio & Cantor, 2015; Veale, 2014). The EHI offers the advantage of being a simple and brief method of evaluating laterality using a quantitative scale (Oldfield, 1971).

The first version of the Oldfield Inventory was based on a modified version of the Humphrey inventory with 20 items (Büsch, Hagemann, & Bender, 2010). There is evidence the original instructions and answer format were difficult to understand, and included problematic items (Fazio et al., 2012; Oldfield, 1971; Veale, 2014). These issues have been improved over several versions (Veale, 2014). The most often used version of the Oldfield Inventory contains 10 items about handedness involving 10 motor tasks [*writing, drawing,*

1
2
3 *throwing, scissors, toothbrush, knife (without fork), spoon, broom (upper hand), striking*
4 *match (match), opening box (lid)]* (Büsch et al., 2010; Oldfield, 1971).

6 This study is dedicated to the EHI, given it is widely utilized in the determination of
7 hand preference. As a small sample, the EHI has been studied in populations from England
8 and Scotland (Oldfield, 1971), Canada (Bryden, 1977), Australia (Dragovic, 2004a), the
9 United States (Messinger & Messinger, 1995), and Serbia (Milenkovic & Dragovic, 2013).
10 The focus of these studies, however, has largely not included possible cultural differences in
11 handedness, potentially explaining a portion of the discrepancies in psychometric properties
12 found amongst studies. There is a lack of information entirely regarding psychometric
13 properties of the EHI for the Portuguese population; to fill this gap, this study is based on the
14 Normative Studies of Neuropsychological Instruments project (ENIN, *Estudos Normativos*
15 *de Instrumentos Neuropsicológicos*), developed at the Miguel Torga Institute.

16
17
18 The general goal is to study the psychometric properties of the EHI in an adult sample
19 of the Portuguese population, in order to determine the rates of right- left-, and other-
20 handedness in this population. Other specific objectives included to: 1) Determine the
21 descriptive statistics for the EHI; 2) Check the role of sociodemographic variables on EHI
22 scores and handedness preference; 3) Analyze the reliability of the EHI (through Cronbach's
23 alpha) and temporal stability (through test-retest); 4) Run a confirmatory factor analysis.

34 35 36 **Methods**

37 38 ***Participants***

39
40 To maintain adequate power in statistical analyses, the intended sample should not be under
41 115, as the power analysis through G*Power software revealed (Buchner, Erdfelder, Faul, &
42 Lang, 2014; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007a, 2007b). A total of 342 volunteers were
43 actually included in the present analyses. Participants were recruited among family, friends,
44 and colleagues of students from neuropsychology classes of our Institute. Each student made
45 a list of all potential participants, totaling 765 individuals. Afterwards prospective
46 participants were randomly selected, with stratification for age, sex, and education in a total
47 of 357 subjects. Of these, six people refused to participate (1.7%). Participants did not
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 receive any financial compensation for joining but were given the option to receive the
4
5 results and their meaning if requested [64 participants asked for results (17.9%)].
6

7 Present data were acquired as part of the ENIN. Because of that, the selection criteria
8
9 included: a) being able to read and write in Portuguese; b) having Portuguese nationality or
10
11 living in Portugal for more than 5 years; c) having more than 50% of their education in
12
13 Portugal; d) age between 18 and 65. Based on these criteria, 15 volunteers were excluded
14
15 because age was inferior to 18 years (4.2%).
16

17
18 The participants in the sample were stratified according to their age, with stratification
19
20 comprising six age groups: 18-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59 and 60-65 years. Participants
21
22 were also stratified according to their educational level. Five educational groups were
23
24 formed: the first cycle of basic education, the second cycle of basic education, the third cycle
25
26 of basic education, secondary education, and higher education¹. The regions category was
27
28 created according to Portuguese territorial units, where the South and the Autonomous
29
30 Regions were merged for statistical analysis.
31
32

33
34 Finally, participants were classified into *right-handed*, *ambiguous*, and *left-handed*, in
35
36 accordance with several authors who, in their studies about handedness, also opted for three
37
38 categories (Fazio et al., 2012; Milenkovic & Dragovic, 2013; Pogetti et al., 2013; Strien,
39
40 2002; Veale, 2014).
41
42

43 44 ***Procedures***

45
46 All participants filled out an informed consent form in accordance with the Helsinki
47
48 Declaration. The EHI was administered as part of a neuropsychological battery. The tests
49
50 were administered individually, in reserved areas without any distractive elements. The
51
52 complete neuropsychological battery had a duration of 1 hour and took place between
53
54 November 2014 and March 2015.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Instruments

The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971) determines hand preference (Büsch et al., 2010; Oldfield, 1971), and consists of ten items (writing, drawing, throwing, using scissors, a toothbrush, cutting with a knife, using spoon, the upper hand when using a broom, striking a match, and opening the lid of a box). On the response sheet, each item is followed by two columns labelled “left” and “right”. The subject indicates “++” in the “left” or “right” column if they strongly prefer to use one hand for that task, “+” if the preference for using one hand is weak, and “-” in both columns if they are indifferent (Oldfield, 1971). Each “++” symbol is scored as 2 points and “+” as 1 point; therefore, the **quotient** of laterality may range between -100 (preference of “strong left”) and +100 (preference of “strong right”) and, finally, the formula is applied for the Laterality Quotient: $LQ = [(R - L)/(R+L) \times 100]$ (Oldfield, 1971).

For the Portuguese EHI version, the guidelines proposed by Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemain and Ferraz (2000) were followed. A psychologist translated the EHI, and a person with no knowledge in the field of Psychology made a naïve translation. Both translations were compared, creating a consensual version with minor changes. Another psychologist back translated to English. Translation and back translation were compared, and the final version was created with no alterations.

Statistical analysis

For the analysis and processing of data, the statistical program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Statistics, version 20.0 for Windows 10, SPSS, 2011) was used. For the preliminary analyses, descriptive statistics were computed for the EHI total scores, including means and standard deviations.

1
2
3 Using the cut-off of 60 for EHI LQ (Hardie & Wright, 2014; Milenkovic & Dragovic,
4 2013; Veale, 2014), handedness was classified as right-handed (100 to 61), ambiguous (-60
5 to 60), and left-handed (-61 to -100). After this, frequencies and percentages were calculated
6 and chi-square tests for goodness of fit were computed. To evaluate the association between
7 each pair of handedness item, odds ratio (*OR*) were used (Agresti, 2010).
8
9

10
11 To explore the proportion of handedness cases that fall into each category of every
12 sociodemographic variable, the chi-square test of independence (Mantel-Haenzsel linear-by-
13 linear association/*MH*) or likelihood-ratio (G^2) were computed as appropriate according to
14 the variable's nature (Agresti, 2010). *T*-test/ANOVA was used to explore the effects of
15 sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, education, area of residence, region, and
16 profession) on EHI scores. For the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the homogeneity of
17 variances according to the Levene's test was determined. Whenever there was homogeneity
18 ($p > .05$), a Hochberg *post hoc* was used, otherwise a Games-Howell post hoc was used, both
19 with the Bonferroni correction ($p/\text{number of pairwise comparisons}$) (Marôco, 2011).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 For the analysis of the psychometric properties, internal consistency was determined
35 by Cronbach's alpha. For test-retest analysis, Pearson's correlations (r) and *t*-tests for paired
36 samples (2-tailed; $p < .05$) were computed. The *t*-test for paired samples was used to verify if
37 the means between the two moments of evaluation were different or which one of them was
38 higher.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a maximum likelihood approach was
46 performed using AMOS software version 23 (Arbuckle, 2014) taking in consideration the
47 following aspects: a) items were considered as categorical variables and analysed by
48 polychoric correlations (Jöreskog, 1994); b) as a parameter of fit estimation, the ratio of χ^2 to
49 the degrees of freedom (*df*) was computed, considering values lower than 3 as indicators of
50 good fit of the model (Hu & Bentler, 1999); c) the Tucker-Lewis coefficient (*TLI*) was
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 calculated as another measure of goodness of fit, with values over 0.90 indicating good fit
4
5 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); d) another parameter for fit estimation was the comparative fit index
6
7 (*CFI*), with values larger than 0.90 indicating acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline,
8
9 2005); e) the root mean square error of approximation (*RMSEA*) was an additional index with
10
11 values lower than 0.08 suggesting good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005).

12
13
14 Finally, the reliability of the construct was calculated using the composite reliability
15
16 (*CR*) estimate for the latent variable, which should be greater than 0.7; Jöreskog, 1971a). The
17
18 factorial validity (individual reliability) was examined by analysing items' standardized
19
20 weights, which, ideally, should exceed the recommended minimum of 0.60 (Bagozzi & Yi,
21
22 1988); however, standardized weights between 0.5 and 0.6 are accepted when scales are
23
24 applied in different contexts (Barclay et al. 1995). Convergent validity, or how much
25
26 variance in the measured items is captured by a latent construct, was assessed by
27
28 investigating the mean extracted variance (*MEV*) (an acceptable level should be above 0.5;
29
30 Fornell & Larcker, 1981).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Results

40 Sociodemographic

41
42 Ages of participants ranged between 18 and 65 years old ($M = 32.12$, $SD = 13.43$). Of the
43
44 participants, 45.9% were men and 54.1% women. The time of their formal education ranged
45
46 from 4 to 28 years of education² ($M = 14.49$, $SD = 4.07$).

47
48 Regarding area of residence, 75.1% of individuals lived in urban areas, 5.6% in a
49
50 transition area, and 19.3% in rural areas. As a result of recategorization, 17.8% lived in the
51
52 North, 67.3% in the Centre, 7% lived in the Lisbon, and 7.9% in the South-Autonomous
53
54 Regions. Concerning profession, 12.1% were in the manual category (i.e., workers) and
55
56 87.9% in the intellectual category (i.e., technical). Thirty-six individuals did not provide us
57
58
59
60

any information regarding their profession. Full demographic information can be seen in Table 1.

(Table 1 about here)

Preliminary analysis

The mean EHI LQ was 63.52 ($SD = 38.00$). The distribution of EHI scores was negatively asymmetrical and leptokurtic. The Shapiro-Wilk test revealed a non-normal distribution ($p < .001$). Nevertheless, the skewness (-1.44) and kurtosis (2.03) were within the Kim (2013) values; therefore, parametric statistical analyses were conducted. When using a cut-off of 60 for EHI LQ, of the participants, 59.1% were *right-handed* (202 in number), 40.4% were *ambiguous-handed*, and 0.6% reported being *left-handed*. Handedness was not equally distributed in the sample [$\chi^2(2, N = 342) = 183.02; p < .001$].

These results should be read in the light of what is *true ambiguousness* and *mixed-handedness*. *True ambiguousness* could be considered as having a high number of “either” responses or indifferent/inconsistent hand use *within* an item, and *mixed-handed* as having “left” and “right” responses or inconsistency *across* items (Fazio, Lykins, & Cantor, 2014; Shaw, Claridge, & Clark, 2001). Some have established a high number of “either” responses as two (Fazio et al., 2014), but others have referred to inconsistencies on three or more tasks (Satz, Nelson, & Green, 1989). This calculation methodology is not well-established, so some procedure variations were tested.

First, following Fazio et al.’s methodology (2014), *ambiguous-handedness* was defined as having more or equal to two “either” responses. To start, the number of each type of response was calculated, resulting in five new continuous variables (designated strong right, weak right, strong left, weak left, and either). Because there were no weak responses,

1
2
3 this kind of response was not considered. Then combinations of strong right, strong left, and
4
5 either counts were considered resulting in new categories. As such, ambiguous-handedness
6
7 corresponded to the following combinations: 2-10 “either” responses, 0-8 “right” responses,
8
9 and/or 0-8 “left” responses; mixed-handed corresponded to combinations of 0-1 “either”, 1-9
10
11 “right” and 1-9 “left” responses (at least one “right” and one “left” must be present); right-
12
13 handed to combinations 9-10 “right” and 0-1 “either”; and left-handed to combinations 9-10
14
15 “left” with 0-1 “either”. As a consequence of this classification, 54.4% of the total sample
16
17 were truly ambiguous, although 89.8% also had between 1 to 8 “right” responses, and 14.0%
18
19 had between 1 to 8 “left” responses. As mixed-handed there were 11.4% participants, with
20
21 21.6% of them having 1 “either” response. Of those participants categorized as ambiguously
22
23 handed (by means of cut-off of 60), 91.4% were truly ambiguous and 8.6% mixed-handed.
24
25 The two types of handedness categorization were significantly associated ($MH(1, N = 342) =$
26
27 $135.67, p < .001$).

28
29
30
31
32 Second, using the number of items for which an “either” response was given as a
33
34 continuous variable (Shaw et al. (2001) did the same for the Annett scale), a high number
35
36 was having more or equal to five of the ten possible responses. In the resulting categories,
37
38 *true ambiguous-handed* corresponded to 5-10 “either” responses, 0-5 “right” responses,
39
40 and/or 0-5 “left” responses; *mixed-handed* to combinations of 0-4 “either”, 0-9 “right” and/or
41
42 0-9 “left” responses (at least one “right” and one “left” must be present); *right-handed* to
43
44 combinations 10-6 “right”, 0-4 “either” or 0-1 “left”; and *left-handed* to combinations 6-10
45
46 “left” and 0-4 “either”. In this classification, 27.5% of the total sample were *truly ambiguous*,
47
48 among these 81.9% had between 1 and 5 “right” responses and 19.0% up to five “left”
49
50 responses, and no one had 10 “either” responses. As *mixed-handed* there were 4.1%
51
52 participants. Of participants categorized as ambiguously handed (cut-off of 60), 67.6% were
53
54 *truly ambiguous*, 10.1% *mixed-handed*, 0% *left-handed*, and 22.3% *right-handed*. The two
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 types of handedness categorization were significantly associated ($MH(1, N = 342) = 224.15$,
4
5 $p < .001$).

6
7 The third solution allowed “pure” categories to emerge, and true ambiguousness did
8
9 not include any mixed handedness. So for *true ambiguousness* the high number was
10
11 considered whenever “either” counts surpassed the counts of the “right” or “left” responses
12
13 (individually or added up), and for *mixed-handed* when the number of response type in two
14
15 or three variables were equal, and if the same procedure is used, then new combinations of
16
17 *strong right*, *strong left*, and *either* resulted in: *ambiguous-handed* corresponded to 6-10
18
19 “either” responses, 0-4 “right” responses, and/or 0-4 “left” responses; *mixed-handed* to
20
21 combinations of 0-5 “either”, 0-9 “right” and/or 0-9 “left responses (at least one “right” and
22
23 one “left” must be present). Then 19.3% were *truly ambiguousness*, with 81.8% also having
24
25 between 1 and 4 “right” responses, and 18.2% between 2 to 4 “left” responses (there were no
26
27 mixed answers). As *mixed-handed* there were 21.6% participants, with 58.1% of them having
28
29 between 1 and 5 “either” response, 93.2% had between 1 and 9 “right” responses, and 79.3%
30
31 had between 1 and 8 “left” responses. Ambiguously handed participants (EHI LQ cut-off of \pm
32
33 60) included 47.5% *truly ambiguous*, 33.8% *mixed-handed*, 0.7% *left-handed*, and 18.0%
34
35 *right-handed*. Also, the two types of handedness categorization were significantly associated
36
37 ($MH(1, N = 342) = 178.87$, $p < .001$).

38
39 Given the results of the three solutions, for the purposes of the following analysis,
40
41 “ambiguousness” will be used in *lato sensu*.

42
43 From the item by item analysis (Table 2) it was determined that for the items *broom*
44
45 and *box* the percentages were slightly higher in the *ambiguous* category. Even on these two
46
47 items, however, the observed proportion of participants who reported performing this activity
48
49 with both the right hand and with the left hand (*ambiguous*) was very similar to the
50
51 percentage of participants who reported performing this activity with only the right hand. For
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the items *writing* and *drawing* the lowest percentages of *ambiguous* were observed. These
4
5 were items in which participants indicated more extreme responses, and it was where the
6
7 highest percentages of *right-handed* and *left-handed* responses were found. Notably, the *left-*
8
9 *handed* responses for these two items were the same people. The items *broom* and *box* were
10
11 the other two items where the highest percentages of *left-handers* were found.
12

13
14
15
16 (Table 2 about here)
17
18
19

20
21 High positive associations were found for all the pairs of items ($p < .001$). The highest
22
23 associations occurred between the items *writing* and *drawing* ($OR = 165.71$), *scissors* and
24
25 *brush* ($OR = 129.94$), *scissors* and *spoon* ($OR = 110.77$), *scissors* and *striking match* ($OR =$
26
27 123.48), *brush* and *spoon* ($OR = 163.27$), *brush* and *knife* ($OR = 118.34$), *brush* and *striking*
28
29 *match* ($OR = 133.94$), *spoon* and *knife* ($OR = 123.02$), *spoon* and *striking match* ($OR =$
30
31 146.85), *spoon* and *box* ($OR = 114.90$), and *knife* and *striking match* ($OR = 139.14$).
32
33
34
35

36 ***Role of sociodemographic variables***

37
38 From Table 3, it can be seen that regarding age, the highest percentages of right-handed
39
40 individuals fall in the 18-19, 40-49, and 50-59 age categories; the frequencies showed little
41
42 variation, but the linear-by-linear association was not statistical significant ($MH (1, N = 342)$
43
44 $= 1.43; p = .232$). Hand preference across ages varied in some activities: individuals ages 31-
45
46 40 and 61-70 were equally likely to be classified as *right-handed* or *ambiguous-handed* in
47
48 using a *knife* or a *spoon* (MH respectively $1.79, p < .05$; and $= 12.63, p < .001$); 18-30, 31-40,
49
50 and 61-70 participants were more likely to be categorized as *ambiguous-handed* in *opening a*
51
52 *box* ($MH (1, N = 342) = 17.10; p < .001$).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Regarding sex, women were slightly more dexterous than men. However, the chi-
4 square test for independence (linear-by-linear association) indicated no significant association
5 between sex and handedness. The same was verified in each item: there was no relationship
6 between sex and nine of the ten variables representing the range of handedness preference
7 (G^2 between 0.23 and 2.74, $p > .05$), except for using a *broom*, where females were likely to
8 be classified as *right-handed* or *ambiguous-handed*, and males more likely to be classified as
9 *ambiguous-handed* (G^2 (2, $N = 342$) = 6.42, $p < .05$).

10
11
12 For education, the proportion of right-handers was larger in the first, second, and third
13 cycle of basic education than secondary education and higher education. In secondary
14 education and higher education, the percentages of *right-handed* and *ambiguous* were similar.
15 There was no association between education and hand preference across the ten items ($p >$
16 $.05$). Regarding profession, *right-handedness* prevailed in the manual category, but there was
17 no association with each EHI item (G^2 between .20 and 3.65, $p > .05$).

18
19
20 Concerning residence area, there was a greater number of right-handers in the
21 transition area; in rural areas there were more *ambiguous* individuals than *right-handed*.
22 Regarding the regions, a greater proportion of *ambiguousness* was observed both in Lisbon
23 and in the South-Autonomous Regions compared to the North and the Center where the
24 population appears more *right-handed*. The same happened for all activities (G^2 between
25 18.20, $p < .01$ and 74.04, $p < .001$).

26
27
28 These observations fell mostly in the *right-handed* and *ambiguous* categories, as there
29 were only two subjects in the *left-handed* category; it was therefore not feasible to perform
30 comparison to other categories. As is apparent from Table 3, these individuals were in the age
31 groups of 20-29 and 40-49 years old, a woman and a man who completed the second cycle of
32 basic education and higher education, resided in the urban areas of the North regions, and
33 practiced an intellectual profession.

1
2
3
4
5 (Table 3 about here)
6
7
8
9

10 Table 4 illustrates the differences in EHI LQ mean scores between groups defined by
11 sociodemographic variables with *t*-test/ANOVA values as appropriate. The scores on the EHI
12 LQ differed significantly among the six age groups [$F(5, 336) = 3.64; p < .01; \eta^2 = 0.05$].
13 Regarding sex, there were no statistically significant differences [$t(340) = 1.49; p = .136$;
14 Cohen's $d = 0.16$]. Level of education had no influence on EHI LQ [$F(4, 337) = 0.69; p =$
15 $.598; \eta^2 = 0.008$]. With regard to the three residential areas, the scores on the EHI were
16 statistically different [$F(2, 339) = 3.30; p < .05; \eta^2 = 0.02$]. The scores on the EHI LQ
17 differed significantly among the four regions as well [$F(3, 338) = 19.71; p < .001; \eta^2 = 0.15$].
18 Profession did not influence EHI LQ [$t(304) = 0.51; p = .62$; Cohen's $d = 0.10$].
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 (Table 4 about here)
33
34
35

36 The Hochberg post hoc test (Table 5) with Bonferroni correction indicated differences
37 between age category 20-29 and 50-59 with EHI LQ, with there being more *ambiguous* in the
38 first and more *right-handed* in the 50-59 category. About the area of residence, the Games-
39 Howell post hoc test showed differences between the rural and transition area for EHI LQ. As
40 for the regions, the Hochberg *post hoc* test was used with the Bonferroni correction, where
41 differences were found between the North and Lisbon; the North and South-Autonomous
42 Regions; the Centre and Lisbon; and the Center and the South-Autonomous Regions for EHI
43 LQ. There were more *right-handed* people in the North than Lisbon and South-Autonomous
44 Regions; in Lisbon and South-Autonomous Regions, *ambiguousness* prevailed.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Table 5 about here)

To check if these results could be explained by potential differences in education or profession among area of residence and regions, correlations were computed between EHI LQ scores and those variables in the subgroups defined by area/regions. For education, the only significant correlation was found with EHI LQ in the North region ($r = -0.28$; $p < .05$), where the level of education was significantly lower ($M = 12.67$; $SD = 4.28$). For profession, participants with manual occupations had higher EHI LQ scores in the transition areas ($r = -0.51$; $p < .05$).

Psychometric properties

Reliability. Concerning the internal consistency of the EHI, Cronbach's alpha was 0.877. This value is considered good for research purposes (Pestana & Gageiro, 2008), meaning that the scale has good internal consistency.

Test-retest reliability. To determine the temporal stability of EHI, the test was re-administered to a group of 25 individuals after a period of 5 months ($M = 4.96$; $SD = 1.34$). Through *t*-test it was found that there were no statistically significant differences [$t(24) = 0.37$; $p > .05$] between the first and the second moment, and the effect size was insignificant (Cohen's $d = 0.02$). Pearson correlations confirmed a high positive correlation ($r = 0.97$; $p < .001$) (Pestana & Gageiro, 2008).

Factor analysis. Since there was collinearity between the writing and drawing items ($r = 0.94$), an adjustment was made through the establishment of a correlation between the error variance of those items, and the resulting model (Figure 1) was adequate ($\chi^2/df = 2.141$; $TLI = 0.972$; $CFI = 0.979$; $RMSEA = 0.058$; $p[RMSEA < .05] < .001$).

1
2
3 Analyzing the reliability of the model through the composite reliability, we verified that *CR*
4 was 0.91. The factorial validity (individual reliability) was also appropriate since almost all
5 items had standardized weights > 0.5 and square weights > 0.25 (the broom item had a
6 weight close to adequate). The convergent validity analyzed regarding the mean extracted
7 variance was good (*MEV* = 0.61).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 (Figure 1 about here)
16
17

18 19 20 **Discussion and conclusion**

21
22 The purpose of the present study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the
23 Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI). From the descriptive statistics, we observed only
24 two *left-handed* participants in our sample. Interestingly, according to the *item-by-item*
25 analysis, we found there were 23 participants that reported performing the activity *writing*
26 only with the left hand; the same participants (except for one) also indicated *drawing* only
27 with the left hand. Our data suggests that there is a possibility of social pressure to be *right-*
28 *handed*, in line with several studies (e.g., Christman, Prichard, & Corser, 2015; Strien, 2002),
29 which state that hand preference may be related to culture/environment. The present data
30 indicates the conformity pressures, brain, and behavioral lateralization may have grown under
31 social selection pressures (Ghirlanda & Vallortigara, 2004; Payne, 1987). Giving strength to
32 this hypothesis is the *inconsistency* found in the preference for writing-drawing-using
33 scissors (activities more related to formal education) and other activities (using knife, match,
34 spoon, toothbrush, broom, throwing, and opening box). Formal education activities are more
35 prone to forced correction than the other activities, and congruency between these two types
36 of activities might be an indicator of forced correction decreasing (Lai, Serra, Petretto,
37 Masala, & Preti, 2014; Merni, Di Michele, & Soffritti, 2014). Another *finding* reinforcing
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this hypothesis is the unusually high percentage of ambiguous-handedness (which was much
4
5 higher than left-handedness in this sample).
6

7 The prevalence of ambiguous-handedness raises other reflections. No matter the
8
9 calculation procedure used in the present study, the rates are relatively high (between 19.3%
10
11 and 54.4%), not substantiating early hypotheses that ambiguous-handedness is rare among
12
13 normal populations (Satz et al., 1989: 3-4%), and presumed to be pathological (e.g.,
14
15 Bolinsky, Iati, Hunter, & Novi, 2013; Fazio et al., 2014; Lange et al., 2010; Shaw et al.,
16
17 2001; Soper & Satz, 1984; Tsuang, Chen, & Kuo, 2013). Nonetheless, a note of caution
18
19 should be made: the left/right/ambiguous classification schemes vary largely due to different
20
21 cutoff scores, as a review of 899 papers published from 1998 to 2012 has shown, making
22
23 difficult the basic left-right differentiation and hampering rate comparisons between studies
24
25 (Edlin, Leppanen, Fain, & Hackländer, 2015).
26
27
28

29 Regarding the effect of sociodemographic variables on the performance of EHI, the
30
31 results showed that concerning the six sociodemographic variables (age, sex, education, area
32
33 of residence, region, and profession) three influenced EHI scores: age, area of residence, and
34
35 region. Regarding age, we found significant differences, which is also consistent with
36
37 Milenkovic and Dragovic (2013). There were differences between the category 20-29 and 50-
38
39 59. The fact that there are more *ambiguous* in the 20-29 age group and more *right-handed in*
40
41 the 50-59 category allows one to conclude that social pressure to be *right-handed* it is not as
42
43 strong as it was in the past, but it still does not follow the increasing trend of left-hand
44
45 preference in the younger generations reported by others (McManus, Moore, Freegard, &
46
47 Rawles, 2010; Preti et al., 2011). This is somewhat different from Medland, Perelle, De
48
49 Monte, & Ehrman (2004), where older participants were more likely to be classified as *left-*
50
51 *handed*. This disparate evidence reinforces the idea of cultural pressure as a shifting influence
52
53 upon handedness.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In contrast to studies by Bryden (1977), Oldfield (1971), Martin, Papadatou-Pastou,
4 Jones, & Munafò (2010), Medland et al. (2004), and Papadatou-Pastou, Martin, Munafò, &
5 Jones (2008) which showed a greater propensity for men to be more *left-handed* than women,
6 and distinguished from the meta-analytic study of Papadatou-Pastou et al. (2008) that
7 reported a greater tendency of mixed-handedness among males, we found no differences in
8 scores on the EHI between men and women. This absence of differences may also reflect the
9 influence of cultural factors given the overall very low prevalence of *left-handedness* in this
10 sample. Although the level of *left-handedness* was much higher in the Preti et al. (2011)
11 study (c. 10%), they also found that males were not more likely to report left-hand preference
12 in writing. Nevertheless, in using a broom we found some differences, which may reflect,
13 again, a cultural influence.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We also did not find differences between education and scores on the EHI which was
28 in contrast to Fazio et al. (2012), where years of school was a significant predictor, since
29 participants with a higher education level tend to read and follow instructions better. It should
30 be noted though that a correlation between education and EHI scores in the Northern region
31 was found. According to Portuguese census (PORDATA, 2015) this region is similar to the
32 other main regions (Center and Lisbon) insofar as education is concerned, which was not the
33 case in our study. Giving the potential for some selection bias, this finding should be
34 confirmed with more representative samples.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Despite the absence of studies that address the variable of area of residence, we
46 decided to include it in our study. We found differences between rural and transition areas,
47 which is also consistent with Fagard and Dahmen (2010), Leask and Beaton (2007), Medland
48 et al. (2004), and Strien (2002) on the binding of hand preference with culture. As with the
49 variable described above, the same happens with the regions. By observing the Northern
50 average falls into the *right-handed* category compared with the other groups that fall into the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *ambiguous* category, it may reinforce the suggestion that there is actually an interference of
4
5 culture and pressure, in this case by the inhabitants of the North, to be *right-handed*. The
6
7 same explanation was drawn by Greenwood, Greenwood, McCullagh, Beggs, & Murphy
8
9 (2006), Leask and Beaton (2007), and Viggiano, Borelli, Vannucci, & Rocchetti (2001) that
10
11 there are potential regional differences in tolerance for left-handedness. Geographical
12
13 variations in disease (e.g., psychosis) or developmental conditions (e.g., developmental
14
15 coordination disorder) can also be invoked as possible explanations (Dragovic & Hammond,
16
17 2005; Goetz & Zelnik, 2007; Leask & Beaton, 2007). Nevertheless, we should not forget that
18
19 there was a significant correlation between handedness and education only in the North
20
21 region.
22
23

24
25 Regarding profession, no differences in scores were found on the EHI by the
26
27 categories of this variable; there appear to be no published studies that support or contrast
28
29 with these results.
30

31
32 Milenkovic (2013) previously used confirmatory factor analysis to examine the
33
34 psychometric properties of the EHI, and the results showed the EHI has poor psychometric
35
36 properties. In **contrast** in this **study**, we obtained good results both on internal consistency and
37
38 on temporal stability. Studies of Büsch et al. (2010) and Veale (2014) rejected the one-
39
40 dimensionality of the construct. However, from our confirmatory factor analysis, the 1-factor
41
42 model **showed adequacy**, as **in the** Strien (2002) study, which by principal component
43
44 analysis (albeit with a version of EHI which contained 16 items), revealed a single dimension
45
46 of laterality. The **studies** of Williams (1986), McFarland & Anderson (1980), **Fazio & Cantor**
47
48 **(2015)**, and **Richardson (1978)** also obtained one factor. Dragovic (2004) obtained a **one-**
49
50 **factor** solution at expenses of removing two of the items, **and we obtained a one-factor**
51
52 **solution accounting for the inter-item correlation by adjusting the model through the**
53
54 **establishment of a correlation between the error variance of writing and drawing items.**
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Again, this suggests a cultural component in this way of evaluating the handedness, and as
4
5 Medland et al. (2004) indicate, there are some measures of handedness more sensitive to
6
7 cultural influences. Additionally, the different factorial solutions could be a consequence of
8
9 different interpretations of the items which also point to a cultural influence (Jöreskog,
10
11 1971b; Millsap, 2012), or to the difficulty following the instructions (Fazio, Coenen, &
12
13 Denney, 2012).

14
15
16 Since level of education predicts ability to follow the EHI instructions (Fazio et al.,
17
18 2012), in future studies measurement invariance by education level should be tested. It is also
19
20 worth noting that the samples' nature and statistical procedures varied across studies
21
22 (Dragovic, 2004a: mean age 44.8 to 47.4, SEM with LISREL; McFarland & Anderson, 1980:
23
24 students, principal component analysis; Milenkovic, 2013: students, confirmatory factor
25
26 analysis; Büsch et al., 2010: ages between 17-37 years, mixed-Rasch analyses; Williams,
27
28 1986: students, principal component analysis). Moreover, the item-oriented approach
29
30 inherent to the CFA might have contributed to the failure of the model in some studies
31
32 (Büsch et al., 2010).

33
34
35
36 There were some minor methodological limitations to this study. The first relates to
37
38 education, which was operationalized as the number of years of regular formal education
39
40 successfully completed; this approach is vulnerable to the numerous changes in the
41
42 Portuguese education system. This limitation has been minimized, however, by the large size
43
44 of the sample and the absence of significant differences between the various educational
45
46 groups. During the administration of the EHI, some participants showed difficulties in
47
48 understanding the test instructions, similar to the experience of other authors (Fazio et al.,
49
50 2012; Oldfield, 1971; Veale, 2014). We suggest that, in future, the answers of EHI should be
51
52 collected orally or replaced with a five-checkbox system (e.g., with strong left on the left,
53
54 neutral in the middle, and strong right on the far right). Another limitation concerns the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 handedness classification established with cut-off of an LQ of 60 which is not entirely
4
5 consistent with classifications based on number of “either”, “left” or “right” answers. Others
6
7 also have reported misclassification of cases (Dragovic, 2004b; Fazio et al., 2014). In future
8
9 studies, it is proposed, in accordance to Dragovic (2004b), to classify handedness based on
10
11 statistical criteria and use a model based approach (latent class analysis).
12
13

14
15 Finally, the main limitation of this study was the fact that the sample was not
16
17 representative of the Portuguese population. The distribution of percentages in most of the
18
19 sociodemographic variables was not according to the last census conducted in Portugal
20
21 (National Institute of Statistics, 2014). A large percentage of participants were between the
22
23 ages of 20 to 29 years; there were also a large percentage of participants with higher
24
25 education. The same applies to the area of residence and regions: the urban area and the
26
27 central region were over-represented in comparison to other categories. This limitation may
28
29 be the result of the sampling type that was used (non-probability sampling). In future studies,
30
31 we suggest using a random sampling method, so as to better generalize the results (Hill &
32
33 Hill, 2000).
34
35

36
37 In conclusion, results suggest that handedness measured by EHI is potentially
38
39 sensitive to cultural influences although it is a measure with good internal consistency,
40
41 temporal stability, and construct validity. A warning for studies of handedness in Portugal
42
43 and perhaps other countries should be added: incidence of hand preference from one
44
45 region/area of the country should not be compared with data from another region/area
46
47 without a consideration of the potential cultural or biological factors. More generally, for the
48
49 practicing neuropsychologist, this study serves two main purposes. The first is to establish the
50
51 EHI as a valid measure for evaluating handedness with individuals from Portugal. The
52
53 second is to provide information regarding the difference in lateralization amongst
54
55 individuals from these areas. In the setting of pre-surgical epilepsy evaluations or other
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

important neurological evaluations of language lateralization, the EHI scores obtained may not be adequate for this purpose in non-North American individuals. Future research correlating EHI scores to fMRI results would be illustrative in this scenario.

For Peer Review Only

Footnotes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. The Portuguese school system comprises the first cycle of basic education which includes the 1st to 4th grade; the second cycle of basic education that includes the 5th to 6th grade; the third cycle of basic education with 7th to 9th grades; secondary education with the 10th to 12th grade; and higher education that corresponds to university or college.

2. In the Portuguese educational system (pre-Bologna, 2005), high school took 12 years, a college degree 4 to 6 years (depending on the course), a master's degree 2 years, a doctoral degree 4 years, and a post-doctoral degree 3 years. Before 2005, it was not uncommon to take 3-4 years to get a master's degree and more than 4 years to a doctoral degree, and that is why two participants have 28 years of education. After 2006, a full education can still take 23 years without failing.

References

- Agresti, A. (2010). *Analysis of ordinal categorical data*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Annett, M. (1970). A classification of hand preference by association analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, *61*, 303-321. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1970.tb01248.x
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2014). IBM SPSS® Amos™ 23 user's guide. Amos Development Corporation. Retrieved from ftp://public.dhe.ibm.com/software/analytics/spss/documentation/amos/23.0/en/Manuals/IBM_SPSS_Amos_User_Guide.pdf
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *16*(1), 74-94. doi: 10.1007/BF02723327
- Barbieri, F. A., & Gobbi, L. T. B. (2009). Assimetrias laterais no movimento de chute e rendimento no futebol e no futsal [Lateral asymmetry in the kicking motion and performance in football and futsal]. *Motricidade*, *5*(2), 33-47. doi: 10.6063/motricidade.5(2).180
- Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS) approach to causal modelling: personal computer adoption and use as an illustration. *Technology Studies*, *2*(2), 285-309.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *SPINE*, *25*(24), 3186-3191.
- Bolinskey, P. K., Iati, C. A., Hunter, H. K., & Novi, J. H. (2013). Season of birth, mixed-handedness, and psychometric schizotypy: Preliminary results from a prospective study. *Psychiatry Research*, *208*(3), 210-214. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2012.12.023
- Bryden, M. P. (1977). Measuring handedness with questionnaires. *Neuropsychologia*, *15*(4-5), 617-624. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(77)90067-7
- Buchner, A., Erdfelder, E., Faul, F. e Lang, A.-G. (2014). *G*Power 3* (Version 3.1.9.2 for Macintosh) [Informatic software]. Düsseldorf: Heinrich-Heine-Universität Dusseldorf.

Retrieved from <http://www.gpower.hhu.de/en.html>

- Büsch, D., Hagemann, N., & Bender, N. (2010). The dimensionality of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: an analysis with models of the item response theory. *Laterality*, 15(6), 610-628. doi: 10.1080/13576500903081806
- Chang, A. (2014). *StatsToDo* [Online calculator]. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.statstodo.com/SSiz1Alpha_Pgm.php#
- Christman, S. D., Prichard, E. C., & Corser, R. (2015). Factor analysis of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: Inconsistent handedness yields a two-factor solution. *Brain and Cognition*, 98, 82-86. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2015.06.005
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of testes. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Dragovic, M. (2004a). Towards an improved measure of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: A one-factor congeneric measurement model using confirmatory factor analysis. *Laterality*, 9(4), 411-419. doi:10.1080/13576500342000248
- Dragovic, M. (2004b). Categorization and validation of handedness using latent class analysis. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica*, 16(4), 212-218. doi: 10.1111/j.0924-2708.2004.00087.x
- Dragovic, M., & Hammond, G. (2005). Handedness in schizophrenia: A quantitative review of evidence. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 111, 410-419.
- Dragovic, M., Milenkovic, S., & Hammond, G. (2008). The distribution of hand preference is discrete: A taxometric examination. *British Journal of Psychology*, 99, 445-459. doi: 10.1348/000712608X304450
- Edlin, J. M., Leppanen, M. L., Fain, R. J., & Hackländer, R. P. (2015). On the use (and misuse?) of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. *Brain and Cognition*, 94, 44-51. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2015.01.003

- 1
2
3 Fagard, J., & Dahmen, R. (2010). Cultural influences on the development of lateral
4 preferences: A comparison between French and Tunisian children. *Laterality*, *9*(1), 67-
5 78. doi: 10.1080/13576500342000167
6
7
8
9
10 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007a). G*Power 3: A Flexible
11 Statistical Power Analysis Program for the Social, Behavioral, and Biomedical Sciences.
12 *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191.
13
14
15
16 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007b). G*Power 3 (Version 3.1.9.2 for
17 Windows 10) [Computer Program]. Düsseldorf: Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf.
18 Retrieved from <http://www.gpower.hhu.de/en.html>
19
20
21
22
23 Fazio, R. L., & Cantor, J. M. (2015). Factor Structure of the Edinburgh Handedness
24 Inventory versus the Fazio Laterality Inventory in a Population with established atypical
25 handedness. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, *9095*(April), 1-5.
26 doi:10.1080/23279095.2014.940043
27
28
29
30
31
32 Fazio, R., Coenen, C., & Denney, R. L. (2012). The original instructions for the Edinburgh
33 Handedness Inventory are misunderstood by a majority of participants. *Laterality*, *17*(1),
34 70-77. doi: 10.1080/1357650X.2010.532801
35
36
37
38
39 Fazio, R. L., Lykins, A. D., & Cantor, J. M. (2014). Elevated rates of atypical handedness in
40 paedophilia: Theory and implications. *Laterality*, *19*(6), 690-704.
41 <http://doi.org/10.1080/1357650X.2014.898648>
42
43
44
45 **Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables**
46 **and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39–50.**
47
48
49
50 Ghirlanda, S., & Vallortigara, G. (2004). The evolution of brain lateralization: a game-
51 theoretical analysis of population structure. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences / The*
52 *Royal Society*, *271*(1541), 853-7. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2669
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 disorder. *Journal of Child Neurology*, 23(2), 151-154.
- 4
5 Greenwood, J. G., Greenwood, J. J., McCullagh, J. F., Beggs, J., & Murphy, C. A. (2006). A
6
7 survey of sidedness in Northern Irish school children: The interaction of sex, age and
8
9 task. *Laterality*, 12(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/13576500600886630
- 10
11
12 Hardie, S. M., & Wright, L. (2014). Differences between left- and right-handers in
13
14 approach/avoidance motivation: influence of consistency of handedness measures.
15
16 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 134. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00134
- 17
18 Hill, M. M., & Hill, A. (2000). *Investigação por questionário* (1st ed.) [Research by
19
20 questionnaire]. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- 21
22
23 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
24
25 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*,
26
27 6(1), 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- 28
29 Instituto Nacional de Estatística (2014). *Estatísticas Demográficas 2011* [Demographic
30
31 Statistics 2011]. Lisboa: INE.
- 32
33
34 Jöreskog, K. G. (1971a). Statistical analysis of sets of congeneric test. *Psychometrika*, 36,
35
36 109–133. doi:10.1007/BF02291393
- 37
38 Jöreskog, K. G. (1971b). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika*,
39
40 36, 409-426. doi:10.1007/BF02291366
- 41
42
43 Jöreskog, K. G. (1994). On the estimation of polychoric correlations and their asymptotic
44
45 covariance matrix. *Psychometrika*, 59, 381–389. doi:10.1007/BF02296131
- 46
47 Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution.
48
49 *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52-54. doi: 10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52
- 50
51
52 Lai, A., Serra, M., Petretto, D. R., Masala, C., & Preti, A. (2014). Patterns of hand preference
53
54 in Italian adolescent high-school students. *Laterality*, 19(6), 718-744. doi:
55
56 10.1080/1357650X.2014.911747
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lange, N. (2010). Atypical diffusion tensor hemispheric asymmetry in autism. *Autism*
4
5 *Research*, 3(6), 350-358. doi: 10.1002/aur.162
6
7 Leask, D. S. J., & Beaton, A. A. (2007). Handedness in Great Britain. *Laterality*, 12(6), 559-
8
9 572. doi: 10.1080/13576500701541936
10
11 Marôco, J. (2011). *Análise Estatística com o SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.) [Statistical analysis with
12
13 SPSS statistics]. Pêro Pinheiro: ReportNumber.
14
15 Martin, M., Papadatou-Pastou, M., Jones, G. V., & Munafò, M. R. (2010). Sex and location
16
17 as determinants of handedness: Reply to Vuoksima and Kaprio (2010). *Psychological*
18
19 *Bulletin*, 136, 348-350.
20
21 McFarland, K., & Anderson, J. L. (1980). Factor stability of the Edinburgh Handedness
22
23 Inventory as a function of test-retest performance, age and sex. *British Journal of*
24
25 *Psychology*, 71(1), 135-142. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.1980.tb02739.x
26
27
28
29
30 McManus, I. C., Moore, J., Freegard, M., & Rawles, R. (2010). Science in the making: Right
31
32 hand, left hand. III: Estimating historical rates of left-handedness. *Laterality*, 15, 186-
33
34 208. doi:10.1080/ 13576500802565313
35
36 Medland, S. E., Duffy, D. L., Wright, M. J., Geffen, G. M., Hay, D. A., Levy, F., ... Hewitt,
37
38 A. W. (2009). Genetic influences on handedness: data from 25,732 Australian and
39
40 Dutch twin families. *Neuropsychologia*, 47(2), 330-337. doi:
41
42 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.09.005
43
44 Medland E, S., Perelle, I., Monte De, V., & Ehrman, L. (2004). Effects of culture, sex, and
45
46 age on the distribution of handedness: An evaluation of the sensitivity of three measures
47
48 of handedness. *Laterality*, 9(3), 287-297.
49
50 Merni, F., Di Michele, R., & Soffritti, G. (2014). Assessment of handedness using latent class
51
52 factor analysis. *Laterality*, 19(4), 405-423. doi: 10.1080/1357650X.2013.845572
53
54 Messinger, H. B., & Messinger, M. I. (1995). Factoring handedness data: I. Item analysis.
55
56 *Cortex*, 31(4), 757-765. doi:10.1016/S0010-9452(13)80026-3
57
58 Milenkovic, S., & Dragovic, M. (2013). Modification of the Edinburgh Handedness
59
60

Inventory: a replication study. *Laterality*, 18(3), 340-348. doi:
10.1080/1357650X.2012.683196

Millsap, R. E. (2012). *Statistical approaches to measurement invariance*. New York, NY:
Routledge.

Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh Inventory.
Neuropsychologia, 9(1), 97-113. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for
Windows* (4th ed.). Crows Nest NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Papadatou-Pastou, M., Martin, M., Munafò, M. R., & Jones, G. V. (2008). Sex differences in
left-handeness: A meta-analysis of 144 studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(5), 677-
699. doi: 10.1037/a0012814

Payne, M. A. (1987). Impact of cultural pressures on self-reports of actual and approved hand
use. *Neuropsychologia*, 25(1 PART 2), 247-258. doi:10.1016/0028-3932(87)90135-7

Perelle, I. B., & Ehrman, L. (1994). An international study of human handedness: The data.
Behavior Genetics, 24(3), 217-227. doi: 10.1007/BF01067189

Pestana, M. H., & Gageiro, J. N. (2008). *Análise de dados para ciências sociais; A
complementaridade do SPSS* (5th ed.) [Data analysis for the social sciences;
Complementarity SPSS]. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.

Pogetti, L. S., De Souza, R. M., Tudella, E., & Teixeira, L. A. (2013). Visibilidade dos braços
afeta a preferência manual em bebês [Visibility of arms affect the hand preference in
infants]. *Motriz. Revista de Educação Física*, 19(1), 160-170. doi: 10.1590/S1980-
65742013000100016

PORDATA (2015). População residente com 15 e mais anos segundo os Censos: total e por nível
de escolaridade completo mais elevado [Resident population aged 15 and over, according to
the Census: total and by highest level of educational qualifications obtained]. Retrieved from
<http://www.pordata.pt/Municipios/População+residente+com+15+e+mais+anos+segundo+os>

- +Censos+total+e+por+n%C3%ADvel+de+escolaridade+completo+mais+elevado-69-257
- Preti, A., Sisti, D., Rocchi, M. B., Busca, M., Vellante, M., Camboni, M. V. ... Masala, C. (2011). Male-female differences in left-handedness in Sardinia, Italy. *Laterality*, *16*(6), 737-752. doi:10.1080/1357650X.2010.515991
- Razali, N. M., & Wah, Y. B. (2011). Power comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Lilliefors and Anderson-Darling tests. *Journal of Statistical Modeling and Analytics*, *2*, 21-33.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (1978). A factor analysis of self-reported handedness. *Neuropsychologia*, *16*(6), 747-748. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(78)90010-6
- Satz, P., Nelson, L., & Green, M. (1989). Ambiguous-handedness: incidence in a non-clinical sample. *Neuropsychologia*, *27*(10), 1309-1310.
- Shaw, J., Claridge, G., & Clark, K. (2001). Schizotypy and the shift from dextrality: A study of handedness in a large non-clinical sample. *Schizophrenia Research*, *50*(3), 181-189. doi: 10.1016/S0920-9964(00)00167-5
- Soper, H. V., & Satz, P. (1984). Pathological left-handedness and ambiguous handedness: A new explanatory model. *Neuropsychologia*, *22*(4), 511-515.
- Souza, R. M., & Teixeira, L. A. (2011). Sobre a relação entre filogenia e ontogenia no desenvolvimento da lateralidade na infância [On the relationship between phylogeny and ontogeny in the development of laterality in childhood]. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, *24*(1), 62-70. doi: 10.1590/S0102-79722011000100008
- van Strien, J. W. (2002). *The Dutch Handedness Questionnaire*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/956>
- Tsuang, H. C., Chen, W. J., & Kuo, S. Y. (2013). The cross-cultural nature of the relationship between schizotypy and mixed-handedness. *Laterality*, *18*(4), 476-490. doi: 10.1080/1357650X.2012.720985

1
2
3 Veale, J. F. (2014). Edinburgh Handedness Inventory - short form: A revised version based
4
5 on confirmatory factor analysis. *Laterality*, 19(2), 164-77. doi:
6
7 10.1080/1357650X.2013.783045
8

9
10 Viggiano, M. P., Borelli, P., Vannucci, M., & Rocchetti, G. (2001). Hand preference in
11
12 Italian students. *Laterality*, 6(3), 283-286. doi: 10.1080/713754412
13

14 Williams, S. M. (1986). Factor analysis of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. *Cortex*,
15
16 22(2), 325-326. doi:10.1016/S0010-9452(86)80058-2
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Handedness remains relevant for neuropsychologists in an increasingly multicultural society. The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI) is persistently the most used inventory to evaluate handedness. Despite this, the cultural influences on EHI performance are poorly understood generally, and there is no information on how this instrument functions in a Portuguese population. The objective of this study was therefore to examine the sociodemographic influences on handedness in Portugal and establish psychometric properties of the EHI in a Portuguese sample. The sample consisted of 342 people (157 men and 185 women), aged between 18 and 65 years. All participants completed an informed consent form and a battery of neuropsychological tests. The mean EHI Laterality Quotient (LQ) was 63.52 ($SD = 38.00$). The results showed that from six sociodemographic variables (age, sex, education, area of residence, regions, and profession), only three showed significant influence on EHI scores. The reliability and temporal reliability of EHI were adequate. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the model was explained by a one-factor model. The present data give support for the notion that handedness measured by EHI is sensitive to cultural influences.

Keywords: Handedness; Hand Preference; Edinburgh Handedness Inventory; Psychometric Properties.

Introduction

Handedness is still a common consideration for neuropsychologists, who practice in increasingly culturally diverse settings. Handedness is a broad concept involving a variety of neural and behavioral processes (Barbieri & Gobbi, 2009; Strien, 2002). Both genetic and epigenetic factors (i.e., environmental and cultural) influence handedness (Pogetti, De Souza, Tudella & Teixeira, 2013; Souza & Teixeira, 2011). Specifically, by some estimates, genetic effects account for only about 24% of the variance in hand preference (Medland et al., 2009). Although it has not been determined exactly what percent is explained by the effects of culture, there are some indications it plays an important role. For example, Strien (2002) found in his study that the choice of hand for writing is influenced by culture; the cultural differences demonstrated in the survey by Perelle and Ehrman (1994) are also quite striking. Considering that there is a social pressure for using the right hand, the environment likely plays a primary role in establishing laterality (Souza & Teixeira, 2011).

Before delving further into these cultural phenomena, however, the methodological issue of the measurement of handedness and the effects of such must also be dealt with. It is well known that manual preference of humans is primarily classified into two distinct groups: having a dominant right hand (*right-handed*) or a dominant left hand (*left-handed*). However, in some cases, this dichotomy is accompanied by a third category: individuals who use both hands, whether this is indiscriminately or with set patterns of hand use for certain tasks (*ambiguous-handedness* and *mixed-handedness*) (Dragovic, Milenkovic, & Hammond, 2008). To evaluate handedness, the two methods most commonly used include observation of the use of the dominant hand and the application of inventories answered by the individual (Barbieri & Gobbi, 2009). The three most popular inventories (Strien, 2002) are by Crovitz and Zener (1962), Annett (1970), and Oldfield (1971). The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI; Oldfield, 1971) is the most used from the previous three (Fazio & Cantor, 2015; Veale, 2014). The EHI offers the advantage of being a simple and brief method of evaluating laterality using a quantitative scale (Oldfield, 1971).

The first version of the Oldfield Inventory was based on a modified version of the Humphrey inventory with 20 items (Büsch, Hagemann, & Bender, 2010). There is evidence the original instructions and answer format were difficult to understand, and included problematic items (Fazio et al., 2012; Oldfield, 1971; Veale, 2014). These issues have been improved over several versions (Veale, 2014). The most often used version of the Oldfield Inventory contains 10 items about handedness involving 10 motor tasks [*writing, drawing,*

1
2
3 *throwing, scissors, toothbrush, knife (without fork), spoon, broom (upper hand), striking*
4 *match (match), opening box (lid)]* (Büsch et al., 2010; Oldfield, 1971).

6 This study is dedicated to the EHI, given it is widely utilized in the determination of
7 hand preference. As a small sample, the EHI has been studied in populations from England
8 and Scotland (Oldfield, 1971), Canada (Bryden, 1977), Australia (Dragovic, 2004a), the
9 United States (Messinger & Messinger, 1995), and Serbia (Milenkovic & Dragovic, 2013).
10 The focus of these studies, however, has largely not included possible cultural differences in
11 handedness, potentially explaining a portion of the discrepancies in psychometric properties
12 found amongst studies. There is a lack of information entirely regarding psychometric
13 properties of the EHI for the Portuguese population; to fill this gap, this study is based on the
14 Normative Studies of Neuropsychological Instruments project (ENIN, *Estudos Normativos*
15 *de Instrumentos Neuropsicológicos*), developed at the Miguel Torga Institute.

16
17
18 The general goal is to study the psychometric properties of the EHI in an adult sample
19 of the Portuguese population, in order to determine the rates of right- left-, and other-
20 handedness in this population. Other specific objectives included to: 1) Determine the
21 descriptive statistics for the EHI; 2) Check the role of sociodemographic variables on EHI
22 scores and handedness preference; 3) Analyze the reliability of the EHI (through Cronbach's
23 alpha) and temporal stability (through test-retest); 4) Run a confirmatory factor analysis.

34 35 36 **Methods**

37 38 ***Participants***

39
40 To maintain adequate power in statistical analyses, the intended sample should not be under
41 115, as the power analysis through G*Power software revealed (Buchner, Erdfelder, Faul, &
42 Lang, 2014; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007a, 2007b). A total of 342 volunteers were
43 actually included in the present analyses. Participants were recruited among family, friends,
44 and colleagues of students from neuropsychology classes of our Institute. Each student made
45 a list of all potential participants, totaling 765 individuals. Afterwards prospective
46 participants were randomly selected, with stratification for age, sex, and education in a total
47 of 357 subjects. Of these, six people refused to participate (1.7%). Participants did not
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 receive any financial compensation for joining but were given the option to receive the
4
5 results and their meaning if requested [64 participants asked for results (17.9%)].
6

7 Present data were acquired as part of the ENIN. Because of that, the selection criteria
8
9 included: a) being able to read and write in Portuguese; b) having Portuguese nationality or
10
11 living in Portugal for more than 5 years; c) having more than 50% of their education in
12
13 Portugal; d) age between 18 and 65. Based on these criteria, 15 volunteers were excluded
14
15 because age was inferior to 18 years (4.2%).
16

17
18 The participants in the sample were stratified according to their age, with stratification
19
20 comprising six age groups: 18-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59 and 60-65 years. Participants
21
22 were also stratified according to their educational level. Five educational groups were
23
24 formed: the first cycle of basic education, the second cycle of basic education, the third cycle
25
26 of basic education, secondary education, and higher education¹. The regions category was
27
28 created according to Portuguese territorial units, where the South and the Autonomous
29
30 Regions were merged for statistical analysis.
31
32

33
34 Finally, participants were classified into *right-handed*, *ambiguous*, and *left-handed*, in
35
36 accordance with several authors who, in their studies about handedness, also opted for three
37
38 categories (Fazio et al., 2012; Milenkovic & Dragovic, 2013; Pogetti et al., 2013; Strien,
39
40 2002; Veale, 2014).
41
42

43 44 ***Procedures***

45
46 All participants filled out an informed consent form in accordance with the Helsinki
47
48 Declaration. The EHI was administered as part of a neuropsychological battery. The tests
49
50 were administered individually, in reserved areas without any distractive elements. The
51
52 complete neuropsychological battery had a duration of 1 hour and took place between
53
54 November 2014 and March 2015.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Instruments

The Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield, 1971) determines hand preference (Büsch et al., 2010; Oldfield, 1971), and consists of ten items (writing, drawing, throwing, using scissors, a toothbrush, cutting with a knife, using spoon, the upper hand when using a broom, striking a match, and opening the lid of a box). On the response sheet, each item is followed by two columns labelled “left” and “right”. The subject indicates “++” in the “left” or “right” column if they strongly prefer to use one hand for that task, “+” if the preference for using one hand is weak, and “-” in both columns if they are indifferent (Oldfield, 1971). Each “++” symbol is scored as 2 points and “+” as 1 point; therefore, the **quotient** of laterality may range between -100 (preference of “strong left”) and +100 (preference of “strong right”) and, finally, the formula is applied for the Laterality Quotient: $LQ = [(R - L)/(R+L) \times 100]$ (Oldfield, 1971).

For the Portuguese EHI version, the guidelines proposed by Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemain and Ferraz (2000) were followed. A psychologist translated the EHI, and a person with no knowledge in the field of Psychology made a naïve translation. Both translations were compared, creating a consensual version with minor changes. Another psychologist back translated to English. Translation and back translation were compared, and the final version was created with no alterations.

Statistical analysis

For the analysis and processing of data, the statistical program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Statistics, version 20.0 for Windows 10, SPSS, 2011) was used. For the preliminary analyses, descriptive statistics were computed for the EHI total scores, including means and standard deviations.

1
2
3 Using the cut-off of 60 for EHI LQ (Hardie & Wright, 2014; Milenkovic & Dragovic,
4 2013; Veale, 2014), handedness was classified as right-handed (100 to 61), ambiguous (-60
5 to 60), and left-handed (-61 to -100). After this, frequencies and percentages were calculated
6 and chi-square tests for goodness of fit were computed. To evaluate the association between
7 each pair of handedness item, odds ratio (*OR*) were used (Agresti, 2010).
8
9

10
11 To explore the proportion of handedness cases that fall into each category of every
12 sociodemographic variable, the chi-square test of independence (Mantel-Haenzsel linear-by-
13 linear association/*MH*) or likelihood-ratio (G^2) were computed as appropriate according to
14 the variable's nature (Agresti, 2010). *T*-test/ANOVA was used to explore the effects of
15 sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, education, area of residence, region, and
16 profession) on EHI scores. For the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the homogeneity of
17 variances according to the Levene's test was determined. Whenever there was homogeneity
18 ($p > .05$), a Hochberg *post hoc* was used, otherwise a Games-Howell post hoc was used, both
19 with the Bonferroni correction ($p/\text{number of pairwise comparisons}$) (Marôco, 2011).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 For the analysis of the psychometric properties, internal consistency was determined
35 by Cronbach's alpha. For test-retest analysis, Pearson's correlations (r) and *t*-tests for paired
36 samples (2-tailed; $p < .05$) were computed. The *t*-test for paired samples was used to verify if
37 the means between the two moments of evaluation were different or which one of them was
38 higher.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a maximum likelihood approach was
46 performed using AMOS software version 23 (Arbuckle, 2014) taking in consideration the
47 following aspects: a) items were considered as categorical variables and analysed by
48 polychoric correlations (Jöreskog, 1994); b) as a parameter of fit estimation, the ratio of χ^2 to
49 the degrees of freedom (*df*) was computed, considering values lower than 3 as indicators of
50 good fit of the model (Hu & Bentler, 1999); c) the Tucker-Lewis coefficient (*TLI*) was
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 calculated as another measure of goodness of fit, with values over 0.90 indicating good fit
4
5 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); d) another parameter for fit estimation was the comparative fit index
6
7 (*CFI*), with values larger than 0.90 indicating acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline,
8
9 2005); e) the root mean square error of approximation (*RMSEA*) was an additional index with
10
11 values lower than 0.08 suggesting good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005).

12
13
14 Finally, the reliability of the construct was calculated using the composite reliability
15
16 (*CR*) estimate for the latent variable, which should be greater than 0.7; Jöreskog, 1971a). The
17
18 factorial validity (individual reliability) was examined by analysing items' standardized
19
20 weights, which, ideally, should exceed the recommended minimum of 0.60 (Bagozzi & Yi,
21
22 1988); however, standardized weights between 0.5 and 0.6 are accepted when scales are
23
24 applied in different contexts (Barclay et al. 1995). Convergent validity, or how much
25
26 variance in the measured items is captured by a latent construct, was assessed by
27
28 investigating the mean extracted variance (*MEV*) (an acceptable level should be above 0.5;
29
30 Fornell & Larcker, 1981).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Results

40 Sociodemographic

41
42 Ages of participants ranged between 18 and 65 years old ($M = 32.12$, $SD = 13.43$). Of the
43
44 participants, 45.9% were men and 54.1% women. The time of their formal education ranged
45
46 from 4 to 28 years of education² ($M = 14.49$, $SD = 4.07$).

47
48 Regarding area of residence, 75.1% of individuals lived in urban areas, 5.6% in a
49
50 transition area, and 19.3% in rural areas. As a result of recategorization, 17.8% lived in the
51
52 North, 67.3% in the Centre, 7% lived in the Lisbon, and 7.9% in the South-Autonomous
53
54 Regions. Concerning profession, 12.1% were in the manual category (i.e., workers) and
55
56 87.9% in the intellectual category (i.e., technical). Thirty-six individuals did not provide us
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 any information regarding their profession. Full demographic information can be seen in
4
5 Table 1.
6
7
8

9
10 (Table 1 about here)
11

12 13 14 ***Preliminary analysis*** 15

16 The mean EHI LQ was 63.52 ($SD = 38.00$). The distribution of EHI scores was negatively
17 asymmetrical and leptokurtic. The Shapiro-Wilk test revealed a non-normal distribution ($p <$
18 $.001$). Nevertheless, the skewness (-1.44) and kurtosis (2.03) were within the Kim (2013)
19 values; therefore, parametric statistical analyses were conducted. When using a cut-off of 60
20 for EHI LQ, of the participants, 59.1% were *right-handed* (202 in number), 40.4% were
21 *ambiguous-handed*, and 0.6% reported being *left-handed*. Handedness was not equally
22 distributed in the sample [$\chi^2(2, N = 342) = 183.02; p < .001$].
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 These results should be read in the light of what is *true ambiguousness* and *mixed-*
33 *handedness*. *True ambiguousness* could be considered as having a high number of “either”
34 responses or indifferent/inconsistent hand use *within* an item, and *mixed-handed* as having
35 “left” and “right” responses or inconsistency *across* items (Fazio, Lykins, & Cantor, 2014;
36 Shaw, Claridge, & Clark, 2001). Some have established a high number of “either” responses
37 as two (Fazio et al., 2014), but others have referred to inconsistencies on three or more tasks
38 (Satz, Nelson, & Green, 1989). This calculation methodology is not well-established, so some
39 procedure variations were tested.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 First, following Fazio et al.’s methodology (2014), *ambiguous-handedness* was
50 defined as having more or equal to two “either” responses. To start, the number of each type
51 of response was calculated, resulting in five new continuous variables (designated strong
52 right, weak right, strong left, weak left, and either). Because there were no weak responses,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this kind of response was not considered. Then combinations of strong right, strong left, and
4
5 either counts were considered resulting in new categories. As such, ambiguous-handedness
6
7 corresponded to the following combinations: 2-10 “either” responses, 0-8 “right” responses,
8
9 and/or 0-8 “left” responses; mixed-handed corresponded to combinations of 0-1 “either”, 1-9
10
11 “right” and 1-9 “left” responses (at least one “right” and one “left” must be present); right-
12
13 handed to combinations 9-10 “right” and 0-1 “either”; and left-handed to combinations 9-10
14
15 “left” with 0-1 “either”. As a consequence of this classification, 54.4% of the total sample
16
17 were truly ambiguous, although 89.8% also had between 1 to 8 “right” responses, and 14.0%
18
19 had between 1 to 8 “left” responses. As mixed-handed there were 11.4% participants, with
20
21 21.6% of them having 1 “either” response. Of those participants categorized as ambiguously
22
23 handed (by means of cut-off of 60), 91.4% were truly ambiguous and 8.6% mixed-handed.
24
25 The two types of handedness categorization were significantly associated ($MH(1, N = 342) =$
26
27 $135.67, p < .001$).

28
29
30
31
32 Second, using the number of items for which an “either” response was given as a
33
34 continuous variable (Shaw et al. (2001) did the same for the Annett scale), a high number
35
36 was having more or equal to five of the ten possible responses. In the resulting categories,
37
38 *true ambiguous-handed* corresponded to 5-10 “either” responses, 0-5 “right” responses,
39
40 and/or 0-5 “left” responses; *mixed-handed* to combinations of 0-4 “either”, 0-9 “right” and/or
41
42 0-9 “left” responses (at least one “right” and one “left” must be present); *right-handed* to
43
44 combinations 10-6 “right”, 0-4 “either” or 0-1 “left”; and *left-handed* to combinations 6-10
45
46 “left” and 0-4 “either”. In this classification, 27.5% of the total sample were *truly ambiguous*,
47
48 among these 81.9% had between 1 and 5 “right” responses and 19.0% up to five “left”
49
50 responses, and no one had 10 “either” responses. As *mixed-handed* there were 4.1%
51
52 participants. Of participants categorized as ambiguously handed (cut-off of 60), 67.6% were
53
54 *truly ambiguous*, 10.1% *mixed-handed*, 0% *left-handed*, and 22.3% *right-handed*. The two
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 types of handedness categorization were significantly associated ($MH(1, N = 342) = 224.15$,
4
5 $p < .001$).

6
7 The third solution allowed “pure” categories to emerge, and true ambiguousness did
8
9 not include any mixed handedness. So for *true ambiguousness* the high number was
10
11 considered whenever “either” counts surpassed the counts of the “right” or “left” responses
12
13 (individually or added up), and for *mixed-handed* when the number of response type in two
14
15 or three variables were equal, and if the same procedure is used, then new combinations of
16
17 *strong right*, *strong left*, and *either* resulted in: *ambiguous-handed* corresponded to 6-10
18
19 “either” responses, 0-4 “right” responses, and/or 0-4 “left” responses; *mixed-handed* to
20
21 combinations of 0-5 “either”, 0-9 “right” and/or 0-9 “left responses (at least one “right” and
22
23 one “left” must be present). Then 19.3% were *truly ambiguousness*, with 81.8% also having
24
25 between 1 and 4 “right” responses, and 18.2% between 2 to 4 “left” responses (there were no
26
27 mixed answers). As *mixed-handed* there were 21.6% participants, with 58.1% of them having
28
29 between 1 and 5 “either” response, 93.2% had between 1 and 9 “right” responses, and 79.3%
30
31 had between 1 and 8 “left” responses. Ambiguously handed participants (EHI LQ cut-off of \pm
32
33 60) included 47.5% *truly ambiguous*, 33.8% *mixed-handed*, 0.7% *left-handed*, and 18.0%
34
35 *right-handed*. Also, the two types of handedness categorization were significantly associated
36
37 ($MH(1, N = 342) = 178.87$, $p < .001$).

38
39 Given the results of the three solutions, for the purposes of the following analysis,
40
41 “ambiguousness” will be used in *lato sensu*.

42
43 From the item by item analysis (Table 2) it was determined that for the items *broom*
44
45 and *box* the percentages were slightly higher in the *ambiguous* category. Even on these two
46
47 items, however, the observed proportion of participants who reported performing this activity
48
49 with both the right hand and with the left hand (*ambiguous*) was very similar to the
50
51 percentage of participants who reported performing this activity with only the right hand. For
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the items *writing* and *drawing* the lowest percentages of *ambiguous* were observed. These
4
5 were items in which participants indicated more extreme responses, and it was where the
6
7 highest percentages of *right-handed* and *left-handed* responses were found. Notably, the *left-*
8
9 *handed* responses for these two items were the same people. The items *broom* and *box* were
10
11 the other two items where the highest percentages of *left-handers* were found.
12

13
14
15
16 (Table 2 about here)
17
18
19

20
21 High positive associations were found for all the pairs of items ($p < .001$). The highest
22
23 associations occurred between the items *writing* and *drawing* ($OR = 165.71$), *scissors* and
24
25 *brush* ($OR = 129.94$), *scissors* and *spoon* ($OR = 110.77$), *scissors* and *striking match* ($OR =$
26
27 123.48), *brush* and *spoon* ($OR = 163.27$), *brush* and *knife* ($OR = 118.34$), *brush* and *striking*
28
29 *match* ($OR = 133.94$), *spoon* and *knife* ($OR = 123.02$), *spoon* and *striking match* ($OR =$
30
31 146.85), *spoon* and *box* ($OR = 114.90$), and *knife* and *striking match* ($OR = 139.14$).
32
33
34
35

36 ***Role of sociodemographic variables***

37
38 From Table 3, it can be seen that regarding age, the highest percentages of right-handed
39
40 individuals fall in the 18-19, 40-49, and 50-59 age categories; the frequencies showed little
41
42 variation, but the linear-by-linear association was not statistical significant ($MH (1, N = 342)$
43
44 $= 1.43; p = .232$). Hand preference across ages varied in some activities: individuals ages 31-
45
46 40 and 61-70 were equally likely to be classified as *right-handed* or *ambiguous-handed* in
47
48 using a *knife* or a *spoon* (MH respectively $1.79, p < .05$; and $= 12.63, p < .001$); 18-30, 31-40,
49
50 and 61-70 participants were more likely to be categorized as *ambiguous-handed* in *opening a*
51
52 *box* ($MH (1, N = 342) = 17.10; p < .001$).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Regarding sex, women were slightly more dexterous than men. However, the chi-
4 square test for independence (linear-by-linear association) indicated no significant association
5 between sex and handedness. The same was verified in each item: there was no relationship
6 between sex and nine of the ten variables representing the range of handedness preference
7 (G^2 between 0.23 and 2.74, $p > .05$), except for using a *broom*, where females were likely to
8 be classified as *right-handed* or *ambiguous-handed*, and males more likely to be classified as
9 *ambiguous-handed* ($G^2 (2, N = 342) = 6.42, p < .05$).

10
11 For education, the proportion of right-handers was larger in the first, second, and third
12 cycle of basic education than secondary education and higher education. In secondary
13 education and higher education, the percentages of *right-handed* and *ambiguous* were similar.
14 There was no association between education and hand preference across the ten items ($p >$
15 $.05$). Regarding profession, *right-handedness* prevailed in the manual category, but there was
16 no association with each EHI item (G^2 between .20 and 3.65, $p > .05$).

17
18 Concerning residence area, there was a greater number of right-handers in the
19 transition area; in rural areas there were more *ambiguous* individuals than *right-handed*.
20 Regarding the regions, a greater proportion of *ambiguousness* was observed both in Lisbon
21 and in the South-Autonomous Regions compared to the North and the Center where the
22 population appears more *right-handed*. The same happened for all activities (G^2 between
23 18.20, $p < .01$ and 74.04, $p < .001$).

24
25 These observations fell mostly in the *right-handed* and *ambiguous* categories, as there
26 were only two subjects in the *left-handed* category; it was therefore not feasible to perform
27 comparison to other categories. As is apparent from Table 3, these individuals were in the age
28 groups of 20-29 and 40-49 years old, a woman and a man who completed the second cycle of
29 basic education and higher education, resided in the urban areas of the North regions, and
30 practiced an intellectual profession.

1
2
3
4
5 (Table 3 about here)
6
7
8
9

10 Table 4 illustrates the differences in EHI LQ mean scores between groups defined by
11 sociodemographic variables with *t*-test/ANOVA values as appropriate. The scores on the EHI
12 LQ differed significantly among the six age groups [$F(5, 336) = 3.64; p < .01; \eta^2 = 0.05$].
13 Regarding sex, there were no statistically significant differences [$t(340) = 1.49; p = .136$;
14 Cohen's $d = 0.16$]. Level of education had no influence on EHI LQ [$F(4, 337) = 0.69; p =$
15 $.598; \eta^2 = 0.008$]. With regard to the three residential areas, the scores on the EHI were
16 statistically different [$F(2, 339) = 3.30; p < .05; \eta^2 = 0.02$]. The scores on the EHI LQ
17 differed significantly among the four regions as well [$F(3, 338) = 19.71; p < .001; \eta^2 = 0.15$].
18 Profession did not influence EHI LQ [$t(304) = 0.51; p = .62$; Cohen's $d = 0.10$].
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 (Table 4 about here)
33
34
35

36 The Hochberg post hoc test (Table 5) with Bonferroni correction indicated differences
37 between age category 20-29 and 50-59 with EHI LQ, with there being more *ambiguous* in the
38 first and more *right-handed* in the 50-59 category. About the area of residence, the Games-
39 Howell post hoc test showed differences between the rural and transition area for EHI LQ. As
40 for the regions, the Hochberg *post hoc* test was used with the Bonferroni correction, where
41 differences were found between the North and Lisbon; the North and South-Autonomous
42 Regions; the Centre and Lisbon; and the Center and the South-Autonomous Regions for EHI
43 LQ. There were more *right-handed* people in the North than Lisbon and South-Autonomous
44 Regions; in Lisbon and South-Autonomous Regions, *ambiguousness* prevailed.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Table 5 about here)

To check if these results could be explained by potential differences in education or profession among area of residence and regions, correlations were computed between EHI LQ scores and those variables in the subgroups defined by area/regions. For education, the only significant correlation was found with EHI LQ in the North region ($r = -0.28$; $p < .05$), where the level of education was significantly lower ($M = 12.67$; $SD = 4.28$). For profession, participants with manual occupations had higher EHI LQ scores in the transition areas ($r = -0.51$; $p < .05$).

Psychometric properties

Reliability. Concerning the internal consistency of the EHI, Cronbach's alpha was 0.877. This value is considered good for research purposes (Pestana & Gageiro, 2008), meaning that the scale has good internal consistency.

Test-retest reliability. To determine the temporal stability of EHI, the test was re-administered to a group of 25 individuals after a period of 5 months ($M = 4.96$; $SD = 1.34$). Through t -test it was found that there were no statistically significant differences [$t(24) = 0.37$; $p > .05$] between the first and the second moment, and the effect size was insignificant (Cohen's $d = 0.02$). Pearson correlations confirmed a high positive correlation ($r = 0.97$; $p < .001$) (Pestana & Gageiro, 2008).

Factor analysis. Since there was collinearity between the writing and drawing items ($r = 0.94$), an adjustment was made through the establishment of a correlation between the error variance of those items, and the resulting model (Figure 1) was adequate ($\chi^2/df = 2.141$; $TLI = 0.972$; $CFI = 0.979$; $RMSEA = 0.058$; $p[RMSEA < .05] < .001$).

1
2
3 Analyzing the reliability of the model through the composite reliability, we verified that *CR*
4 was 0.91. The factorial validity (individual reliability) was also appropriate since almost all
5 items had standardized weights > 0.5 and square weights > 0.25 (the broom item had a
6 weight close to adequate). The convergent validity analyzed regarding the mean extracted
7 variance was good (*MEV* = 0.61).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 (Figure 1 about here)
16
17

18 19 20 **Discussion and conclusion**

21
22 The purpose of the present study was to investigate the psychometric properties of the
23 Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (EHI). From the descriptive statistics, we observed only
24 two *left-handed* participants in our sample. Interestingly, according to the *item-by-item*
25 analysis, we found there were 23 participants that reported performing the activity *writing*
26 only with the left hand; the same participants (except for one) also indicated *drawing* only
27 with the left hand. Our data suggests that there is a possibility of social pressure to be *right-*
28 *handed*, in line with several studies (e.g., Christman, Prichard, & Corser, 2015; Strien, 2002),
29 which state that hand preference may be related to culture/environment. The present data
30 indicates the conformity pressures, brain, and behavioral lateralization may have grown under
31 social selection pressures (Ghirlanda & Vallortigara, 2004; Payne, 1987). Giving strength to
32 this hypothesis is the *inconsistency* found in the preference for writing-drawing-using
33 scissors (activities more related to formal education) and other activities (using knife, match,
34 spoon, toothbrush, broom, throwing, and opening box). Formal education activities are more
35 prone to forced correction than the other activities, and congruency between these two types
36 of activities might be an indicator of forced correction decreasing (Lai, Serra, Petretto,
37 Masala, & Preti, 2014; Merni, Di Michele, & Soffritti, 2014). Another *finding* reinforcing
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this hypothesis is the unusually high percentage of ambiguous-handedness (which was much
4
5 higher than left-handedness in this sample).
6

7
8 The prevalence of ambiguous-handedness raises other reflections. No matter the
9
10 calculation procedure used in the present study, the rates are relatively high (between 19.3%
11
12 and 54.4%), not substantiating early hypotheses that ambiguous-handedness is rare among
13
14 normal populations (Satz et al., 1989: 3-4%), and presumed to be pathological (e.g.,
15
16 Bolinsky, Iati, Hunter, & Novi, 2013; Fazio et al., 2014; Lange et al., 2010; Shaw et al.,
17
18 2001; Soper & Satz, 1984; Tsuang, Chen, & Kuo, 2013). Nonetheless, a note of caution
19
20 should be made: the left/right/ambiguous classification schemes vary largely due to different
21
22 cutoff scores, as a review of 899 papers published from 1998 to 2012 has shown, making
23
24 difficult the basic left-right differentiation and hampering rate comparisons between studies
25
26 (Edlin, Leppanen, Fain, & Hackländer, 2015).
27
28

29
30 Regarding the effect of sociodemographic variables on the performance of EHI, the
31
32 results showed that concerning the six sociodemographic variables (age, sex, education, area
33
34 of residence, region, and profession) three influenced EHI scores: age, area of residence, and
35
36 region. Regarding age, we found significant differences, which is also consistent with
37
38 Milenkovic and Dragovic (2013). There were differences between the category 20-29 and 50-
39
40 59. The fact that there are more *ambiguous* in the 20-29 age group and more *right-handed in*
41
42 the 50-59 category allows one to conclude that social pressure to be *right-handed* it is not as
43
44 strong as it was in the past, but it still does not follow the increasing trend of left-hand
45
46 preference in the younger generations reported by others (McManus, Moore, Freegard, &
47
48 Rawles, 2010; Preti et al., 2011). This is somewhat different from Medland, Perelle, De
49
50 Monte, & Ehrman (2004), where older participants were more likely to be classified as *left-*
51
52 *handed*. This disparate evidence reinforces the idea of cultural pressure as a shifting influence
53
54 upon handedness.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In contrast to studies by Bryden (1977), Oldfield (1971), Martin, Papadatou-Pastou,
4 Jones, & Munafò (2010), Medland et al. (2004), and Papadatou-Pastou, Martin, Munafò, &
5 Jones (2008) which showed a greater propensity for men to be more *left-handed* than women,
6 and distinguished from the meta-analytic study of Papadatou-Pastou et al. (2008) that
7 reported a greater tendency of mixed-handedness among males, we found no differences in
8 scores on the EHI between men and women. This absence of differences may also reflect the
9 influence of cultural factors given the overall very low prevalence of *left-handedness* in this
10 sample. Although the level of *left-handedness* was much higher in the Preti et al. (2011)
11 study (c. 10%), they also found that males were not more likely to report left-hand preference
12 in writing. Nevertheless, in using a broom we found some differences, which may reflect,
13 again, a cultural influence.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We also did not find differences between education and scores on the EHI which was
28 in contrast to Fazio et al. (2012), where years of school was a significant predictor, since
29 participants with a higher education level tend to read and follow instructions better. It should
30 be noted though that a correlation between education and EHI scores in the Northern region
31 was found. According to Portuguese census (PORDATA, 2015) this region is similar to the
32 other main regions (Center and Lisbon) insofar as education is concerned, which was not the
33 case in our study. Giving the potential for some selection bias, this finding should be
34 confirmed with more representative samples.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Despite the absence of studies that address the variable of area of residence, we
46 decided to include it in our study. We found differences between rural and transition areas,
47 which is also consistent with Fagard and Dahmen (2010), Leask and Beaton (2007), Medland
48 et al. (2004), and Strien (2002) on the binding of hand preference with culture. As with the
49 variable described above, the same happens with the regions. By observing the Northern
50 average falls into the *right-handed* category compared with the other groups that fall into the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *ambiguous* category, it may reinforce the suggestion that there is actually an interference of
4
5 culture and pressure, in this case by the inhabitants of the North, to be *right-handed*. The
6
7 same explanation was drawn by Greenwood, Greenwood, McCullagh, Beggs, & Murphy
8
9 (2006), Leask and Beaton (2007), and Viggiano, Borelli, Vannucci, & Rocchetti (2001) that
10
11 there are potential regional differences in tolerance for left-handedness. Geographical
12
13 variations in disease (e.g., psychosis) or developmental conditions (e.g., developmental
14
15 coordination disorder) can also be invoked as possible explanations (Dragovic & Hammond,
16
17 2005; Goetz & Zelnik, 2007; Leask & Beaton, 2007). Nevertheless, we should not forget that
18
19 there was a significant correlation between handedness and education only in the North
20
21 region.
22
23

24
25 Regarding profession, no differences in scores were found on the EHI by the
26
27 categories of this variable; there appear to be no published studies that support or contrast
28
29 with these results.
30

31
32 Milenkovic (2013) previously used confirmatory factor analysis to examine the
33
34 psychometric properties of the EHI, and the results showed the EHI has poor psychometric
35
36 properties. In **contrast** in this **study**, we obtained good results both on internal consistency and
37
38 on temporal stability. Studies of Büsch et al. (2010) and Veale (2014) rejected the one-
39
40 dimensionality of the construct. However, from our confirmatory factor analysis, the 1-factor
41
42 model **showed adequacy**, as **in the** Strien (2002) study, which by principal component
43
44 analysis (albeit with a version of EHI which contained 16 items), revealed a single dimension
45
46 of laterality. The **studies** of Williams (1986), McFarland & Anderson (1980), **Fazio & Cantor**
47
48 **(2015)**, and **Richardson (1978)** also obtained one factor. Dragovic (2004) obtained a **one-**
49
50 **factor** solution at expenses of removing two of the items, **and we obtained a one-factor**
51
52 **solution accounting for the inter-item correlation by adjusting the model through the**
53
54 **establishment of a correlation between the error variance of writing and drawing items.**
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Again, this suggests a cultural component in this way of evaluating the handedness, and as
4
5 Medland et al. (2004) indicate, there are some measures of handedness more sensitive to
6
7 cultural influences. Additionally, **the different factorial solutions** could be a consequence of
8
9 different interpretations of the items which also point to a cultural influence (Jöreskog,
10
11 1971b; Millsap, 2012), or to the difficulty following the instructions (Fazio, Coenen, &
12
13 Denney, 2012).

14
15
16 Since level of education predicts ability to follow the EHI instructions (Fazio et al.,
17
18 2012), in future studies measurement invariance by education level should be tested. It is also
19
20 worth noting that the samples' nature and statistical procedures varied across studies
21
22 (Dragovic, 2004a: mean age 44.8 to 47.4, SEM with LISREL; McFarland & Anderson, 1980:
23
24 students, principal component analysis; Milenkovic, 2013: students, confirmatory factor
25
26 analysis; Büsch et al., 2010: ages between 17-37 years, mixed-Rasch analyses; Williams,
27
28 1986: students, principal component analysis). **Moreover, the item-oriented approach**
29
30 **inherent to the CFA might have contributed to the failure of the model in some studies**
31
32 **(Büsch et al., 2010).**

33
34
35
36 There were some minor methodological limitations to this study. The first relates to
37
38 education, which was operationalized as the number of years of regular formal education
39
40 successfully completed; this approach is vulnerable to the numerous changes in the
41
42 Portuguese education system. This limitation has been minimized, however, by the large size
43
44 of the sample and the absence of significant differences between the various educational
45
46 groups. During the administration of the EHI, some participants showed difficulties in
47
48 understanding the test instructions, similar to the experience of other authors (Fazio et al.,
49
50 2012; Oldfield, 1971; Veale, 2014). We suggest that, in future, the answers of EHI should be
51
52 collected orally or replaced with a five-checkbox system (e.g., with strong left on the left,
53
54 neutral in the middle, and strong right on the far right). Another limitation concerns the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 handedness classification established with cut-off of an LQ of 60 which is not entirely
4
5 consistent with classifications based on number of “either”, “left” or “right” answers. Others
6
7 also have reported misclassification of cases (Dragovic, 2004b; Fazio et al., 2014). In future
8
9 studies, it is proposed, in accordance to Dragovic (2004b), to classify handedness based on
10
11 statistical criteria and use a model based approach (latent class analysis).
12
13

14
15 Finally, the main limitation of this study was the fact that the sample was not
16
17 representative of the Portuguese population. The distribution of percentages in most of the
18
19 sociodemographic variables was not according to the last census conducted in Portugal
20
21 (National Institute of Statistics, 2014). A large percentage of participants were between the
22
23 ages of 20 to 29 years; there were also a large percentage of participants with higher
24
25 education. The same applies to the area of residence and regions: the urban area and the
26
27 central region were over-represented in comparison to other categories. This limitation may
28
29 be the result of the sampling type that was used (non-probability sampling). In future studies,
30
31 we suggest using a random sampling method, so as to better generalize the results (Hill &
32
33 Hill, 2000).
34
35

36
37 In conclusion, results suggest that handedness measured by EHI is potentially
38
39 sensitive to cultural influences although it is a measure with good internal consistency,
40
41 temporal stability, and construct validity. A warning for studies of handedness in Portugal
42
43 and perhaps other countries should be added: incidence of hand preference from one
44
45 region/area of the country should not be compared with data from another region/area
46
47 without a consideration of the potential cultural or biological factors. More generally, for the
48
49 practicing neuropsychologist, this study serves two main purposes. The first is to establish the
50
51 EHI as a valid measure for evaluating handedness with individuals from Portugal. The
52
53 second is to provide information regarding the difference in lateralization amongst
54
55 individuals from these areas. In the setting of pre-surgical epilepsy evaluations or other
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

important neurological evaluations of language lateralization, the EHI scores obtained may not be adequate for this purpose in non-North American individuals. Future research correlating EHI scores to fMRI results would be illustrative in this scenario.

For Peer Review Only

Footnotes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. The Portuguese school system comprises the first cycle of basic education which includes the 1st to 4th grade; the second cycle of basic education that includes the 5th to 6th grade; the third cycle of basic education with 7th to 9th grades; secondary education with the 10th to 12th grade; and higher education that corresponds to university or college.

2. In the Portuguese educational system (pre-Bologna, 2005), high school took 12 years, a college degree 4 to 6 years (depending on the course), a master's degree 2 years, a doctoral degree 4 years, and a post-doctoral degree 3 years. Before 2005, it was not uncommon to take 3-4 years to get a master's degree and more than 4 years to a doctoral degree, and that is why two participants have 28 years of education. After 2006, a full education can still take 23 years without failing.

References

- Agresti, A. (2010). *Analysis of ordinal categorical data*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Annett, M. (1970). A classification of hand preference by association analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, *61*, 303-321. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1970.tb01248.x
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2014). IBM SPSS® Amos™ 23 user's guide. Amos Development Corporation. Retrieved from ftp://public.dhe.ibm.com/software/analytics/spss/documentation/amos/23.0/en/Manuals/IBM_SPSS_Amos_User_Guide.pdf
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *16*(1), 74-94. doi: 10.1007/BF02723327
- Barbieri, F. A., & Gobbi, L. T. B. (2009). Assimetrias laterais no movimento de chute e rendimento no futebol e no futsal [Lateral asymmetry in the kicking motion and performance in football and futsal]. *Motricidade*, *5*(2), 33-47. doi: 10.6063/motricidade.5(2).180
- Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS) approach to causal modelling: personal computer adoption and use as an illustration. *Technology Studies*, *2*(2), 285-309.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *SPINE*, *25*(24), 3186-3191.
- Bolinskey, P. K., Iati, C. A., Hunter, H. K., & Novi, J. H. (2013). Season of birth, mixed-handedness, and psychometric schizotypy: Preliminary results from a prospective study. *Psychiatry Research*, *208*(3), 210-214. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2012.12.023
- Bryden, M. P. (1977). Measuring handedness with questionnaires. *Neuropsychologia*, *15*(4-5), 617-624. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(77)90067-7
- Buchner, A., Erdfelder, E., Faul, F. e Lang, A.-G. (2014). *G*Power 3* (Version 3.1.9.2 for Macintosh) [Informatic software]. Düsseldorf: Heinrich-Heine-Universität Dusseldorf.

Retrieved from <http://www.gpower.hhu.de/en.html>

- Büsch, D., Hagemann, N., & Bender, N. (2010). The dimensionality of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: an analysis with models of the item response theory. *Laterality*, *15*(6), 610-628. doi: 10.1080/13576500903081806
- Chang, A. (2014). *StatsToDo* [Online calculator]. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.statstodo.com/SSiz1Alpha_Pgm.php#
- Christman, S. D., Prichard, E. C., & Corser, R. (2015). Factor analysis of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: Inconsistent handedness yields a two-factor solution. *Brain and Cognition*, *98*, 82-86. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2015.06.005
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of testes. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 297-334.
- Dragovic, M. (2004a). Towards an improved measure of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory: A one-factor congeneric measurement model using confirmatory factor analysis. *Laterality*, *9*(4), 411-419. doi:10.1080/13576500342000248
- Dragovic, M. (2004b). Categorization and validation of handedness using latent class analysis. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica*, *16*(4), 212-218. doi: 10.1111/j.0924-2708.2004.00087.x
- Dragovic, M., & Hammond, G. (2005). Handedness in schizophrenia: A quantitative review of evidence. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *111*, 410-419.
- Dragovic, M., Milenkovic, S., & Hammond, G. (2008). The distribution of hand preference is discrete: A taxometric examination. *British Journal of Psychology*, *99*, 445-459. doi: 10.1348/000712608X304450
- Edlin, J. M., Leppanen, M. L., Fain, R. J., & Hackländer, R. P. (2015). On the use (and misuse?) of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. *Brain and Cognition*, *94*, 44-51. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2015.01.003

- 1
2
3 Fagard, J., & Dahmen, R. (2010). Cultural influences on the development of lateral
4 preferences: A comparison between French and Tunisian children. *Laterality*, 9(1), 67-
5 78. doi: 10.1080/13576500342000167
6
7
8
9
10 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007a). G*Power 3: A Flexible
11 Statistical Power Analysis Program for the Social, Behavioral, and Biomedical Sciences.
12 *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175-191.
13
14
15
16 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007b). G*Power 3 (Version 3.1.9.2 for
17 Windows 10) [Computer Program]. Düsseldorf: Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf.
18 Retrieved from <http://www.gpower.hhu.de/en.html>
19
20
21
22
23 Fazio, R. L., & Cantor, J. M. (2015). Factor Structure of the Edinburgh Handedness
24 Inventory versus the Fazio Laterality Inventory in a Population with established atypical
25 handedness. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, 9095(April), 1-5.
26 doi:10.1080/23279095.2014.940043
27
28
29
30
31
32 Fazio, R., Coenen, C., & Denney, R. L. (2012). The original instructions for the Edinburgh
33 Handedness Inventory are misunderstood by a majority of participants. *Laterality*, 17(1),
34 70-77. doi: 10.1080/1357650X.2010.532801
35
36
37
38
39 Fazio, R. L., Lykins, A. D., & Cantor, J. M. (2014). Elevated rates of atypical handedness in
40 paedophilia: Theory and implications. *Laterality*, 19(6), 690-704.
41 <http://doi.org/10.1080/1357650X.2014.898648>
42
43
44
45 **Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables**
46 **and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.**
47
48
49
50 Ghirlanda, S., & Vallortigara, G. (2004). The evolution of brain lateralization: a game-
51 theoretical analysis of population structure. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences / The*
52 *Royal Society*, 271(1541), 853-7. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2669
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Goez, H., & Zelnik, N. (2007). Handedness in patients with developmental coordination

- 1
2
3 disorder. *Journal of Child Neurology*, 23(2), 151-154.
- 4
5 Greenwood, J. G., Greenwood, J. J., McCullagh, J. F., Beggs, J., & Murphy, C. A. (2006). A
6
7 survey of sidedness in Northern Irish school children: The interaction of sex, age and
8
9 task. *Laterality*, 12(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/13576500600886630
- 10
11
12 Hardie, S. M., & Wright, L. (2014). Differences between left- and right-handers in
13
14 approach/avoidance motivation: influence of consistency of handedness measures.
15
16 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 134. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00134
- 17
18 Hill, M. M., & Hill, A. (2000). *Investigação por questionário* (1st ed.) [Research by
19
20 questionnaire]. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- 21
22
23 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
24
25 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*,
26
27 6(1), 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- 28
29 Instituto Nacional de Estatística (2014). *Estatísticas Demográficas 2011* [Demographic
30
31 Statistics 2011]. Lisboa: INE.
- 32
33
34 Jöreskog, K. G. (1971a). Statistical analysis of sets of congeneric test. *Psychometrika*, 36,
35
36 109–133. doi:10.1007/BF02291393
- 37
38 Jöreskog, K. G. (1971b). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika*,
39
40 36, 409-426. doi:10.1007/BF02291366
- 41
42
43 Jöreskog, K. G. (1994). On the estimation of polychoric correlations and their asymptotic
44
45 covariance matrix. *Psychometrika*, 59, 381–389. doi:10.1007/BF02296131
- 46
47 Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution.
48
49 *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52-54. doi: 10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52
- 50
51
52 Lai, A., Serra, M., Petretto, D. R., Masala, C., & Preti, A. (2014). Patterns of hand preference
53
54 in Italian adolescent high-school students. *Laterality*, 19(6), 718-744. doi:
55
56 10.1080/1357650X.2014.911747
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lange, N. (2010). Atypical diffusion tensor hemispheric asymmetry in autism. *Autism*
4
5 *Research*, 3(6), 350-358. doi: 10.1002/aur.162
6
7 Leask, D. S. J., & Beaton, A. A. (2007). Handedness in Great Britain. *Laterality*, 12(6), 559-
8
9 572. doi: 10.1080/13576500701541936
10
11 Marôco, J. (2011). *Análise Estatística com o SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.) [Statistical analysis with
12
13 SPSS statistics]. Pêro Pinheiro: ReportNumber.
14
15 Martin, M., Papadatou-Pastou, M., Jones, G. V., & Munafò, M. R. (2010). Sex and location
16
17 as determinants of handedness: Reply to Vuoksima and Kaprio (2010). *Psychological*
18
19 *Bulletin*, 136, 348-350.
20
21
22 McFarland, K., & Anderson, J. L. (1980). Factor stability of the Edinburgh Handedness
23
24 Inventory as a function of test-retest performance, age and sex. *British Journal of*
25
26 *Psychology*, 71(1), 135-142. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.1980.tb02739.x
27
28
29 McManus, I. C., Moore, J., Freegard, M., & Rawles, R. (2010). Science in the making: Right
30
31 hand, left hand. III: Estimating historical rates of left-handedness. *Laterality*, 15, 186-
32
33 208. doi:10.1080/13576500802565313
34
35
36 Medland, S. E., Duffy, D. L., Wright, M. J., Geffen, G. M., Hay, D. A., Levy, F., ... Hewitt,
37
38 A. W. (2009). Genetic influences on handedness: data from 25,732 Australian and
39
40 Dutch twin families. *Neuropsychologia*, 47(2), 330-337. doi:
41
42 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.09.005
43
44 Medland E, S., Perelle, I., Monte De, V., & Ehrman, L. (2004). Effects of culture, sex, and
45
46 age on the distribution of handedness: An evaluation of the sensitivity of three measures
47
48 of handedness. *Laterality*, 9(3), 287-297.
49
50 Merni, F., Di Michele, R., & Soffritti, G. (2014). Assessment of handedness using latent class
51
52 factor analysis. *Laterality*, 19(4), 405-423. doi: 10.1080/1357650X.2013.845572
53
54
55 Messinger, H. B., & Messinger, M. I. (1995). Factoring handedness data: I. Item analysis.
56
57 *Cortex*, 31(4), 757-765. doi:10.1016/S0010-9452(13)80026-3
58
59 Milenkovic, S., & Dragovic, M. (2013). Modification of the Edinburgh Handedness
60

Inventory: a replication study. *Laterality*, 18(3), 340-348. doi:
10.1080/1357650X.2012.683196

Millsap, R. E. (2012). *Statistical approaches to measurement invariance*. New York, NY:
Routledge.

Oldfield, R. C. (1971). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh Inventory.
Neuropsychologia, 9(1), 97-113. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(71)90067-4

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for
Windows* (4th ed.). Crows Nest NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Papadatou-Pastou, M., Martin, M., Munafò, M. R., & Jones, G. V. (2008). Sex differences in
left-handeness: A meta-analysis of 144 studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(5), 677-
699. doi: 10.1037/a0012814

Payne, M. A. (1987). Impact of cultural pressures on self-reports of actual and approved hand
use. *Neuropsychologia*, 25(1 PART 2), 247-258. doi:10.1016/0028-3932(87)90135-7

Perelle, I. B., & Ehrman, L. (1994). An international study of human handedness: The data.
Behavior Genetics, 24(3), 217-227. doi: 10.1007/BF01067189

Pestana, M. H., & Gageiro, J. N. (2008). *Análise de dados para ciências sociais; A
complementaridade do SPSS* (5th ed.) [Data analysis for the social sciences;
Complementarity SPSS]. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.

Pogetti, L. S., De Souza, R. M., Tudella, E., & Teixeira, L. A. (2013). Visibilidade dos braços
afeta a preferência manual em bebês [Visibility of arms affect the hand preference in
infants]. *Motriz. Revista de Educação Física*, 19(1), 160-170. doi: 10.1590/S1980-
65742013000100016

PORDATA (2015). População residente com 15 e mais anos segundo os Censos: total e por nível
de escolaridade completo mais elevado [Resident population aged 15 and over, according to
the Census: total and by highest level of educational qualifications obtained]. Retrieved from
<http://www.pordata.pt/Municipios/População+residente+com+15+e+mais+anos+segundo+os>

- 1
2
3 +Censos+total+e+por+n%C3%ADvel+de+escolaridade+completo+mais+elevado-69-257
4
5 Preti, A., Sisti, D., Rocchi, M. B., Busca, M., Vellante, M., Camboni, M. V. ... Masala, C.
6
7 (2011). Male-female differences in left-handedness in Sardinia, Italy. *Laterality*, 16(6),
8
9 737-752. doi:10.1080/1357650X.2010.515991
10
11 Razali, N. M., & Wah, Y. B. (2011). Power comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-
12
13 Smirnov, Lilliefors and Anderson-Darling tests. *Journal of Statistical Modeling and*
14
15 *Anlytics*, 2, 21-33.
16
17
18 Richardson, J. T. E. (1978). A factor analysis of self-reported handedness. *Neuropsychologia*,
19
20 16(6), 747-748. doi: 10.1016/0028-3932(78)90010-6
21
22
23 Satz, P., Nelson, L., & Green, M. (1989). Ambiguous-handedness: incidence in a non-clinical
24
25 sample. *Neuropsychologia*, 27(10), 1309-1310.
26
27
28 Shaw, J., Claridge, G., & Clark, K. (2001). Schizotypy and the shift from dextrality: A study
29
30 of handedness in a large non-clinical sample. *Schizophrenia Research*, 50(3), 181-189.
31
32 doi: 10.1016/S0920-9964(00)00167-5
33
34
35 Soper, H. V., & Satz, P. (1984). Pathological left-handedness and ambiguous handedness: A
36
37 new explanatory model. *Neuropsychologia*, 22(4), 511-515.
38
39
40 Souza, R. M., & Teixeira, L. A. (2011). Sobre a relação entre filogenia e ontogenia no
41
42 desenvolvimento da lateralidade na infância [On the relationship between phylogeny
43
44 and ontogeny in the development of laterality in childhood]. *Psicologia: Reflexão e*
45
46 *Crítica*, 24(1), 62-70. doi: 10.1590/S0102-79722011000100008
47
48
49 van Strien, J. W. (2002). *The Dutch Handedness Questionnaire*. Retrieved from
50
51 <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/956>
52
53 Tsuang, H. C., Chen, W. J., & Kuo, S. Y. (2013). The cross-cultural nature of the relationship
54
55 between schizotypy and mixed-handedness. *Laterality*, 18(4), 476-490. doi:
56
57 10.1080/1357650X.2012.720985
58
59
60

1
2
3 Veale, J. F. (2014). Edinburgh Handedness Inventory - short form: A revised version based
4
5 on confirmatory factor analysis. *Laterality*, 19(2), 164-77. doi:
6
7 10.1080/1357650X.2013.783045
8

9
10 Viggiano, M. P., Borelli, P., Vannucci, M., & Rocchetti, G. (2001). Hand preference in
11
12 Italian students. *Laterality*, 6(3), 283-286. doi: 10.1080/713754412
13

14 Williams, S. M. (1986). Factor analysis of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory. *Cortex*,
15
16 22(2), 325-326. doi:10.1016/S0010-9452(86)80058-2
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Alexandra Mós, Débora Domingues, and Inês Pessoa for their help with recruitment and coding the data. The authors would also like to thank Rita Carvalho, Diogo Oliveira and Bruno Carvalho for their help in the translation and translation review of the article.

For Peer Review Only

Table 1*Sociodemographic Characterization (N = 342)*

		<i>n</i>	%	$\chi^{2,a}$	<i>df</i>
Age (<i>M</i> = 32.12; <i>SD</i> = 13.43)	18-19	19	5.6	389.09***	5
	20-29	191	55.8		
	30-39	35	10.2		
	40-49	38	11.1		
	50-59	44	12.9		
Sex	60-65	15	4.4	2.29 ^{NS}	1
	Men	157	45.9		
Education (<i>M</i> = 14.60; <i>SD</i> = 3.96)	Women	185	55.1	336.45***	4
	1 st cycle of basic education	10	2.9		
	2 nd cycle of basic education	22	6.4		
	3 rd cycle of basic education	19	5.6		
	Secondary education	106	31.0		
Area of Residence	Higher education	185	54.1	278.75***	2
	Urban	257	75.1		
	Transition Area	19	5.6		
Regions	Rural	66	19.3	335.50***	5
	North	61	17.8		
	Center	230	67.3		
	Lisbon	24	7.0		
Profession	South-Autonomous Regions	27	7.9	175.90***	1
	Manual	37	12.1		
	Intellectual	269	87.9		

Notes: *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; ^a Chi-square test for goodness of fit.

*** *p* < .001; ^{NS} Statistically non-significant.

Table 2

Frequency of Types of Handedness Item by Item of EHI (N =342)

Items	Right-handed		Ambiguous		Left-handed		χ^2 ^a	df
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Writing	311	90.9	8	2.3	23	6.7	511.63***	2
Drawing	314	91.8	4	1.2	24	7.0	528.07***	2
Throwing	216	63.2	121	35.4	5	1.5	195.91***	2
Scissors	276	80.7	57	16.7	9	2.6	355.42***	2
Toothbrush	220	64.3	112	32.7	10	2.9	193.47***	2
Knife	247	72.2	81	23.7	14	4.1	252.44***	2
Spoon	222	64.9	110	32.2	10	2.9	197.33***	2
Broom	150	43.9	162	47.4	30	8.8	93.47***	2
Striking Match	223	65.2	105	30.7	14	4.1	192.65***	2
Box	157	45.9	158	46.2	27	7.9	99.60***	2

Notes: ^a Chi-square test for goodness of fit.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 3*Frequency of Types of Handedness by Sociodemographic Variables (N = 342)*

		Right-handed		Ambiguous		Left-handed		χ^2 ^a	df
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
Age	18-19	14	73.7	5	26.3	0	0	6.58*	1
	20-29	97	50.8	93	48.7	1	0.5		
	30-39	20	57.1	15	42.9	0	0		
	40-49	27	71.1	10	26.3	1	2.6		
	50-59	36	81.8	8	18.2	0	0		
	60-65	8	53.3	7	46.7	0	0		
Sex	Men	88	56.1	68	43.3	1	0.6	1.07 ^{NS}	1
	Women	114	61.6	70	37.8	1	0.5		
Education	1 st CBE	7	70.0	3	30.0	0	0	1.53 ^{NS}	1
	2 nd CBE	15	68.2	6	27.3	1	4.5		
	3 rd CBE	14	73.7	5	26.3	0	0		
	Secondary education	60	56.6	46	43.4	0	0		
	Higher education	106	57.3	78	42.2	1	0.5		
Area of Residence	Urban	156	60.7	99	38.5	2	0.8	2.74 ^{NS}	1
	Transition Area	16	84.2	3	15.8	0	0		
	Rural	30	45.5	36	54.5	0	0		
Regions	North	46	75.4	14	23.0	1	1.6	46.86***	1
	Center	151	65.7	78	33.9	1	0.4		
	Lisbon	3	12.5	21	87.5	0	0		
	SAR	2	7.4	25	92.6	0	0		
Profession	Manual	26	70.3	10	27.0	1	2.7	1.00 ^{NS}	1
	Intellectual	159	59.1	109	40.5	1	0.4		

Notes: CBE = Cycle of Basic Education; SAR = South and Autonomous Regions. ^aLinear-by-linear association * $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$; ^{NS} Statistically non-significant.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For Peer Review Only

Table 4
Differences in Scores of EHI between *Categories of the Sociodemographic Variables* ($N = 342$)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ± <i>SD</i>	<i>CI</i> 95% <i>IL</i> - <i>UL</i>	Range Min - Max
Age $F(5, 336) = 3.64$ $p < .01$ $\eta^2 = 0.05$	18-19	19	73.68 ± 37.74	55.49 – 91.88	-50 – 100
	20-29	191	57.54 ± 38.71	52.01 – 63.06	-80 – 100
	30-39	35	60.00 ± 41.16	45.86 – 74.14	-50 – 100
	40-49	38	73.16 ± 38.70	60.44 – 85.88	-80 – 100
	50-59	44	80.23 ± 22.15	73.49 – 86.96	20 – 100
	60-65	15	60.00 ± 39.10	38.35 – 81.65	-20 – 100
Sex $t(340) = 1.49$ $p > .05$	Men	157	60.13 ± 38.21	54.26 – 66.31	-60 – 100
	Women	185	66.27 ± 37.60	60.82 – 71.72	-80 – 100
Education $F(4, 337) = 0.68$ $p > .05$ $\eta^2 = 0.008$	1 st CBE	10	81.00 ± 26.85	61.79 – 100.21	40 – 100
	2 nd CBE	22	64.55 ± 42.40	45.75 – 83.34	-80 – 100
	3 rd CBE	19	68.42 ± 41.67	48.34 – 88.50	-50 – 100
	Secondary Education	106	63.30 ± 39.44	55.71 – 70.90	-60 – 100
	Higher Education	185	61.95 ± 37.95	56.62 – 67.49	-80 – 100
Area of Residence $F(2, 339) = 3.30$ $p < .05$ $\eta^2 = 0.02$	Urban	257	64.63 ± 37.54	60.02 – 69.24	-80 – 100
	Transition Area	19	77.89 ± 24.40	66.13 – 89.65	0 – 100
	Rural	66	54.70 ± 41.18	44.57 – 64.82	-60 – 100
Regions $F(3, 338) = 19.71$ $p < .001$ $\eta^2 = 0.15$	North	61	71.48 ± 36.46	62.14 – 80.81	-80 – 100
	Center	230	69.04 ± 35.24	64.46 – 73.62	-80 – 100
	Lisbon	24	30.42 ± 30.57	17.51 – 43.33	-30 – 80
	SAR	27	27.04 ± 35.28	13.08 – 40.99	-50 – 100
Profession $t(304) = 0.63$ $p > .05$	Manual	37	59.73 ± 49.24	43.31 – 76.15	-80 – 100
	Intellectual	269	64.07 ± 37.61	59.56 – 68.59	-80 – 100

Notes: *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; *CI* 95% = Confidence Interval 95%; *IL* = Inferior Limit; *UL* = Upper Limit; Min = Minimum; Max = Maximum; *F* = ANOVA; *t* = Student *t* test; *p* = level of statistical significance; η^2 = eta-squared; CBE = Cycle of Basic Education; SAR = South and Autonomous Regions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table 5*Post-Hoc Comparisons of the Scores of EHI in which there were Differences by Sociodemographic Variables*

Variables	Categories	<i>M</i> Difference	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i> Interpretation	
Age <i>F</i> (5, 336) = 3.64 <i>p</i> < .01	20-29 <i>M</i> = 57.54 <i>SD</i> = 37.74	50-59	22.69	.005	0.73	Medium Effect
	Area of Residence <i>F</i> (2, 339) = 3.30 <i>p</i> < .05	Rural <i>M</i> = 55.70 <i>SD</i> = 41.18	Transition Area	23.20	.011	0.66
Regions <i>F</i> (3, 338) = 19.80 <i>p</i> < .001	North <i>M</i> = 71.48 <i>SD</i> = 36.46	Lisbon	41.06	< .001	1.22	Large Effect
		SAR	44.44	< .001	1.24	Large Effect
	Center <i>M</i> = 69.04 <i>SD</i> = 35.24	Lisbon	38.63	< .001	1.17	Large Effect
		SAR	42.01	< .001	1.19	Large Effect

Notes: *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; *p* = level of statistical significance; *d* = Cohen's *d*; SAR = South and Autonomous Regions.




FIGURE 1 Confirmatory factor analysis with a maximum likelihood approach of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (λ = standardized factor loadings; e = error variances). Model fit: Ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom = 2.141; Tucker-Lewis coefficient = 0.972; Comparative fit index = 0.979; Root mean square error of approximation = 0.058).

Figure 1. Confirmatory factor analysis with a maximum likelihood approach of the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (λ = standardized factor loadings; e = error variances). Model fit: Ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom = 2.141; Tucker-Lewis coefficient = 0.972; Comparative fit index = 0.979; Root mean square error of approximation = 0.058.

(Figure 1 about here)
755x527mm (96 x 96 DPI)