Assessing social perception can be a reliable and valid exercise: A psychometric study of TASIT
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Introduction

This study examined the reliability and validity of TASIT: a test of social perception, based upon a large sample of adults with severe traumatic brain injury.

Why TASIT was developed

Social skills deficits are common in many clinical groups, e.g. autism, traumatic brain injury, learning disabilities. Social skills comprise:
- Expression (behaviour)
- Perception

There are few tools available that measure perception

What is social perception?

Social perception is the ability to read selected social cues in order to make judgements about the behaviour, attitudes and emotions of others (McFall, 1982).

Social cues include:
- Facial expression and tone of voice
- Gesture and “body language”
- Contextual information
- Knowledge of the world

Participant details

116 adults (27 women and 89 men) took part. On average they were 36 years old (s.d.12) with 12 years of education (s.d. = 3) and all had severe injuries, (mean PTA 78.4 days: s.d. = 82.3). Mean time post injury = 6.7 years, s.d. = 7.4.

Reliability study

65 adults with chronic injuries (at least 9 months post injury) 32 participants were given repeat administrations of Part A, 38 participants were given A then B (or vice versa). NB some were involved in both studies

Construct validity

Validation was estimated based on subgroups from the sample of 65 (above) + a further 51 adults engaged in other research studies using TASIT. The majority of the second group were in the chronic phase of their injuries, but this group also included 12 individuals who were in the acute stages

The Awareness of Social Inference Test (TASIT)

Comprises three parts with alternate forms for re-testing

PART 1: Emotion evaluation Test (EET):
- 26 videoed vignettes of actors enacting ambiguous scripts representing 7 basic emotions
  - These stimuli:
    - Are dynamic
    - Portray naturalistic, complex expressions
    - Provide intonation and gestural cues
  - Respondents choose the perceived emotion from the following descriptors:
    - Happy
    - Sad
    - Amused
    - Angry
    - Neutral
    - Sincerely
    - Revolved (Diagnosed)

PART 2: Social Inference - Minimal (SI-M):
- SI-M examines understanding of conversational meanings that are determined by paralinguistic cues (facial expression, tone of voice, gesture etc)
- SI-M comprises 15 videoed vignettes of everyday conversational exchanges
- Vignettes use neutral scripts enacted by professional actors to represent either:
  - Sincere exchanges
  - Sarcasm

Comprehension is assessed via 4 questions for each vignette. These cover 4 facets of understanding, i.e. the speakers’
- Beliefs (what s/he knows)
- Meaning (what s/he means by what is said)
- Intentions (what s/he intends to do: to insult, to reassure etc)
- Feelings (what s/he feels)

PART 3: Social Inference - Enriched (SI-E):
- SI-E assesses the ability to use contextual knowledge, i.e. visual and verbal information to derive meaning
- SI-E comprises 16 videoed vignettes of everyday exchanges
- In each of these there is a literally untrue comment enacted in one of two ways: As sarcasm meant to amplify the truth
- As a lie meant to conceal or minimise the truth
- SI-E provides two sources of non-verbal cues to determine meaning
  - Paralinguistic features (like Part 2)
  - Contextual cues (e.g. Visual edit indicating the true state of affairs or a prologue that reveals the speaker’s true thoughts)
  - 4 probes are used to assess comprehension of each vignette covering the same facets of understanding as PART 2

TASIT: Normative data

A pool of 283 normal (mainly young) adults achieved a high level of performance on all aspects of the test (84% accuracy or greater) with some influence from both education and intelligence.

In two studies (McDonald et al. 2003, 2004) people with traumatic brain injuries have been found to be poorer judging emotions than matched controls, with particular difficulties recognising neutral items, fear and disgust. They were as capable as matched controls when understanding sincere exchanges and lies but had difficulty with sarcasm
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