

This is a repository copy of *Consistent evidence of a link between alexithymia and general intelligence*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/162521/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Connolly, Hannah, Young, Andy [orcid.org/0000-0002-1202-6297](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1202-6297) and Lewis, Gary (2020) Consistent evidence of a link between alexithymia and general intelligence. *Cognition and Emotion*. ISSN 0269-9931

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2020.1789850>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.


**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

**Authors' version of manuscript, as accepted for publication in *Cognition and Emotion*.**

**This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the final, authoritative version of the article. Please do not copy or cite without authors' permission.**

**Date of acceptance: 25th June 2020.**



**Consistent Evidence of a Link between Alexithymia and General Intelligence**

Journal:	<i>Cognition and Emotion</i>
Manuscript ID	CEM-FA 481.19.R2
Manuscript Type:	Full Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Connolly, Hannah; Royal Holloway University of London, Psychology Young, Andrew; University of York, Psychology Lewis, Gary; Royal Holloway University of London,
Keywords:	alexithymia, emotion recognition, general intelligence, face perception

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5  
6 2  
7  
8  
9 3  
10  
11  
12 4  
13  
14  
15 5  
16  
17  
18 6  
19  
20  
21 7  
22  
23  
24 8  
25  
26  
27 9 **Consistent Evidence of a Link between Alexithymia and General Intelligence**  
28  
29

30 10 Hannah L. Connolly<sup>1\*</sup>, Andrew W. Young<sup>2</sup>, & Gary J. Lewis<sup>1</sup>  
31  
32  
33 11

34  
35  
36 12 1. Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX  
37

38  
39 13 2. Department of Psychology, University of York, Heslington, YO10 5DD  
40

41  
42 14 Re-submission date: 23.06.20  
43

44  
45 15 Word Count: 5871  
46

47  
48 16 \* Corresponding author email: [hannah.connolly.2016@live.rhul.ac.uk](mailto:hannah.connolly.2016@live.rhul.ac.uk)  
49

50  
51 17 The data that support the findings of this study are available on the Open Science Framework  
52

53 18 <https://osf.io/67zda/>  
54  
55  
56 19  
57  
58  
59 20  
60

## Abstract

Alexithymia is a personality construct characterised most notably by a difficulty in identifying and expressing feelings. Although the emotional difficulties in alexithymia are well established, to date little work has examined its relationship to broader cognitive abilities, such as general intelligence. Across three independent, healthy adult samples (Ns = 389, 318, & 273), we examined whether alexithymia was associated with general intelligence. In all three samples, we observed a significant negative association between alexithymia and general intelligence. In two of the samples, general intelligence was a significant predictor of alexithymia even when accounting for performance on tests of facial emotion recognition ability and supramodal emotion recognition ability (measured with faces, bodies, and voices). From a theoretical perspective, these results suggest that models of alexithymia need to incorporate a role for more generalised cognitive functioning. From a practical perspective, studies examining links between alexithymia and clinical disorders, many of which have known links to general intelligence, should consider including a measure of general intelligence in order to adjust for this potentially confounding factor.

**Keywords:** alexithymia; emotion recognition; general intelligence; face perception

## Introduction

Alexithymia is a stable, sub-clinical personality construct characterised by difficulties with emotional awareness, and comprising three components including difficulties in identifying feelings, difficulties in expressing feelings to others, and an externally-oriented style of thinking (Preece, Becerra, Allan, Robinson, & Dandy, 2017). Alexithymia is an important individual differences construct as it has known links to broader psychological difficulties (Mattila, Salminen, Nummi, & Joukamaa, 2006). Indeed, many studies have reported wide-ranging associations with clinically-relevant disorders, such as depression (Grynberg et al., 2012), anxiety (Korkoliakou et al., 2014), eating disorders (Brewer, Cook, Cardi, Treasure, & Bird, 2015), autism spectrum disorder (Cook, Brewer, Shah, & Bird, 2013), atypical empathy (Bernhardt & Singer, 2012), alcohol dependence (Lyvers, Onuoha, Thorberg, & Samios, 2012), and medically unexplained somatic symptoms (De Gucht & Heiser, 2003).

To date, most studies of alexithymia have considered it a deficit in emotion processing. For example, Bird and colleagues (2010) described alexithymia as a “subclinical phenomenon marked by difficulties in identifying and describing feelings and difficulties in distinguishing feelings from the bodily sensations of emotional arousal” (p. 1516). While this description does indeed appear to capture key features of alexithymia, here we sought to address a largely unexamined issue: the possibility that the alexithymia construct might to some extent reflect individual differences in general intelligence.

There are several reasons to posit this broader psychological footprint. Firstly, it has been noted that alexithymia is related to non-emotional interoceptive abilities, with individuals higher in alexithymia showing a poorer ability to accurately count their own heartbeat (Herbert, Herbert, & Pollatos, 2011). A more recent study has bolstered this earlier

1  
2  
3 1 finding, reporting that alexithymia is negatively correlated with other interoceptive abilities;  
4  
5 2 specifically, the ability to accurately gauge if a drinking solution is saltier than a target  
6  
7 3 solution, to estimate and balance the weights of two-rice filled buckets in each hand, and to  
8  
9 4 gauge the strength of one's own respiratory output (Murphy, Catmur, & Bird, 2018). Such  
10  
11 5 findings indicate that alexithymia cannot be adequately characterised by emotion-related  
12  
13 6 processes alone.  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 7 Secondly, several of the items in the most widely-used measure of alexithymia, the  
19  
20 8 Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20), appear to capture, at least in part, the ability to  
21  
22 9 understand and integrate complex information, which of course is one of the cardinal features  
23  
24 10 of general intelligence (Gottfredson, 1998). For example, agreement with the following items  
25  
26 11 'I prefer to analyse problems rather than just describe them' (reverse-scored) and 'I prefer to  
27  
28 12 just let things happen rather than to understand why they turned out that way' both reflect  
29  
30 13 higher levels of alexithymia. Stronger agreement to these items may indeed reflect difficulty  
31  
32 14 with emotional awareness. Equally, it seems plausible that such agreement, at least in part,  
33  
34 15 might reflect difficulties in processing complex contingencies and thus general intelligence.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 16 Thirdly, there are a number of abilities and clinically-relevant disorders that are  
40  
41 17 known to be related both to alexithymia and general intelligence. These include emotion  
42  
43 18 recognition ability in the normal population (Lewis, Lefevre, & Young, 2016) and clinical  
44  
45 19 conditions such as depression (Honkalampi et al., 2000), eating disorders (Lopez, Stahl, &  
46  
47 20 Tchanturia, 2010; Brewer et al., 2015), schizophrenia (Gawęda & Kręzolek, 2019), and  
48  
49 21 dementia (Sturm & Levenson, 2011). These again suggest that a link between alexithymia  
50  
51 22 and general intelligence is plausible.  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 23 Only a handful of studies have examined this putative link, and these have mainly  
57  
58 24 relied on measuring more focal aspects of intelligence. For example, negative associations  
59  
60

1 have been noted with vocabulary (N=81: Bagby, Taylor, & Ryan, 1986; N=115: Hsing,  
2 Mohr, Stansfield, & Preston, 2013). Similarly, Lumley and colleagues (2005) noted a  
3 moderate inverse link between verbal ability and the Externally Oriented Thinking subscale  
4 of the TAS-20 (N=140: Lumley, Gustavson, Partridge, & Labouvie-Vief, 2005). In a recent  
5 study comprising three samples (Ns=296, 131, & 121), alexithymia was associated with  
6 poorer memory for neutral words and poorer executive functioning, as measured by the Trail-  
7 making Tests, the Symbol Digit Modalities Test, and a test of category fluency (Correro,  
8 Paitel, Byers, & Nielson, 2019). Finally, in a number of large-scale community studies,  
9 alexithymia has shown negative associations with level of education (N=2297: Kauhanen,  
10 Kaplan, Julkunen, Wilson, & Salonen, 1993; N=5028: Kokkonen, Karvonen, Veijola, Läksy,  
11 & Jokelainen, 2001), consistent with a link to general intelligence (Deary, Strand, Smith, &  
12 Fernandes, 2007). However, not all studies have reported a link between alexithymia and  
13 intelligence (or related) measures. For example, Parker, Taylor, and Bagby (1989) found no  
14 association of the TAS-26 scale to the Shipley Institute of Living Scale, which comprises  
15 both vocabulary and abstract reasoning subscales.

16         These studies have provided grounds for further examination of how alexithymia  
17 might relate to general intelligence; but a number of weaknesses in their study designs  
18 necessitate further work. For example, a number of the empirical samples have been small  
19 (N≤140) and often limited to university students (e.g. Lumley et al., 2005; Hsing et al., 2013).  
20 Many of them use a proxy measure for general intelligence (e.g. Kauhanen et al., 1993,  
21 Kokkonen et al., 2001) or use a measure that taps only a limited aspect of intelligence, such  
22 as reading ability (Lumley et al., 2005). A comprehensive measure tapping the broad range of  
23 intelligence is needed to fully explore a possible link with alexithymia, and may be why  
24 Lumley et al. (2005) observed a link between verbal ability and only one of the TAS-20  
25 subscales. Moreover, most of the above studies do not include a good measure of emotion



1 recognition ability (that is, the ability to accurately recognise emotional expressions in other  
2 people). Given that emotion recognition ability has been linked to both general intelligence  
3 and alexithymia (Lewis et al., 2016), it is important to adjust for this variable to validly assess  
4 a link between alexithymia and intelligence. That is, any association that might emerge  
5 between alexithymia and intelligence could be attributed to their widely noted mutual link  
6 with emotion recognition ability.

7 With this in mind, we sought here to provide a strong test of the proposed link  
8 between alexithymia and general intelligence using well-established measures. Study 1  
9 involved a retrospective analysis of data collected for other purposes from two adult samples  
10 (each with  $N > 300$ ). Study 2 was pre-registered to give a sample ( $N > 270$ ) derived from power  
11 calculations based on the effect sizes observed in Study 1.

## 12 Study 1

13 In two adult samples ( $N > 300$ ), we tested whether general intelligence and  
14 alexithymia are negatively associated. We also examined the extent to which any such  
15 association provides incremental prediction over and above facial and supramodal emotion  
16 recognition ability (i.e. measures of emotion recognition ability that incorporate stimuli from  
17 more than one sensory modality: Study 1a: face and body; Study 1b: face and voice).

## 18 Methods

### 19 Participants

20 *Study 1a*: 400 participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk  
21 (MTurk) service as part of an unrelated study that included a measure of alexithymia and  
22 general intelligence (Lewis et al., 2016). We excluded participants who showed evidence of  
23 lack of attention, for example if the same response key was used repeatedly, or who scored  
24 below chance level on two or more of the emotion recognition ability tasks. This resulted in

1 the omission of 11 participants, producing a final sample size of 389 (131 men). Mean age of  
2 participants was 37.0 years (SD = 11.7), and ethnicity was reported as follows: White  
3 (n=290), Hispanic (n=14), Asian (n=22), Black (n=11), Native American (n=2), Other (n=32)  
4 and Undisclosed (n=18).

5 **Study 1b:** 412 participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk service as  
6 part of an unrelated study that included a measure of alexithymia and of general intelligence  
7 (Connolly, Lefevre, Young, & Lewis, 2020). The exclusion criteria were the same as above,  
8 with the addition of participants also being excluded if they failed an auditory test at the  
9 beginning of the survey. This resulted in the omission of 94 participants, producing a final  
10 sample size of 318 (159 men). Mean age of participants was 35.9 years, and ethnicity was  
11 reported as follows: White (n=254), Hispanic (n=21), East Asian (n=14), Black (n=22),  
12 Native American (n=2), South Asian (n=1), and Other (n=4).

13 These participant demographics represent the typical pattern observed for MTurk  
14 samples (Huff & Tingley, 2015).

## 16 **Stimuli**

### 17 ***Facial Emotion Recognition Ability (Face Emot):***

18 Study 1a: Stimuli were static images taken from the Facial Expressions of Emotion:  
19 Stimuli and Tests (FEEST) set (Young, Perrett, Calder, Sprengelmeyer, & Ekman, 2002), and  
20 were morphed to differing intensities of expression, from 25% (a morph that involved a 75%  
21 neutral and 25% emotional expression) to 100% (representing the prototype expressions from  
22 the Ekman series). They were piloted across different levels of emotional intensity in a  
23 previous study (Lewis et al., 2016), and in order to try and avoid floor or ceiling effects,  
24 exemplars for each emotion with appropriate means and variabilities were selected. In Study

1  
2  
3 1 1a, the modality block comprised 50 selected items (10 items for each of the 5 basic  
4  
5 2 emotions: anger, disgust, fear, happiness, and sadness) shown twice to the participants. Split  
6  
7 3 half reliability was  $r=.69$ .

8  
9  
10 4 Study 1b. For the participants in Study 1b the block comprised an abbreviated subset  
11  
12 5 of stimuli, which were fully outlined in a previous study (Connolly et al., 2020). The subset  
13  
14 6 block comprised 15 items (3 items for each emotion) shown once each. Split half reliability  
15  
16 7 was  $r=.53$ .

18  
19 8

20  
21 9 ***Alice Heim 4 Test of General Intelligence (AH4):***

22  
23  
24 10 Study 1a: This test consists of 65 items which are either numerical or verbal in nature.  
25  
26 11 Half of the questions require multiple-choice responses (from a choice of 5), and half require  
27  
28 12 open entry 'creative answers'. The participants have a maximum time limit of 10 minutes to  
29  
30 13 complete as many of the items as they can, after which the page automatically advances to  
31  
32 14 the next section of the survey. They are encouraged to complete the questions in the order in  
33  
34 15 which they are given, but are also told they may skip to the next questions if they become  
35  
36 16 stuck. The participants were awarded one point for every correct answer, and their total score  
37  
38 17 was generated out of a maximum of 65. This test is suitable for the current research question  
39  
40 18 given that it is considered a good test of *general* intelligence as it incorporates elements of both  
41  
42 19 crystallized knowledge (vocabulary) and fluid intelligence (online manipulation of novel  
43  
44 20 information). It is also easy and relatively quick to administer online, and relates well to other  
45  
46 21 measures of *g* (e.g. Tombaugh, 2006).

47  
48  
49  
50  
51 22 Study 1b: The identical procedure as for Study 1a was followed.

52  
53  
54 23 ***Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20):*** The TAS-20 is a 20-item instrument that assesses  
55  
56 24 alexithymic traits in three broad sub-domains: Difficulty Identifying Feelings (7 items),  
57  
58 25 Difficulty Describing Feelings (5 items), and Externally Oriented Thinking (8 items) (Bagby,  
59  
60

1 Parker, & Taylor, 1994). Participants in both Studies 1a and 1b completed this test. They  
2 respond on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’, and 5 being ‘strongly  
3 agree’. A total score was generated by summing the responses from all 20 items: a higher  
4 score indicates a greater degree of alexithymic traits. Scale scores for each individual sub-  
5 scale were also generated. Cronbach’s alpha for both datasets was good for the total scale  
6 ( $\alpha=.89$ ;  $\alpha=.89$ , respectively), and the Difficulty Identifying Feelings ( $\alpha=.91$ ;  $\alpha=.94$ ) and  
7 Difficulty Describing Feelings ( $\alpha=.84$ ;  $\alpha=.83$ ) sub-scales. The Externally-Oriented Thinking  
8 (EOT) subscale had a relatively low alpha in both samples ( $\alpha=.67$ ;  $\alpha=.61$ ), consistent with  
9 reports from other studies (e.g. Preece et al., 2017). This is of minor concern here, though,  
10 given that we did not analyse this measure at the subscale level, and factor analytic work has  
11 consistently shown evidence for a latent general factor of alexithymia across the three sub-  
12 scales (Meganck et al., 2008; Preece et al., 2020).

13 Additionally in Study 1a, a measure of body emotion recognition ability was included,  
14 and in Study 1b, a measure of voice emotion recognition ability was included. These are  
15 outlined below.

16 ***Point-light Bodily Emotion Recognition Ability:*** Stimuli were dynamic point-light  
17 walker stimuli previously described by Atkinson, Dittrich, Gemmell, and Young (2004). In  
18 short, 10 actors were recorded performing each of five emotions, and subsequent rendering  
19 removed all information other than high visibility patches from each video, resulting in a  
20 short video clip of light points whose combined movement simulated a human body  
21 expressing a natural, dynamic emotion. Video clips lasted between 4.2 and 8 seconds. As  
22 with the facial emotion stimuli selected for Study 1a, 10 stimuli for each emotion were  
23 chosen (i.e., total  $N=50$ ) that showed adequate means and variances following a pilot  
24 experiment in a previous study (Lewis, Lefevre, & Young, 2016). Participants in Study 1a  
25 were shown the 50-item block of bodily emotion stimuli twice.

1  
2  
3           1           **Vocal Emotion Recognition Ability:** Stimuli were short audio clips from the Montreal  
4  
5           2           Affective Voices (MAV) set (Belin, Fillion-Bilodeau, & Gosselin, 2008), which comprises  
6  
7           3           actors portraying different emotions in vocal bursts, with each audio burst lasting between  
8  
9           4           1.45 and 2.23 seconds. To ensure that this set was in line with the other emotion stimuli, it  
10  
11           5           was first piloted in a previous study (Connolly et al., 2020) to select appropriate items for the  
12  
13           6           five basic emotions, and then to select 15 items (3 for each emotion) with psychometric  
14  
15           7           properties comparable to the other two expressive domains. Participants in Study 1b were  
16  
17           8           presented with the 15-item block of vocal emotion stimuli once.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24           10           **Procedure**

25  
26           11           In both samples, the emotion recognition blocks were first presented to the participant  
27  
28           12           (faces and bodies in Study 1a, faces and voices in Study 1b), with the within-block  
29  
30           13           presentation order being fully randomised. In a five alternative-choice paradigm, participants  
31  
32           14           had to select the emotion they perceived was being portrayed. Stimuli presentation consisted  
33  
34           15           of a black screen for 500ms, a fixation cross for 750ms, and a further 500ms black screen that  
35  
36           16           preceded the onset of the stimulus. Facial stimuli in both samples were presented for 1000ms.  
37  
38           17           Bodily (Study 1a) and vocal (Study 1b) stimuli lasted for the duration of each individual  
39  
40           18           video or audio clip. Participants could respond at any point following the stimulus onset.  
41  
42           19           Following the emotion recognition blocks, participants completed as much of the general  
43  
44           20           intelligence test as possible in the maximum time of 10 minutes allowed. Following this, they  
45  
46           21           completed the alexithymia questionnaire. Participants were debriefed following completion.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53           23           **Results**

54  
55           24           First, we explored links to facial emotion recognition, as this has been a focus in  
56  
57           25           previous theorising. A similar pattern of associations was noted across both samples.  
58  
59  
60

1 Alexithymia was significantly negatively correlated with general intelligence (Study 1a:  $r=-$   
2  $.11, p=.026$ ; Study 1b:  $r=-.38, p<.001$ ) and with facial emotion recognition ability (Study  
3 1a:  $r=-.28, p<.001$ ; Study 1b:  $r=-.35, p<.001$ ). Additionally, facial emotion recognition  
4 ability was significantly positively correlated with general intelligence (Study 1a:  $r=.28,$   
5  $p<.001$ ; Study 1b:  $r=.38, p<.001$ ).

6 For completeness, we then investigated links to emotion recognition ability more  
7 generally, by examining the correlations when emotion recognition ability was based on a  
8 composite supramodal score derived from the face and body emotion recognition scores  
9 (Study 1a) (split half reliability  $r=.61$ ) or face and voice emotion recognition scores (Study  
10 1b) (split half reliability  $r=.58$ ). Alexithymia was significantly negatively correlated with  
11 supramodal emotion recognition ability (Study 1a:  $r=-.18, p=.003$ ; Study 1b:  $r=-.36,$   
12  $p<.001$ ). Additionally, supramodal emotion recognition ability was significantly positively  
13 correlated with general intelligence (Study 1a:  $r=.38, p<.001$ ; Study 1b:  $r=.45, p<.001$ ).

14 Hierarchical regression analysis then enabled our other hypotheses to be tested. In the  
15 first step, age and sex were entered as predictors of alexithymia. In Study 1a, neither of these  
16 variables were significant predictors. In Study 1b, age was a significant negative predictor of  
17 alexithymia ( $\beta=-.11, p=.046$ ), whereas sex was not. In the second step, facial emotion  
18 recognition ability was entered into the respective models. In both samples, this was a  
19 significant negative predictor of alexithymia (Study 1a:  $\beta=-.27, p<.001$ ; Study 1b:  $\beta=-.34,$   
20  $p<.001$ ). In Study 1a, this was the only significant predictor, but in Study 1b, age also  
21 remained a significant negative predictor ( $\beta=-.12, p=.031$ ).

22 In the critical third step, general intelligence was entered into the model. In Study 1a,  
23 this variable was not a significant predictor of alexithymia, but facial emotion recognition  
24 remained a significant negative predictor ( $\beta=-.26, p<.001$ ). Including intelligence in the

1 model did not improve the overall fit ( $R^2$  changed from .081 to .082,  $p=.560$ ). In Study 1b,  
 2 however, both general intelligence ( $\beta=-.29$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and facial emotion recognition ability  
 3 ( $\beta=-.23$ ,  $p<.001$ ) were significant negative predictors of alexithymia, and the inclusion of  
 4 general intelligence significantly improved the fit of the model ( $R^2$  changed from .135 to  
 5 .205,  $p<.001$ ). The full results of both regression analyses are shown in Tables 1 (Study 1a)  
 6 and 2 (Study 1b). It should also be highlighted that Step 3 in both Tables 1 and 2 show that  
 7 emotion recognition ability and alexithymia are significantly associated independent of  
 8 general intelligence.

9 Table 1: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion  
 10 recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 1a.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.08	.119	-.05	.302	-.05	.285
Sex	.09	.068	.04	.439	.04	.413
Face Emot			<b>-.27</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.26</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>
General Intelligence					-.03	.560

11

12

13

14 Table 2: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion  
 15 recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 1b.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	<b>-.11</b>	<b>.046</b>	<b>-.12</b>	<b>.031</b>	-.10	.059

60

Sex	-.10	.081	-.04	.513	-.04	.406
Face Emot			<b>-.34</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.23</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>
General Intelligence					<b>-.29</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>

---

Again, for completeness, we ran the regression models with ‘supramodal’ emotion recognition ability scores derived from a composite of either face and body emotion recognition (Study 1a) or face and voice emotion recognition (Study 1b). The results were highly similar to the models that tested face emotion recognition ability alone. That is, they followed the exact pattern as in the outputs in Tables 3 and 4: the magnitude of the beta values were not appreciably different and the same predictor variables at each step were significant as in the facial emotion regression models.

### Discussion

We observed the expected negative association between alexithymia and emotional emotion recognition in both samples (i.e. Studies 1a and 1b). Importantly, we also observed a significant negative correlation between alexithymia and general intelligence across samples. Of note, though, in Study 1a, general intelligence was not a significant predictor of alexithymia over and above that of emotion recognition ability. In contrast, in Study 1b, both general intelligence and emotion recognition ability were significant predictors when entered in the model simultaneously. These patterns held regardless of whether emotion recognition ability was measured from facial expressions alone or from supramodal performance involving faces and voices or bodies.

These findings clearly leave unanswered the question as to whether intelligence has a *unique* association with alexithymia once adjusting for emotion recognition ability. In order



1 to provide a more definitive answer to this research question, we addressed this issue using an  
2 independent sample and a pre-registered study plan.

## 3 4 **Study 2**

### 5 **Methods**

#### 6 **Participants**

7 This pre-registered study (<https://osf.io/67zda/>) sought to provide 80% power with an  
8 alpha level of .05 to detect an increase in  $R^2$  of .03. It also sought to provide 80% power with  
9 an alpha of .05 (one-tailed) to test for a zero-order association of  $r \geq .15$ . These effect sizes  
10 allowed us to provide a strong test of the results observed in Study 1b. A power analysis  
11 indicated that an N of 270 was required to achieve sufficient power under these conditions  
12 and so we recruited participants until the desired N was reached after removing those who  
13 met our exclusion criteria. Therefore, a total of 357 participants were recruited from  
14 Amazon's Mechanical Turk service. A proportion of participants failed the pre-survey  
15 auditory test and were excluded before completing the survey (N=25). We also excluded  
16 participants who showed evidence of lack of attention, e.g. using the same response key  
17 repeatedly, or chance level performance on at least two of the emotion recognition batteries  
18 (N=53). Finally, a small number of participants indicated that they had not completed the  
19 survey seriously and were thus excluded (N=6). This resulted in an omission of 84  
20 participants, producing a final sample size of 273 (138 men). Participants gave informed  
21 consent and ethical approval was granted by the Royal Holloway Ethics Committee.

22 Mean age of participants was 38.5 years (SD = 12.2, Range=19-74), and ethnicity was  
23 reported as follows: White (n=192), Hispanic (n=18), Asian (n=18), Black (n=36), Native  
24 American (n=1), Middle Eastern (n=1), Other (n=6) and Undisclosed (n=1). As with the

1 previous two samples, these participants represent the typical demographic pattern for MTurk  
2 samples (Huff & Tingley, 2015).

### 3 **Stimuli**

4 **Facial Emotion Recognition Ability (Face Emot):** The same facial emotion battery  
5 was used as in Study 1b; i.e. a subset of items from Study 1a taken from the FEEST set  
6 (Young et al., 2002). The subset block comprised 15 items (3 items for each basic emotion)  
7 that were shown to participants once each. Split-half reliability was  $r=.55$ .

8 **Bodily Emotion Recognition Ability:** Bodily emotional stimuli were taken from the  
9 same battery used in Study 1a (Atkinson et al., 2004). In line with the facial and vocal  
10 batteries, a subset of these 50 items were piloted in a previous study to ensure suitability for  
11 individual differences research, and 15 items with appropriate psychometric properties were  
12 selected. This abbreviated battery comprised 15 items (3 items for each basic emotion) shown  
13 to participants once. Split-half reliability was  $r=.67$ .

14 **Vocal Emotion Recognition Ability:** The same vocal stimuli battery was used as in  
15 Study 1b (Belin et al., 2008). The battery comprised 15 items (3 items for each basic  
16 emotion) presented to participants once. Split-half reliability was  $r=.63$ .

17 **Alice Heim 4 Test of General Intelligence (AH4):** This same 65-item general  
18 intelligence was used as in Studies 1a and 1b.

19 **Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20):** The same 20-item alexithymia measure was  
20 used as in Studies 1a and 1b. Cronbach's alpha for our data was good for the total scale  
21 ( $\alpha=.91$ ) and for the Difficulty Identifying Feelings ( $\alpha=.94$ ) and Difficulty Describing Feelings  
22 ( $\alpha=.83$ ) sub-scales. As with the previous two samples, the alpha for the Externally-Oriented  
23 Thinking subscale was relatively low ( $\alpha=.67$ ).

### 24 **Procedure**

1           The emotion recognition blocks were first presented to the participant in the same  
2  
3  
4  
5           2 fixed order (voice, face, body), with the within-block presentation order being fully  
6  
7  
8           3 randomised. Stimulus presentation duration and response format were identical to the  
9  
10          4 previous samples. Following the emotion recognition blocks, participants completed as many  
11  
12          5 items on the general intelligence test as they were able to in 10 minutes. Finally, they  
13  
14          6 completed the alexithymia questionnaire. Participants were debriefed following survey  
15  
16  
17          7 completion.

8

## 9 **Analysis**

10           The same analyses were conducted as in Studies 1a and 1b, but with one difference.  
11  
12          11 In both Studies 1a and 1b, emotion recognition ability comprised either facial emotion stimuli  
13  
14          12 alone, or a composite supramodal score across two different expressive modalities (faces and  
15  
16          13 bodies in Study 1a; faces and voices in Study 1b). In Study 2, all participants were tested on  
17  
18          14 facial, bodily, and vocal emotion recognition, and therefore, emotion recognition ability was  
19  
20          15 measured as both facial (in line with the previous two samples) and as a supramodal score  
21  
22          16 (derived from facial, vocal, and bodily emotion recognition ability, and intended as a more  
23  
24          17 ecologically generalisable measure). Therefore, each of the following analyses was carried  
25  
26          18 out twice, with either facial or supramodal emotion recognition ability measures, in line with  
27  
28          19 our pre-registered protocol.

29           20 Firstly, we assessed the association between our variables of interest, in order to  
30  
31          21 answer our first research question of whether alexithymia is negatively correlated with  
32  
33          22 intelligence and (facial or supramodal) emotion recognition ability. Secondly, hierarchical  
34  
35          23 regression analyses were used to examine the unique associations of general intelligence and  
36  
37          24 emotion recognition ability to alexithymia. As in the previous two samples, we conducted a  
38  
39          25 three-step multiple regression analysis with alexithymia as the dependent variable.

1

2

### 3 **Pre-registered analyses**

4 As seen in Study 1, alexithymia was significantly negatively correlated with both  
 5 general intelligence ( $r=-.42, p<.001$ ) and with facial emotion recognition ability ( $r=-.22,$   
 6  $p<.001$ ). Facial emotion recognition was significantly positively correlated with general  
 7 intelligence ( $r=.35, p<.001$ ).

8 A very similar pattern of results was also observed for supramodal emotion  
 9 recognition ability. Alexithymia was significantly negatively correlated with supramodal  
 10 emotion recognition ability ( $r=-.35, p<.001$ ). Supramodal emotion recognition ability was  
 11 significantly positively correlated with general intelligence ( $r=.51, p<.001$ ).

12 We next used hierarchical linear regression to test whether general intelligence was a  
 13 predictor of alexithymia over and above emotion recognition ability (and other variables). In  
 14 the first of these models, age and sex were entered as predictors of alexithymia in the first  
 15 step. Neither of these variables reached statistical significance. In the second step, facial  
 16 emotion recognition ability was entered, which was a significant negative predictor of  
 17 alexithymia ( $\beta=-.20, p=.001$ ). In the third step, general intelligence was entered into the  
 18 model. This variable was a significant predictor of alexithymia ( $\beta=-.40, p<.001$ ), but facial  
 19 emotion recognition was then no longer statistically significant. Inclusion of general  
 20 intelligence in the model significantly improved model fit ( $R^2$  changed from .054 to .191,  
 21  $p<.001$ ). The full results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 3.

22

23 Table 3: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion  
 24 recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 2.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
--	--------	--------	--------

59

60

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.03	.614	-.03	.672	-.03	.576
Sex	-.11	.068	-.08	.209	-.10	.094
Face Emot			<b>-.20</b>	<b>.001</b>	-.06	.317
General Intelligence					<b>-.40</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>

In the second of these models, age and sex were first entered as predictors of alexithymia: the results were of course identical to those above. In the second step, supramodal emotion recognition ability was entered and was observed to be a significant negative predictor of alexithymia ( $\beta = -.34, p < .001$ ). In the third step, general intelligence was entered into the model. General intelligence was a significant predictor of alexithymia ( $\beta = -.33, p < .001$ ), and supramodal emotion recognition also remained a significant negative predictor ( $\beta = -.17, p = .008$ ). The full results of this regression analysis are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, supramodal emotion recognition ability (Supra Emot), and general intelligence in Study 2.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.03	.614	-.05	.391	-.04	.449
Sex	-.11	.068	-.06	.324	-.08	.156
Supra Emot			<b>-.34</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.17</b>	<b>.008</b>
General Intelligence					<b>-.33</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>

1  
2  
3 1  
4  
5  
6 2 Of additional note, in contrast to Studies 1a and 1b, *face* emotion recognition ability  
7  
8 3 did not show a significant unique association with alexithymia (i.e. independent of general  
9  
10 4 intelligence) (Step 3 in Table 3). However, *supramodal* emotion recognition ability did show  
11  
12 5 a significant unique relationship with alexithymia (i.e. independent of general intelligence)  
13  
14 6 (Step 3 in Table 4).  
15  
16

### 17 7 **Subsidiary Exploratory Analyses**

18  
19  
20  
21 8 As an exploratory step to complement the pre-registered analyses, we examined the  
22  
23 9 correlations between general intelligence and the three alexithymia subscales across all three  
24  
25 10 of our sets of data.  
26  
27

28  
29 11 In Study 1a, only the Externally Oriented Thinking (EOT) subscale showed a  
30  
31 12 significant negative association with intelligence:  $r = -.13, p = .014$ ). Neither the Difficulty  
32  
33 13 Identifying Feelings (DIF) nor the Difficulty Describing Feelings (DDF) subscales showed  
34  
35 14 significant associations with intelligence (DIF:  $r = -.09, p = .077$ ; DDF:  $r = -.06, p = .251$ ). In  
36  
37 15 Study 1b, all three of the subscales were significantly and negatively associated with  
38  
39 16 intelligence (DIF:  $r = -.38, p < .001$ ; DDF:  $r = -.25, p < .001$ ; EOT:  $r = -.26, p < .001$ ).  
40  
41  
42

43 17 In Study 2, all three of the alexithymia subscales were significantly and negatively  
44  
45 18 correlated with intelligence (DIF:  $r = -.38, p < .001$ ; DDF:  $r = -.31, p < .001$ ; EOT:  $r = -.34,$   
46  
47 19  $p < .001$ ). The results from across the three samples therefore suggest that the association  
48  
49 20 between total alexithymia score and general intelligence is not being solely driven by any  
50  
51 21 particularly cognitively oriented items, for example, those in the Externally Oriented  
52  
53 22 Thinking subscale.  
54  
55

56  
57  
58 23 Secondly, in light of an interesting recently proposed perspective, involving the idea  
59  
60 24 of verbal difficulty giving rise to the alexithymia construct, we carried out some exploratory

1 post-hoc analyses that were also not included in our original pre-registration plan. Hobson  
2 and colleagues (2019) recently proposed the alexithymia-language hypothesis positing that  
3 verbal impairment may be one of several mechanisms underpinning the aetiology of the  
4 alexithymic phenotype. This idea arose from the finding that language processes are widely  
5 considered to contribute to typical emotional development (Ornaghi & Grazzani, 2013).  
6 Indeed, Hobson et al. (2019) report evidence from clinical populations in which early speech  
7 and language difficulties are associated with emotion processing difficulties in later life, for  
8 example in deaf or autistic children, and cite alexithymia as a key mediator between linguistic  
9 and emotional capabilities (Hobson, Brewer, Catmur, & Bird, 2019).

10 Since our measure of general intelligence included both verbal and nonverbal  
11 components, we sought to provide a test of this alexithymia-language hypothesis by assessing  
12 whether the verbal intelligence sub-score was more predictive of alexithymia than nonverbal  
13 intelligence. In Study 1a, the correlations between the verbal and nonverbal components with  
14 alexithymia were  $-.11$  ( $p=.039$ ) and  $-.11$  ( $p=.028$ ), respectively, which did not differ  
15 significantly from each other ( $p=.50$ ). In Study 1b, the correlations between the verbal and  
16 nonverbal components with alexithymia were  $-.40$  ( $p<.001$ ) and  $-.33$  ( $p<.001$ ), respectively,  
17 which did significantly differ from each other ( $p=.023$ ). In Study 2, the correlations between  
18 the verbal and nonverbal components with alexithymia were  $-.43$  ( $p<.001$ ) and  $-.37$  ( $p<.001$ ),  
19 respectively, and whilst these did not statistically differ from each other ( $p=.053$ ), interpreting  
20  $p$  values close to the nominal threshold should be done with caution. Overall, then, these  
21 results suggest that alexithymia is associated with general intelligence and that this  
22 association is not driven by a specific relationship with verbal intelligence. However, we  
23 discuss this interpretation in more depth below.

24

## General Discussion

The construct of alexithymia as an impairment in emotional understanding has been studied in some depth, especially in clinical populations. To date, however, little work has examined the relation of alexithymia to broader cognitive abilities. In the current study, across three independent samples, we consistently observed a significant negative association between alexithymia and general intelligence, and the magnitude of this association was moderate-to-large in two of our three samples.

Regarding the question of whether alexithymia and intelligence have an independent association, over and above the effects of emotion recognition ability, the results were somewhat more mixed. However, on the balance of evidence – that is, the results from Study 1b and our pre-registered Study 2 – we conclude that general intelligence is uniquely associated with alexithymia, over and above emotion recognition ability. This finding is important because it indicates that the psychological footprint of alexithymia extends beyond affect/emotion-relevant processes and abilities, and that a full understanding of individual differences in alexithymia will likely require including a role for general intelligence.

We also observed a consistent link between emotion recognition ability and alexithymia independent of general intelligence (although in Study 2 this link was only evident for supramodal emotion recognition ability). This result is important because it indicates that the link between emotion recognition ability and alexithymia is not explained away by their common links to general intelligence, and thus the alexithymia construct appears to reflect cognitive ability across (at least) two levels of abstraction, enriching our understanding of this trait.

In addition to our core research questions, data from the current study enabled us also to test a recent hypothesis in the literature that posited a specific link between verbal



1 intelligence and alexithymia (Hobson et al., 2019). Across the three samples, we observed  
2 relatively limited evidence in favour of this hypothesis. In Study 1a, we observed a nominally  
3 significant difference between the verbal and non-verbal associations with alexithymia in the  
4 predicted direction. In Study 1b, we did not see this difference. In Study 2, we observed a  
5 ‘marginally’ significant difference in the predicted direction. These mixed results, along with  
6 the modest observed effect sizes, indicate that verbal intelligence does not seem to be a  
7 special relative of alexithymia, in contrast to the model proposed by Hobson et al. (2019).

8         What might underlie the observed association between alexithymia and general  
9 intelligence? There are several proposed aetiologies of alexithymia, one of them concerning  
10 difficulties in evaluating an emotional response, as posited by the attention-appraisal model  
11 (Preece et al., 2017). In this model, it is proposed that alexithymic individuals have under-  
12 developed emotion schemas, and as such, they experience an emotional response but do not  
13 attend to it or evaluate it appropriately, leading to difficulties such as poor emotional  
14 regulation. Given that the development of emotion schemas depends on sufficient cognitive  
15 development (Izard, 2011), it is plausible that poor development of cognitive structures may  
16 underlie the difficulties in both emotion recognition and general intelligence. For example, if  
17 an individual is poor at evaluating complex information, this would have an adverse effect on  
18 their general cognitive ability and their recognition of emotional stimuli.

19         Our findings have some practical implications for examining alexithymia in clinical  
20 disorders that are known to show an association with general intelligence, including  
21 schizophrenia (Fett, Viechtbauer, Penn, van Os, & Krabbendam, 2011) and depression  
22 (Marazziti, Consoli, Picchetti, Carlini, & Faravelli, 2010). In these populations, what may  
23 appear to be alexithymic traits may actually reflect deficits in broader cognitive ability, and  
24 given the associations reported here, it will be important in future to adjust for general  
25 intelligence to eliminate this potential confound.

1           Some potential limitations of the current work require mention. Firstly, the studies  
2 reported here were carried out online on a commonly used data collection platform:  
3 Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Although there have been concerns raised about the  
4 quality of online data, other studies have suggested that they provide reliable, replicable  
5 results in a cost- and time-efficient way (Miller, Crowe, Weiss, Maples-Keller, & Lynam,  
6 2017). Indeed, there may be benefits to online testing over traditional lab-based student  
7 samples; for example larger, more diverse samples that are more representative of the general  
8 US population and who have high internal motivation to respond honestly and accurately  
9 (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004). Our choice of the MTurk platform is bolstered  
10 by the extensive use of it in previous work (e.g. Ramsey, Thompson, McKenzie, &  
11 Rosenbaum, 2016; Mortensen & Hughes, 2018). That said, it will likely be of value to extend  
12 these findings to broader populations to ensure replicability and generalisability.

13           Secondly, we have observed that the alexithymia construct extends beyond emotion  
14 abilities. However, alexithymia may not reflect general intelligence at the broad level  
15 examined here but perhaps instead at a more intermediary level somewhere in between  
16 emotion recognition ability and general intelligence, such as meta-cognitive awareness.  
17 Although this perspective does not invalidate our core argument – namely, that alexithymia  
18 clearly extends beyond the emotion sphere itself - further work will now be required to  
19 examine this possibility and thus further refine our understanding of the alexithymia  
20 construct.

21           Finally, future work should build on the association we report by including a measure  
22 of mood. Recent factor analytic evidence suggests that some of the variance of the DIF  
23 subscale of the TAS-20 captures an individual's distress level (and some captures their  
24 alexithymia) (Preece et al., 2020). Given also that there exists an association between  
25 cognitive ability and depression (Rock, Roiser, Riedel, & Blackwell, 2014), it would be

1 appropriate to adjust for a measure of negative affect to assess if and how the association  
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 appropriate to adjust for a measure of negative affect to assess if and how the association  
2 between alexithymia and intelligence changes with the inclusion of this potential confound.

### 3 **Conclusion**

4 In summary, across three independent healthy samples, we observed significant  
5 negative associations between alexithymia and general intelligence. Importantly, in two of  
6 the samples, intelligence was a significant predictor of alexithymia even after adjusting for  
7 emotion recognition ability. These results suggest that to achieve a full understanding of the  
8 alexithymia construct, theorists will need to engage with broader cognitive abilities and  
9 processes.



- 1  
2  
3 1 Corroero II, A. N., Paitel, E. R., Byers, S. J., & Nielson, K. A. (2019). The role of alexithymia  
4  
5 2 in memory and executive functioning across the lifespan. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1-  
6  
7 3 16.  
8  
9  
10 4 Deary, I. J., Strand, S., Smith, P., & Fernandes, C. (2007). Intelligence and educational  
11  
12 5 achievement. *Intelligence*, 35(1), 13-21.  
13  
14 6 De Gucht, V., & Heiser, W. (2003). Alexithymia and somatisation: a quantitative review of  
15  
16 7 the literature. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 54(5), 425-434.  
17  
18 8 Duncan, J., Burgess, P., & Emslie, H. (1995). Fluid intelligence after frontal lobe lesions.  
19  
20 9 *Neuropsychologia*, 33(3), 261-268.  
21  
22 10 Fett, A. K. J., Viechtbauer, W., Penn, D. L., van Os, J., & Krabbendam, L. (2011). The  
23  
24 11 relationship between neurocognition and social cognition with functional outcomes in  
25  
26 12 schizophrenia: a meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 35(3), 573-  
27  
28 13 588.  
29  
30 14 Grynberg, D., Chang, B., Corneille, O., Maurage, P., Vermeulen, N., Berthoz, S., & Luminet,  
31  
32 15 O. (2012). Alexithymia and the processing of emotional facial expressions (EFEs):  
33  
34 16 Systematic review, unanswered questions and further perspectives. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8).  
35  
36 17 <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042429>  
37  
38 18 Haier, R. J., Jung, R. E., Yeo, R. A., Head, K., & Alkire, M. T. (2005). The neuroanatomy of  
39  
40 19 general intelligence: sex matters. *NeuroImage*, 25(1), 320-327.  
41  
42 20 Herbert, B. M., Herbert, C., & Pollatos, O. (2011). On the relationship between interoceptive  
43  
44 21 awareness and alexithymia: is interoceptive awareness related to emotional  
45  
46 22 awareness?. *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 1149-1175.  
47  
48 23 Hobson, H., Brewer, R., Catmur, C., & Bird, G. (2019). The role of language in alexithymia:  
49  
50 24 moving towards a multi-route model of alexithymia. *Emotion Review*. 1-59.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 Hsing, C. K., Hofelich Mohr, A., Brent Stansfield, R., & Preston, S. D. (2013). Alexithymia  
4  
5 2 slows performance but preserves spontaneous semantic decoding of negative  
6  
7 3 expressions in the emotion task. *International Journal of Psychological Research*,  
8  
9 4 6(SPE), 56-67.
- 10  
11  
12 5 Huff, C., & Tingley, D. (2015). "Who are these people?" Evaluating the demographic  
13  
14 6 characteristics and political preferences of MTurk survey respondents. *Research &*  
15  
16 7 *Politics*, 2(3), 2053168015604648. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168015604648>
- 17  
18  
19 8 Izard, C. E. (2011). Forms and functions of emotions: Matters of emotion–cognition  
20  
21 9 interactions. *Emotion Review*, 3(4), 371-378.
- 22  
23  
24 10 Kauhanen, J., Kaplan, G. A., Julkunen, J., Wilson, T. W., & Salonen, J. T. (1993). Social  
25  
26 11 factors in alexithymia. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 34(5), 330-335.
- 27  
28  
29 12 Kokkonen, P., Karvonen, J. T., Veijola, J., Läksy, K., & Jokelainen, J. (2001). Perceived and  
30  
31 13 sociodemographic correlates of alexithymia in a population sample of young  
32  
33 14 adults. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*. 471-476.
- 34  
35  
36 15 Korkoliakou, P., Christodoulou, C., Kouris, A., Porichi, E., Efstathiou, V., Kaloudi, E., ... &  
37  
38 16 Douzenis, A. (2014). Alexithymia, anxiety and depression in patients with psoriasis: a  
39  
40 17 case–control study. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 13(1), 38.
- 41  
42  
43 18 Larsen, J. K., Brand, N., Bermond, B., & Hijman, R. (2003). Cognitive and emotional  
44  
45 19 characteristics of alexithymia: a review of neurobiological studies. *Journal of*  
46  
47 20 *Psychosomatic Research*, 54(6), 533-541.
- 48  
49  
50 21 Lewis, G. J., Lefevre, C. E., & Young, A. W. (2016). Functional architecture of visual  
51  
52 22 emotion recognition ability: A latent variable approach. *Journal of Experimental*  
53  
54 23 *Psychology: General*, 145(5), 589–602. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000160>.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 Lumley, M. A., Gustavson, B. J., Partridge, R. T., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2005). Assessing  
4  
5 2 alexithymia and related emotional ability constructs using multiple methods:  
6  
7 3 Interrelationships among measures. *Emotion*, 5(3), 329-342.  
8  
9  
10 4 Lyvers, M., Onuoha, R., Thorberg, F. A., & Samios, C. (2012). Alexithymia in relation to  
11  
12 5 parental alcoholism, everyday frontal lobe functioning and alcohol consumption in a  
13  
14 6 non-clinical sample. *Addictive Behaviors*, 37(2), 205-210.  
15  
16  
17 7 Marazziti, D., Consoli, G., Picchetti, M., Carlini, M., & Faravelli, L. (2010). Cognitive  
18  
19 8 impairment in major depression. *European Journal of Pharmacology*, 626(1), 83-86.  
20  
21  
22 9 Mattila, A. K., Salminen, J. K., Nummi, T., & Joukamaa, M. (2006). Age is strongly  
23  
24 10 associated with alexithymia in the general population. *Journal of Psychosomatic*  
25  
26 11 *Research*, 61(5), 629-635.  
27  
28  
29 12 Meganck, R., Vanheule, S., & Desmet, M. (2008). Factorial validity and measurement  
30  
31 13 invariance of the 20-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale in clinical and nonclinical  
32  
33 14 samples. *Assessment*, 15(1), 36-47.  
34  
35  
36 15 Miller, J. D., Crowe, M., Weiss, B., Maples-Keller, J. L., & Lynam, D. R. (2017). Using  
37  
38 16 online, crowdsourcing platforms for data collection in personality disorder research:  
39  
40 17 The example of Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Personality Disorders: Theory,*  
41  
42 18 *Research, and Treatment*, 8(1), 26.  
43  
44  
45 19 Mortensen, K., & Hughes, T. L. (2018). Comparing Amazon's Mechanical Turk platform to  
46  
47 20 conventional data collection methods in the health and medical research literature.  
48  
49 21 *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 33(4), 533-538.  
50  
51  
52 22 Murphy, J., Catmur, C., & Bird, G. (2018). Alexithymia is associated with a multidomain,  
53  
54 23 multidimensional failure of interoception: Evidence from novel tests. *Journal of*  
55  
56 24 *Experimental Psychology: General*, 147(3), 398-408.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 Ornaghi, V., & Grazzani, I. (2013). The relationship between emotional-state language and  
4  
5 2 emotion understanding: A study with school-age children. *Cognition &*  
6  
7 3 *Emotion*, 27(2), 356-366.
- 8  
9  
10 4 Parker, J. D., Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (1989). The alexithymia construct: relationship  
11  
12 5 with sociodemographic variables and intelligence. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 30(5),  
13  
14 6 434-441.
- 15  
16  
17 7 Preece, D., Becerra, R., Allan, A., Robinson, K., & Dandy, J. (2017). Establishing the  
18  
19 8 theoretical components of alexithymia via factor analysis: Introduction and validation  
20  
21 9 of the attention-appraisal model of alexithymia. *Personality and Individual*  
22  
23 10 *Differences*, 119, 341-352.
- 24  
25  
26 11 Preece, D. A., Becerra, R., Boyes, M. E., Northcott, C., McGillivray, L., & Hasking, P. A.  
27  
28 12 (2020). Do self-report measures of alexithymia measure alexithymia or general  
29  
30 13 psychological distress? A factor analytic examination across five samples. *Personality*  
31  
32 14 *and Individual Differences*, 155, 109721.
- 33  
34  
35 15 Ramsey, S. R., Thompson, K. L., McKenzie, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (2016). Psychological  
36  
37 16 research in the internet age: The quality of web-based data. *Computers in Human*  
38  
39 17 *Behavior*, 58, 354-360.
- 40  
41  
42 18 Rock, P. L., Roiser, J. P., Riedel, W. J., & Blackwell, A. D. (2014). Cognitive impairment in  
43  
44 19 depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, 44(10),  
45  
46 20 2029-2040.
- 47  
48  
49 21 Tombaugh, T. N. (2006). A comprehensive review of the paced auditory serial addition test  
50  
51 22 (PASAT). *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(1), 53-76.
- 52  
53  
54 23 Vorst, H. C., & Bermond, B. (2001). Validity and reliability of the Bermond–Vorst  
55  
56 24 alexithymia questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(3), 413-434.
- 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

1 Young, A., Perrett, D., Calder, A., Sprengelmeyer, R., & Ekman, P. (2002). *Facial*  
2 *expressions of emotion – stimuli and tests (FEEST)*. Thames Valley Test Company,  
3 Bury St Edmunds, England.

For Peer Review Only

Table 1: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 1a.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.08	.119	-.05	.302	-.05	.285
Sex	.09	.068	.04	.439	.04	.413
Face Emot			<b>-.27</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.26</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>
General Intelligence					-.03	.560

Table 2: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 1b.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	<b>-.11</b>	<b>.046</b>	<b>-.12</b>	<b>.031</b>	-.10	.059
Sex	-.10	.081	-.04	.513	-.04	.406
Face Emot			<b>-.34</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.23</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>
General Intelligence					<b>-.29</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>

Table 3: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, facial emotion recognition ability (Face Emot), and general intelligence in Study 2.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.03	.614	-.03	.672	-.03	.576
Sex	-.11	.068	-.08	.209	-.10	.094
Face Emot			<b>-.20</b>	<b>.001</b>	-.06	.317
General Intelligence					<b>-.40</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>

Table 4: Multiple regressions predicting alexithymia scores from age, sex, supramodal emotion recognition ability (Supra Emot), and general intelligence in Study 2.

Independent Variables	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig	$\beta$	Sig
Age	-.03	.614	-.05	.391	-.04	.449
Sex	-.11	.068	-.06	.324	-.08	.156
Supra Emot			<b>-.34</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>	<b>-.17</b>	<b>.008</b>
General Intelligence					<b>-.33</b>	<b>&lt;.001</b>