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1. The general idea that guided the author is attention, and a more specific concept is Stroop task/Stroop effect. Saying that if the eye gazes are pointed at the right while being in the box on the left, will the RT be fast for people to recognize where the eye gaze is pointed at. Same with the arrows. The study is also focused on the reaction time of the brain while being in the context of the Stroop effect.

2. The question that the authors are asking in this research is: The question that the authors are asking is “Are eye gazes going to have a similar RT in a Stroop effect? Or is it going to have faster RTs in a reverse Stroop effect?”, “Do our brains react in the same way to eye gazes as they do to the arrows?”.

3. Gaze and arrows leads to spatial interference in response selection in a context of a typical special Stroop effect. The hypothesis focused on the concept that participants will have faster RTs when arrows were in congruent directions and incongruent directions for eye gazes. And the other one that the participants will take more time to recognize eye gazes than arrows. It was justified on the hypothesis which was done in the background research because Stroop effect was found in all of the previous researches mentioned. It was found with the arrows but was argued that there might be a different kind of effect with the eye gazes. The approach of this study was done differently comparing to the previous studies done.

4. The research was done on the college students. 27 women and 9 men with self-report of normal vision. In my opinion the sample was not representative enough.

5.Variable 1: Eye-gazes were used as targets. They were manipulated by the researches. They were put in the boxes on the right or on the left with the gazes either pointing on the right or on the left. The authors predicted that they will have a reverse Stroop effect.

Variable 2: Arrows stimuli were also used as targets. Were presented to the left or to the right of a fixation point, with either pointing to the left or to the right. Predicted to have a Stroop effect.

6. Variable 1: Speed of RTs (arrow)

 Variable 2: Speed of RTs (eye-gaze)

The dependent variables were majored when comparing the RT of Stroop effect and reverse Stroop effect of both arrows and eye-gazes. And the faster RTs were in the conclusion, which meant that people would recognize either one with the faster speed.

7. The results supported the hypothesis. Eye gazes had a reverse Stroop effect with higher RT, and arrows had a higher RT with Stroop effect.

8. That the responses for eye gazes were slower than for arrows, and therefore, the coding of eye gaze takes people much more time than the arrows. And as mentioned in the previous response, the main finding was that eye gaze had the reverse Stroop effect comparing to the arrows.

9. If I was conducting this study, I would use not only college students because the mean age is 20.4 and, therefore, these results can’t be generalized because there might be confounding factors, which could affect the attention because we can’t be sure that people of other age groups will have the same reaction as college students. Moreover, the sample wasn’t representative enough by having more women than men and no representation of the races, nationalities, etc. Also, I am not sure if the results can be applicable in a real life setting rather than in a lab because there are a lot of other factors in real life such as different facial expressions.

10. The authors mention some things which could be problematic with this study. The study might not be generalized for real life events. It’s hard to say if in real life people look at the eyes only or of they look at the face as a whole. Therefore, when other facial expressions are involved it’s hard to say if the effect is going to be similar as the one done in a lab setting.
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