

Outcome Measure	Cambridge Face Recognition Tasks: Face Memory test (CFMT), Face Perception Test (CFPT)
Sensitivity to Change	Not known
Population	Adult
How to obtain	https://www.testable.org/library Email author Brad.Duchaine@gmail.com for Australian and other versions.
Domain	Social Cognition
Type of Measure	Objective test
Time to administer	Approximately 8-12 minutes
Description	<p>The CFMT (Duchaine & Nakayama, 2006): Examinees are consecutively exposed to three images of the same face (different angles) for 3 seconds each. Part 1: Following this, they must select the same image from amongst three different identities in 3 trials. This is repeated for 6 identities (6 faces x 3 presentations) (score max = 18). Part 2: They are shown a review image (frontal) of the six identities for 20 seconds then required to pick one of the identities out in 30 forced choice trials (6 faces x 5 presentations) where the target and distractors vary with respect to visual angle or lighting. (max score = 30) Part 3: After exposure to the review image again for 20 seconds, examinees are given 24 test trials (6 identities x 4 presentations) where the target identity must be selected from a series of images with heavy visual noise (max score = 24). Administration time approximately 10-15 minutes.</p> <p>The CFPT (Duchaine, Germine, & Nakayama, 2007): In the CFPT, examinees are shown a target face (three quarter view) and asked to sort 6 images below in similarity to the target (in one minute). The images below are morphs between other identities and the original face (from 28-88% blend). There are 8 trials with different morphed images beneath. These are shown upright once and inverted once. The score is the total number of items wrongly ranked and by the degree of deviation from the correct sequence.</p>
Properties	<p><u>Internal consistency</u>: Coefficient alpha: CFMT: .89-.92 (Albonico, Malaspina, & Daini, 2017; Bowles et al., 2009; Palermo et al., 2017; Wilmer et al., 2010). CFPT: .74 for upright faces, .50 for inverted faces (Bowles et al., 2009).</p> <p><u>Test-retest reliability</u>- CFMT: .70 (6 months) (Wilmer et al., 2010)</p> <p><u>Construct validity</u>: CFMT: Correlates with the CFPT_(upright) $r = -.61$ (Bowles et al., 2009), $r = .67$ (Russell, Duchaine, & Nakayama, 2009) and long-term face memory ($r = .72$ (Russell et al., 2009), $r = .51$ (Wilmer et al., 2010). CFMT performance also correlates with self-reported problems with face recognition ($r = .14$) (Palermo et al., 2017) whereas the BFRT does not. In terms of divergent validity, there is no significant correlation between CFMT scores and an abstract art memory test (Wilmer et al., 2010) or a verbal memory test (Bowles et al., 2009; Wilmer et al., 2010). In well-educated samples, education did not influence scores (Bowles et al., 2009) although women tend to out-perform men (approx. 3-point advantage (Albonico et al., 2017). Further there is evidence that ethnicity similarity between target items and examinees influences scores (Bowles et al., 2009) The CFPT has been found to correlate with verbal memory (Bowles et al., 2009) suggesting intelligence may play a role in scores.</p>

	<p>Discriminative validity: CFMT: 25/32 people with suspected prosopagnosia performed below the cut-off on the CFMT vs only 6/32 on the BFRT (Albonico et al., 2017). CFPT: People with prosopagnosia were only mildly impaired on the CFPT relative to the CFMT (Bowles et al., 2009).</p> <p>Normative data: There is normative data for the CFMT (N= 3000+ collected via the internet) (Wilmer et al., 2010), for young adults from USA (N=50), Israel (N = 49), Germany (N= 153), Italy (N =217), Australia (N=117, 241) (Albonico et al., 2017) (Bowles et al., 2009; Palermo et al., 2017) and older adults from 35 to 79 (Bowles et al., 2009). Similar data for young to older adults (65-88 years old) is available for the CFPT (N = 125) (Bowles et al., 2009).</p>
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFMT is differentially sensitive to prosopagnosia
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inverted part of CFPT is not reliable.

References

- Albonico, A., Malaspina, M., & Daini, R. (2017). Italian normative data and validation of two neuropsychological tests of face recognition: Benton Facial Recognition Test and Cambridge Face Memory Test. *Neurol Sci, 38*(9), 1637-1643. doi:10.1007/s10072-017-3030-6
- Bowles, D. C., McKone, E., Dawel, A., Duchaine, B., Palermo, R., Schmalzl, L., . . . Yovel, G. (2009). Diagnosing prosopagnosia: Effects of ageing, sex, and participant–stimulus ethnic match on the Cambridge Face Memory Test and Cambridge Face Perception Test. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 26*(5), 423-455. doi:10.1080/02643290903343149
- Duchaine, B., Germine, L., & Nakayama, K. (2007). Family resemblance: ten family members with prosopagnosia and within-class object agnosia. *Cogn Neuropsychol, 24*(4), 419-430. doi:10.1080/02643290701380491
- Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2006). The Cambridge Face Memory Test: results for neurologically intact individuals and an investigation of its validity using inverted face stimuli and prosopagnosic participants. *Neuropsychologia, 44*(4), 576-585. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.07.001
- Palermo, R., Rossion, B., Rhodes, G., Laguesse, R., Tez, T., Hall, B., . . . McKone, E. (2017). Do people have insight into their face recognition abilities? *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 70*(2), 218-233.
- Russell, R., Duchaine, B., & Nakayama, K. (2009). Super-recognizers: people with extraordinary face recognition ability. *Psychonomic bulletin & review, 16*(2), 252-257. doi:10.3758/PBR.16.2.252
- Wilmer, J. B., Germine, L., Chabris, C. F., Chatterjee, G., Williams, M., Loken, E., . . . Duchaine, B. (2010). Human face recognition ability is specific and highly heritable. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 107*(11), 5238-5241. doi:10.1073/pnas.0913053107