

Henning Brand

**On Strategies in Person Perception –
Predicting Others by Mental Simulation or Theory?**

Berichte aus der Psychologie

Henning Brand

**On Strategies in Person Perception -
Predicting Others by Mental Simulation or Theory?**

Shaker Verlag
Aachen 2002

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Brand, Henning:

On Strategies in Person Perception - Predicting Others by Mental
Simulation or Theory? / Henning Brand.

Aachen : Shaker, 2002

(Berichte aus der Psychologie)

Zugl.: Koblenz/Landau, Univ., Diss., 2002

ISBN 3-8265-9980-2

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2002

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 3-8265-9980-2

ISSN 0945-0971

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 1290 • D-52013 Aachen

Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9

Internet: www.shaker.de • eMail: info@shaker.de

About the Author

Henning Brand was born 1970 in Lemgo/Germany. Studied music at the Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de Kunsten/Netherlands. He taught music at the Universität Bielefeld from 1996-2001. From 1995-1999 studied psychology and sociology at the Universität Bielefeld/Germany. After graduation in 1999 he became assistant lecturer in social psychology at the Universität Koblenz-Landau. The present publication was accepted as doctoral dissertation in social psychology by the Department of Psychology at the Universität Koblenz-Landau/Campus Landau.

Summary

Common sense psychology is used in everyday life to understand and predict other people's behavior. As for the nature of this folk psychology, it is commonly held that it consists of naïve theories and therefore is rule-based, although some authors assume that such rules are applied in terms of an implicit psychology. As an alternative perspective on predicting others, mental simulation is discussed as a process by which hypothetical situations are explored by "putting oneself in the other's shoes" and using one's reactions to such situations as a means for predicting others. It is argued that mental simulation is a second force in person perception. Predicting others hence can be achieved by means of theory or by mental simulation. Addressing the issue of how these two strategies of person perception can be distinguished, existing research paradigms are presented and discussed. In contrast to these paradigms, it is argued that mental simulation may trigger emotional reactions that serve as information when predicting others, whereas in case of theory use, prediction is independent of such reactions. A series of experiments about predicting a target's surprise is then presented. The evidence from these experiments suggests a bias induced by one's own emotional reactions when predicting others. At the same time, subjects correct for this bias by using information about the target's mental states. In the absence of information, mental simulation is applied as a strategy resulting in accurate prediction of target's behavior whereas in the presence of information, theory is applied resulting in biased prediction in terms of underestimating target's surprise. Finally, an experiment is presented in which subjects accurately predicted others by theory, but independent of their own reactions. Implications for research in social psychology are discussed with special regard to emotion.

Acknowledgements

Many people have supported and inspired this work in many respects, of whom I would first like to thank Rainer Reisenzein for encouraging this project in the beginning and for many helpful comments and inspirations that will be also traceable throughout this book. I would also like to thank Gerhard Blickle, Bernd Bossong, and Ottmar Braun for comments and discussions, as well as the encouraging atmosphere in the department that was always supportive. Arie W. Kruglanski and Robert A. Wicklund offered fruitful criticism and comments as well as, of course, important points of view that became part of the discussion of topics in this work. Thanks are due to Naomi Brenner for help in collecting the data and comments, as well as to many students of psychology at our department with whom discussing was fun. I finally would like to thank Günter F. Müller for being always so encouraging and supportive, and for the helpful advice and commentaries with which he supervised this project from the very beginning.

I would finally recommend the Florence Foster Jenkins Institute for the Simulation of Music of which being a founding member years ago at first raised my interest in the issue of simulation.

Content

1.	Social Psychological Conceptions of Layman's Thinking: Person Perception and Theory Theory	15
1.1.	Assessing Others by Theory	16
1.1.1.	Scientific vs. Layman's Theory	17
1.2.	A Different Perspective: Mental Simulation.	20
1.2.1.	Tacit Knowledge	21
2.	Simulation or Theory Theory?	22
2.1.	"Predicting Others Through Simulation or by Theory?"	26
2.2.	Simulation and the Counterintuitive	28
2.3.	A Preliminary Conclusion	30
3.	Mental Simulation and Emotion	31
3.1.	Emotions as Metarepresentational States of Mind	31
3.2.1.	Extending the Theory : The case of Simulation	33
3.2.2.	"A cognitive Theory of Pretense"	34
3.3.	Pretense, Simulation and Emotion	38
3.4.	What is Simulation?	42
3.5.	Psychoevolutionary Perspectives: Exploring the Unknown	43
3.6.	Dual Process Models in Social Psychology	46
3.6.1.	Dual Process Models Separating Motivation from Cognition	46
3.6.2.	Sloman's <i>Criterion S</i> and Evidence for Two Systems of Reasoning	49
4.	Simulation vs. Theory use in Prediction: Applying Theory to Empirical Assessment	50
4.1.	A Case for Surprise	51
4.2.	Quiz Paradigm	53
4.3.	The Research Project	53
5.	Pretest: Exploring the Paradigm	55
5.1.	Is the Folk Psychological Concept of Surprise Right?	55
5.2.	Itemselection	56
5.3.	Participants	56
5.4.	Laboratory Arrangements	57
5.5.	Procedure	57
5.6.	Results	59
5.6.1.	Explorative Analysis of Reaction Time Measures: Controlling for Outliers	59

5.6.2. Categorization of Item Surprisingness	60
5.6.3. Item Surprisingness and “Feeling of Knowing”	62
5.6.4. Item Surprisingness and Reaction Time	63
5.6.5. Item Surprisingness and Self-Reported Surprise	64
5.6.6. Reaction Time and Self-Reported Surprise	65
5.6.7. Self-Reports on Surprise Intensity	66
5.6.8. Videodata	67
5.7. Discussion	68
6. Emotional Bias in Prediction vs. Theory-Evidence from Sloman’s <i>Criterion S70</i>	
6.1. Participants	70
6.2. Laboratory Arrangements	70
6.3. Itemselection and Design	71
6.4. Procedure	71
6.5. Results	73
6.5.1. Right- vs. Lefthanded Position of “Yes” / “No” Signs	73
6.5.2. Target’s Surprise	73
6.5.3. Bias in Prediction	74
6.5.4. Evidence for Prediction by Theory	75
6.6. Discussion	76
7. Assessing Mental Simulation vs. Theory in Predicting Target’s Surprise	77
7.1. Method	78
7.1.1. Participants	79
7.1.2. Laboratory Arrangements	79
7.1.3. Procedure	80
7.1.3.1 Juxtaposed Group	80
7.1.3.2 Observer Group 1	81
7.1.3.3 Observer Group 2 / Theory	82
7.1.3.4 Concluding Remarks on Procedure	83
7.2. Results	84
7.2.1. Evidence for Prediction by Theor.	84
7.2.1.1 Predicted Surprise	84
7.2.1.2 Predicted Surprise Intensit.	85
7.2.1.3 Predicted Reaction Time	87
7.2.1.4 Predicted Surprise Expression	88

7.2.1.5 Informal Postexperimental Interview	90
7.2.1.6 Interim Discussion	90
7.2.2. Accuracy of Prediction	91
7.2.2.1 Predictive Accuracy-Surprise	91
7.2.2.2 Predictive Accuracy-Surprise Intensity	92
7.2.2.3 Predictive Accuracy-Reaction Time	93
7.2.2.4 Predictive Accuracy-Surprise Expression	93
7.3. Discussion	94
8. Predicting Target's Surprise by Theory	96
8.1.1. Participants	97
8.1.2. Laboratory Arrangements	97
8.1.3. Procedure	97
8.1.3.1 Condition 1: "Theory Correct"	98
8.1.3.2 Condition 2: "Theory False"	99
8.1.3.3 Concluding Remarks on Procedure	99
8.2. Results	101
8.2.1. Target's Surprise	101
8.2.2. Target's Surprise Intensity	102
8.2.3. Predicted Reaction Time	103
8.2.4. Subject's Reaction Time	104
8.2.5. Accuracy of Prediction	104
8.3. Discussion	104
9. General Discussion	105
10. Loose Ends	113
References	115
Appendix I-ERTS Syntax / Pretest	125
Appendix II-Itemlist, Statistics and Itemcategories from the Pretest	139
Appendix III-Reliability Analysis for Itemcategories Across Studies	141