

Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK; Email: k.y.wong2@lancaster.ac.uk

Introduction

- Implicit mentalising: Automatic awareness of others' perspectives.
- Occurs even when detrimental to taskperformance; e.g., Visual perspective-taking.
- Joint Simon Effect (JSE): Spatiallydefined response to non-spatial stimuli features (spatial compatibility effect; SCE) is stronger in Joint Simon (tasksharing) vs. Individual go/no-go task.

Phase 1: Adapted Simon Task

- Participants are assigned one colour (blue/orange) to respond to, regardless of stimuli location (left/right).
- Critical novel manipulation: Replaced typical Simon task geometric stimuli with unique sets of coloured animal silhouettes (blue/orange).

Key Results

- 1. No significant Task Condition x Compatibility interaction (p=.053, $BF_{10}=0.019$).
- 2. No significant Task Condition x Assignment interaction (p=.052, $BF_{10}=0.154$).

<u> </u>	(-)100 -	
\ 450 -		
/		
425 -	90 -	

- Result of implicit mentalising during tasksharing, re-establishing SCE?
- **Domain-Specificity** of JSE has been hotly debated.
- Is JSE driven by social domain-specific mechanisms, or does it recruit nonsocial, domain-general processes?
- No consensus in literature; possible insight from examining *what* is being corepresented during task sharing, operationalised through an adapted Joint Simon and incidental memory tasks?

Research Aims

- 2 between-pt (Task Condition:. Joint vs. Individual) x 2 within-pt (Compatibility: Compatible vs. Incompatible) design.
- Measured Response Time (RT) as the DV.

Phase 2: Surprise Recognition Task

- Asked if participants recall seeing certain animal silhouettes appearing in the Phase 1 (new silhouettes were mixed in as foils).
- 2 between-subject (Task Condition: Joint vs. Individual) x 2 within-subject (Assignment: Self-assigned vs. Other-assigned) design.
- Measured *Recognition Accuracy* as DV – Proxy for degree of incidental processing & encoding of stimuli



3. No significant IOS x Assignment interaction (p=.088, $BF_{10}=0.154$).

Conclusions

- Present study did not elicit the JSE possibly due to experimental alterations, and/or changes to analyses methods.
- Raises concerns regarding the robustness of the JSE (to methodological alterations & more broadly).
- Bayesian evidence indicates that Joint

- 1. Validate if adapted Simon Task elicits JSE.
- 2. Examine contents of co-representation.
- 3. Examine effect of interpersonal closeness on JSE & content co-representation.

Participants

Study 1: Undergraduate students, N = 52 (M = 18.80 years, SD = 2.32; 40 females)



in the Simon task.

Phase 3: Interpersonal Closeness

- Inclusion of the Other in the Self (IOS) • scale assessed interpersonal closeness of partners in the Joint Task Condition.
- 6-point scale, with increasingly overlapping circles of "self" (i.e., the participant) and "other" (i.e., task partner).



Condition participants did not recognise Other-assigned stimuli better than participants in the Individual Condition.

- IOS did not predict Recognition Accuracy.
- Demos potential utility of surprise recognition task; taps self/other assignment

Upcoming Studies

- Confirm the reason for failing to replicate lacksquarethe JSE using the current paradigm.
- Expand population to younger children to test if the present findings are consistent from childhood to adulthood.
- Account for individual differences in explicit Theory of Mind (ToM), EF, vocab.
- ToM rapidly matures from 4+ years; may \bullet be informative to test if those individual

differences positively predicts the strength of JSE and/or Recog. Accuracy.

An effect of ToM may suggest that implicit mentalising is influenced by domainspecific mechanisms (at least in children).

Registered Report OSF QR Code

