

07/07/2020 12:28

Predictive person models elicit motor biases: the face-inhibition effect revisited

Kimberley C. Schenke¹, Natalie A. Wyer², Steven P. Tipper³, Patric Bach^{4,5}

¹ School of Natural and Social Sciences, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire, UK

² Department of Psychology, East Anglia University, Norwich, UK

³ Department of Psychology, University of York, Yorkshire, UK

⁴ School of Psychology, University of Plymouth, Devon, UK

⁵ School of Psychology, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK

* corresponding author kschenke1@glos.ac.uk

Tel: 01242 714559

School of Natural and Social Sciences

University of Gloucestershire

Cheltenham,

Gloucestershire,

GL50 4AZ

United Kingdom

Total word count: 8026 (excluding abstract, figure captions & references)

Key words: embodied cognition, motor priming, person memory, predictive processing, social perception

Acknowledgements: This research was supported by a PhD grant from Plymouth University to Kimberley Schenke and by the Economic and Social Research Council grant [ES/J019178/1] awarded to Patric Bach.

Disclosure of interest: The authors report no conflicts of interest

07/07/2020 12:28

Abstract

Using an established paradigm (Bach & Tipper, 2007; Tipper & Bach, 2010), we tested whether people derive motoric predictions about an actor's forthcoming actions from both prior knowledge about them, and the context in which they are seen. In two experiments, participants identified famous tennis and soccer players using either hand or foot responses. Athletes were shown either carrying out or not carrying out their associated actions (swinging, kicking), either in the context where these actions are typically seen (tennis court, soccer field) or outside these contexts (beach, awards ceremony). Replicating prior work, identifying non-acting athletes revealed the negative compatibility effects: viewing tennis players led to faster responses with a foot than a hand, and vice versa for viewing soccer players. Consistent with the idea that negative compatibility effects result from the absence of a predicted action, these effects were eliminated (or reversed) when the athletes were seen carrying out actions typically associated with them. Strikingly, however, these motoric biases were not limited to In-Context trials but were, if anything, more robust in the Out-of-Context trials. This pattern held even when attention was drawn specifically to the context (Experiment 2). These results confirm that people hold motoric knowledge about the actions that others typically carry out and that these actions are part of perceptual representations that are accessed when those others are re-encountered, possibly in order to resolve uncertainty in person perception.

07/07/2020 12:28

Predictive person-models elicit motor biases: the face-inhibition effect revisited

Social interactions are highly dynamic and ambiguous. Yet, they require us to rapidly make sense of the internal mental states that drive others' behaviour and respond to them appropriately. Motoric accounts of social perception solve this problem by assuming that others' behaviour is directly mapped onto the observer's own motor system, so that the associated internal states can be accessed and the behaviour can be understood "from the inside" (e.g., Rizzolatti, Cattaneo, Fabbri-destro, & Rozzi, 2014; Giacomo Rizzolatti & Sinigaglia, 2010; Wilson & Knoblich, 2005). Mirror neurons – which fire both when we perform an action, and when we merely observe someone else perform that same action – are assumed to be a central mechanism in this mapping, directly matching incoming kinematic features to corresponding motor programs in the observer (di Pellegrino, Fadiga, Fogassi, Gallese, & Rizzolatti, 1992; Rizzolatti, Fadiga, Gallese, & Fogassi, 1996).

The robust motoric activation present in behavioural and neuroimaging studies of human action observation (for reviews, see Cracco et al., 2018; Naish, Houston-Price, Bremner, & Holmes, 2014; Oosterhof, Tipper, & Downing, 2013) has been taken as support of this view. For example, simply seeing someone lift a finger facilitates the same finger lift by the observer (Brass, Bekkering, Wohlschlagel, & Prinz, 2000; Stürmer, Aschersleben, & Prinz, 2000; for a review, see Cracco et al., 2018). Similarly, viewing someone act with their hand (e.g., typing on a keyboard) or foot (e.g., kicking a football) speeds up the participants' responses with the same body parts (e.g., Bach & Tipper, 2006; Bach, Peatfield, & Tipper, 2007; Gillmeister, Catmur, Liepelt, Brass & Heyes, 2008).

More recently, it has recently been argued that the ambiguity inherent in perceptual input cannot be resolved by such simple bottom-up mechanisms, even in low-level, non-social vision where the mapping is much simpler (e.g., Clark, 2013; Yuille & Kersten, 2006). The

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 same social stimulus (e.g., a smile) can have different meanings in different situations (e.g., a
4
5 polite, happy, or sad smile), and the same internal state can express itself through different
6
7 behaviours (e.g., experiencing anger can result in either aggressive or avoidant behaviour).
8
9 More recent approaches therefore cast social perception as a top-down process of hypothesis-
10
11 testing and revision, in which prior action expectations – derived from various contextual
12
13 cues, such as facial expressions, nearby objects, or verbal statements – are tested against
14
15 others' actual behaviour (e.g., Bach, Nicholson & Hudson, 2014; Bach & Schenke, 2017;
16
17 Hickok, 2009; Kilner, Friston, & Frith, 2007a; Liepelt et al., 2009). In such predictive
18
19 processing accounts, the robust motor activation during action observation reflects not a
20
21 bottom-up matching of observed behaviour to own motor representations, but instead an
22
23 attempt to *predict* the other's most likely action and to test it against what was actually
24
25 observed (e.g., Hickok, 2009; Kilner et al., 2007; Csibra, 2008; Bach, Nicholson & Hudson,
26
27 2014). Recent studies provide direct evidence for such predictions, showing, for example,
28
29 that attributing goals to others induces predictive perceptual biases in action identification
30
31 and perceptual judgments (Hudson et al., 2016^{ab}; 2017, 2018; McDonough, Hudson, & Bach,
32
33 2019; Schenke et al., 2016; see Bach & Schenke, 2017, for a review). Moreover, consistent
34
35 with motor prediction views, the well-documented motor activation during action observation
36
37 can reflect actions that are expected but not (yet) observed (Avenanti, Annella, Candidi,
38
39 Urgesi, & Aglioti, 2013), even on the level of single neurons (Maranesi, Livi, Fogassi,
40
41 Rizzolatti, & Bonini, 2014; Urgesi et al., 2010). It is sensitive to the (inferred) goal of the
42
43 action (Liepelt et al., 2009), and is strongest for actions compatible with goal achievement
44
45 (e.g., Bach, Bayliss & Tipper, 2011).

46
47
48 So far, most research to date has investigated how action predictions are derived from overt
49
50 cues: the objects surrounding the actor, their gaze, facial expressions or overt intention
51
52 statements (e.g., Bach, Nicholson & Hudson, 2014; Adams, Ambady, Macrae, & Kleck,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 2006; Bach et al., 2011; Hudson, Nicholson, Ellis, & Bach, 2016; Hudson, Nicholson, Ellis,
4 & Bach, 2015; Hunnius & Bekkering, 2010; Johnston, Miles, & Macrae, 2010; Pierno et al.,
5
6 2006; Stapel, Hunnius, & Bekkering, 2012). Recently, we and others have argued that the
7
8 *identity* of the actors themselves could make an important contribution as well (Bach &
9
10 Schenke, 2017; Schenke, Wyer & Bach, 2016; Barresi & Moore, 1996; Newen, 2015).
11
12
13
14
15 Humans form sophisticated internal models of how other people behave in different
16
17 situations, such as which toy our child typically picks, or which wine our spouse prefers (e.g.,
18
19 Schenke et al., 2016; Barresi & Moore, 1996; Newen, 2015; Monroy, Meyer, Gerson &
20
21 Hunnius, 2017; Buchsbaum, Gopnik, Griffiths, & Shafto, 2011). As soon as such models are
22
23 established, they can support social interactions by providing information about which
24
25 actions will be carried out by an individual when they are encountered again in the same
26
27 situation. Consistent with this view, studies have shown, for example, that people’s attention
28
29 is automatically biased towards the object someone *usually* looks at rather than where they
30
31 are actually looking (Joyce, Schenke, Bayliss, & Bach, 2015). Moreover, people are faster to
32
33 identify an action that is typically carried out by one person in a given situation, compared to
34
35 an action that is typically carried out by someone else (Schenke et al., 2016), and they
36
37 unconsciously learn another player’s idiosyncratic “tells” that predict their actions in
38
39 gambling (Heerey & Velani, 2010).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Here, we examine whether the activation of internal person models can be tracked not only
47
48 by perceptual measures, but by motoric activation as well. This hypothesis follows from the
49
50 idea that people embody their action knowledge of the other person, using their own motor
51
52 system to *predict* the other person’s forthcoming actions (e.g., Csibra, 2008; Kilner et al.,
53
54 2007ab; Bach et al., 2014; Schenke & Bach, 2017). Prior work from ourselves and others
55
56 (Bach and Tipper , 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011; Candidi, Vicario, Abreu, & Aglioti, 2010;
57
58 Sinnett, Hodges, Chua, & Kingstone, 2011) provides suggestive evidence for just such an
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 effect. In these studies, participants were asked to identify famous soccer and tennis players
4
5 from their faces with hand or foot responses. The results revealed a negative compatibility
6
7 effect between the foot and hand responses required of the participant and the hand and foot-
8
9 centric sports of the athletes. That is, participants responded more slowly with their own hand
10
11 when identifying tennis players than soccer players and more slowly with their own foot
12
13 when identifying a soccer than a tennis player. According to predictive processing views,
14
15 these negative compatibility effects may index a prediction error: the activation of a predicted
16
17 action that cannot be matched to the actual sensory input in the photographs that showed non-
18
19 acting athletes. Indeed, the effects reversed (i.e., turned into positive compatibility effects),
20
21 when, in a later study, the same athletes were shown carrying out the actions they are known
22
23 for (hitting a tennis ball or kicking a football; Tipper & Bach, 2011).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Here, we test whether this actor-specific modulation of motor output reflects the activation of
31
32 person-specific internal models for action prediction. One key signature of such person
33
34 models is that they should not just generally capture the actions that others' typically carry
35
36 out, but also the situations in which these actions are typically seen in (Bach & Schenke,
37
38 2017; Barresi & Moore, 1996). In our case, for example, participants should not only predict
39
40 that Ronaldo generally kicks a ball, but that he would do so specifically when he is seen on
41
42 the soccer pitch (but not, say, on the beach). Similarly, a famous tennis player should only be
43
44 predicted to use the racket on, but not off, the tennis court. Thus, if positive and negative
45
46 compatibility effects reflect successful and unsuccessful motoric predictions from such
47
48 situation-specific person models, they should be observed primarily when the athletes are
49
50 seen in their sporty contexts but less so in neutral contexts where these actions are not
51
52 expected. This hypothesis has not yet been directly tested in any of the previous studies. For
53
54 example, while Tipper and Bach (2010) showed acting or not-acting athletes, they did not
55
56 manipulate whether they were seen within or outside their sports contexts. In contrast, Bach
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 & Tipper (2006) did manipulate context, but mostly to increase variability of the stimuli, and
4
5 only showed not-acting athletes. Moreover, as the stimuli showed mostly the athletes' faces,
6
7 the sporty and neutral contexts were not salient and no differential compatibility effects were
8
9 observed.
10

11
12 Here, we report two experiments that adapted the original design to directly test the
13
14 predictions outlined above. As before, we presented participants with various images of four
15
16 famous athletes – two tennis players and two soccer players – either carrying out their usual
17
18 sporting actions (kicking a football, hitting a tennis ball with a racket) or showing them in a
19
20 neutral pose not related to these behaviours. In a fully factorial design, we varied
21
22 independently whether these athletes were seen within their typical contexts (e.g., on the
23
24 tennis court or soccer pitch) or outside those contexts (e.g., at an awards ceremony or at the
25
26 beach). Participants again identified these athletes using either a finger or foot key press, such
27
28 that for each participant, one tennis and one soccer player had to be identified with the foot,
29
30 and the other two athletes with the hand.
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 This design enables us to confirm, first, whether the athletes' typical behaviour is an
38
39 embodied component of the observer's person knowledge that is matched against the
40
41 behaviour that is observed. If so, then, just as in prior research, identifying the famous
42
43 athletes should induce compatibility effects in opposite directions depending on whether the
44
45 athletes are seen acting or not-acting: Athletes that are carrying out their usual behaviour
46
47 should elicit *positive* compatibility effects; they should be identified more quickly with a
48
49 body part that matches these typical behaviours (e.g., faster foot responses to identify a
50
51 footballer than a tennis player, and vice versa for hand responses, Bach et al., 2007; Bach &
52
53 Tipper, 2006; Gillmeister et al., 2008). In contrast, athletes that are seen not-acting should
54
55 elicit *negative* compatibility effects. They should be identified *more slowly* with the body part
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 that matches their usual motor behaviour, indexing the unexpected absence of these actions
4
5 (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2010).
6
7

8
9 Second, and more importantly, this design allows us to test the novel hypothesis, derived
10 from predictive person model accounts, that these motoric predictions reflect the actions that
11 actors are expected to carry out in a specific situation. If so, then the motoric modulation
12
13 should be sensitive to the context in which the athletes are observed: both positive and
14
15 negative compatibility effects should be stronger when the actors are seen in their typical
16
17 sporty contexts – the soccer field and tennis court – where these behaviours are expected, but
18
19
20
21 less so in more neutral contexts in which they are not.
22
23

24
25 The current findings will help test predictive person model accounts against competing
26 theories. For example, in associative accounts (Heyes, 2010; Keysers & Perrett, 2004;
27
28 Hommel, Müsseler, Aschersleben & Prinz, 2001; Hommel, 2019), motor activation during
29
30 action observation reflects domain-general learning processes that have associated one's
31
32 motor behaviours to the perceptual effects that reliably go along with them, rather than
33
34 attempts to test predictions against the perceptual input. Such associative learning
35
36 mechanisms readily account for the positive compatibility effects elicited by the different
37
38 athletes, and potentially also by their tennis- and soccer-contexts, as these could simply be
39
40 linked to the initial motor-action representations via spreading activation. However, they
41
42 have a hard time accounting for the negative compatibility effects that emerge when the
43
44 athletes are seen not-acting: if athletes have been associated with different motor behaviours,
45
46 then these behaviours should be activated – but not inhibited – when the athletes are seen
47
48 again, even when the actions themselves are not part of the stimulus display.
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Another possibility is that actor-related motor activations do not reflect predictions of a
56
57 specific action in a given situation, but instead reflect more general predictive person
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 knowledge that is not linked to a particular context. For example, from watching the athletes
4
5 play, we might have formed rather general links between them and their typical behaviour:
6
7 that Rooney and Ronaldo typically kick soccer balls and that Federer and Murray typically hit
8
9 tennis balls with their rackets, irrespective of whether they are in or out of their sporty
10
11 contexts. Later on, when re-encountering the athlete, we might rely on these general action
12
13 expectations to confirm that it is really them that we are seeing. If this were the case, then the
14
15 positive and negative compatibility effects should be insensitive to the current situation and
16
17 be observed both when the athletes are seen in their sporting contexts and outside of it. In
18
19 fact, it could even be the case that such motoric knowledge is recruited particularly when
20
21 people are seen *outside* their usual context. Encountering someone out of their usual context
22
23 (e.g., running into one of your students at the supermarket) produces surprise and uncertainty.
24
25 This uncertainty may, in turn, draw attention and lead to the recruitment of additional
26
27 processing – including activating the actions the individuals typically carry out – to make
28
29 sense of the novel situation (e.g., Bar, 2003; Fenske, Aminoff, Gronau, & Bar, 2006;
30
31 Reichardt, Polner, & Simor, 2020). Context should then have the opposite effects than those
32
33 assumed by predictive person models: positive and negative compatibility effects should be
34
35 stronger, not weaker, whenever the athletes are seen outside their usual contexts.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Experiment 1**

50
51 Experiment 1 tested whether participants' motor systems represent the merely predicted (but
52
53 not observed) actions of other people, based on our prior knowledge of them. Participants
54
55 were presented with photographs of famous soccer (Wayne Rooney, Cristiano Ronaldo) and
56
57 tennis (Andy Murray, Roger Federer) players either acting, or not acting, in a neutral context
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 or in their usual sports context, in a fully counterbalanced factorial design. Participants had to
4
5 identify these athletes with hand and foot responses, such that one tennis player (e.g., Andy
6
7 Murray) and one footballer (e.g., Wayne Rooney) had to be identified with a foot response,
8
9 and the others (e.g., Roger Federer and Cristiano Ronaldo) with a hand response.
10
11

12
13 The goal of Experiment 1 was, first, to replicate the finding that identifying famous athletes
14
15 interferes with participants' ability to use the body part used in their sport when they are seen
16
17 not acting (i.e., the face inhibition effect, Bach & Tipper, 2006), but facilitates similar motor
18
19 output when they are seen carrying out the expected actions (Tipper & Bach, 2011). Second,
20
21 and more importantly, it tested whether these effects reflect underlying person models that
22
23 predict others' behaviour in different situations. If so, then these effects should be context-
24
25 specific: both the negative and positive compatibility effects should be stronger when the
26
27 athlete is in their sporty situation (e.g., on a soccer pitch), where such an action is expected,
28
29 but not in a neutral situation (e.g., at the beach), where these actions are less likely to be seen.
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

Participants

43 participants (34 female, mean age = 20.86 years, SD= 4.49; 38 right-handed) took part in
exchange for course credit. They were recruited based on their self-reported ability to
recognise the four athletes. All participants provided written consent. The experiment was
approved by the Faculty of Health and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee at the
University of Plymouth prior to data collection [reference number: 14/15-320]. We report all
measures, manipulations and exclusions for both experiments. Sample size matched prior
studies on this effect (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011; Sinnott et al., 2011). Four

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 participants had technical difficulties with the foot pedal and were excluded from the
4
5 analysis. The final sample size provides 80% power to detect medium effect sizes in the
6
7 predicted direction with $d > .405$, and in either direction with $d > .460$, as determined with a
8
9 sensitivity analysis using G-Power (Erdfeiler, Faul, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The smallest
10
11 effect sizes of interest (SESOI; Lakens, Scheel, & Isager, 2018) given the sample size and
12
13 test are $d = 0.324$ (two-sided) and $d = 0.270$ (one-sided).
14
15
16

17 *Materials and apparatus*

18
19
20 The experiment was administered with E-prime 2.0 (Psychology Software Tools, Pittsburgh,
21
22 PA), running on an Intel i3 CPU, 4GB Memory, 500GB HDD, Windows 10 Professional
23
24 with a Philips Brilliance 221P monitor set to a resolution of 1024 by 768.
25
26
27

28
29 The stimulus set consisted of 32 photographs of four athletes: two well-known soccer players
30
31 (Wayne Rooney, Cristiano Ronaldo) and two well-known tennis players (Andy Murray,
32
33 Roger Federer). Each of the four athletes were shown in two photographs for each of the four
34
35 conditions that resulted from the factorial combination of In-Context and Out-of-Context
36
37 scenes and acting or not-acting athletes (see Figure 1 for examples). The photographs were
38
39 sourced from a Google image search and selected such that they showed the athletes' full
40
41 body with the face easily identifiable. The In-Context photos showed soccer players on the
42
43 soccer field and tennis players on the tennis court, wearing their usual sports attire. The Out-
44
45 of-Context images showed the four athletes in any situation other than a tennis court or
46
47 soccer field, such as at an awards ceremony, a photo shoot, or on the beach. The images were
48
49 of varying sizes (between 328 and 522 pixels vertically and 169 to 483 pixels horizontally).
50
51 To prevent laterality effects (Simon, 1969), all images were presented centred in the middle
52
53 of the screen and each photograph was cropped so that the athlete filled the whole photograph
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 from left to right, with the identification-relevant features of body and face centred as much
4
5 as possible (see Supplementary Materials for the full stimulus set).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 --- *Insert Figure 1 about here* ---
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 As in Bach and Tipper (2006), a post-experiment questionnaire asked how often participants
20 had seen each athlete playing tennis/football, how skilled they thought the athlete was
21 compared to other professionals within their sport, how talented they thought the athlete
22 would be at the other sport (e.g., for Andy Murray, participants were asked how talented they
23 thought he would be at football), and finally how much participants liked each athlete. Each
24 question was answered on an 8-point Likert scale from -4 to +4 with no zero point.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 The social intelligence scale (Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001) was administered to test
34 correlations between self-report measures of social intelligence and response time effects.
35
36 However, as there were no statistically reliable correlations for either the negative or positive
37 compatibility effects, this will not be discussed further.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Procedure*

48
49 Each trial started with a fixation point in the centre of the screen for between 800 and 1000
50 ms (randomly chosen) followed by the photograph of one of the athletes in one of the
51 conditions. This image disappeared as soon as a response was given, up to a maximum
52 interval of 2000 ms. Participants were instructed to identify the athletes as quickly and as
53 accurately as possible. One soccer player and one tennis player had to be identified by
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 pressing the foot pedal, and the second soccer player and tennis player had to be identified by
4
5 pressing a key on the keyboard, with the response assignment counterbalanced across four
6
7 groups of participants. If participants responded correctly, they were shown a blank screen
8
9 for 300 ms. If not, or if they responded too late, they were given a reminder of which
10
11 response to use for each athlete for 3000 ms.
12
13

14
15
16 As in the prior studies (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011) participants were asked
17
18 to respond with the right hand and the right foot to press centralized response devices. Such a
19
20 response setup should further safeguard against (Simon-like) laterality effects affecting the
21
22 results, as such effects are only observed when there is differential lateralization in *both*
23
24 stimuli and response alternatives (Dolk et al., 2014; Hommel, 1996; Sebanz, Knoblich &
25
26 Prinz, 2003). In contrast, here, participants responded to centrally presented images (see
27
28 Stimuli) with two responses that were equally right-lateralized and therefore only differed in
29
30 whether they involved a foot or hand movement; they should therefore not induce lateralized
31
32 response effects.
33
34

35
36
37 Participants completed 384 trials in total – 12 blocks of the 32 photographs presented in
38
39 random order. After six blocks, participants were given the opportunity for a break. After the
40
41 experiment was completed, participants filled out the exit questionnaire and the social
42
43 intelligence scale and were debriefed and thanked for their participation.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

Results

Response times

Trials were excluded if they had RTs greater than the trial duration, and if they had RTs greater than three SDs from their condition mean (1.65%). For the analysis of RTs, error trials were additionally excluded (4.79%). The remaining data were averaged by condition for each participant and analysed with a repeated measures ANOVA with the within-subjects factors Context (In-Context, Out-of-Context), Action (Action, Non-Action) and Effector Congruency (congruent with the athlete's typical effector, incongruent with the athlete's typical effector). Group (Rooney/Murray hand and Ronaldo/Federer foot, Rooney/Murray foot and Ronaldo/Federer hand, Ronaldo/Murray hand and Rooney/Federer foot, Ronaldo/Murray foot Rooney/Federer hand), was added as a between subjects factor of no interest to account for variability due to one of the four counterbalancing conditions (which of the tennis/soccer players were identified with the hand and which with the foot).

We predicted that the ANOVA would replicate the two-way interaction of Action and Effector Congruency observed in prior research (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011), reflecting that seen and merely predicted actions bias observers' motor systems in the opposite direction, inducing positive and negative compatibility effects, respectively. In addition, we expected compatibility effects to be larger when the athletes are seen in their usual contexts, reflected in a three-way interaction of Context, Action and Effector Congruency. These predicted results will be evaluated against the usual alpha of $p < .05$ (two tailed). Due to alpha-inflation linked to multiple testing in an ANOVA (Cramer et al., 2016), the five other possible main effects and interactions should be evaluated with caution unless they meet a Bonferroni-corrected alpha threshold of $p < .01$ (see Supplementary Materials for a table of the full output).

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 As in the original studies (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011), the analysis of the
4
5 response time data revealed the predicted interaction of Action and Effector Congruency,
6
7 $F[1,35] = 5.580, p = .024, \eta\rho^2 = .138$. Planned comparisons for the Action and Non-Action
8
9 trials separately (with Group as a factor of no interest) revealed that this difference mainly
10
11 reflected that, in the Non-Action trials, responses were slower for Congruent than
12
13 Incongruent trials, $F[1,35] = 5.410, p = .026, \eta\rho^2 = .134$, replicating the face-inhibition effect.
14
15 However, while the Action trials numerically showed the predicted positive compatibility
16
17 effect, the difference between Congruent and Incongruent responses was not robust, $F[1,35]$
18
19 $= 1.251, p = .306$. The predicted three-way interaction of Context, Action and Effector
20
21 Congruency was not significant, $F[1,35] = .048, p = .827, \eta\rho^2 = .001$. Indeed, when In-
22
23 Context and Out-of-Context trials were analysed separately in planned comparisons, the
24
25 crucial interaction of Action and Effector Congruency was, if anything, more robust in the
26
27 Out-of-Context trials, $F[1,35] = 3.834, p = .058, \eta\rho^2 = .099$, than the In-Context trials,
28
29 $F[1,35] = 1.241, p = .273, \eta\rho^2 = .034$, contrary to our predictions.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Aside from these confirmatory hypothesis tests, the ANOVA only revealed a theoretically
38
39 uninteresting main effect of Context, $F[1,35] = 80.740, p < .001, \eta\rho^2 = .698$, with faster
40
41 response times for identification of athletes Out-of-Context than In-Context, as well as a main
42
43 effect of Action, $F[1,35] = 9.278, p = .004, \eta\rho^2 = .210$, with faster responses when athletes
44
45 were seen performing their action compared to when they were not acting. As in the original
46
47 study, these differences probably reflect low-level differences in the stimuli in these
48
49 conditions but are independent of our main results. There was no main effect of Effector
50
51 Congruency, $F[1,35] = 1.111, p = .299, \eta\rho^2 = .031$.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

--- Insert Figure 2 about here ---

07/07/2020 12:28

Error rates

An analogous ANOVA as for the response time was carried out on the error rates (see Table 1) but revealed no theoretically relevant effects.

--- Insert Table 1 about here ---

Correlations with subjective ratings

In the study of Tipper and Bach (2011), the positive compatibility effects when the athletes were seen acting, but not the negative compatibility effects when the athletes were seen not carrying out these actions, correlated with participants' familiarity with the athletes and their evaluation of their skills, with positive compatibility effects being larger for participants that were very familiar with the athletes and judged their skills highly. No correlations were observed with assessments of the athletes' respective other sport (e.g., tennis for Ronaldo), nor for how much the athletes were generally liked. Exactly this pattern was observed here (see Supplementary Materials for a table of the full results). The positive, but not the negative, compatibility effects correlated with the familiarity of the athletes ($r = .331$, $p = .040$) and assessments of their skill ($r = .381$, $p = .017$), but not with the other measures ($r < .180$).

Discussion

Experiment 1 tested whether seeing a famous athlete elicits a motoric expectation that they would carry out their sporting actions, and whether these expectations depend upon whether the athlete is seen within or outside his usual sporting contexts. The results replicated

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 previous findings that viewing famous athletes influences the observer's motor systems
4
5 (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011) in a completely new stimulus set. As before,
6
7 identifying the athletes when they were not-acting elicited negative compatibility effects.
8
9 Participants responded more slowly when identifying the tennis player Andy Murray with a
10
11 hand compared to a foot response, for example, and vice versa for the soccer player Cristiano
12
13 Ronaldo. Moreover, as in Tipper and Bach (2011), these negative compatibility effects were
14
15 eliminated – and turned numerically into positive compatibility effects – when participants
16
17 identified the athletes performing their typical actions, in line with the idea that the negative
18
19 compatibility effects index a prediction failure: the surprising absence of an action that the
20
21 athlete would have been expected to carry out.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Contrary to the predictions of situation-specific internal person models, Experiment 1 did not
28
29 provide evidence that these positive and negative compatibility effects would be stronger
30
31 when the athletes were seen in their usual sporty context, where they would be most likely to
32
33 execute these expected actions. If anything, while this was not supported by a robust
34
35 statistical difference, effects were larger and more reliable when the athletes were seen
36
37 *outside* their usual sporting contexts, potentially in line with the idea that seeing the athletes
38
39 in unexpected environments draws attention and recruits additional action knowledge about
40
41 them.
42
43
44

45
46 One reason for the absence of a reliable difference might be that the context manipulation
47
48 was not strong enough to induce detectable effects within the current paradigm. The relevant
49
50 context may not have been salient enough, and may be activated too late, to influence
51
52 responses. Therefore, in Experiment 2, each athlete image was preceded with a short preview
53
54 of the context they would be presented with in the next critical image.
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

Experiment 2

Experiment 2 sought to enhance the availability of context information in order to more clearly delineate the conditions most likely to produce positive and negative compatibility effects. It therefore provided photographs of the contexts in which the athlete would later be seen (a tennis court, soccer pitch, or one of two beach scenes) for 500 ms. prior to the critical athlete photograph. As before, the following photograph then showed one of the four athletes either carrying out their specific action (kicking or playing tennis) or not carrying out this action in an unusual situation or in their usual sporty context. Participants identified the athletes with a foot or hand response which was either congruent or incongruent with the expected or observed action of the athlete.

As before, we hypothesized that any motoric expectancy effects should be stronger when the athlete is seen in their typical situation (e.g., on a soccer pitch), where they would be expected to perform these actions, compared to a situation, where such an action would be less expected (e.g., at the beach). Thus, the In-Context trials should show that identifying famous athletes interferes with participants' ability to use the body part primarily used in their sport when they are seen not acting, but facilitates similar motor output when they are seen carrying out the expected actions (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011). These effects should be absent or reduced when the athletes are seen outside their usual sporty contexts.

Method

Participants

56 participants (35 female, mean age = 21.29 years, SD = 5.28; 49 right-handed) took part in the study in exchange for course credit. All other aspects of the participant selection were

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 identical to Experiment 1. Sample size was increased relative to Experiment 1 to be able to
4
5 detect potentially smaller effects. This sample size provides 80% power to detect medium
6
7 effect sizes in the predicted direction with $d > .336$, and in either direction with $d > .381$, as
8
9 determined with a sensitivity analysis using G-Power (Erdfelder et al., 2007), in line with the
10
11 effect size of the Action by Effector Congruency interaction observed in Experiment 1 ($d =$
12
13 $.358$). The smallest effect sizes of interest (SESOI; Lakens, Scheel, & Isager, 2018) given the
14
15 sample size are $d = 0.268$ (two-sided) and $d = 0.224$ (one-sided).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Materials, apparatus and procedure*

25
26
27 The experiment was identical to Experiment 1 except that an additional ‘priming’ photograph
28
29 of either a beach scene or a tennis/soccer scene was now presented for 500 ms prior to the
30
31 critical photograph, 509 and 512 pixels wide and 396 and 384 pixels tall. There were four
32
33 priming photographs altogether, two showing non-sports environments (two different beach
34
35 scenes) for priming the Out-of-Context images, and two showing the two (tennis and soccer)
36
37 sports environments for priming the In-Context images. To ensure that the Out-of-Context
38
39 scenes were as predictive of the subsequent athlete type as the In-Context scenes, one of the
40
41 beach scenes always preceded tennis players and one always preceded soccer players. In
42
43 addition, all Out-of-Context photographs now showed the actors on the beach.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 --- Insert Figure 3 about here ---
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

Results

Response times

Trials were excluded as before (5.29% for error trials, 1.83% for scores greater than 3 SD from the mean). The remaining data for each participant were averaged by condition and analysed with a repeated measures ANOVA with the factors Context (In-Context, Out-of-Context), Action (Action, Non-Action) and Effector Congruency (congruent with the athlete's typical effector, incongruent with the athlete's typical effector) with Group (Rooney/Murray hand and Ronaldo/Federer foot identification, Rooney/Murray foot and Ronaldo/Federer hand identification, Ronaldo/Murray hand and Rooney/Federer foot identification, Ronaldo/Murray foot Rooney/Federer hand identification) included as a between subjects factor of no interest.

As in Experiment 1, we predicted a two-way interaction of Action and Effector Congruency (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011) and/or a three-way interaction of Context, Action and Effector Congruency. Due to alpha-inflation linked to multiple testing in an ANOVA (Cramer, 2016), the five other possible main effects and interactions should be evaluated with caution unless they meet a Bonferroni-corrected alpha threshold of $p < .01$ (see Supplementary Materials for a table of the full output).

Replicating Experiment 1, and previous experiments (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011), the analysis of response times revealed the predicted interaction between Action and Effector Congruency, $F[1,52] = 6.531$, $p = .014$, $\eta p^2 = .112$. Planned comparisons revealed faster response times when acting athletes were identified with the Congruent compared to Incongruent effector, $F[1,52] = 4.148$, $p = .047$, $\eta p^2 = .074$, showing positive compatibility effects. The negative compatibility effect for identifying non-acting athletes seen in Experiment 1, and previous research (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011), were

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 present numerically but failed to reach significance, $F[1,52]=2.744$, $p = .104$, $\eta\rho^2 = .050$. The
4
5 predicted three-way interaction was, again, not significant, $F[1,52] = 1.579$, $p = .215$, $\eta\rho^2 =$
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
.029. As before, and contrary to the predictions of situation-specific person models, when
Out-of-Context and In-Context trials were analysed separately in planned comparisons, the
crucial interaction of Action and Effector Congruency was statistically robust in the Out-of-
Context trials, $F[1,52] = 6.748$, $p = .012$, $\eta\rho^2 = .115$, but not in the In-Context trials, $F[1,52]$
 $= 1.434$, $p = .237$, $\eta\rho^2 = .027$.

Beyond these confirmatory hypotheses, the analysis only revealed a theoretically
uninteresting main effect of Context, $F[1,52] = 14.524$, $p < .001$, $\eta\rho^2 = .218$, but no interaction
of Action and Context, $F[1,52] = 5.021$, $p = .029$, $\eta\rho^2 = .088$ and no overall main effects of
Effector Congruency, $F[1,52] = .016$, $p = .901$, $\eta\rho^2 < .001$ nor of Action, $F[1,52] = .244$, $p =$
.624, $\eta\rho^2 = .005$.

--- Insert Figure 4 about here ---

Error rates

The same ANOVA was conducted on the error data but revealed no theoretically relevant
effects (see Supplementary Materials and Table 2).

--- Insert Table 2 about here ---

Correlations with subjective judgments

We again tested whether we would replicate the relationships between the positive
compatibility effects and participants' subjective judgments seen in prior research (Bach &

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Tipper, 2006) and Experiment 1 (see Supplementary Materials for a table of the full results).
4
5 Accordingly, we predicted that the positive compatibility effects when the athletes were seen
6
7 acting, but not the negative compatibility effects when they were seen not acting, would
8
9 correlate positively with participants' familiarity with the athletes and their evaluation of their
10
11 skills. However, this pattern was not replicated in Experiment 2 ($r < .187$, for all), which
12
13 differed in methodology in the use of the priming context images to Experiment 1 and the
14
15 prior studies.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Discussion

25
26
27 Experiment 2 showed – as in Experiment 1 and previous studies (Bach & Tipper, 2006;
28
29 Tipper & Bach, 2011) – that viewing famous athletes did influence the observer's motor
30
31 systems. As before, seeing the athletes act or not-act, produced compatibility effects in
32
33 opposite directions. Whilst positive compatibility effects were found when the athletes were
34
35 seen carrying out their sporty activities, they turned (numerically) into negative compatibility
36
37 effects when the athletes were seen not carrying out these actions. These findings are in line
38
39 with the idea that people predict the athletes' forthcoming actions, and that these prediction
40
41 successes and failures are indexed by positive and negative compatibility effects,
42
43 respectively. However, we could not confirm that these effects were stronger when the
44
45 athletes were seen in their usual sporty context, where they would be most likely to execute
46
47 these expected actions. If anything, effects were more reliable when the athletes were seen in
48
49 neutral contexts. To estimate the evidence for the presence or absence of the relevant effects,
50
51 a post-hoc exploratory analysis including Bayesian statistics was conducted on the pooled
52
53 data from both experiments.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

Across-experiment analysis

Both experiments provided evidence that identifying famous athletes modulates the observer's motor system in opposite directions, depending on whether the athletes are seen acting or not acting. However, neither experiment supported the prediction that the resulting positive and negative compatibility effects were larger when the athletes were presented in their usual contexts (e.g., tennis court, soccer field). If anything, the effects were more robust when the athletes were seen *outside* these contexts (e.g., at the beach). In order to estimate the extent to which the combined data provide evidence for – or against – a difference between the two contexts, we conducted an exploratory analysis using both Frequentist and Bayesian analysis methods that combines the data from both experiments for additional power. This combination of both experiments ($n=95$) provides us with 80% power to detect $d=.256$ (one-sided) and $d=.290$ (two-sided), with a smallest effect size of interest of $d=.203$ (two-sided) and $d=.170$ (one-sided).

This analysis also allows us to estimate the robustness of the positive and negative compatibility effects. While the overall modulation of motor output when seeing acting or not-acting athletes was robust and present in both experiments, it is not clear whether this mainly reflects (1) positive compatibility effects when the athletes were seen acting, (2) negative compatibility effects when they were seen not acting, or (3) both. While the negative compatibility effects elicited by not-acting athletes were statistically robust in Experiment 1, they were only present numerically in Experiment 2. Conversely, the positive compatibility effects for acting athletes were statistically robust in Experiment 2, but only present numerically in Experiment 1. Combining the data from both experiments will therefore reveal to what extent the data provide evidence for either effect.

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 We used the same ANOVA model as in Experiments 1 and 2 and applied it to the pooled
4 data, including the factors Context (In-Context, Out-of-Context), Action (Action, Non-
5 Action) and Effector Congruency (congruent with athlete's typical effector, incongruent with
6 athlete's typical effector) with counterbalancing Group and Experiment added as between-
7 subjects factors of no interest. This ANOVA was run both in Frequentist and Bayesian
8 versions (using JASP, JASP Team, 2018) to robustly estimate evidence for each effect, and
9 then further investigated with step-down analyses.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The omnibus ANOVA confirmed the interaction of Action and Effector Congruency that was
20 present in both experiments, providing considerable evidence that viewing acting or not-
21 acting athletes induces congruency effects in opposite directions, $F[1,87] = 10.66, p = .002,$
22 $\eta^2 = .109, BF_{10} = 3.954$. Step-down analyses showed that this interaction was mainly driven
23 by the negative compatibility effects when identifying not-acting athletes, $F[1,87] = 8.014, p$
24 $= .006, \eta^2 = .084, BF_{10} = 2.604$, but not the positive compatibility effects when seeing them
25 act, $F[1,87] = 0.485, p = .488, \eta^2 = .006, BF_{10} = 0.220$.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Most importantly, as in the single experiments, the predicted interaction of this effect with
37 Context was not present, $F[1,87] = 1.33, p = .252, \eta^2 = .015$, with the Bayesian analysis
38 providing considerable evidence *against* such a three-way interaction, $BF_{10} = .251$. Indeed,
39 planned step-down analyses in each context condition separately revealed considerable to
40 strong evidence for the presence of an interaction of Action and Effector Congruency in the
41 Out-of-Context trials, $F[1,87] = 10.435, p = .002, \eta^2 = .107, BF_{10} = 9.260$, but anecdotal to
42 considerable evidence for its *absence* in the In-Context trials, $F[1,87] = 2.448, p = .121, \eta^2 =$
43 $.001, BF_{10} = 0.367$.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 As the pattern is, if anything, opposite to the hypothesis of situation-specific person models
55 for action prediction we directly compared the contrast values for the critical Action by
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Effector Congruency interaction in the In-Context and Out-of-Context trials against each
4
5 other with Bayesian t-tests. This allows one to separately evaluate evidence for the directed
6
7 hypotheses that the motoric modulation is either stronger or weaker in the In-Context
8
9 compared to the Out-Of-Context trials. This analysis provided strong evidence *against* the
10
11 hypothesis that the motoric modulation is situation-specific and larger in the In-Context than
12
13 the Out-of-Context trials, $BF_{10}=.06$, but may leave some (limited) scope that it may
14
15 potentially be smaller, $BF_{10}=.312$.
16
17
18

19
20 Together, therefore, this analysis of the pooled data provides evidence for a robust
21
22 modulation of the observer's motor system when seeing famous athletes not acting, which is
23
24 – against our predictions – not larger when the athletes are seen in their usual contexts. In
25
26 fact, the results are mostly driven by seeing these athletes *not* act in Out-of-Context
27
28 situations.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **General discussion**

41
42
43 We tested whether person identification involves activating – *predicting* – the actions that an
44
45 individual typically carries out, and whether these predictions rely on the observer's motor
46
47 system. In two experiments, participants viewed well-known soccer and tennis players in
48
49 their typical contexts (soccer field, tennis court) or outside their typical contexts (e.g., on the
50
51 beach), either carrying out their typical actions or in a neutral posture. Participants identified
52
53 these individuals by making either foot or hand responses, allowing us to test whether merely
54
55 identifying these athletes biases the observer's motor system towards the effector typically
56
57 used in their sport, even if this action is not currently observed.
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Both experiments confirmed that identifying famous athletes modulates the observers' motor
4 systems in opposite directions depending on whether the athletes were seen acting or not-
5 acting (Bach & Tipper, 2006; Tipper & Bach, 2011; Candidi et al., 2010; Sinnett et al., 2011).
6
7
8 When the athletes were seen *not carrying out their expected actions* we found the expected
9 negative compatibility effects, such that participants were impaired in using the effector that
10 was primarily used in the seen athlete's sport, as reported previously (Tipper and Bach; 2011;
11 Bach & Tipper, 2006; Candidi et al., 2010). Thus, participants were slower to identify a
12 tennis player (e.g., Andy Murray) with a hand than a foot response, and vice versa for a
13 famous soccer player (e.g., Cristiano Ronaldo). We also replicated – at least in Experiment 2
14 – the usual automatic imitation (“mirror”) responses when the athletes were seen carrying out
15 their usual actions, such that participants more quickly identified a soccer player with a foot
16 response and a tennis player with a hand response (Bach et al., 2007; Gillmeister, Catmur,
17 Liepelt, Brass, & Heyes, 2008; Tipper & Bach, 2011). Note though that this difference was
18 not robust in the pooled data across experiments, consistent with the view that these effects
19 are rarely observed in static displays where no motion draws attention to the observed actions
20 (e.g., Bach et al., 2006).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The observed modulation of the observer's motor system is consistent with our proposal that
42 person identification draws not only upon information about the individual's visual features
43 (e.g., face shape, complexion, etc.) or known traits (Macrae, Quinn, Mason, & Quadflieg,
44 2005; Quinn, Mason, & Macrae, 2009; Quinn, Mason, & Macrae, 2010), but also information
45 about their expected behaviours (Schenke et al., 2016; Joyce et al, 2015; for theoretical
46 arguments, see Bach & Schenke, 2017; Barresi & Moore, 1996). It implies that these action
47 expectations are represented in an (at least partially) embodied format and are matched
48 against the behaviour that is actually observed, such that seeing the athletes either carry out or
49 not-carry out their expected actions facilitates or impairs the use of the relevant body part in
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 the observer. Such a reversal is not consistent with the idea that the compatibility effects
4
5 reflect mere associations of athletes to motor behaviours, which would have been
6
7 independent from the athletes' actual behaviour. Instead, it implies that the positive and
8
9 negative compatibility effects reflect either successful or unsuccessful attempts to match
10
11 these prior action expectations to the behaviour that was indeed observed.
12
13

14
15 Strikingly, this opposite modulation of the motor system was not larger when these athletes
16
17 were seen in their usual contexts. We had hypothesized that any action expectation should be
18
19 strongest when the athletes are seen in situations in which these actions are most likely to
20
21 occur – on the soccer field or the tennis court – and weaker outside these contexts. However,
22
23 neither of the experiments provided evidence for such a context-based modulation, and the
24
25 Bayesian analysis of both experiments together revealed decisive evidence *against* it. If
26
27 anything, both the single experiments and the Bayesian across-experiment analysis pointed to
28
29 the opposite pattern: there was strong evidence for the signature pattern of positive and
30
31 negative compatibility effects only when the athletes were presented *outside* their usual
32
33 context (e.g., at the beach), but there was no such evidence when the athletes were seen
34
35 *within* the contexts in which they usually carried out these behaviours (the tennis court, the
36
37 soccer field). This counterintuitive pattern was even present in the original study on which
38
39 the current work was based (Bach & Tipper, 2006), where the negative compatibility effects
40
41 were numerically stronger for athletes' faces identified outside their usual contexts.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Together, while larger samples and/or stronger manipulations are required to establish
50
51 whether the motoric modulation is indeed stronger for athletes outside their usual action
52
53 contexts, the current data – and Bayesian analyses – provide clear evidence that it is *not*
54
55 stronger when athletes are seen within their typical contexts. This result challenges the
56
57 hypothesis that the compatibility effects emerge from sophisticated person-models which
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 predict the actions an individual is most likely to carry out in a situation (e.g., Barresi &
4
5 Moore, 1996; Bach & Schenke, 2017; Schenke, Wyer & Bach, 2017). Instead, the effects
6
7 seem to reflect the re-activation of more stereotypical, not situation-specific action
8
9 knowledge about the athletes that ultimately serves person identification rather than action
10
11 prediction or social interaction. In such views, a kick is not predicted because it is the action
12
13 we expect to see Ronaldo carry out on the soccer field, but simply because it has been a
14
15 typical feature of this athlete in our prior perceptual experience with him, and can therefore
16
17 help to confirm that it is really him that we are seeing.
18
19
20

21
22 The finding that such cross-checking occurs primarily when these athletes need to be
23
24 identified outside their usual context fits well to such a view. It is well-established that other
25
26 people – and objects in general – can be identified from minimal information when we see
27
28 them in their typical situations that provide converging evidence for person identification
29
30 (e.g., Davenport & Potter, 2004; Ganis & Kutas, 2003; Young, Hay, & Ellis, 1985).
31
32 However, seeing them outside these contexts attracts attention and recruits more extensive
33
34 knowledge about the stimulus to compensate for the increased uncertainty (e.g., Bar, 2003;
35
36 Fenske, Aminoff, Gronau, & Bar, 2006; Reichardt, Polner, & Simor, 2020). If confirmed by
37
38 further research, this would suggest that the observed ‘mapping’ of others’ actions onto one’s
39
40 own motor system may not be a default process during social perception, but part of these
41
42 compensatory activations of person knowledge, which is then actively projected onto the
43
44 unusual stimulus to confirm – or reject – initial hypotheses about its identity. Note though
45
46 that this would either require a stronger context manipulation and/or much larger sample
47
48 sizes ($n > 600$ at the current effect size) to convincingly demonstrate such a stronger motoric
49
50 modulation in the unusual Out-of-Context trials.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Such an account would integrate the compatibility effects during person recognition with the
4 larger field of person-knowledge, as noted above, but is also consistent with several other
5 literatures that have argued that the activation of “embodied” knowledge reflects a process of
6 confirmatory hypothesis testing. For example, Csibra (2007, see also Kilner, Friston & Frith,
7 2007^{ab}, Bach, Nicholson & Hudson, 2014) argued that the well-known motor activation
8 during action observation does not reflect a bottom-up process of identifying the motoric
9 components of the action, but a top-down verification about whether the observed action fits
10 the goals we attribute to them. Consistent with such a proposal, these motor activations
11 depend on observing a goal-directed action (e.g., Liepelt, Von Cramon, & Brass, 2008;
12 Longo & Bertenthal, 2009; see Bach, Nicholson, & Hudson, 2014 for a review), and increase
13 the less clear these goals are, consistent with such a secondary verification process (e.g.,
14 Nicholson, Roser, & Bach, 2017). Even more fundamental visuospatial perspective taking
15 processes seem to be stronger with unusual contextual information, for example, when
16 conflict between another’s gaze and action need to be resolved (Furlanetto, Cavallo, Manera,
17 Tversky, & Becchio, 2013) or the other person shows an unusual fearful facial expression, for
18 which the referent in the real world is unclear (e.g., Zwicker and Müller, 2010). Butterfill and
19 Apperly (2013) therefore argued for a two-stage approach to theory of mind, in which people
20 can either be initially ‘registered’ but not fully represented (e.g., in terms of attitudes, beliefs,
21 etc.), but which is expanded to more elaborate processing for more complicated or uncertain
22 situations. The embodiment of the actions that others’ typically carry out might therefore be
23 part of such a secondary recruitment of knowledge that is engaged when the visual input is
24 uncertain (e.g., when people need to be identified in unusual contexts).

07/07/2020 12:28

Conclusion

We tested whether effector-specific positive and negative compatibility effects when identifying well-known athletes emerge from person-models that predict this athlete's most likely forthcoming actions (kicking a soccer ball, hitting a tennis ball). We generally replicate these effects, showing that the typical actions of others are activated when they are seen, even when completely irrelevant to the participants' task. We cannot confirm, however, that these action expectations emerge from an integration of person and situation cues (e.g., Barresi & Moore, 1996; Bach & Schenke, 2017). Instead, our data suggests that person-specific motor knowledge is activated because it is a frequently encountered feature when watching these athletes. We argue that when these individuals are later re-encountered, such as in our task here, this information is used to confirm – in a perceptual hypothesis-testing process – one's initial hypotheses about the actor's identity, specifically in uncertain stimulus situations when the person is not encountered in their typical context.

Supplementary Material

The Supplementary Material is available at: qjep.sagepub.com

07/07/2020 12:28

References

Adams, R. B., Ambady, N., Macrae, C. N., & Kleck, R. E. (2006). Emotional expressions forecast approach-avoidance behavior. *Motivation and Emotion*, *30*(2), 177–186.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9020-2>

Avenanti, A., Annella, L., Candidi, M., Urgesi, C., & Aglioti, S. M. (2013). Compensatory Plasticity in the Action Observation Network: Virtual Lesions of STS Enhance Anticipatory Simulation of Seen Actions. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y. : 1991)*, *23*(3), 570–580. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs040>

Bach, P., & Tipper, S. P. (2006). Bend it like Beckham: Embodying the motor skills of famous athletes. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *59*(12), 2033–2039.

Bach, Patric, Bayliss, A. P., & Tipper, S. P. (2011). The predictive mirror: interactions of mirror and affordance processes during action observation. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *18*(1), 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-010-0029-x>

Bach, Patric, Nicholson, T., & Hudson, M. (2014). The affordance-matching hypothesis: how objects guide action understanding and prediction. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*(May), 254. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00254>

Bach, Patric, Peatfield, N. A., & Tipper, S. P. (2007). Focusing on body sites: The role of spatial attention in action perception. *Experimental Brain Research*, *178*(4), 509–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-006-0756-4>

Bach, Patric, & Schenke, K. C. (2017). Predictive social perception: Towards a unifying framework from action observation to person knowledge. *Social and Personality*

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 *Psychology Compass*, 11(7), e12312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12312>

4
5
6 Bar, M. (2003). A cortical mechanism for triggering top-down facilitation in visual object
7
8 recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15(4), 600–609.
9
10 <https://doi.org/10.1162/089892903321662976>

11
12
13 Barresi, J., & Moore, C. (1996). Intentional relations and social understanding. *Behavioral*
14
15 *and Brain Sciences*, 19, 107–154. Retrieved from
16
17 <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=6761980>

18
19
20 Brass, M., Bekkering, H., Wohlschlagel, A., & Prinz, W. (2000). Compatibility between
21
22 observed and executed finger movements: comparing symbolic, spatial, and imitative
23
24 cues. *Brain and Cognition*, 44, 124–143.

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
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Cracco, E., Bardi, L., Desmet, C., Genschow, O., Rigoni, D., De Coster, L., ... Brass, M.

07/07/2020 12:28

- 1
2
3 (2018). Automatic Imitation: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(5), 453–
4
5 500. Retrieved from 10.1037/bul0000143
6
7
8
9 Cramer, A. O. J., van Ravenzwaaij, D., Matzke, D., Steingroever, H., Wetzels, R., Grasman,
10
11 R. P. P. P., ... Wagenmakers, E. J. (2016). Hidden multiplicity in exploratory multiway
12
13 ANOVA: Prevalence and remedies. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 23(2), 640–647.
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0913-5>
16
17
18
19 Davenport, J. L., & Potter, M. C. (2004). Scene consistency in object and background
20
21 perception. *Psychological Science*, 15(8), 559–564. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956->
22
23 [7976.2004.00719.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00719.x)
24
25
26
27 di Pellegrino, G., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., Gallese, V., & Rizzolatti, G. (1992). Understanding
28
29 motor events: a neurophysiological study. *Experimental Brain Research*, 91, 176–180.
30
31
32
33 Dolk, T., Hommel, B., Colzato, L. S., Schütz-Bosbach, S., Prinz, W., & Liepelt, R. (2014).
34
35 The joint Simon effect: a review and theoretical integration. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5,
36
37 974.
38
39
40 Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). GPOWER: A flexible statistical
41
42 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*
43
44 *Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
45
46
47
48 Fenske, M. J., Aminoff, E., Gronau, N., & Bar, M. (2006). Top-down facilitation of visual
49
50 object recognition: object-based and context-based contributions. *Progress in Brain*
51
52 *Research*, 155 B, 3–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123\(06\)55001-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(06)55001-0)
53
54
55
56 Furlanetto, T., Cavallo, A., Manera, V., Tversky, B., & Becchio, C. (2013). Through your
57
58 eyes: incongruence of gaze and action increases spontaneous perspective taking.
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7(August), 1–5.

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00455>
6
7

8
9 Gallese, V., Fadiga, L., Fogassi, L., & Rizzolatti, G. (1996). Action recognition in the
10 premotor cortex. *Brain : A Journal of Neurology*, 119 (Pt 2, 593–609. Retrieved from
11 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8800951>
12
13

14
15
16
17 Ganis, G., & Kutas, M. (2003). An electrophysiological study of scene effects on object
18 identification. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 16(2), 123–144.
19
20 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410\(02\)00244-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-6410(02)00244-6)
21
22

23
24
25 Gillmeister, H., Catmur, C., Liepelt, R., Brass, M., & Heyes, C. (2008). Experience-based
26 priming of body parts: a study of action imitation. *Brain Research*, 1217, 157–170.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2007.12.076>
29
30

31
32
33 Heerey, E. a., & Velani, H. (2010). Implicit learning of social predictions. *Journal of*
34 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(3), 577–581.
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.01.003>
37
38

39
40
41 Hickok, G. (2009). Eight problems for the mirror neuron theory of action understanding in
42 monkeys and humans. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 21(7), 1229–1243.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21189>
45
46

47
48
49 Hommel, B. (1996). S-R compatibility effects without response uncertainty. *Q. J. Exp.*
50 *Psychol.* 49A, 546–571. doi: 10.1080/713755643
51

52
53
54 Hommel, B. (2019). Theory of Event Coding (TEC) V2. 0: Representing and controlling
55 perception and action. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 81(7), 2139-2154.
56
57

58
59
60 Hudson, M., Nicholson, T., Ellis, R., & Bach, P. (2016). I see what you say: Prior knowledge

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 of other's goals automatically biases the perception of their actions. *Cognition*, 146,
4
5 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.09.021>
6
7

8
9 Hudson, M., Nicholson, T., W.A., S., Ellis, R., & Bach, P. (2015). One step ahead: the
10
11 perceived kinematics of others' actions are biased towards expected goals. *Journal of*
12
13 *Experimental Psychology. General*, 145(1), 1–7.
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
16
17

18
19 Hunnius, S., & Bekkering, H. (2010). The early development of object knowledge: a study of
20
21 infants' visual anticipations during action observation. *Developmental Psychology*,
22
23 46(2), 446–454. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016543>
24
25

26
27 Johnston, L., Miles, L., & Macrae, C. N. (2010). Why are you smiling at me? Social
28
29 functions of enjoyment and non-enjoyment smiles. *British Journal of Social Psychology*,
30
31 49(1), 107–127. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466609X412476>
32
33

34
35 Joyce, K., Schenke, K., Bayliss, A., & Bach, P. (2015). Looking ahead: Anticipatory cueing
36
37 of attention to objects others will look at. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, (July), 1–8.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17588928.2015.1053443>
40
41

42
43 Kilner, J. M., Friston, K. J., & Frith, C. D. (2007). Predictive coding: an account of the mirror
44
45 neuron system. *Cognitive Processing*, 8(3), 159–166. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-007-0170-2)
46
47 007-0170-2
48

49
50 Lakens, D., Scheel, A. M., & Isager, P. M. (2018). Equivalence Testing for Psychological
51
52 Research : A Tutorial. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918770963>
53
54

55
56 Liepelt, R, Ullsperger, M., Obst, K., Spengler, S., von Cramon, D. Y., & Brass, M. (2009).
57
58 Contextual movement constraints of others modulate motor preparation in the observer.
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 *Neuropsychologia*, 47, 268–275.

4
5
6 Liepelt, Roman, Von Cramon, D. Y., & Brass, M. (2008). How do we infer others' goals
7
8 from non-stereotypic actions? The outcome of context-sensitive inferential processing in
9
10 right inferior parietal and posterior temporal cortex. *NeuroImage*, 43(4), 784–792.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.08.007>
13
14

15
16
17 Longo, M.R., & Bertenthal, B. I. (2009). Attention modulates the specificity of automatic
18
19 imitation to human actors. *Experimental Brain Research*, 192(4), 739–744.
20

21
22 Longo, Matthew R, Kosobud, A., & Bertenthal, B. I. (2008). Automatic Imitation of
23
24 Biomechanically Possible and Impossible Actions : Effects of Priming Movements
25
26 Versus Goals, 34(2), 489–501. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.34.2.489>
27
28

29
30 Macrae, C. N., Quinn, K. A., Mason, M. F., & Quadflieg, S. (2005). Understanding Others :
31
32 The Face and Person Construal, 89(5), 686–695. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.5.686)
33
34 3514.89.5.686
35

36
37
38 Maranesi, M., Livi, A., Fogassi, L., Rizzolatti, G., & Bonini, L. (2014). Mirror Neuron
39
40 Activation Prior to Action Observation in a Predictable Context. *Journal of*
41
42 *Neuroscience*, 34(45), 14827–14832. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2705-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2705-14.2014)
43
44 14.2014
45

46
47
48 Naish, K. R., Houston-Price, C., Bremner, A. J., & Holmes, N. P. (2014). Effects of action
49
50 observation on corticospinal excitability: Muscle specificity, direction, and timing of the
51
52 mirror response. *Neuropsychologia*, 64, 331–348.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.09.034>
55
56

57
58 Newen, A. (2015). Understanding Others. *Open MIND*, 26, 1–28.
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 <https://doi.org/10.15502/9783958570320>

4
5
6 Nicholson, T., Roser, M., & Bach, P. (2017). Understanding the Goals of Everyday
7
8 Instrumental Actions Is Primarily Linked to Object, Not Motor-Kinematic, Information:
9
10 Evidence from fMRI. *Plos One*, *12*(1), e0169700.
11

12
13 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169700>

14
15
16
17 Oosterhof, N. N., Tipper, S. P., & Downing, P. E. (2013). Crossmodal and action-specific:
18
19 Neuroimaging the human mirror neuron system. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *17*(7),
20
21 311–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.04.012>

22
23
24
25 Pierno, A. C., Becchio, C., Wall, M. B., Smith, A. T., Turella, L., & Castiello, U. (2006).
26
27 When gaze turns into grasp. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *18*(12), 2130–2137.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2006.18.12.2130>

30
31
32
33 Quinn, K. a., Mason, M. F., & Macrae, C. N. (2009). Familiarity and person construal:
34
35 individuating knowledge moderates the automaticity of category activation. *European*
36
37 *Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 852–861. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.596>

38
39
40
41 Quinn, K. A., Mason, M. F., & Macrae, C. N. (2010). When Arnold is ““ The Terminator””,
42
43 We No Longer See Him as a Man The Temporal Determinants of Person Perception,
44
45 *57*(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000004>

46
47
48 Reichardt, R., Polner, B., & Simor, P. (2020). Novelty Manipulations , Memory Performance
49
50 , and Predictive Coding : the Role of Unexpectedness, *14*(April), 1–11.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00152>

53
54
55
56 Rizzolatti, G, Fadiga, L., Gallese, V., & Fogassi, L. (1996). Premotor cortex and the
57
58 recognition of motor actions. *Brain Research. Cognitive Brain Research*, *3*(2), 131–141.
59
60

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8713554>

4
5
6 Rizzolatti, Giacomo, Cattaneo, L., Fabbri-destro, M., & Rozzi, S. (2014). Cortical
7
8 mechanisms underlying the organization of goal-directed actions and understanding C.
9
10 *Physiol Rev*, *94*, 655–706. <https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00009.2013>

11
12
13 Rizzolatti, Giacomo, & Craighero, L. (2004). The mirror-neuron system. *Annual Review of*
14
15 *Neuroscience*, *27*, 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.27.070203.144230>

16
17 Rizzolatti, Giacomo, & Sinigaglia, C. (2010). The functional role of the parieto-frontal mirror
18
19 circuit : interpretations and misinterpretations, *9*(March), 1–11.

20
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2805>

23
24
25 Schenke, K. C., Wyer, N. A., & Bach, P. (2016). The Things You Do: Internal Models of
26
27 Others' Expected Behaviour Guide Action Observation. *Plos One*, *11*(7), e0158910.
28
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158910>

31
32
33 Sebanz, N., Knoblich, G., & Prinz, W. (2003). Representing others' actions: just like one's
34
35 own?. *Cognition*, *88*(3), B11-B21.

36
37
38 Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale,
39
40
41 a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandanavian Journal of Psychology*, *42*,
42
43
44 313–319.

45
46
47 Simon, J. R. (1969). Reactions toward the source of stimulation. *Journal of Experimental*
48
49
50 *Psychology*, *81*(1), 174.

51
52
53 Sinnett, S., Hodges, N. J., Chua, R., & Kingstone, A. (2011). Embodiment of motor skills
54
55
56 when observing expert and novice athletes. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental*
57
58
59 *Psychology (2006)*, *64*(4), 657–668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2010.513736>

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Sparenberg, P., Springer, A., & Prinz, W. (2012). Predicting others' actions: Evidence for a
4 constant time delay in action simulation. *Psychological Research*, 76(1), 41–49.

5
6
7
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-011-0321-z>

9
10
11 Stapel, J. C., Hunnius, S., & Bekkering, H. (2012). Online prediction of others' actions: The
12 contribution of the target object, action context and movement kinematics.

13
14
15
16 *Psychological Research*, 76(4), 434–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-012-0423-2>

17
18
19 Stürmer, B., Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (2000). Correspondence effects with manual
20 gestures and postures: a study of imitation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human*

21
22
23
24 *Perception and Performance*, 26(6), 1746–1759. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096->

25
26
27 1523.26.6.1746

28
29 Tipper, S. P., & Bach, P. (2011). The face inhibition effect: social contrast or motor
30 competition? *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 23(1).

31
32
33
34
35 Urgesi, C., Maieron, M., Avenanti, A., Tidoni, E., Fabbro, F., & Aglioti, S. M. (2010).

36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Simulating the Future of Actions in the Human Corticospinal System. *Cerebral Cortex*,
20, 2511–2521.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Wilson, M., & Knoblich, G. (2005). The Case for Motor Involvement in Perceiving
Conspecifics. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(2), 460–473.

Young, A. W., Hay, D. C., & Ellis, A. W. (1985). The faces that launched a thousand slips:

Everyday difficulties and errors in recognizing people. *British Journal of Psychology*,
76, 495–523.

Yuille, A., & Kersten, D. (2006). Vision as Bayesian inference: analysis by synthesis? *Trends*
in Cognitive Sciences, 10(7), 301–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.05.002>

07/07/2020 12:28

1
2
3 Zwickel, J., & Müller, H. J. (2010). Observing fearful faces leads to visuo-spatial perspective
4
5 taking. *Cognition*, 117(1), 101–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2010.07.004>
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

07/07/2020 12:28


Figure Captions

Figure 1. Examples of the athlete stimuli, showing well-known tennis and soccer players either carrying out their typical actions (left two columns) or not carrying out these actions (right two columns), in either their usual contexts (top row) or outside these contexts (bottom row). Note that the stimulus images shown here are vectorized schematics but were presented as high-resolution photographs in the experiments.

Figure 2. Average response times for Experiment 1. The top panel shows average response times in the In-Context conditions, and the bottom panel shows average response times in the Out-of-Context condition. In each panel, the left bars reflect identification times of athletes carrying out their typical actions, and the right bars represent them not carrying out these actions. The black bars show identification with a congruent effector, and the white bars show identification with an incongruent effector. Error bars show the between-subjects standard error of the mean.

Figure 3. Trial sequence. A fixation point was presented for 800-100ms (randomly chosen), this was followed by a context priming image (either a beach scene or a tennis court/soccer pitch) presented for 500 ms. Finally, the image of the athlete was shown (either performing their typical action or not and either in their usual sporty context or not). Note that the stimulus images shown here are schematics but were presented as high-resolution photographs in the experiments.

Figure 4. Average response times for Experiment 2. The top panel shows average response times in the In-Context conditions, and the bottom panel shows average response times in the Out-of-Context condition. In each panel, the left bars reflect identification times of athletes carrying out their typical actions, and the right bars represent them not carrying out these actions. The black bars show identification with a Congruent effector, and the white bars show identification with an Incongruent effector. Error bars show the between-subjects standard error of the mean.



26
27
28
29
30
31

Figure 1. Examples of the athlete stimuli, showing well-known tennis and soccer players either carrying out their typical actions (left two columns) or not carrying out these actions (right two columns), in either their usual contexts (top row) or outside these contexts (bottom row). Note that that the stimulus images shown here are vectorized schematics but were presented as high-resolution photographs in the experiments.

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

297x177mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. Average response times for Experiment 1. The top panel shows average response times in the In-Context conditions, and the bottom panel shows average response times in the Out-of-Context condition. In each panel, the left bars reflect identification times of athletes carrying out their typical actions, and the right bars represent them not carrying out these actions. The black bars show identification with a congruent effector, and the white bars show identification with an incongruent effector. Error bars show the between-subjects standard error of the mean.

148x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 3. Trial sequence. A fixation point was presented for 800-1000ms (randomly chosen), this was followed by a context priming image (either a beach scene or a tennis court/soccer pitch) presented for 500 ms. Finally, the image of the athlete was shown (either performing their typical action or not and either in their usual sporty context or not). Note that the stimulus images shown here are schematics but were presented as high-resolution photographs in the experiments.

284x154mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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




Figure 4. Average response times for Experiment 2. The top panel shows average response times in the In-Context conditions, and the bottom panel shows average response times in the Out-of-Context condition. In each panel, the left bars reflect identification times of athletes carrying out their typical actions, and the right bars represent them not carrying out these actions. The black bars show identification with a Congruent effector, and the white bars show identification with an Incongruent effector. Error bars show the between-subjects standard error of the mean.

152x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Table 1. *Mean proportion of errors in Experiment 1. Values in brackets show standard deviations.*

	Action		Non-action	
	Effector Congruent	Effector Incongruent	Effector Congruent	Effector Incongruent
In-Context	.053 (.037)	.060 (.035)	.046 (.040)	.057 (.046)
Out-of-Context	.040 (.034)	.040 (.033)	.040 (.037)	.041 (.031)

Table 2. *The mean proportion of errors in Experiment 2. Values in brackets show standard deviations.*

	Action		Non-action	
	Effector congruent	Effector incongruent	Effector congruent	Effector incongruent
In-Context	.046 (.036)	.047 (.032)	.038 (.035)	.038 (.035)
Out-of-Context	.034 (.030)	.034 (.031)	.030 (.028)	.040 (.035)