Gradual process theory:
The role of self-control in syllogistic reasoning

Thesis submitted to the University of Plymouth
for the MSc in Psychological Research Methods
by Christopher B. Germann
2010

Gradual process theory: The role of self-control in syllogistic reasoning

Thesis submitted to the University of Plymouth for the MSc in Psychological Research Methods by Christopher B. Germann

2010

CONTENTS

Contents **-6**

1 Introduction **2**

1.1 Belief bias in syllogistic reasoning 8

1.2 The strength model of self-control 11

1.3 Theoretical similarities between paradigms 14

1.3.1 The conceptual junction between self-control and executive functioning . . . 14

1.3.2 Neuropsychological underpinnings of self-control and executive functioning . 16

1.4 Present Research 19

2 Experiment 1 **20**

2.1 Methods 20

2.1.1 Participants and Design 20

2.1.2 Materials and Procedures 21

2.2 Results 25

2.2.1 Data treatment 25

2.2.2 Response accuracy analysis 25

2.2.3 Reaction time analysis 28

2.3 Discussion 30

3 Experiment 2 **32**

3.1 Methods 32

3.1.1 Participants and Design 32

3.1.2 Materials and Procedures 33

3.2 Results 36

3.2.1 Response accuracy analysis 36

3.2.2 Reaction time analysis 37

3.3 Discussion 39

4 General discussion **39**

5 Limitations and future directions **51**

5.1 Operationalization of ego depletion 51

5.2 Sampling bias 52

5.3 Other potentially confounding factors 53

5.4 Pretest of materials 53

6 Statistical and methodological issues **55**

6.1 Analytic techniques 55

6.2 Interpretation of results 55

References **59**

Appendices **89**

Appendix A 89

The logic of hypothetical syllogisms as used in Experiment 1 89

The logic of categorical syllogisms as used in Experiment 2 89

Appendix B 97

Appendix C 99

Appendix D 100

Appendix E 102

Appendix F 103

Appendix G 105

Appendix H 106

Appendix I 107

Appendix J 109

Appendix K 110

LIST OF FIGURES

1 An example of the limitations of intuitive judgments 6

2 The Müller-Lyer illusion 7

3 Flowchart depicting the default-interventionist model 10

4 The multicomponent working memory model 16

5 Prefrontal and anterior cingulate cortex 18

6 An example of a trial sequence in the reasoning task in Experiment 1 25

7 Accuracy as a function of problem type and instructions in Experiment 1 28

8 Accuracy as a function of ego depletion condition and instructions in Experiment 1 29

9 Reaction time as a function of problem type and instructions in Experiment 1 . . . 30

10 Accuracy as a function of ego depletion condition and instructions in Experiment 2 37

11 Reaction time as a function of problem type and instructions in Experiment 2 . . . 38

12 Flowchart depicting the the parallel-distributive model 48

13 Classical square of oppositions 92

14 Venn diagram of an EIO-4 argument as used in Experiment 2 95

LIST OF TABLES

1 Features attributed by various theorists to the hypothesized cognitive systems . . . 4

2 Experimental matrix of Experiment 1 and 2 . . . 21

3 Examples of hypothetical syllogisms used in Experiment 1 . . . 24

4 Examples of categorical syllogisms used in Experiment 2 . . . 35

5 Justification of modus ponens arguments via truth table . . . 90

6 Standard form syllogism . . . 90

7 Logic of syllogisms . . . 91

8 The four figures of a syllogism . . . 96

9 Materials used in Experiment 1 . . . 102

10 Results of the response accuracy analysis of Experiment 1 . . . 105

11 Results of the reaction time analysis of Experiment 1 . . . 105

12 Materials used in Experiment 2 . . . 106

13 Results of the response accuracy analysis of Experiment 2 . . . 109

14 Results of the reaction time analysis of Experiment 2 . . . 109