

Familiarity preference something something???

Gal Raz¹ (galraz@mit.edu), Anjie Cao² (anjiecao@stanford.edu),
Michael C. Frank² (mcfrank@stanford.edu), and Rebecca Saxe¹ (saxe@mit.edu)

¹Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT, ²Department of Psychology, Stanford University

Abstract

haha

Keywords: decision making; learning; bayesian modeling; cognitive development

Introduction

Experiment 1

Methods

Participants

66 children completed a task modified from the adult self-paced looking time studies reported in CITE. Following our pre-registration (LINK), 2 children were excluded from the analysis because their performance in the attention-check task failed to meet the inclusion criteria. We also excluded trials with looking time that were three absolute deviations away from the median in the log-transformed space across participants. The final datasets includes 64 children in total (3YO: N = 18; 4YO: N = 26; 5YO: N = 20). All participants were recruited in a university-affiliated research preschool.

Stimuli

We used a subset of stimuli created for the adult self-paced looking time studies. In the previous study, we created a set of animated creatures using Spore (a game developed by Maxis in 2008). Half of the creatures had high perceptual complexity, and half had low perceptual complexity. We used the high perceptual complexity stimuli for the current study.

Procedures


Children were tested individually in a test room by an experimenter. The experimenter invited the child to “meet some monster friends” and then familiarized the child with the laptop computer used to present the experiment. Before the test, each child went through a practice phase where they practiced pressing the space bar to move on to the next trial. The child was instructed that they can press the key and move on to meet more monster friends whenever they want.

On each trial, the child would see an animated creature appear on the screen. The child can move on to the next trial by pressing the space bar. Each block consisted of six trials. Usually, the same creature will be shown repeatedly (the background stimulus), but each block could contain either

zero or one deviant trial. Deviant trials were trials that present a different creature from the background stimulus. Deviant trials appeared on the second, the fourth, or the sixth trial of the block. Each child saw eight blocks in total.

At the offset of each block, a memory task was presented to ensure children are appropriately attending to the task. The memory task was a 2-Alternative Forced Choice (2AFC) question, asking the children to identify which of the two stimuli they have seen before. The pair of stimuli contained one stimulus used as a background stimulus in the preceding block and a novel stimulus that did not appear anywhere else in the experiment.

Results and discussion



We anticipated that the preschooler children would show patterns of habituation and dishabituation similar to adults. We also expected to see developmental changes in the shape of habituation trajectories. Our pre-registered mixed-effect mod includes a three-way interaction term between age (in months; scaled and centered), trial number, and trial type (background or deviant) to predict log-transformed looking time. The interaction between the trial number and trial type was significant, suggesting the paradigm has captured habituation and novelty preference in preschoolers ($\beta = 0.14$, $SE = 0.02$, $t = 6.22$, $p < 0.01$). However, we did not find any significant interaction with age, nor was the main effect significant (all $p > 0.1$).

We also explored the potential familiarity preference by comparing the looking time at the second background trial and the second deviant trial. Under the Hunter & Ames (1988), the second trial in each block is most likely to yield a familiarity preference, since participants receive the least amount of familiarization with the background stimulus in a block. If there was a familiarity preference, participants should look longer at a background trial than a deviant trial. However, we did not find evidence supporting this prediction. We ran a mixed effect model predicting looking time at the second trial with trial type as the predictor. There was a significant trial type effect in the opposite direction, suggesting participants looked longer at the deviant trial than the background trial even with as little as one trial of familiarization time ($\beta = 0.41$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = 12.24$, $p < 0.01$).

In summary, this experiment captured habituation and novelty preference with in preschoolers, replicating the patterns we saw in the previous adult samples (CITE). Notably, under the current paradigm, we did not find any evidence of familiarity preference. We moved to the infant samples in the next experiment.

Experiment 2

Methods

Results and discussion

cache pre-registered models

$\beta = r$; $SE = r$; $t = r$; $p = r$

To test the prediction that partial encoding elicits familiarity preferences, while complete encoding elicits novelty preferences, we pre-registered a model which allows for a non-linear interaction between exposure duration by adding a quadratic effect of familiarization duration, and its interaction with novelty.

We found that neither the main effect, nor the interaction of that quadratic term were significant (Main effect: $\beta = 0.46$; $SE = 0.88$; $t = 0.53$; $p = 0.6$; Interaction effect: $\beta = 0.4$; $SE = 1.58$; $t = 0.26$; $p = 0.8$), while the interaction of novelty with the linear term was significant ($\beta = 4.38$; $SE = 1.56$; $t = 2.8$; $p = 0.01$). This suggests that novelty preferences get stronger as a function familiarization duration, but that there is no special effect of partial encoding as posited by H&A. Furthermore, there was a significant decrease in looking times to the familiar items as a function of familiarization duration, indicating that infants habituated to familiar stimuli in our paradigm ($\beta = -2.32$; $SE = 0.87$; $t = -2.66$; $p = 0.01$).

We next tested specifically for the existence of familiarity preference in our dataset. After finding a hint of a familiarity preference after four familiarizations in the first study, which did not turn out significant in an exploratory analysis ($\beta = -0.2$; $SE =$; $t = -1.06$; $p = 0.3$), we argued that if familiarity preferences are driven by partial encoding, any condition in which there were fewer exposures should also reveal a familiarity preference. We therefore tested whether looking to the familiar stimulus was longer in all trial with four or less

exposures, which it did not ($\beta = 0.07$; $SE =$; $t = 0.65$; $p = 0.52$).

Novelty preferences, on the other hand, were robust after 8 ($\beta = 0.5$; $SE =$; $t = 2.9$; $p = 0.01$) and 9 familiarizations ($\beta = 0.6$; $SE =$; $t = 4.15$; $p < 0.01$), as well as in the combined dataset ($\beta = 0.54$; $SE =$; $t = 4.44$; $p < 0.01$).

General discussion

References