OSF supplementary material:

You *Can* Tell a Prodigy from a Professional Musician: A Replication of Comeau et al.'s (2017) Study

Pausch, V., Düvel, N., & Kopiez, R.

Variable Name	Description
CaseNo	Case number
Language	Language of the questionnaire: D = German (Deutsch) C = Traditional Chinese
RatingStim01	Responses to Stimulus 1 on the scale displayed in Figure 1 in the paper: 1 = prodigy, high confidence 8 = professional adult, high confidence (prodigy stimulus)
RatingStim02	Same for Stimulus 2 (adult professional stimulus)
RatingStim03	Same for Stimulus 3 (prodigy stimulus)
RatingStim04	Same for Stimulus 4 (adult professional stimulus)
RatingStim05	Same for Stimulus 5 (prodigy stimulus)
RatingStim06	Same for Stimulus 6 (adult professional stimulus)
RatingStim07	Same for Stimulus 7 (prodigy stimulus)
RatingStim08	Same for Stimulus 8 (adult professional stimulus)
RatingStim09	Same for Stimulus 9 (prodigy stimulus)
RatingStim10	Same for Stimulus 10 (adult professional stimulus)
RatingCorrectStim01	Was the classification of Stimulus 1 correct? 1 = yes, correct 2 = no, wrong
RatingCorrectStim02	Same for Stimulus 2
RatingCorrectStim03	Same for Stimulus 3
RatingCorrectStim04	Same for Stimulus 4
RatingCorrectStim05	Same for Stimulus 5
RatingCorrectStim06	Same for Stimulus 6
RatingCorrectStim07	Same for Stimulus 7
RatingCorrectStim08	Same for Stimulus 8
RatingCorrectStim09	Same for Stimulus 9
RatingCorrectStim10	Same for Stimulus 10
RatingAsProdigyStim2	Was the stimulus classified as being played by a prodigy? 1 = yes, prodigy 2 = no, adult professional

Variable Name	Description
RatingAsProdigyStim4	Same for Stimulus 4
RatingAsProdigyStim6	Same for Stimulus 6
RatingAsProdigyStim8	Same for Stimulus 8
RatingAsProdigyStim10	Same for Stimulus 10
P_Hits	Proportion of hits (prodigy stimuli classified as such)
P_FAs	Proportion of false alarms (adult professional stimuli classified as prodigy)
Sensitivity_d	Sensitivity d' calculated according to Section B in the supplementary online material (Formula B1)
Bias_c	Response bias c calculated according to the same section (Formula B2)
ResponsePattern_a	Number of responses corresponding to Pattern a (see Table 5 in the paper, Section B and Table B1 in the supplementary online material)
ResponsePattern_b	Same for Pattern b
ResponsePattern_c	Same for Pattern c
ResponsePattern_d	Same for Pattern d
percent_corr_pair1	Proportion of correct responses to Stimulus Pair 1 (Stimuli 1 and 2)
percent_corr_pair2	Same for Stimulus Pair 2 (Stimuli 3 and 4)
percent_corr_pair3	Same for Stimulus Pair 3 (Stimuli 5 and 6)
percent_corr_pair4	Same for Stimulus Pair 4 (Stimuli 7 and 8)
percent_corr_pair5	Same for Stimulus Pair 5 (Stimuli 9 and 10)
RatingStim01_Retest	Response to the retest of Stimulus 1 (prodigy stimulus) Same scale as for RatingStim01, 0 = missing value
RatingStim03_Retest	Same for Stimulus 3
RatingStim05_Retest	Same for Stimulus 5
RatingStim07_Retest	Same for Stimulus 7
RatingStim09_Retest	Same for Stimulus 9
Retest_prodigy_Yes1No0	Has this participant rated a retest prodigy stimulus? (Not all have) 0 = no 1 = yes
Retest_prodigy_rating	Response to the retest prodigy stimulus (disregarding if it was Stimulus 1, 3, 5, 7, or 9)
Test_prodigy_rating	Test value (from variable RatingStim01 to RatingStim09) for the same stimulus that has been retested Missing value if no prodigy stimulus has been retested
RatingStim02_Retest	Response to the retest of Stimulus 2 (adult stimulus) Same scale as for RatingStim02, 0 = missing value

Variable Name	Description
RatingStim04_Retest	Same for Stimulus 4
RatingStim06_Retest	Same for Stimulus 6
RatingStim08_Retest	Same for Stimulus 8
RatingStim10_Retest	Same for Stimulus 10
Retest_adult_Yes1No0	Has this participant rated a retest adult professional stimulus? (Not all have) 0 = no 1 = yes
Retest_adult_rating	Response to the retest adult professional stimulus (disregarding if it was Stimulus 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10)
Test_adult_rating	Test value (from variable RatingStim02 to RatingStim10) for the same stimulus that has been retested Missing value if no adult professional stimulus has been retested
Number_measurements_retest	How many retests have been answered? 0, 1 (either prodigy or adult professional), or 2 (both prodigy and adult professional)
JudgementConsistency_prodigy	Judgement consistency as measured by Comeau et al. (2017): **0 =** the test item (Test_prodigy_rating) and the retest item (Retest_prodigy_rating) have been classified as "prodigy" and "adult professional" or vice versa OR no prodigy retest was answered **1 =** the test item (Test_prodigy_rating) and the retest item (Retest_prodigy_rating) have both been classified either as "prodigy" or as "adult professional" Note: the 8-point scale was dichotomized as: 1–4 = prodigy 5–8 = adult professional
JudgementConsistency_adult	Same for the adult retests
JudgementConsistency	Judgement consistency for both prodigy and adult professional retests: **0 =** one or two retests were administered but none was consistent **.5 =** half of the administered retests were rated consistently (they rated both and one was consistent and one was not consistent) **1 =** all administered retests were rated consistently (disregarding if they rated just one of the two or both retests) **Missing value** if Number_measurements_retest = 0
ConfidenceStim01	Confidence rating of Stimulus 1 1 = high confidence (either 1 or 8 on the 8-point scale of RatingStim01) 2 = (either 2 or 7 on the 8-point scale) 3 = (either 3 or 6 on the 8-point scale) 4 = low confidence (either 4 or 5 on the 8-point scale)
ConfidenceStim02	Same for Stimulus 2
ConfidenceStim03	Same for Stimulus 3
ConfidenceStim04	Same for Stimulus 4

Variable Name	Description
ConfidenceStim05	Same for Stimulus 5
ConfidenceStim06	Same for Stimulus 6
ConfidenceStim07	Same for Stimulus 7
ConfidenceStim08	Same for Stimulus 8
ConfidenceStim09	Same for Stimulus 9
ConfidenceStim10	Same for Stimulus 10
Conf_prodigy	Average confidence rating for the prodigy stimuli (Average of ConfidenceStim01 to ConfidenceStim09 [odd numbers])
Conf_adult	Average confidence rating for the adult professional stimuli (Average of ConfidenceStim02 to ConfidenceStim10 [even numbers])
Conf_all	Average confidence for all 10 stimuli
Quiz1	Who composed the piece? 1 = Prokofiev 2 = Bruckner *3 = Chopin* 4 = Liszt 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimulus 1, therefore 3 = Chopin is correct)
Quiz2	Who composed the piece? 1 = Beethoven 2 = J. S. Bach 3 = Schumann 4 = Ravel 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimuli 3 and 5, therefore 1 = Beethoven is correct)
Quiz3	Who composed the piece? 1 = Haydn 2 = Debussy 3 = Händel 4 = Mozart 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimuli 7 and 10, therefore 4 = Mozart is correct)
Quiz4	What is the name of the piece? (posed together with Quiz2) 1 = Toccata in D minor, Op. 11 2 = Arabesque No. 2 3 = Waldesrauschen [Sound of forest] 4 = Étude Op. 10, No. 5 in G flat major ("Black Keys") 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimulus 1, therefore 4 = Étude Op. 10, No. 5 in G flat major is correct)
Quiz5	What is the name of the piece? (posed together with Quiz3) 1 = Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25 2 = Piano Sonata in C sharp minor, Op. 27, No. 2 (''Moonlight Sonata'') 3 = Solfeggietto

Variable Name	Description
	4 = Fantasie-Impromptu in C sharp minor, Op. 66 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimuli 3 and 5, therefore 2 = Piano Sonata in C sharp minor, Op. 27, No. 2 is correct)
Quiz6	What is the name of the piece? (posed together with Quiz4) 1 = Piano Concerto No. 23 in A major, K. 488, Allegro 2 = Sonata in F major, K. 332, Allegro 3 = Toccata in D minor, Op. 11 4 = Étude Op. 10, No. 5 in G flat major 5 = I don't know. (Relates to Stimuli 7 and 10, therefore 1 = Piano Concerto No. 23 in A major, K. 488, Allegro is correct)
Quiz_Score	Number of correct answers from the 6 quiz items (ranging from 0 to 6)
HALT_Headphones1_ Loudspeakers2	Item of the HALT by Wycisk et al. (2018, 2021): Result of the headphones-or-loudspeakers-test: 1 = participant used headphones 2 = participant used loudspeakers
HALT_MonoStereo	Polarity of the playback: 1 = stereophonic, correct polarity 2 = stereophonic, channels swapped 3 = monophonic 4 = wrong answer to the item, no conclusion about polarity
HALT_Stereo1_ MonoOrWrong2	Polarity of the playback (dichotomous variable): 1 = stereophonic, correct or swapped polarity 2 = monophonic or wrong answer
GoldMSI_ItemNo01 GoldMSI_ItemNo03 GoldMSI_ItemNo04 GoldMSI_ItemNo07 GoldMSI_ItemNo10 GoldMSI_ItemNo12 GoldMSI_ItemNo14 GoldMSI_ItemNo15 GoldMSI_ItemNo17 GoldMSI_ItemNo19 GoldMSI_ItemNo23 GoldMSI_ItemNo24 GoldMSI_ItemNo25 GoldMSI_ItemNo27	Items from the Gold-MSI (Müllensiefen et al., 2014; Schaal et al., 2014; www.shiny.gold-msi.org), item numbers according to Appendix A of Schaal et al. (2014, p. 441 ff.); Rating scales for GoldMSI_ItemNo14, GoldMSI_ItemNo23, GoldMSI_ItemNo25, and GoldMSI_ItemNo27: 7 = I disagree completely to 1 = I agree completely, and for all other items: 1 = I disagree completely to 7 = I agree completely.

Variable Name	Description
GoldMSI_ItemNo29	
GoldMSI_ItemNo32	
GoldMSI_ItemNo33	
GoldMSI_ItemNo37	
BestInstrument	Item BI_01 of the Gold-MSI: "The instrument I play best (including voice) is: ..." (responses in either German or Traditional Chinese)
GoldMSI_Score	Sum of all Gold-MSI items
Gender	Participants' gender: 1 = female 2 = male 3 = diverse 4 = not specified
Age	Participants' age in years
MusicalProfession	Musical profession: 1 = non-musician 2 = amateur musician 5 = professional musician 6 = other (specified in the next variable)
MusicalProfession_Other	Specification of „other" musical profession (responses in either German or Traditional Chinese)
Pianist	Pianist: 0 = no (non-musician) 1 = no, but musician 2 = yes, amateur pianist 4 = yes, professional pianist
PianistAndMusicians Groups	A = professional pianists B = other professional musicians C = amateur pianists D = other amateur musicians E = non-musicians
CriteriaForClassification	Participants' decision criteria for the classification of the stimuli (free text entry, responses in German or Traditional Chinese)

References

Comeau, G., Vuvan, D. T., Picard-Deland, C., & Peretz, I. (2017). Can you tell a prodigy from a professional musician? *Music Perception, 35*(2), 200–210. https://doi.org/10.1525/MP.2017.35.2.200

Müllensiefen, D., Gingras, B., Musil, J., & Stewart, L. (2014). The musicality of non-musicians: An index for assessing musical sophistication in the general population. *PloS one, 9*(2), e89642. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0089642

Schaal, N. K., Bauer, A.-K. R., & Müllensiefen, D. (2014). Der Gold-MSI: Replikation und Validierung eines Fragebogeninstrumentes zur Messung Musikalischer Erfahrenheit anhand einer deutschen Stichprobe [The Gold-MSI: Replication and validation of a questionnaire instrument for measuring musical sophistication, based on a German sample]. *Musicae Scientiae, 18*(4), 423–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864914541851

Wycisk, Y., Kopiez, R., Bergner, J., Sander, K., Preihs, S., Peissig, S., & Platz, F. (2021). *The headphone and loudspeaker test – part I: Suggestions for controlling characteristics of playback devices in internet experiments* [Manuscript submitted for publicationt]. Hanover University of Music, Drama and Media, Hanover, Germany.

Wycisk, Y., Kopiez, R., & Wolf, A. (2018, 23–28 July). *Control of headphone and loudspeaker characteristics in online experiments* [poster presentation]. 15th International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition, Graz. https://static.uni-graz.at/fileadmin/veranstaltungen/music-psychology-conference2018/documents/ICMPC15ESCOM10abstractbook.pdf