

Peekbank: Exploring child lexical processing through a large-scale open-source database of developmental eyetracking datasets

Anonymous CogSci submission

Abstract

Developing lexical processing skills - the ability to rapidly process words and link them to referents in context - is central to children's early language development. Children's lexical processing is typically studied in the looking-while-listening paradigm - also called the visual world paradigm -, which measures infants' fixation of a target object (as opposed to a distracter) after hearing a target label. In the following paper, we present a large-scale open-source database of infant and toddler looking-while-listening studies. The goal of this database is to address theoretical and methodological challenges in measuring infant vocabulary development that go beyond the scope of individual studies. We present three preliminary analyses from the current database: (1) models capturing item-level variability in infants' lexical processing across age; (2) an analysis of how a central methodological decision - selecting the time window of analysis - impacts modeling results; (3) an analysis demonstrating the link between the age of acquisition of specific words and children's ability to rapidly and accurately link those words to their referents. Future efforts will expand the scope of the current database to advance our understanding of participant-level and item-level variation in children's vocabulary development.

Keywords: lexical processing; eyetracking; database; vocabulary development; looking-while-listening; visual world paradigm

Introduction

Across their first years of life, children learn words in their native tongues at a rapid pace. A key part of the word learning process is children's ability to rapidly process words and link them to relevant meanings in context - often referred to as lexical processing. Developing lexical processing skills builds a foundation for children's language development and is predictive of both linguistic and more general cognitive outcomes later in life.

The success of the looking-while-listening paradigm

Lexical processing is traditionally studied in "looking-while-listening" studies (sometimes called the intermodal preference procedure). In such studies, infants listen to a sentence prompting a specific referent (e.g., Look at the dog!) while viewing two images on the screen (e.g., an image of a dog - the target image - and an image of a duck - the distractor image). Infants' lexical processing is measured in terms of how quickly and accurately infants subsequently fixate the correct target image after hearing its label. Studies using this basic design have contributed to our understanding of a wide

range of questions in language development, including infants' early noun knowledge (Bergelson & Swingley, 2012), phonological representations of words (Swingley & Aslin, 2000), prediction during language processing (Lew-Williams & Fernald, 2007), and individual differences in language development (Marchman et al., 2018).

Outstanding challenges

While the looking-while-listening paradigm has been highly fruitful in advancing understanding of early word knowledge, fundamental questions remain both about the nature of children's early word knowledge and the nature of the method itself. One central question relates to understanding word-specific variability across development, and generalizing lexical processing on the level of specific words. Most studies of infant lexical processing focus on generalizing performance across participants, and are constrained in their ability to provide generalizations across the item level - the level of specific words. Generalizing behavior on the level of both participants and items simultaneously is often difficult in the context of a solitary study, especially given practical constraints on the number of trials (and consequently items) tested within a given infant. However, drawing inferences about item-level variability is key to many questions in how word learning unfolds, including how properties of the language input influence lexical development (Item-based analytic approach - Goodman, Dale, & Li (2008), Roy et al. (2015), Braginsky et al. (2018) all look at predicting items from input). One key to meeting this challenge is having sufficiently large datasets to interrogate variability in lexical processing on the item level.

A second question relates to evaluating methodological best-practices. In particular, many fundamental analytic decisions vary substantially across studies. For example, researchers vary in their decisions regarding how to select time windows for analysis (XX), modeling how lexical processing unfolds over time (XX), and the appropriate transformations to perform on the dependent measure of target fixations. Establishing best practices regarding analytic decisions of this kind requires a large database of infant lexical processing studies, in order to independently test the potential consequences of a variety of methodological decisions on the interpretation of study results.

Peekbank: A large-scale database of looking-while-listening-studies

What these questions and challenges share is that they are difficult to answer at the scale of a single looking-while-listening study. In order to address these questions, we introduce peekbank, a flexible and reproducible interface to an open database of developmental eye-tracking studies. Here, we give a brief overview over the key components of the peekbank project and some initial demonstrations of its utility in advancing theoretical and methodological questions in the study of children’s lexical processing. The peekbank project (a) collects a large set of eye-tracking datasets on children’s lexical processing, (b) introduces a data format and processing tools for standardizing eyetracking data across different data sources, and (c) provides an API for quickly accessing and analyzing the database.

Methods

Database Framework

The Peekbank data framework consists of a relational database and two R libraries: one to extract and rigorously validate data in preparation for ingestion (peekds), and one that serves as an API that provides high-level abstractions to run common analysis tasks on the database (peekbankr).

The schema of the database (Fig. #) is sufficiently general to handle the dataset-specific parameters of datasets from many labs. Entities in the schema include subjects (an individual participant, who may contribute to multiple datasets), administrations (a subject completing a specific experiment), datasets (a data collection effort by a lab), stimuli (a visual stimuli representing a common word, the label can be in various languages), trials (a subject completing a specific trial), trial_types (metadata about a trial, which may be shared across subjects), aoi_region_sets (areas of interest, linked to a specific trial), aoi_timepoints (coded looking behavior), xy_timepoints (raw looking behavior).

Current Data Sources

dataset_name	num_admin	avg_age	method
adams_marchman_2018	270	17.1	manual coding
casillas_tseltal_2015	23	31.3	manual coding
garrison_bergelson_2020	35	14.5	eyetracking
mahr_coartic	29	20.8	eyetracking
perry_cowpig	45	20.5	manual coding
pomper_saffran_2016	60	44.3	manual coding
pomper_salientme	44	40.1	manual coding
potter_canine	36	23.8	manual coding
reflook_socword	435	33.6	eyetracking
reflook_v4	347	37.2	eyetracking

Table 1: Overview over the datasets in the current database.

Results

Describing Variability across Items

Predicting Age-Related Changes While Generalizing Across Items




Figure 2: One column image.

Time Window Selection

Following the approach of Peelle and Van Engen (2020), we conducted a multiverse-style analysis considering possible time windows for estimating the effect of age on proportion target looking in linear mixed-effects models. The mixed-effects models included random intercepts for participants and words.

Splitting into age bins.

Intriguingly, each age range shows its own “hot spot” in terms of the largest effects: upper right for 12-24 mos, bottom middle for 24-36 mos, and bottom right for 36-48 mos. This suggests that researchers may be justified in using different start times and window sizes for different age ranges, likely due to the varying pull of familiarity and novelty as learners age.

Word AOA Predicts Target Fixation

Discussion

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the labs and researchers that have made their data publicly available in the database.

References

- Bergelson, E., & Swingle, D. (2012). At 6-9 months, human infants know the meanings of many common nouns. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(9), 3253–8. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1113380109>
- Lew-Williams, C., & Fernald, A. (2007). Young children learning Spanish make rapid use of grammatical




Figure 1: Item-level variability in proportion target looking within each dataset. Colored lines represent specific target labels.

- gender in spoken word recognition. *Psychological Science*, 18(3), 193–198. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01871.x>
- Marchman, V. A., Loi, E. C., Adams, K. A., Ashland, M., Fernald, A., & Feldman, H. M. (2018). Speed of language comprehension at 18 months old predicts school-relevant outcomes at 54 months old in children born preterm. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, 1. <http://doi.org/10.1097/DBP.0000000000000541>
- Peelle, J. E., Engen, K. J. V., & Sciences, B. (2020). Time stand still : Effects of temporal window selection on eye tracking analysis. <http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pc3da>
- Swingle, D., & Aslin, R. N. (2000). Spoken word recognition and lexical representation in very young children. *Cognition*, 76(2), 147–66.




Figure 3: Item-level variability in proportion target looking within each dataset. Colored lines represent specific target labels.