Measuring individual differences in the understanding of gaze cues across the lifespan

Julia Prein[1], Manuel Bohn[1], Luke Maurits[1], Steven Kalinke[1], & Daniel M. Haun[1]

[1] Department of Comparative Cultural Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Prein, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher Platz 6, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. E-mail: julia_prein@eva.mpg.de

Abstract

There must be an abstract of no more than 250 words. One or two sentences providing a **basic introduction** to the field, comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

Two to three sentences of **more detailed background**, comprehensible to scientists in related disciplines.

One sentence clearly stating the **general problem** being addressed by this particular study.

One sentence summarizing the main result (with the words “**here we show**” or their equivalent).

Two or three sentences explaining what the **main result** reveals in direct comparison to what was thought to be the case previously, or how the main result adds to previous knowledge.

One or two sentences to put the results into a more **general context**.

Two or three sentences to provide a **broader perspective**, readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

Keywords: social cognition, individual differences, gaze cues, psychometrics

Word count: X

Measuring individual differences in the understanding of gaze cues across the lifespan

Introduction

Idea for an opener :)

Developmental psychology is facing a dilemma: many research questions are questions about individual differences, yet, there is a lack of tasks to reliably measure these individual differences. For example … .

- individual differences in developmental psychology:
- reliable tasks, variation needed, more trials
- existing tasks for social cognition: wellman
- goal of the current project: standardized, easy to use continuous methods

Design of our balloon finding task

- face value of task (or maybe in intro already?)

Stimuli

Our newly implemented balloon finding task displays cartoon-like stimuli that are engaging for children and adults alike. An animal character (i.e., agent; sheep, monkey, or pig) is placed centrally in a window. A balloon (i.e., target; blue, green, yellow, or red) is located in front of them. The target then falls to the ground. At all times, the agent's gaze tracks the movement of the target. That is, the pupils and iris of the agent move in a way that their center aligns with the center of the target. While the distance of the target's flight depends on the final location, the target moves at a constant speed. Participants are then asked to locate the target's destination: they respond by touching or clicking onto position on the screen.

To keep participants engaged and interested, the presentation of events is accompanied by cartoon-like effects. Each trial starts with an attention-getter: an eye-blinking sound plays while the pupils and iris of the agent enlarge (increase to 130%) and change in opacity (decrease to 75%) for 0.3 sec. The landing of the target is accompanied by a tapping sound. Once the target landed, the instructor's voice asks "Where is the balloon?". After the response is registered, a short plop sound plays and a small orange circle confirms the participants' location choice. If no response got registered within 5 secs after the target landed, an audio prompt reminds the participant to respond.

Trials

Before the test trials start, we present four training trials during which participants familiarize themselves with selection positions on the screen. In the first training trial, participants have full visual access to the target flight and the target's end location and are simply asked to click on the visible balloon. In the second and third training trials, participants have partial visual access: they witness the target flight but cannot see the target's end location. They are then asked to click on the invisible balloon, i.e., the location where they saw the target land. In test trials, participants have no visual access to the target flight nor the end location. Participants are expected to use the agent's gaze as a cue to locate the target. The first trial of each type comprises a voice-over description of the presented events. The audio descriptions explicitly state that the agent is always looking at the target (see Appendix for audio script). After these four training and audio guided trials, participants receive 15 test trials. The complete sequence of four training trials and 15 test trials can be administered within 5-10 minutes of testing time.

Study versions

We designed two study versions which can be chosen according to the researchers' need: there is a continuous *hedge* version and a discrete *box* version. Both versions use the same first training trial and then differ in the consecutive training and test trials. In the *hedge* version, participants have to indicate their estimated target location directly on a hedge (i.e., hedge version). Here, the dependent variable is imprecision, which is defined as the absolute difference between the target's true x coordinate and the x coordinate of the participant's click. In the *box* version, participants are asked to click on a box that hides the target. Researchers have the choice of how many boxes are shown: one up to eight boxes can be displayed as potential hiding locations. Here, we use a categorical outcome (i.e., which box was clicked) to calculate the proportion of correct responses. Note that in the test trials of both study versions, the target flight is covered by a hedge. In the *hedge* version, the hedge then shrinks to a minimum height required to cover the target's end location. In the *box* version, the hedge shrinks completely. The boxes then hide the target's final destination.

Randomization

All agents and target colors appear equally often and are not repeated in more than two consecutive trials. The randomization of the target end location depends on the study version. In the *hedge* version, the full width of the screen is divided into ten bins. Exact coordinates within each bin are then randomly generated. In the *box* version, the target randomly lands in one of the boxes. As with agent and color choice, each bin/box occurs equally often and can only occur twice in a row.

Implementation

Our balloon finding task is presented as an interactive web-app. The task is portable across devices and web browsers and does not require any installation. A great advantage of online testing is that our testing procedure is standardized across participants. By using pre-recorded study instructions, no interaction with the experimenter is necessary during



Figure 1. **Study setup**. (a) Infrastructure for online testing. (i) Subjects aged 3 – 99+ can participate. Data collection can take place anywhere: at home, in kindergartens or research institutes. (ii) The task is presented as a website that works across devices. (iii) The scripts for the website and the recorded data are stored on secure local servers. (b) Continuous *hedge* version of the balloon finding task. (i) The agent stands in a window with the target in front of them. (ii) A hedge grows and covers the target. (iii) The target falls to a random location on the ground. The agent's eyes track the movement of the target. (c) Discrete *box* version of the balloon finding task. Number of boxes (min. 1; max. 8) as potential hiding locations can be set individually.

the study. The code is open-source (https://github.com/ccp-eva/gafo-demo) and a live demo version can be found under: https://ccp-odc.eva.mpg.de/gafo-demo/.

The web-app was programmed in JavaScript (ECMAScript 2015, i.e., ES6), HTML5, CSS and PHP. We utilized the zero configuration bundler Parcel to enable a live server for debugging, easy imports and minified scripts in order to save data storage. For stimulus presentation, a scalable vector graphic (SVG) composition was parsed. This way, the composition scales according to the user's view port without loss of quality, while keeping the aspect ratio and relative object positions constant. Furthermore, SVGs allow us to define all composite parts of the scene (e.g., pupil of the agent) individually. This is needed for precisely calculating exact pupil and target locations and sizes. Additionally, it makes it easy to adjust the stimuli and, for example, add another agent to the scene. The GreenSock Animation Platform (GSAP; TODO: insert citation) library was used to animate the movement of single SVG elements. We use URL parameters to capture the participant's ID, language and study version.

The web-app generates two file types: (1) a text file (.json) containing meta-data, trial specifications and participants' click responses, and (2) a video file (.webm) of the participant's webcam recording. For our samples described in this paper, we deployed the web-app on servers located in Leipzig, Germany. Data got automatically collected and safely stored on these in-house servers. If no internet connection or server is available, researchers could download a local version of the experiment which stores the generated data automatically on the used device. For child samples, we upload safety copies of the already collected responses after the fourth test trial. In cases where children want to stop participation earlier, no responses get lost.

Data processing

We used R (Version 4.1.2; R Core Team, 2021) and the R-packages *brms* (Version 2.15.0; Bürkner, 2017, 2018), *dplyr* (Version 1.0.8; Wickham, François, Henry, & Müller, 2021), *forcats* (Version 0.5.1; Wickham, 2021a), *ggplot2* (Version 3.3.5; Wickham, 2016), *ggpubr* (Version 0.4.0; Kassambara, 2020), *ggthemes* (Version 4.2.4; Arnold, 2021), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust & Barth, 2020), *purrr* (Version 0.3.4; Henry & Wickham, 2020), *Rcpp* (Eddelbuettel & Balamuta, 2018; Version 1.0.6; Eddelbuettel & François, 2011), *readr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham & Hester, 2020), *splithalfr* (Version 2.1.1; Thomas, Dylan, Reinout, & Jaap, 2021), *stringr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham, 2019), *tibble* (Version 3.1.6; Müller & Wickham, 2021), *tidyboot* (Version 0.1.1; Braginsky & Yurovsky, 2018), *tidyr* (Version 1.2.0; Wickham, 2021b), *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham et al., 2019), *tinylabels* (Version 0.2.3; Barth, 2022), *viridis* (Version 0.6.1; Garnier et al., 2021a, 2021b), and *viridisLite* (Version 0.4.0; Garnier et al., 2021b) for all our analyses. Regression models were fitted as Bayesian generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) with default priors for all analyses. All test trials without voice over description are included in our analyses.

Does the balloon finding task induce variation?

Our first aim was to assess whether our balloon finding task induces variation in a child and adult sample. The pre-registrations can be found here: https://osf.io/snju6 (child sample) and here: https://osf.io/r3bhn (adult sample). Participants were equally distributed across the two study versions. The study was approved by an internal ethics committee at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Data was collected between May 2021 and XXX 2022.

Participants

For our child sample, we went to kindergartens in Leipzig and surroundings that cooperate with the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Children in our sample grow up in an industrialized, urban Central-European context. Information on socioeconomic status was not formally recorded, although the majority of families come from mixed, mainly mid to high socioeconomic backgrounds with high levels of parental education. The child sample consisted of 120 children, including 40 3-year-olds (mean = 41.45 months, SD = 3.85, range = 36 - 47, 22 girls), 40 4-year-olds (mean = 54.60 months, SD = 3.10, range = 48 - 59, 19 girls), and 40 5-year-olds (mean = 66.95 months, SD = 3.39, range = 60 - 71, 22 girls). Children received a small thank-you gift for their participation in the study.

In addition, we recruited adult participants by advertising the study on *Prolific*. *Prolific* is an online participant recruitment service from the University of Oxford with a predominantly European and US-american subject pool. Participants consisted of 100 English-speakers with an average age of 31.34 years (SD = 10.77, range = 18 - 63, 64 females). For completing the study, subjects were payed above the fixed minimum wage (in average £10.00 per hour). *Prolific* distributed our study link to potential participants, while the hosting of the online study was done by local servers in the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany.

Procedure

Children were tested in a quiet room in their daycare. An experimenter guided the child through the different parts of the study. All participants received 15 test trials that were displayed as described above. In the box version, we decided to adjust the task difficulty according to the participant's age: children were presented with five boxes while adults were presented with eight boxes as possible hiding location of the target.

Results

We assessed the effect of data collection mode and age (in months, z-transformed) in a Bayesian generalized linear mixed model with target position and subject ID as random effects. In the hedge version, the estimate of age is -0.33 ([-0.42; -0.23]) and of data collection mode is -0.32 ([-0.50; -0.14], with remote unsupervised data collection as the reference category). In the box version, the estimate of age is 0.64 ([0.41; 0.88]) and of data collection mode is 1.16 ([0.73; 1.61], with remote unsupervised data collection as the reference category).

We captured a developmental trajectory of gaze cue understanding: with increasing age, participants get more and more accurate in their performance. In the hedge version, children's click imprecision drops with age, while in the box version the proportion of correct responses increases (see Figure 2 A and F). By the end of their sixth year of life, children come close to the adult's proficiency level. We find interindividual variation across studyversions and age groups: some three-year-olds are more accurate in their responses than some five-year-olds.

Remote data collection. Since our task is implemented in a way that no experimenter interaction is necessary, data can also be collected without supervision. To assess whether we would gain similar results in a remote testing context, we recruited an additional online sample of 147 children, including 45 3-year-olds (mean = 42.62 months, SD = 3.35, range = 36 - 47, 14 girls), 47 4-year-olds (mean = 52.64 months, SD = 3.40, range = 48 - 59, 25 girls), and 55 5-year-olds (mean = 65.11 months, SD = 3.77, range = 60 - 71, 27 girls). Families were recruited on a voluntary basis via email from the institute internal database. Every child received a personalized link and families could participate at any time or location they wanted. In the beginning of the online study, families were invited to enter "our virtual institute" and were welcomed by an introductory video of the study leader, shortly describing the research background and further procedure. Then,



Figure 2. **Measuring interindividual variation**. (a) Developmental trajectory in continuous *hedge* version. Performance is measured as average imprecision, i.e., the absolute distance between the target's center and the participant's click. The unit of imprecision is counted in the width of the target, i.e., a participant with an imprecision of 1 clicked in average one target width to the left or right of the true target center. (b) Internal consistency (odd-even split) in hedge child sample. (c) Internal consistency in hedge adult sample. (d) Test-retest reliability in hedge child sample. (e) Test-retest reliability in hedge adult sample. (f) Developmental trajectory in discrete *box* version. Performance is measured as the proportion of correct responses, i.e., how many times the participant clicked on the box that actually contained the target. Dotted black line shows level of performance expected by chance (for child sample 20%, i.e., 1 out of 5 boxes; for adult sample 12.5%, i.e., 1 out of 8 boxes). (g) Internal consistency (odd-even split) in box child sample. (h) Internal consistency in box adult sample. (i) Test-retest reliability in box child sample. (j) Test-retest reliability in box adult sample. Regression lines with 95% CI show product-moment-correlations with Pearson's correlation coefficient r. Large data points with 95% CI (based on non-parametric bootstrap) represent performance means by age group (binned by year). Small data points show the mean performance for each subject. Shape of data points represents data collection mode: opaque round circles with stand for in-person supervised data collection, translucent diamonds stand for remote unsupervised data collection. Color of data points represent each age group (binned by year).

caregivers were informed about data security and were asked for their informed consent. They were asked to enable the sound and seat their child centrally in front of their device. Before the study started, families were instructed how to setup their webcam and enable the recording permissions. We stressed that caregivers should not help their children and that all kinds of child behavior were interesting to us. Study participation was video recorded whenever possible in order to ensure that the answers were generated by the children themselves. After completion, families received a little crafting / coloring sheet as a small thank-you gift. Depending on the participant's device, the website automatically presented the hedge or box version of the study. For families that used a tablet with touchscreen, the hedge version was shown. Here, children could directly click on the touchscreen themselves to indicate where the target is. For families that used a computer without touchscreen, the website presented the box version of the task. We assumed that younger children in our sample would not be acquainted with the usage of a computer mouse. Therefore, we asked children to point to the screen. Caregivers were then asked to act as the "digital finger" of their children and click on the indicated box.

As Figure 2 A and F show, our remotely collected data closely resembled the data from the kindergarten sample. We found a minor difference in that children that participate remotely are slightly more precise. This difference was mainly driven by the younger participants and especially prominent in the box version of the task. It is conceivable that caregivers were especially prone to help with the behavior of younger children. In the box version, caregivers might have had more opportunities to interfere since they carried out the clicking for their children.

Discussion

Study 1 showed that our newly implemented balloon finding task can be used to study gaze cue understanding in both children and adults. With increasing age, participants got more and more precise in locating the target. We found inter-individual variation in across all age groups. Furthermore, we found a comparable developmental trajectory for an unsupervised remote child sample. This underlines how flexibly our new task can be used.

Can we capture variation reliably?

Based on the results of Study 1, we wanted to further investigate whether the variation that we captured with our balloon finding task is reliable. For this aim, we assessed the internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The pre-registrations can be found here: https://osf.io/xqm73 (child sample) and here: https://osf.io/nu62m (adult sample). Participants were equally distributed across the two study versions. The study was approved by an internal ethics committee at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Data was collected between XXX 2021 and XXX 2022.

Participants

For our child sample, we again went to kindergartens in Leipzig and surroundings. The child sample consisted of 93 children, including 24 3-year-olds (mean = 42.49 months, SD = 2.99, range = 38 - 47, 13 girls), 38 4-year-olds (mean = 53.77 months, SD = 3.16, range = 48 - 59, 19 girls), and 31 5-year-olds (mean = 66 months, SD = 3.42, range = 61 - 71, 17 girls).

The adult sample was again recruited over *Prolific* and consisted of 136 English-speakers with an average age of 25.74 years (SD = 8.11, range = 18 - 71, 87 females).

Procedure

The procedure was as in the first study, with the following differences. Participants completed the study twice, with a delay of 14 $\pm$ 3 days. The target locations as well as the succession of animals and target colors was randomized once. Each participant then received this fixed randomized order of target location, animal, and target color. The child sample received 15 test trials. In the hedge version, each bin occurred once, making up ten of the test trials. For the remaining five test trials, we repeated one out of two adjacent bins (i.e., randomly chose between bin 1 & 2, bin 3 & 4, etc). In the box version, we ensured that each of the five boxes occurred exactly three times. For the remaining training trials, we repeated a fixed order of four random bins/boxes. Adults in the hedge version received 30 test trials, each of the ten bin occurring exactly three times. Adults in the box version received 32 test trials with each of the eight boxes occurring exactly four times.

Results

- internal consistency
- test-retest

For estimating the internal consistency, we analyzed the raw performance per subject of the first test day. Our main analysis focuses on an odd-even split on our data.

In the hedge version, odd-even splitting yielded an estimate of 0.86 for the child sample (see Figure 2B), and an estimate of 0.77 for the adult sample (see Figure 2C). In the box version, odd-even splitting yielded an estimate of 0.55 for the child sample (see Figure 2G), and an estimate of 0.76 for the adult sample (see Figure 2H).

A recent paper by [TODO: insert citation splithalfr paper] presents new techniques to analyze internal consistency. The modern statistical approach of stratification allows for a better representation of the data and experimental structure. To compare our traditional approach of a simple odd-even split, we explored the results of random, odd-even and first-second-testhalf splits without and with stratification by target position. As can be seen in Table 1, stratifying by target position leads to similar or even higher estimates. As might be expected, we found higher coefficients for the samples with higher variation, i.e. for our continuous hedge version of the task.

study version	age group	splitting method	stratification	mean estimate	lower 95%CI	up
hedge	kids	random	none	0.8043888	0.6920419	
hedge	kids	random	target position	0.9476184	0.8969928	
hedge	kids	odd even	none	0.8594840	0.7205078	
hedge	kids	odd even	target position	0.8024165	0.5332674	
hedge	kids	first second	none	0.8181923	0.6947852	
hedge	kids	first second	target position	0.8024165	0.5203456	
hedge	adults	random	none	0.8653142	0.7987080	
hedge	adults	random	target position	0.9239187	0.8751052	
hedge	adults	odd even	none	0.7686066	0.5965930	
hedge	adults	odd even	target position	0.8024056	0.6640335	
hedge	adults	first second	none	0.6752549	0.5261556	
hedge	adults	first second	target position	0.8024056	0.6561634	
box	kids	random	none	0.7660606	0.5458261	
box	kids	random	target position	0.9088431	0.8521932	
box	kids	odd even	none	0.5483231	0.3375113	
box	kids	odd even	target position	0.6137607	0.3960722	
box	kids	first second	none	0.5022750	0.2369860	
box	kids	first second	target position	0.6137607	0.3772301	
box	adults	random	none	0.8004204	0.6814629	
box	adults	random	target position	0.8657569	0.7669845	
box	adults	odd even	none	0.7597443	0.6424789	
box	adults	odd even	target position	0.6673433	0.4851349	
box	adults	first second	none	0.6685946	0.4850376	
box	adults	first second	target position	0.6673433	0.4845532	

Our results indicated that the measured variation was systematic. These results hold for both the continuous hedge version as well as the discrete box version of the task.

Discussion

Exploring the external validity of our task

Our third aim was to assess whether the captured individual variation in gaze cue understanding relates to factors in children's real live social surroundings.

Participants

For this exploratory analysis, we included all children of the aforementioned samples where families filled out a short demographic questionnaire. This ub sample consisted of 130 children, including 39 3-year-olds (mean = 43.02 months, SD = 3.20, range = 37 - 47, 20 girls), 44 4-year-olds (mean = 54.43 months, SD = 2.77, range = 48 - 59, 26 girls), and 47 5-year-olds (mean = 66.13 months, SD = 3.55, range = 60 - 71, 23 girls).

Procedure

Families of our kindergarten and online child sample were asked to fill out a brief demographic questionnaire (print out / online questionnaire). We asked for (1) the total number of household members, (2) the number of children, (3) age of the other children, (4) whether the child was in day care, and if yes, (5) since when and (6) for how long on an average day.

Results

- peer exposure (hedge & box combined?)

Discussion

Limitations

Future development / extending the task

Conclusion

Declarations

Open practices statement

The web application (https://ccp-odc.eva.mpg.de/gafo-demo/) described here is open source (https://github.com/ccp-eva/gafo-demo). The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available in the [gazecues-methods] repository, (https://github.com/jprein/gazecues-methods). All experiments were preregistered (https://osf.io/zjhsc/).

Funding

This study was funded by the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, a noncommercial, publicly financed scientific organization (no grant number). We thank all the children and parents who participated in the study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethics approval

Consent to participate

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study or their legal guardians.

Consent for publication

Open access

Authors' contributions

optional: please review the submission guidelines from the journal whether statements are mandatory

References

Arnold, J. B. (2021). *Ggthemes: Extra themes, scales and geoms for 'ggplot2'.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggthemes

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown.* Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

Barth, M. (2022). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels.* Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org/package=tinylabels

Braginsky, M., & Yurovsky, D. (2018). *Tidyboot: Tidyverse-compatible bootstrapping.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyboot

Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *80*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01

Bürkner, P.-C. (2018). Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *The R Journal*, *10*(1), 395–411. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-017

Eddelbuettel, D., & Balamuta, J. J. (2018). Extending extitR with extitC++: A Brief Introduction to extitRcpp. *The American Statistician*, *72*(1), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2017.1375990

Eddelbuettel, D., & François, R. (2011). Rcpp: Seamless R and C++ integration. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *40*(8), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v040.i08

Garnier, Simon, Ross, Noam, Rudis, Robert, … Cédric. (2021a). *viridis - colorblind-friendly color maps for r.* https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4679424

Garnier, Simon, Ross, Noam, Rudis, Robert, … Cédric. (2021b). *viridis - colorblind-friendly color maps for r.* https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4679424

Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr

Kassambara, A. (2020). *Ggpubr: 'ggplot2' based publication ready plots.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr

Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Thomas, P., Dylan, M., Reinout, W., & Jaap, M. (2021). Methods to split cognitive task data for estimating split-half reliability: A comprehensive review and systematic assessment. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-021-01948-3

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis.* Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr

Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors).* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats

Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., … Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

Wickham, H., & Hester, J. (2020). *Readr: Read rectangular text data.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr

Supplements

Adult sample

Recruitment. We recruited participants using the online participant recruitment service *Prolific* from the University of Oxford. *Prolific*'s subject pool consists of a mostly European and US-american sample although subjects from all over the world are included. The recruitment platform realises ethical payment of participants, which requires researchers to pay participants a fixed minimum wage of £5.00 (around US$6.50 or €6.00) per hour. We decided to pay all participants the same fixed fee which was in relation to the estimated average time taken to complete the task. *Prolific* distributed our study link to potential participants, while the hosting of the online study was done by local servers in the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig. Therefore, study data was saved only on our internal servers, while *Prolific* provided demographic information of the participants. Participants' *Prolific* ID was forwarded to our study website using URL parameters. This way, we could match participant demographic data to our study data. The same technique was used to confirm study completion: we redirected participants from our study website back to the *Prolific* website using URL parameters. We used *Prolific*'s inbuilt prescreening filter to include only participants who were fluent in English and could therefore properly understand our written and oral study instructions.

Study 1 - Validation hedge version. The aim of Study 1 was to validate the hedge version of our balloon finding task. The pre-registration can be found here: https://osf.io/r3bhn. We recruited participants online by advertising the study on *Prolific*.

50 adults participated in the study. One additional subject returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. Data collection took place in May 2021. Participants were compensated with £1.25 for completing the study. We estimated an average completion time of 6 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £10.00. In average, participants took 05:56min to complete the

study. Participants were required to complete the study on a tablet or desktop. Participation on mobile devices was disabled since the display would be too small and would harm click precision. It was indicated that the study required audio sound.

We stored *Prolific*'s internal demographic information, while not asking for additional personal information.

Study 2 - Validation box version. As in study 1, we recruited participants on *Prolific*, and employed the same methodology. However, this time we focussed on validating the box version of the task in an adult sample. Participants were presented with eight boxes in which the target could land. 50 adults participated in the study. One additional subject returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. Data collection took place in June 2021. Participants were compensated with £1.00 for completing the study. We estimated an average completion time of 6 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £10.00. In average, participants took 04:43min to complete the study.

Study 3 - Reliability hedge version. In study 3 and 4, we assessed the test-retest reliability of our balloon-finding task in an adult sample. The pre-registration can be found here: https://osf.io/nu62m. We tested the same participants twice with a delay of two weeks. The testing conditions were as specified in Study 1 and 2. However, the target locations as well as the succession of animals and target colors was randomized once. Each participant then received the same fixed randomized order of target location, animal, and target color. Participants received 30 test trials without voice-over description, so that each of the ten bins occurred exactly three times.

In addition to the beforementioned prescreening settings, we used a whitelist. *Prolific* has a so-called *custom allowlist prescreening filter* where one can enter the *Prolific* IDs of participants who completed a previous study. Only these subjects are then invited to participate in a study. This way, repeated measurements can be implemented, collecting data from the same subjects at different points in time.

In a first round, 60 participants took part on the first testday. Additional two subjects returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. One additional participant timed out, i.e., did not finish the survey within the allowed maximum time. The maximum time is calculated by *Prolific*, based on the estimated average completion time. For this study, the maximum time amounted to 41 minutes. For the first testday, participants were compensated with £1.25. We estimated an average completion time of 9 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £8.33. In average, participants took 07:11min to complete the first part.

Of the 60 participants that completed testday 1, 41 subjects finished testday 2. One additional participant timed out, i.e., did not finish the survey within the allowed maximum time. Participants were compensated with £1.50 for completing the second part of the study. We estimated an average completion time of 9 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £10. In average, participants took 06:36min to complete the second part of the study.

Since we aimed for a minimum sample size of 60 subjects participating on both testdays, we reran the first testday with additional 50 participants. Additional seven subjects returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. Two additional participants timed out, i.e., did not finish the survey within the allowed maximum time. Again, participants were compensated with £1.25 for completing the first part of the study (estimated average completion time 9 minutes, estimated hourly rate of £8.33). In average, participants took 06:51min to complete the first part.

Of the additional 50 participants that completed testday 1, 29 subjects finished testday 2. Again, participants were compensated with £1.50 for completing the second part of the study (estimated average completion time 9 minutes, estimated hourly rate of

£10). In average, participants took 06:26min to complete the second part of the study.

Study 4 - Reliability box version. As in study 3, we recruited participants on *Prolific*, and employed the same methodology. However, this time participants were presented with the box version of the task. Participants received 32 test trials without voice-over description, so that each of the eight boxes occurred exactly four times. As in study 2, we employed eight boxes in which the target could land.

In a first round, 60 participants took part on the first testday. Additional five subjects returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. For the first testday, participants were compensated with £1.25. We estimated an average completion time of 9 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £8.33. In average, participants took 07:33min to complete the first part.

Of the 60 participants that completed testday 1, 41 subjects finished testday 2. Participants were compensated with £1.50 for completing the second part of the study. We estimated an average completion time of 9 minutes, resulting in an estimated hourly rate of £10. In average, participants took 07:50min to complete the second part of the study.

Since we aimed for a minimum sample size of 60 subjects participating on both testdays, we reran the first testday with additional 50 participants. Additional eight subjects returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. One additional participant timed out, i.e., did not finish the survey within the allowed maximum time. Again, participants were compensated with £1.25 for completing the first part of the study (estimated average completion time 9 minutes, estimated hourly rate of £8.33). In average, participants took 07:37min to complete the first part.

Of the additional 50 participants that completed testday 1, 28 subjects finished testday 2. Additional three subjects returned their submission, i.e., decided to leave the study early or withdrew their submission after study completion. One additional participant timed out, i.e., did not finish the survey within the allowed maximum time. Again, participants were compensated with £1.50 for completing the second part of the study (estimated average completion time 9 minutes, estimated hourly rate of £10). In average, participants took 06:30min to complete the second part of the study.

Child sample

Study 1 - Validation Remote and in-person. The validation of our task in a in-person and remote child sample can be found here: https://osf.io/snju6. We chose to have at least 20 data points per cell (i.e. unique combination of data collection mode, study version, and age-group). Across the two data collection modes, a total of … children participated. Participants received a small gift as thank you for their participation in the study.

For our in-person supervised testing sample, we went to kindergartens in Leipzig and surroundings that cooperate with the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. For our remote unsupervised testing sample, families were recruited on a voluntary basis via email from the database of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Children in both sub samples live in Leipzig, Germany or surrounding areas and grow up in an industrialized, urban Central-European context. Information on socioeconomic status was not formally recorded, although the majority of families come from mixed, mainly mid to high socioeconomic backgrounds with high levels of parental education. Written informed consent was obtained from at least one caregiver prior to testing. TODO: how to phrase for kiga testing?

Procedure Remote Testing

In the beginning of the online study, families were invited to enter "our virtual institute" and were welcomed by an introductory video of the study leader, shortly describing the research background and further procedure. Then, caregivers were informed about data security and were asked for their informed consent. They were asked to enable the sound and seat their child centrally in front of their device. Subsequently, a brief demographic questionnaire was displayed, asking for (1) the total number of household members, (2) the number of children, (3) age of the other children, (4) whether the child was in day care, and if yes, (5) since when and (6) for how long on an average day. Before the study started, families were instructed how to setup their webcam and enable the recording permissions. Study participation was video recorded whenever possible in order to ensure that the answers were generated by the children themselves. Then, families were guided through the online study with pre-recorded audio instructions. After completion, families received a little crafting / coloring sheet as a small thank-you gift.

Depending on the participant's device, the website automatically presents the hedge or box version of the study. For families that use a tablet with touchscreen, the hedge version is shown. Here, children can directly click on the screen themselves to indicate where the target is. For families that use a computer without touchscreen, the website presents the box version of the task. We assumed that younger children in our sample would not be acquainted with the usage of a computer mouse. Therefore, we asked children to point to the screen. Caregivers were then asked to act as the "digital finger" of their children and click on the indicated box. In order to facilitate the translation of children's pointing and caregivers' clicking, we decided to implement this categorical version of the task.

Study 2 - Reliability in-person. https://osf.io/xqm73

Instructions and voice over descriptions

This is the content of our voice recordings. Children listen to this during the game.

Nr	Timeline	German	English	Filename
1	**welcome**	Hallo! Schön, dass du da bist. Wir spielen jetzt das Ballon-Spiel! Siehst du die Tiere auf dem Bild da? Wir möchten gleich zusammen mit den Tieren mit einem Ballon spielen. Was genau passiert, erklären wir dir jetzt ganz in Ruhe.	Hello! Great that you're here. We'll now play a balloon game. Can you see the animals in the picture over there? We want to play together with the animals using the balloon. We'll now talk you through exactly what will happen.	welcome.mp3

2	**touch**	Schau mal, da steht ein Tier im Fenster. Und siehst du den Ballon da? Der Ballon fällt immer runter und landet auf dem Boden. Und du musst ihn dann finden. Das Tier hilft Dir und schaut immer den Ballon an.	Look, an animal is standing in the window. And can you see the balloon over there? The balloon always falls down and lands on the ground. And you have to find it! The animal helps you and always looks at the balloon.	touch-1.mp3
3		Wo ist der Ballon? Drück auf den Ballon!	Where is the balloon? Click on the balloon!	prompt-touch-long.mp3

4	**fam - HEDGE**	Klasse, das war super! Jetzt spielen wir weiter. Siehst du wieder das Tier und den Ballon da? Der Ballon fällt wieder runter. Diesmal fällt er hinter eine Hecke. Du musst ihn wieder finden. Das Tier hilft dir und schaut immer den Ballon an.	Perfect, that was great! Now, we'll continue playing. Can you see the animal and the balloon again? The balloon will fall down again. This time, it will fall behind a hedge. And you have to find it! The animal helps you and looks at the balloon.	fam-hedge-1.mp3
5		Wo ist der Ballon? Drücke auf die Hecke - wo der Ballon ist.	Where is the balloon? On the hedge, click where the balloon is.	prompt-hedge-long.mp3

6	**fam - BOX**	Klasse, das war super! Jetzt spielen wir weiter. Siehst du wieder das Tier und den Ballon da? Der Ballon fällt wieder runter. Diesmal fällt er in eine Kiste. Du musst ihn wieder finden. Das Tier hilft dir und schaut immer den Ballon an.	Perfect, that was great! Now, we'll continue playing. Can you see the animal and the balloon again? The balloon falls down again. This time, it falls into a box. And you have to find it! The animal helps you and looks at the balloon.	fam-box-1.mp3
7		Wo ist der Ballon? Drücke auf die Kiste mit dem Ballon.	Where is the balloon? Click on the box with the balloon.	prompt-box-long.mp3

8	**test - HEDGE**	Klasse , das hast du toll gemacht! Nun spielen wir weiter. Da sind wieder der Ballon, das Tier und die Hecke. Die Hecke wächst jetzt hoch.	Nice, good job! Now, we'll continue playing. There is the balloon, the animal and the hedge. The hedge is growing a bit now.	test-hedge-1.mp3
9		Der Ballon ist nun hinter der Hecke. Du kannst das nicht sehen - das Tier aber! Jetzt fällt der Ballon auf den Boden und du musst ihn wieder finden. Denk dran - das Tier schaut immer den Ballon an.	The balloon is behind the hedge now. You can't see it - but the animal can! The balloon falls to the ground and you have to find it. Remember - the animal always looks at the balloon!	test-hedge-2.mp3

10		Dann schrumpft die Hecke. Drücke auf die Hecke - wo der Ballon ist.	Now, the hedge is shrinking. On the hedge, click where the balloon is.	test-hedge-3.mp3
11	**test - BOX**	Klasse , das hast du toll gemacht! Nun spielen wir weiter. Da sind wieder der Ballon, das Tier und die Kisten. Jetzt wächst eine Hecke hoch.	Nice, good job! Now, we'll continue playing. There is the balloon and the animal. Now, a hedge is growing.	test-box-1.mp3

12		Der Ballon ist nun hinter der Hecke. Du kannst das nicht sehen - das Tier aber! Jetzt fällt der Ballon in eine Kiste und du musst ihn wieder finden. Denk dran - das Tier schaut immer den Ballon an.	The balloon is behind the hedge now. You can't see it - but the animal can! The balloon falls into a box and you have to find it. Remember - the animal always looks at the balloon!	test-box-2.mp3
13		Dann schrumpft die Hecke. Drücke auf die Kiste mit dem Ballon.	Now, the hedge is shrinking. Click on the box with the balloon.	test-box-3.mp3

14	**goodbye**	Geschafft! Die Tiere sind schon ganz glücklich vom Spielen! Vielen Dank für deine Hilfe! Bis zum nächsten Mal und liebe Grüße vom Schwein, Affen und Schaf	The animals are super happy after playing. Thanks a lot for your help! See you soon and goodbye from the pig, monkey and sheep	goodbye.mp3
15	**general prompt**	Wo ist der Ballon?	Where is the balloon?	prompt-general.mp3
16	**touch - no response**	Drück auf den Ballon!	Click on the balloon!	prompt-touch.mp3
17	**hedge - no response**	Drücke auf die Hecke - wo der Ballon ist!	On the hedge, click where the balloon is!	prompt-hedge.mp3
18	**box - no response**	Drücke auf die Kiste mit dem Ballon!	Click on the box with the balloon!	prompt-box.mp3
19	**landing sound of balloon**	-	-	balloon-lands.mp3
20	**sound of blinking eyes**	-	-	blink.mp3

21	**sound for target click**	-	-	positive-feedback.mp3