Behavioral analysis

David R. Quiroga-Martinez
5 feb 2021

In this document, we show the results of an analysis including the 39 participants of the behavioral study who fulfilled the strict inclusion criteria.

Let's load the required libraries:

```
library(reshape2)
library(MASS)
library(lme4)
library(effects)
library(ggplot2)
library(viridis)
library(RColorBrewer)
library(ordinal)
library(cowplot)
library(kableExtra)
library(knitr)
library(broom)
library(broom.mixed)
library(dplyr)
```

Now, load the data:

```
d <- read.table('clean_data/dataset.csv', header = T, sep = ',') # load data

## To reproduce the original analyses with the stricter inclusion criteria
## (39 participants) uncomment these lines to select the subjects:

d <- d[d$prof < 2,] # self-declared as non-musicians
d <- d[d$yomt < 4,] # less than 4 years of musical training
d <- d[d$somt > 9|d$somt ==0,] # started musical traingin at 10 or older
```

After calculating d-prime scores (see Rmd script for the code), we run a t-test on them:

```
t.d <- t.test(d~cond, data= dprime, paired = T)
kable(tidy(t.d)%>%mutate_if(is.numeric,round,3))
```

estimate	statistic	p.value	parameter	conf.low	conf.high	method	alternative
0.646	5.15	0	38	0.392	0.9	Paired t-test	two.sided

The results show a clear effect of condition on d-prime scores. Now we run another t-test for criterion scores:

```
t.cr <- t.test(c~cond, data= dprime, paired = T)
kable(tidy(t.cr)%>%mutate_if(is.numeric,round,3))
```

estimate	statistic	p.value	parameter	conf.low	conf.high	method	alternative
0.067	0.692	0.493	38	-0.129	0.262	Paired t-test	two.sided

The results show no significant effect of condition on criterion scores. Now we fit a (full) cumulative link mixed model of confidence ratings with the two factors and their interaction:

```
conf <- clmm(as.factor(conf)~cond*deviance + (1|sub), data = d, link = "logit")</pre>
```

We inspect the parameters (odds ratios) of the model and the p-values:

term	estimate	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
1 2	0.010	-13.399	0.000	0.005	0.019
2 3	0.044	-9.379	0.000	0.023	0.085
3 4	0.133	-6.176	0.000	0.070	0.252
4 5	0.281	-3.906	0.000	0.149	0.531
5 6	1.410	1.063	0.288	0.748	2.658
6 7	6.775	5.867	0.000	3.576	12.839
condatonal	0.541	-5.007	0.000	0.425	0.688
condatonal:deviancestd	0.776	-1.493	0.136	0.556	1.083
deviancestd	0.874	-1.112	0.266	0.689	1.108

The results show that participants were less confident in the atonal condition. There was not a significant condition*deviance interaction, but participants still tended to give particularly lower ratings to the standard melodies in the atonal condition.

Given this result, we explore whether a similar pattern can be seen for deviance detection. We therefore run a logistic regression on accuracy, with condition (tonal/atonal), deviance (standard/deviant) and their interaction as predictors.

term	estimate	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
(Intercept)	1.849	4.578	0.000	1.421	2.406
condatonal	0.729	-2.282	0.023	0.556	0.956
deviancestd	2.723	6.336	0.000	1.998	3.713
condatonal:deviancestd	0.694	-1.720	0.085	0.458	1.052
sd(Intercept)	0.561	NA	NA	NA	NA

Notably, the same (non-significant) trend can be seen here. Participants tended to be less accurate in atonal melodies, and more so when the melody was a standard. Nevertheless, note that accuracy was already lower for deviant melodies.

Finally, we make the corresponding plots (se Rmd script for the full code)

