

Methods for Toddler's Comprehension of Negation (Pilot Study)

Masoud Jasbi, Annika McDermott-Hinman

6/30/2019

Question 1: At what age do toddlers understand negation in the context of rejecting desires?

Design

The study presents toddlers with video recordings and measures their looking time to the screen in a violation of expectation paradigm (Baillargeon, Spelke, and Wasserman 1985). In each trial, there are two puppets and two objects on the screen. One puppet asks the other if they want one of the objects. The second puppets answers with “yes” or “no”. Then the first puppet goes ahead to give the second one the object they wanted, or the object they did not want.

The study has four within-subject trial types. These four trial-types are created based on two factors:

1. Whether the answer to the question is positive or negative
2. Whether the reaction to the answer is consistent or inconsistent with the expressed desire

The table below summarizes the study's 2×2 design. Positive trial types constitute the control condition and negative trial types constitute the test condition. Additionally, there will be a familiarization trial at the beginning of the study to allow the children to become accustomed to the stimuli before the test trials.

Condition	Trial-Type	Objects	Question	Answer	Reaction
Control	Positive-Consistent	X, Y	Do you want the X?	Yes	gives X
Control	Positive-Inconsistent	X, Y	Do you want the X?	Yes	gives Y
Test	Negative-Consistent	X, Y	Do you want the X?	No	gives Y
Test	Negative-Inconsistent	X, Y	Do you want the X?	No	gives X

Stimuli

Puppets

[we should include the picture of the puppets and the objects used in the experiment]

5 Different puppets. 1 puppet that receives the objects and 4 puppets, 1 per condition, that gives objects to the receiver puppet

Objects

Three pairs of objects for the three trial in a condition:

1. apple vs. banana
2. ball vs. car
3. ducky vs. kitty




Figure 1: Production for Yes and No

Linguistic Stimuli

List of lexical items used: no, yes, want, you, do, the, apple, banana, ball, car, dog, cat, duck, bear

According to CDI data (accessed through wordbank.stanford.edu), around 27 months of age almost all children produce “yes” and “no”. The names for all of the objects used are produced by more than 75% of children at 27 months, and are among the first nouns that children produce, as reported by parents (wordbank.stanford.edu). Additionally, Bergelson and Swingley (2012, 2015) provide good evidence that children understand common nouns long before they begin to produce them (as early as 6-9 months).

The remaining words used in the study (do, you, want, the) are clustered around 50% in terms of production at 27 months, and that proportion is increasing rapidly at that age, as seen in the graph. There were not data in the Stanford database for the word ‘want’, so ‘want to/wanna’ has been taken as a proxy under the assumption that production of ‘want’ is at least as high as production of ‘want to’.

Video Recording and Editing

Trials

Familiarization

In the familiarization trials, toddlers are introduced to the six objects in the experiment and their labels. Each object appeared on the screen for 5 seconds and it was labeled by the first puppet (the one that hands out the objects).

Objects	Labeling
Apple	Look! An apple!
Banana	Look! A banana!
Ball	Look! A ball!
Car	Look! A car!
Duck	Look! A duck!
Cat	Look! A cat!

Block 1: Positive Consistent

2			
Objects	Question	Answer	Reaction
Apple, Banana	Do you want the apple?	Yes	gives apple
Ball, Car	Do you want the ball?	Yes	gives ball




Figure 2: Production for Object Words




Figure 3: Production for Other Words

Objects	Question	Answer	Reaction
Apple, Banana	Do you want the apple?	No	gives banana
Ball, Car	Do you want the ball?	No	gives car
Cat, Duck	Do you want the kitty?	No	gives duck

Block 4: Negative Inconsistent

Objects	Question	Answer	Reaction
Apple, Banana	Do you want the apple?	No	gives apple
Ball, Car	Do you want the ball?	No	gives ball
Cat, Duck	Do you want the kitty?	No	gives cat

Participants

Csibra et al. (2016) report that the average effect size in infant looking time studies is about 0.6. Based on this they recommend at least 12 participants and for smaller than usual effect sizes at least 26 participants. Therefore, for our pilot study we aimed at recruiting between 12-26 participants in the age range of 24-30 months.

Measurment

We use the duration of infant’s looking at the screen after a trial video has ended as our dependent measure. All trials end with the last frame frozen on the screen. We move to the next trial if infants stop looking at the screen for more than 2 seconds. Timing, trial ordering, and presentation were managed using the open source software PyHab developed by Jonathan Kominsky.

The stimuli will be controlled by the experimenter, unaware of the stimuli but with a live feed of the child. The experimenter will code the child’s looking time by pressing a key when the child is looking at the screen and releasing when the child looks away. Each trial will end when the last frame is showing and the experimenter has indicated that the child has been looking away from the screen for 2 seconds. The next trial will then start automatically.

Reliability

Trial data provided by each participant will be recoded by an independent coder blind to the stimuli and to the experimental hypotheses. Reliability was computed as ???. We determined the agreement threshold between coders to be 95%.

Results and Analyses

We predict that toddlers who understand our task will look longer at inconsistent trials than consistent ones. In the control condition, success includes correct comprehension of the positive word “yes”. In the test condition, success involves correct comprehension of the negative word “no”.

To test toddler’s performance we use a Bayesian linear regression with the following as predictors: answer (yes/no) and reaction (consistent/inconsistent). Following Barr et al. (2013), we use the maximal by subject and item random effects. Item here is interpreted as the object handed to the second puppet by the first.

Following Csibra et al. (2016), we log-transform the infant looking time for our statistical analyses.

Alternative Accounts

- label-object matching account: if the object given is the label mentioned then no surprise, but if it's a different one = surprise (prediction: surprise at Block 2 and 3)

Baillargeon, Renee, Elizabeth S Spelke, and Stanley Wasserman. 1985. "Object Permanence in Five-Month-Old Infants." *Cognition* 20 (3). Elsevier: 191–208.

Barr, Dale J, Roger Levy, Christoph Scheepers, and Harry J Tily. 2013. "Random Effects Structure for Confirmatory Hypothesis Testing: Keep It Maximal." *Journal of Memory and Language* 68 (3). Elsevier: 255–78.

Csibra, Gergely, Mikołaj Hernik, Olivier Mascaró, Denis Tatone, and Máté Lengyel. 2016. "Statistical Treatment of Looking-Time Data." *Developmental Psychology* 52 (4). American Psychological Association: 521.