

Supplementary material: Children’s interpretation of ambiguous pronouns based on prior discourse

Manuel Bohn^{1,2}, Khuyen Nha Le¹, Benjamin Peloquin¹, Bahar Köymen³, & Michael C. Frank¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Stanford University

² Leipzig Research Center for Early Child Development, Leipzig University

³ School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester

Experiment 1

Method

Materials. The list below shows all words that were used to request objects during training trials for each of the four categories. The corresponding pictures are shown in figure 1 in the main manuscript.

- fruit: strawberry, apple, banana, cherry, orange, melon, pineapple
- vehicles: car, truck, train, bus, airplane, boat, motorbike
- clothes: shoe, sock, hat, shirt, jacket, dress, skirt
- animals: dog, cat, horse, bear, cow, monkey, elephant

The object shown at test for each category was randomly selected from all objects of that category.

Analysis. We used R (Version 3.6.1; R Core Team, 2019) and the R-packages *BayesFactor* (Version 0.9.12.4.2; Morey & Rouder, 2018), *bayesplot* (Version 1.7.0; Gabry,

Table S1
*Bayes factors based on Bayesian t-test with different
priors on standardized effect size*

Age	default prior	wide prior	ultrawide prior
2	0.59	0.45	0.34
3	90.77	90.58	81.99
4	10.39	9.52	8.03

Simpson, Vehtari, Betancourt, & Gelman, 2019), *brms* (Version 2.10.0; Bürkner, 2017, 2018), *broom* (Version 0.5.2; Robinson & Hayes, 2019), *coda* (Version 0.19.3; Plummer, Best, Cowles, & Vines, 2006), *dplyr* (Version 0.8.3; Wickham, François, Henry, & Müller, 2019), *forcats* (Version 0.4.0; Wickham, 2019a), *ggplot2* (Version 3.2.1; Wickham, 2016), *ggpubr* (Version 0.2.3; Kassambara, 2019), *ggridges* (Version 0.5.2; Wilke, 2020), *ggthemes* (Version 4.2.0; Arnold, 2019), *knitr* (Version 1.25; Xie, 2015), *langcog* (Version 0.1.9001; Braginsky, Yurovsky, & Frank, 2019), *magrittr* (Version 1.5; Bache & Wickham, 2014), *Matrix* (Version 1.2.17; Bates & Maechler, 2019), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9842; Aust & Barth, 2018), *purrr* (Version 0.3.2; Henry & Wickham, 2019), *Rcpp* (Eddelbuettel & Balamuta, 2017; Version 1.0.2; Eddelbuettel & François, 2011), *readr* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham, Hester, & Francois, 2018), *reshape2* (Version 1.4.3; Wickham, 2007), *stringr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham, 2019b), *tibble* (Version 2.1.3; Müller & Wickham, 2019), *tidyr* (Version 1.0.0; Wickham & Henry, 2019), and *tidyverse* (Version 1.2.1; Wickham, 2017) for all our analyses reported in the main manuscript and the supplementary material.

Results. We conducted a sensitivity analysis for the Bayes factors that informed the comparison to chance in each age group. We re-ran the analysis using wider priors than the default priors from the package. Table S1 reports the results. Results show that the conclusions - 3- and 4-year-olds, but not 2-year-olds, select the object from the same category above chance - are robust to changes in the prior width.

Supplementary Experiment

In this study, we varied the number of training trials before the test event. Procedures and analysis were pre-registered at https://osf.io/x2k4p/?view_only=d3440e61d88e42c892e3294a6072cc05. Our main focus was on condition differences and we therefore sampled a smaller number of children from each age group.

Method

Participants. We tested 33 children, including 19 3-year-olds (mean = 3.45, range = 3.00 - 3.93, 5 girls) and 14 4-year-olds (mean = 4.44, range = 4.02 - 4.97, 7 girls). For details on population characteristics and ethical approval see experiment 1.

Materials and Procedure. Study material and procedure were identical to study 1 with the following change: we administered two types of trials that varied in the number of training trials that preceded the test. *Low input* trials had one training trial while *high input* trials had six training trials. Participants received four trials, two in each condition. The order of conditions was randomized. Categories were randomly assigned to each condition and object positions were randomized in the same way as in study 1. Experimental procedures can be found in the associated online repository.

Results. We used WAIC scores and weights to compare models including condition as a predictor to models lacking it. Table S2 shows the results of the model comparison. The model without condition as a predictor (either as main effect or as an interaction with age) provided the best fit. In this model, the predictor for age was largely positive and different from zero ($\beta = 1.09$, 95% CI = -0.71 - 3.08) suggesting an increase in performance with age. Figure S1 shows that, in contrast to study 1, 3-year-olds had difficulties with this version of the task.

Discussion. The results of this experiment suggest that hearing fewer examples of objects from the implied category does not automatically result in worse performance

Table S2
Model comparison for Experiment 2

Model	WAIC	SE	weight
correct \sim age + RE	178.93	9.40	0.61
correct \sim age + condition + RE	180.51	9.90	0.28
correct \sim age * condition + RE	182.34	10.46	0.11

Note. All models included random intercepts for participant and speaker and random slopes for condition.




Figure S1. Correct responses in supplementary experiment by age and condition. Transparent dots show aggregated data from individual participants. Blue and red crosses show mean within age bin based on aggregated data with 95% CI based on non-parametric bootstrap. Colored lines show the mean of the posterior distribution for each condition based on the interaction model (note that the model comparison favored the model without condition). Lighter lines show 1000 random draws per condition from the model posterior to depict uncertainty. Dotted line indicates level of performance expected by chance.

overall. However, this interpretation should be taken with caution. As it turns out, mixing low and high input trials substantially affected 3-year-olds' performance in the task. That is, in contrast to study 1 and 2, they struggled with the basic inference. This suggests that including low input trials made the task harder overall. The difference between conditions might be more prominent in a between subjects design. However, more data is needed to reach a conclusion and, as of now, we see these results as inconclusive.

Exploratory analysis

This is an exploratory analysis that was not pre-registered. From all experiments we select the data with six training trials and the same speaker. That is, we included all data from study 1, the high input condition from the supplementary experiment and the same speaker condition from study 2.

Methods

Participants. Data from all children ($N = 164$) who participated in one of the three experiments were included. For detailed information about age and population characteristics see individual experiments.

Analysis. We compared three models. The interaction model included an interaction between age and category, the main effects model included age and category as main effects and the baseline model only included age as a predictor. Models were compared in the same way as in previous experiments. Furthermore, to investigate the relative difficulty of each target category, we compare the posterior distributions of the parameter estimate for each category.

Results. Figure S2A shows that performance differed widely across categories. This visual impression was corroborated in the model comparison. Table S3 shows that the main effects model with category as a predictor was clearly favored. For comparisons between categories we set animals as the reference category. Figure S2B and S3 show that children chose the object from the same category most often when fruits was the target category. Vehicles and animals resulted in intermediate levels of performance while clothes was the most difficult category.

Table S3

Model comparison for exploratory analysis on category differences

Model	WAIC	SE	weight
correct ~ age + category + RE	626.56	12.09	0.85
correct ~ age * category + RE	630.13	12.93	0.14
correct ~ age + RE	637.92	8.55	0.00

Note. All models included random intercepts for participant and speaker and random slopes for category within speaker

Discussion

This exploratory analysis suggests that children's ability to infer the topic of a conversation depends, in part, on the implied topic itself. Categories may differ in difficulty either because some category members might be less familiar to children and/or because children are less familiar with the category itself. The general discussion section in the main manuscript offers a discussion of how these results relate to the other studies.




Figure S2. (A) Data plotted by age bin and category. Transparent dots show data from individual participants. Colored crosses show mean within age bin and category with 95% confidence intervals based on non-parametric bootstrap. (B) Correct responses for age continuously. Colored lines show the mean of the posterior distribution of the model including category. Lighter lines show 1000 random draws from the model posterior to depict uncertainty in the model. Dotted line indicates level of performance expected by chance.




Figure S3. Posterior distribution of model estimates for each category with animals as the reference category. Thick blue lines show mean and shaded regions show 95% credible intervals.

References

- Arnold, J. B. (2019). *Ggthemes: Extra themes, scales and geoms for 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggthemes>
- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2018). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Bache, S. M., & Wickham, H. (2014). *Magrittr: A forward-pipe operator for r*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magrittr>
- Bates, D., & Maechler, M. (2019). *Matrix: Sparse and dense matrix classes and methods*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Matrix>
- Braginsky, M., Yurovsky, D., & Frank, M. (2019). *Langcog: Language and cognition lab things*. Retrieved from <http://github.com/langcog/langcog>
- Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 80(1), 1–28. doi: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. doi:10.32614/RJ-2018-017
- Eddelbuettel, D., & Balamuta, J. J. (2017). Extending extitR with extitC++: A Brief Introduction to extitRcpp. *PeerJ Preprints*, 5, e3188v1. doi:10.7287/peerj.preprints.3188v1
- Eddelbuettel, D., & François, R. (2011). Rcpp: Seamless R and C++ integration. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 40(8), 1–18. doi:10.18637/jss.v040.i08
- Gabry, J., Simpson, D., Vehtari, A., Betancourt, M., & Gelman, A. (2019). Visualization in bayesian workflow. *J. R. Stat. Soc. A*, 182(2), 389–402. doi:10.1111/rssa.12378
- Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2019). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved from

- <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>
- Kassambara, A. (2019). *Ggpubr: 'Ggplot2' based publication ready plots*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr>
- Morey, R. D., & Rouder, J. N. (2018). *BayesFactor: Computation of bayes factors for common designs*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BayesFactor>
- Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2019). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>
- Plummer, M., Best, N., Cowles, K., & Vines, K. (2006). CODA: Convergence diagnosis and output analysis for mcmc. *R News*, 6(1), 7–11. Retrieved from <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/>
- R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Robinson, D., & Hayes, A. (2019). *Broom: Convert statistical analysis objects into tidy tibbles*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=broom>
- Wickham, H. (2007). Reshaping data with the reshape package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 21(12), 1–20. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v21/i12/>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *Ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- Wickham, H. (2017). *Tidyverse: Easily install and load the 'tidyverse'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse>
- Wickham, H. (2019a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors)*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- Wickham, H. (2019b). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*.

- Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- Wickham, H., & Henry, L. (2019). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2019). *Dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- Wickham, H., Hester, J., & François, R. (2018). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Ggridges: Ridgeline plots in 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggridges>
- Xie, Y. (2015). *Dynamic documents with R and knitr* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman; Hall/CRC. Retrieved from <https://yihui.name/knitr/>