

BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Symeonidou, I. and Dumontheil, Iroise and Ferguson, H.J. and Breheny, R. (2020) Adolescents are delayed at inferring complex social intentions in others, but not basic (false) beliefs: an eye movement investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* , ISSN 1747-0218. (In Press)

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/31563/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

Adolescents are delayed at inferring complex social intentions in others, but not basic (false) beliefs: An eye movement investigation

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	QJE-STD-19-328.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Mar-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Symeonidou, Irene; University College London, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences Ferguson, Heather; University of Kent, School of Psychology Dumontheil, Iroise; Birkbeck University of London, Breheny, Richard; University College London, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences
Keywords:	Theory of mind, Adolescence, Development, Visual world Eyetracking

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 Adolescents are delayed at inferring complex social intentions in others, but not basic (false) beliefs: An
15 eye movement investigation
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 Irine Symeonidou ¹
23 Iroise Dumontheil ²
24 Heather J Ferguson ³
25 Richard Breheny ¹
26

27 ¹ Department of Linguistics, University College London, UK

28 ² Centre for Brain and Cognitive Development, Department of Psychological Sciences,
29 Birkbeck, University of London, UK

30 ³ School of Psychology, University of Kent, UK
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Author Note
43
44

45 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Richard Breheny: Department
46 of Linguistics, University College London, Chandler House, 2 Wakefield Street, London,
47 WC1N 1PF.
48

49
50 Email: r.breheny@ucl.ac.uk

51 Telephone: [020 7679 4039](tel:02076794039)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Most developmental research on Theory of Mind (ToM) - our ability to infer the beliefs, intentions, and desires of others - has focused on the preschool years. This is unsurprising since it was previously thought that ToM skills are developed between the ages of 2 and 7 years old (Wellman, Cross, & Watson, 2001). Over the last couple of decades however, studies have provided evidence for significant structural and functional changes in the brain areas involved in ToM (the “social brain”) not only during childhood, but also during adolescence. Importantly, some of these findings suggest that the use of ToM shows a prolonged development through middle childhood and adolescence. Although evidence from previous studies suggests a protracted development of ToM, the factors that constrain performance during middle childhood and adolescence are only just beginning to be explored. In the current paper we report two visual world eye-tracking studies that focus on the timecourse of predictive inferences. We establish that when the complexity of ToM inferences are at a level which is comparable to standard change-of-location False-belief tasks, then adolescents and adults generate predictions for other agents’ behaviour in the same timecourse. However, when inferences are socially more complex, requiring inferences about higher-order mental states, adolescents generate predictive gaze bias at a marked delay relative to adults. Importantly, our results demonstrate that these developmental differences go beyond differences in executive functions (inhibitory control or working memory), and point to distinct expectations between groups and greater uncertainty when predicting actions based on conflicting desires.

Keywords

Theory of mind; Adolescence; Development; Visual world Eye-tracking; Executive Function

Introduction

Theory of Mind (ToM) describes our ability to infer the beliefs, thoughts, intentions, desires and feelings of others. It is long known that by 6-7 years old, children's performance is at ceiling with standardly administered False-Belief tasks (Surian et al., 2007; Wellman, Cross, & Watson, 2001; Wimmer & Perner, 1983). Recently, however, paradigms have been developed that involve more sensitive implicit measures, such as reaction times (Apperly, Riggs, Simpson, Chiavarino, & Samson, 2006; Back & Apperly, 2010; Bradford, Jentsch, & Gomez, 2015), brain responses (Ferguson, Cane, Douchkov, & Wright, 2015a; Geangu, Gibson, Kaduk, & Reid, 2013; Meinhardt, Kühn-Popp, Sommer, & Sodian, 2012) and eye-tracking (Ferguson, Apperly, Ahmad, Bindemann, & Cane, 2015b; Ferguson & Breheny, 2012; Rubio-Fernández & Glucksberg, 2012) where adults' ToM performance is less-than-ceiling. Despite the creation of more advanced tests of ToM ability, only a few have investigated children beyond the middle childhood years into early adolescence and older adolescents (14 and older).

Looking at studies that focused on younger adolescents, two have used tasks that involved participants' understanding of belief. The first is a study by Devine and Hughes (2013), which involved a novel ToM reasoning task - the Silent Film task - and tested children between 8-13 years of age. The task is a film-based analogue to the Strange stories task (Happé, 1994) that is well suited to exploring the ability to understand others' beliefs in children beyond the age of 7. Participants were presented with short film clips that depicted scenarios involving deception, false-belief, and misunderstanding and were tasked with explaining the behaviour of a character. Performance on the task improved with age, independently of individual differences in verbal ability and socioeconomic status, suggesting that ToM abilities do continue to develop through middle childhood.

1
2
3 More recently, Begeer and colleagues (2016) tested typically developing 7-13 year
4 olds as well as children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) using a modified false-belief
5 task- the Sandbox task- and a visual hindsight bias task. They found that the adolescent
6 control group, as well as the ASD group, showed more bias in a false-belief condition than in
7 a memory control condition. According to the authors, this suggests that a tendency to
8 prioritise one's own perspective over the other is more similar among these two groups than
9 previously reported.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Other studies have explored the development of ToM inferences beyond childhood
20 using versions of the Director task (Keysar, Barr, Balin, & Brauner, 2000), in which
21 participants are instructed to move objects around a grid by a director who cannot see some
22 objects in the participants' view (Dumontheil et al., 2010; Epley, Morewedge, & Keysar,
23 2004; Mills, Dumontheil, Speekenbrink, & Blakemore, 2015; Symeonidou, Dumontheil,
24 Chow, & Breheny, 2016; Zhao, Yang, & Apperly, 2018). These studies generally converge in
25 showing that the ability to accommodate a speaker's limited perspective continues to develop
26 between childhood and adolescence to adulthood. Notably, Symeonidou et al. (2016),
27 following Dumontheil et al. (2010), included older adolescents (14-17.9) in addition to young
28 adolescents (9-13 years old) and adults (19-29 years old), which allowed them to track this
29 developmental trajectory more closely. They also included a control condition that required
30 participants to perform the same task in the absence of the director, having been told their
31 instructions would only refer to items on slots without a back panel, controlling for general
32 cognitive demands of the task. As was found in Dumontheil et al. (2010), Symeonidou et al.
33 report that in the director-present condition, but not the control condition, children and
34 adolescents made more errors than adults, suggesting that ToM use continues to improve
35 between adolescence and adulthood. They also found that inhibitory control accounted for
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 only some of the variance in behavioural results, indicating that it is a factor of
4
5 developmental change in perspective-taking, but not the only one.
6

7
8 Symeonidou et al. (2016) also collected eye-tracking data during the Director task,
9
10 which allowed them to investigate the online processes that are activated while participants
11
12 use perspective to identify the mutually-available target object. They found that participants
13
14 who reached for the wrong object adopted a different gaze pattern to participants who
15
16 reached for the correct object. That is, looking first to the target and then the competitor
17
18 object *versus* looking first to the competitor and then the target object. Moreover, when
19
20 considering correct vs. incorrect trials separately, the timecourse of bias formation was the
21
22 same for adults and adolescents. This evidence indicated that participants' gaze patterns were
23
24 based on information that is accessed rapidly, while the difference in outcome depended on
25
26 whether participants adopted the speaker's perspective.
27
28
29

30
31 The version of the Director task used in these studies is widely known to be more
32
33 challenging to adults than other versions (Hanna et al., 2003; Brown-Schmidt et al., 2008;
34
35 Heller et al., 2008) or than other on-line false-belief tasks (e.g. Ferguson & Breheny, 2012;
36
37 Ferguson et al., 2010, 2015b). This particular difficulty of the Director task has been
38
39 attributed to the 'third' occluded object, which provides the best fit for verbal description
40
41 from the participant's own perspective, making it especially difficult to ignore. Indeed, Heller
42
43 et al. (2016) report that participants show a high degree of 'egocentrism' when presented with
44
45 stimuli from this kind of *triples* Director task, but show very un-'egocentric' behaviour when
46
47 presented with stimuli from *pairs* Director task (as in Heller et al., 2008).¹
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 ¹ In both the pairs and triples versions of the Director task, participants hear a referring expression with a
55
56 modifier (e.g. 'the small candle'). In the triples version (e.g. Keysar et al., 2000), the target object is the smaller
57
58 of two candles in common view but it is not the smallest candle visible to the participant, as there is an even
59
60 smaller candle which the participant but not the director can see. Several replications of this study show that
even adults find it difficult to ignore the best-fit competitor and even reach for that object (e.g. Wu & Keysar,
2007; Dumontheil et al., 2010; Heller et al., 2016). In the pairs version (e.g. Nadig & Sedivy, 2002; Heller et al.,
2008), the participant sees a small (target) candle and a larger (target contrast object) candle, as well as a small

1
2
3 Generally, evidence from research that has used various versions of the Director task
4 with adults weighs heavily against a model which proposes a strong egocentric-first heuristic
5 (e.g. Back & Apperly, 2010; Keysar et al., 2000; Keysar, Lin, & Barr, 2003). Heller et al.
6 (2016) propose that multiple representational domains compete in processing communicative
7 stimuli where uncertainty is involved, while factors such as goodness of fit of the description
8 in an instruction weight one domain over the others (see also Ferguson & Breheny, 2012).
9
10 Moving forward, the general question for adult ToM research is what constrains decisions
11 about other agents' actions. It is widely acknowledged that executive function (EF) abilities
12 are a factor for adults, particularly those for inhibiting salient but irrelevant perspective
13 information (e.g. Bradford et al., 2015; Brown-Schmidt, 2009; Bull, Philips, & Conway,
14 2008; German & Hehman, 2006), or holding information in working memory (e.g. Cane,
15 Ferguson, & Apperly, 2017; Carlson, Moses, & Breton, 2002; Davis & Pratt, 1996; Mills et
16 al., 2015; Lin et al., 2010). However, differences in such abilities are not thought to be the
17 only factor, with attention to perspective-relevant situational cues (Brown-Schmidt, 2012;
18 Heyes, 2014; Rubio-Fernandez & Geurts, 2016; Santiesteban et al., 2014), and broader social
19 or cultural factors (Bradford et al., 2018; Ferguson et al., 2015a; Nielsen, Slade, Levy, &
20 Holmes, 2015; Savitsky et al., 2011; Wu & Keysar, 2007) among the other factors cited as
21 relevant. Results from the adolescent research reviewed above can be seen in this light:
22 differences between adolescent and adult groups can be attributed to developing EF abilities,
23 and abilities to attend to and process available stimuli that are relevant to mental state
24 inferences. The link between EF abilities and ToM development is in line with research
25 showing that some executive function skills, including inhibition and working memory,

26 cup (competitor) and either a larger cup (competitor contrast object) or irrelevant distractor. When all the
27 participant's information is in common view, it is shown that participants anticipate the target while hearing the
28 modifier ('small') when the competitor contrast object is absent (Sedivy et al., 1999). When the competitor
29 contrast object (large cup) is only visible to the participant, the prediction is that the same advantage in
30 anticipating the target would occur if the participant can accommodate the Director's ignorance of this object.
31 This is what is found (Nadig & Sedivy, 2002; Heller et al., 2008; 2016).

1
2
3 develop throughout childhood and adolescence, and even into adulthood (e.g. Gathercole,
4 Pickering, Ambridge, Wearing, 2004; Van den Wildenberg & van der Molen, 2004). In this
5 paper, we ask whether and how any limitations that are independent of EF abilities might
6 impact on adolescents' abilities to engage in more complex social interactions, requiring
7 richer or higher-order mental inferences. In particular, we explored this question by looking
8 at the timecourse of processing more complex situations. As a first step, we revisited the
9 timecourse of processing less complex events.

19 As far as the application of ToM abilities go, the different versions of the Director
20 task are similar to a basic change-of-location false-belief task. In both cases, the participant
21 has to reason about another agent's actions given first-order beliefs that differ to their own.
22 To date, Theory of Mind in adolescents has been investigated using the *triples* Director task.
23 A standard change-of-location false-belief task does not impose the extra demands of the
24 *triples* Director task, due to the role of the better-fit competitor object in the latter (see
25 footnote 1). This is borne out by the fact that, in the triples Director task, participants of all
26 age groups are liable to make reaching errors, albeit with adolescents and older children
27 making more than adult controls. As mentioned above, Symeonidou et al. (2016) report
28 distinctive gaze patterns for the different behavioural outcomes and that the onset of these
29 patterns occurs at the same time for all groups, very early in the instruction. They conclude
30 that, where adolescents and adults succeed, the timecourse of processing ToM information is
31 comparable. However, this conclusion is based on post-hoc assumptions and it also relies on
32 sparse data regarding trials where adults made errors.

51 One aim of our first experiment is to compare the timecourse of integrating perspective
52 information between adults and adolescents using a task where the outcomes for adults and
53 older children or adolescents are more uniform. For this purpose, we adopted the procedure
54 used in Ferguson et al. (2015). This is a visual-world eye-tracking study in which participants
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 view videos of change-of-location false-belief or true-belief scenarios. For adults in this task,
4 gaze bias forms toward the correct location prior to the point of disambiguation, and develops
5 in a steady, monotonic way toward that target. Thus eye gaze patterns are expected to be
6 more straightforward to interpret than in the triples Director task. In sum, we tested whether
7 developmental differences in the timecourse with which adolescents and adults use
8 perspective to predict others' actions can be detected using a sensitive eye-tracking paradigm
9 that does not require explicit correct/incorrect judgements (c.f. Symeonidou et al., 2016).
10 Moreover, the use of a passive 'look-and-listen' design means that mental state inferences
11 should be relatively spontaneous, and external demands on executive capacities should be
12 minimal.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Experiment 1

29
30 The task used in the current experiment is adapted from Ferguson and colleagues (2015), and
31 involves videos portraying true- and false-belief scenarios. Experimental videos presented
32 two characters, Sarah and Jane. At the beginning of the video both Sarah and Jane are
33 standing behind a table which has a target object (e.g. a pen) in the centre and three
34 containers, one on the left, one in the middle, and one on the right. While Jane is watching,
35 Sarah moves the object into one of the three containers. Sarah then moves the object into one
36 of the other containers, either while Jane is still present and watching (true-belief for Jane) or
37 after she has left (false-belief for Jane). Participants were then presented with a still image of
38 the final scene of the video while they heard an auditory description such as, "Jane will look
39 for the pen in the container on the [left/middle/right]". In a TB condition the final container
40 would be the object's true location, and in the FB condition it would be the initial container.
41 During this presentation, participants' eye-gaze around the visual scene (the three containers)
42 was recorded to examine visual biases to the different containers.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In addition to the main task we wanted to check whether individual difference
4
5 measures that have previously been shown to be associated with ToM differed between
6
7 groups. Here we tested two measures of executive function: inhibitory control (IC) and verbal
8
9 working memory (WM). Previous studies have found an association between inhibition and
10
11 the application of ToM inference in children (3-4 year olds in Carlson, Moses, & Claxton,
12
13 2004; 4-10 year olds in Hansen Lagattuta, Sayfan, & Harvey, 2014; 4-9 year olds in
14
15 Lagattuta, Sayfan, & Blattman, 2010; 2-5 year olds in Nilsen & Graham, 2009; meta-analysis
16
17 of 3-6 year olds in Devine and Hughes, 2014), in adolescents (Symeonidou et al., 2016;
18
19 Vetter, Altgassen, et al., 2013a) and in adults (Bradford et al., 2015; Brown-Schmidt, 2009;
20
21 Bull et al., 2008; German & Hehman, 2006 - though see Humphrey & Dumontheil, 2016).
22
23 Previous research has also shown a relationship between working memory (WM) and
24
25 perspective-taking (Cane et al., 2017; Carlson et al., 2002; Davis & Pratt, 1996; Lin et al.,
26
27 2010; McKinnon & Moscovitch, 2007; Mills et al., 2015; Nilsen & Graham, 2009; Schneider,
28
29 Lam, Bayliss, & Dux, 2012), with a lower WM capacity or increased working memory load
30
31 leading to poorer performance on ToM tasks. Neuropsychological research has demonstrated
32
33 that EF has a protracted period of development, which begins in early childhood (~2 years
34
35 old) and continues into young adulthood, and each sub-component of EF develops at its own
36
37 rate (Anderson, 2002; Diamond, 2013; Garon, Bryson, & Smith, 2008). For example,
38
39 inhibitory control and working memory have been shown to develop throughout childhood
40
41 and into adolescence or early adulthood (e.g. Conklin et al., 2007; Gathercole et al., 2004;
42
43 Luna et al., 2004b; Van den Wildenberg & van der Molen, 2004).

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 In sum Experiment 1 aims to i) replicate the adult findings from Ferguson et al.
52
53 (2015), ii) examine whether adolescents' expectations are affected by others' (false) beliefs
54
55 as spontaneously and as early as adults, iii) explore whether individual differences in
56
57 inhibitory control or working memory are possible factors in constraining performance
58
59
60

1
2
3 during online false-belief reasoning. In line with previous studies, we also expected to see
4
5 age-related differences in IC and WM.
6
7
8
9

10 Method

11 *Participants*

12
13
14 Forty-one participants took part in this study, of which 17 were adults (24-36 years old, $M =$
15
16 26.9, $SD = 2.93$) and 24 were adolescents (11-18 years old, $M = 15.53$, $SD = 2.25$). All were
17
18 native English speakers. The sample size for each group is comparable to the sample size per
19
20 experiment in Altmann and Kamide (1999), and the total sample matches that used in
21
22 Ferguson et al. (2015)'s passive group². Adult participants were recruited from the University
23
24 College London (UCL) participant pool while adolescents were recruited from London
25
26 schools. Data from three adolescents were excluded from the analysis due to insufficient eye
27
28 tracking data (more than 50% data loss). Thus the final adolescent group consisted of 21
29
30 participants (11-18 years old, $M = 15.33$, $SD = 2.05$). Parents/guardians of all adolescent
31
32 participants, as well as all adult participants gave informed consent prior to taking part. This
33
34 study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ² Note that a post-hoc power calculation showed that a minimum of 90 participants (calculated using the simr
58 package in R; Green & MacLeod, 2016) would have been needed to detect a significant 2-way interaction with
59 the significance level of $\alpha = .05$ on 80% of occasions (as suggested by Cohen, 1988). The current sample sizes
60 yield an estimated power of 41% for Experiment 1. We discuss this limitation further in the General Discussion.

1
2
3
4
5
6 *Stimuli and design*

7
8 *False-belief task* The task design and stimuli were based on that used in Ferguson et al.
9
10 (2015). Thus, the experiment employed a 2 x 2 mixed design, with belief condition (true
11 belief vs false-belief) as the within-participant factor, and age group (adult vs adolescent) as
12 the between-participants factor. Stimuli consisted of sixteen sets of experimental videos and
13 pictures with their respective auditory description in one of two conditions. The video clips
14 and auditory narratives were taken from Ferguson et al (2015).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Two different video sequences set up the two belief conditions (Figure 1). All videos
22 involved a transfer event which began with the two actors (Jane and Sarah) standing behind a
23 table. Videos began with three possible containers on the left, middle and right side of the
24 table, and the target object in the centre of the table (note that containers and objects changed
25 on each trial). In the first part of the video, Jane and Sarah were both present and Sarah
26 moved the target object into one of the three containers while Jane watched. In the second
27 part Sarah moved the target object into one of the other containers. Crucially, in one
28 condition, Jane was present for this second transfer event which meant that Jane had a true
29 belief about the object's location. However, in the other condition Jane left the scene after the
30 first transfer events and was absent during the second transfer which meant that Jane has a
31 false-belief about the object's location. All videos concluded with Sarah standing alone
32 behind the table and the three closed containers. This final scene of the video was extracted
33 and presented as a picture after the video ended, during which participants heard the
34 following single-pre-recorded sentence, "Jane will look for the [object] in the container on
35 the [left/middle/right]".
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

--- Insert Figure 1 about here ---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

One version of each item was assigned to one of two lists and participants were randomly assigned to one of these two lists. Each list contained sixteen unique experimental items, eight in each condition (true and false-belief). Sixteen filler trials were also included in each list to prevent participants from guessing the aim of the study; videos depicted similar transfer events or the object was replaced into the first container, and auditory descriptions referred to either Jane's, Sarah's, a stranger's, or reality perspective (see Ferguson et al. (2015) for full details of fillers). To ensure participants were paying attention, a comprehension question was randomly presented after half of the experimental trials and half of the filler trials (e.g. 'The objects are actually in the chocolate box? True < > False').

Individual measures Participants' inhibitory control and working memory were measured. To measure inhibitory control participants completed a simple and a complex Go-NoGo task, with trial type (Go, NoGo) as the within-participant factor. The simple Go-NoGo task was based on the standard Go-NoGo paradigm (Simmonds, Pekar, & Mostofsky, 2008). A coloured square was presented on the left or right side of the screen in each trial. If the square was green (a Go trial) participants had to indicate which side of the screen it appeared on. If the square was red (a NoGo trial) participants had to inhibit their response. The Complex Go-NoGo task used yellow and blue squares and included a 1-back WM requirement (see Simmonds et al., 2008). The 1-back WM requirement was that participants had to indicate on which side of the screen the square was shown (Go trials) except when a blue square was preceded by a yellow square (NoGo trials). For analysis, we calculated the mean difference in percentage accuracy between NoGo trials and Go trials, and the median correct response time on Go trials, for each participant. Verbal WM was measured using the backward Digit Span subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Third edition (WAIS-III; Wechsler, 1997).

Procedure

Participants were tested individually and completed the tasks (False-belief, Go-NoGo, Digit Span) in a single session of approximately 45 minutes. The false-belief task was always administered first. Eye-movements during the false-belief task were recorded using a Tobii TX300 eye-tracker at a sampling rate of 300Hz. Stimuli for the false-belief task were presented using E-Prime 2 and the Go-NoGo tasks were programmed in Cogent (www.vislab.ucl.ac.-uk/Cogent/index.html) running in Matlab 7.0 (MathWorks).

For the false-belief task participants were given the following instructions as in Ferguson et al. (2015): “In this experiment you will watch short videos, each of which will be followed by a still frame from that video and a spoken description of events. Your task is simply to watch and listen and respond to the comprehension questions when prompted”. After the instructions were given, the experimenter introduced the two characters (Sarah and Jane) by name by showing them a still image of the two characters in the first stage of the video (see **Figure 1**), with the name of each character written by the character’s side. To ensure that all participants had a clear understanding of which character was Sarah and which character was Jane they were tested before the start of the experiment by hiding the names from the picture and asking them to point to each character and state their name. Participants were then presented with two practice trials to familiarise them with the task.

A centrally-located fixation cross was presented at the beginning of each trial, and the trial was initiated when participants successfully fixated it for at least 1s without blinking. The video was then presented which showed the transfer events described above. On average the videos lasted 28s (ranging from 16-53s). Each video was followed by a 500ms blank screen before the final state picture from the video was presented. After a 1000ms preview of the picture the relevant audio target sentence was presented. The picture was presented for a

1
2
3 total of 7000ms. The audio typically ended 1-2 s before the trial ended (see Table 1). After
4
5 50% of trials, a comprehension question appeared and participants selected one of two
6
7 possible answers using the keyboard (all participants achieved at or above 80% accuracy of
8
9 these questions). Trials were separated by a 500ms blank screen.
10
11
12
13

14 *Eye-tracking data processing and analysis*

15
16
17 Participant's eye movements were tracked while the target image (the 'final state') was on
18
19 screen and were processed on a trial-by-trial basis relative to the respective image and sound
20
21 onsets. For each image, three regions of interest (ROIs) were specified around each container
22
23 location (left, middle and right). This was done by mapping spatial coordinates of fixations
24
25 (in pixels) on each ROI, and if a fixation was located within 20 pixels of a container's
26
27 perimeter it was coded as a look to that object. Any looks outside these AOIs were coded as
28
29 background.
30
31
32

33 The data was then broken down into 20ms time bins and within each bin samples
34
35 were binary coded, with '1' belonging to a ROI (Reality, Belief, Distractor, Background) or
36
37 '0' if there were no looks on the ROIs. These samples were aggregated across participants
38
39 and items to calculate visual preferences to the *reality location* (the object's final location)
40
41 and the *belief location* (the initial location) for seven consecutive time windows of interest.
42
43 The time windows of interest were i) the 1000ms preview (after image onset but before audio
44
45 onset), ii) "Jane will look for the", iii) [object], iv) "in the", v) "container", vi) "on the", vii)
46
47 [location]. Table 1 shows the average durations per condition for the word-based time
48
49 windows.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 --- Insert Table 1 about here ---
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For each time window a location-preference score was calculated, as in Ferguson and
4 Breheny (2011, 2012) using: $\log(\text{Reality/Belief}) = \ln (P_{(\text{Reality})} / P_{(\text{Belief})})$. $P_{(\text{Reality})}$ refers to the
5 sum of looks to the reality location divided by the total number looks to all ROIs, and
6 $P_{(\text{Belief})}$ is the sum of looks to the belief location divided by the total number of looks to all
7 ROIs. The output of this calculation is a single value that measures the bias towards each
8 critical location for each condition within each time window. As this measure is symmetrical
9 around zero, positive scores show a greater bias to look at the reality location and negative
10 scores show a greater bias to look at the belief location. Note that for statistical analysis eye
11 movements were synchronised to the absolute word onsets and offsets on a trial-by-trial
12 basis. The grand mean for the log-transformed location bias score in each condition and
13 group was plotted to visualise the data (**Figure 2**), with eye movements resynchronized
14 according to individual word onsets (Altmann & Kamide, 2009; Ferguson, Apperly, et al.,
15 2015).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

--- Insert Figure 2 about here ---

Statistical analyses were carried out using mixed effect regression models for each time window separately: i) [preview], ii) “Jane will look for the”, iii) [object], iv) “in the”, v) “container”, vi) “on the”, vii) [location]. The models were fitted using the lmer function in the lme4 package (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015) using R (R Core Development Team, 2013). The location-bias score, averaged over a given time window, was used as the dependent variable. Each model included belief (FB vs TB) and age group (Adolescent vs Adult) as fixed effects, deviation coded as -.5 vs .5, respectively. Models included the maximal random effects structure suggested by Barr, Levy, Scheepers, and Tily (2013), including random effects for participants and items, and crossed random slopes for belief by

1
2
3 group on items and a random slope for belief on participants. Random effects were only
4 removed where they lead to non-convergence due to overparameterization. Significant effects
5 of context were followed up for each time window using one sample t-tests to test whether
6 the fixation bias for each context condition was significantly different from zero (thus
7 indicating *when* participants showed a significant preference to fixate the reality or belief
8 location in each condition). For all tests a significance level of 5% was used.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Results

20 *Eye-tracking results*

21
22 Table 2 shows the fixed and random effects for the model adopted in each time window, and
23 Table 3 displays the statistical results from the planned one-sample t-tests for each condition
24 in each time window where there was a significant effect of condition. Note that as there
25 were no significant interactions between belief and age group, all post hoc t-tests were
26 collapsed across age groups for each condition.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 --- *Insert Table 2 about here* ---

39
40
41
42 --- *Insert Table 3 about here* ---
43
44
45
46

47 Analyses showed no significant effects during the 1000ms preview period. However,
48 during “Jane will look for the” a significant effect of belief emerged, reflecting a bias to
49 fixate the reality location when participants shared Jane’s TB about the object’s location but
50 no significant bias to either container when their knowledge of the object’s real location
51 conflicted with Jane’s FB. Interestingly, a significant effect of age group also emerged in this
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time window, showing that adults experienced a stronger egocentric bias to fixate the reality
4 location across true and false-belief conditions compared to adolescents.
5
6

7
8 The significant effect of belief persisted throughout all subsequent time windows.
9
10 Prior to location disambiguation, (i.e. during the [object], “in the”, “container”, and “on the”
11 time windows) this reflected a significant bias to fixate the reality location on TB trials but no
12 significant bias to either container on FB trials. However, once the object’s location was
13 auditorily revealed during the [location] time window, participants showed significant visual
14 biases to the appropriate location (i.e. the reality location when Jane held a TB about the
15 object’s location, and the belief location when Jane held a FB about the object’s location).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 To summarise, the eye movement data suggest that adolescents and adults do not
25 differ in the timecourse of perspective inference and use. Replicating the effects seen in
26 Ferguson et al. (2015), both adults and adolescents showed significantly different visual
27 biases between TB and FB conditions from the pre-object window (“Jane will look for the”),
28 suggesting that participants’ expectations were influenced by contextual information about
29 Jane’s belief as soon as they heard whose perspective to take. However, the significant effect
30 of age in the pre-object time window suggests that adults’ initial processing was more
31 egocentric than adolescents. In addition, both groups showed appropriate biases to the reality
32 location on TB trials in all time windows of interest. However, although participants seem
33 sensitive to Jane’s belief from when they hear “Jane” (i.e. they are not biased to the reality
34 location), they do not seem to use this perspective information until the location time
35 window, where they begin to correctly anticipate reference to the belief location on FB trials.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Individual differences results

Results for one way ANOVAs comparing adolescent and adult groups on the individual measures are shown in Table 4. Adults and adolescents did not differ in any of the IC and WM measures (all p 's > .30).

--- Insert Table 4 about here ---

To further explore whether individual differences in IC and WM had an effect on looks to the correct target, and whether this differs depending on whether the character's belief was true or false, Pearson correlations were performed separately for each condition between the average bias score during "container on the" and participants' computed z-scores for IC (simple and complex accuracy) and WM. This time window was selected to calculate the averaged bias score as it immediately precedes the disambiguating information, and therefore should show the clearest effects of anticipation. We did not run correlations using the median Go response times since responses on Go trials do not require inhibitory control. The significance level for each test was corrected for the six correlations using Bonferoni correction ($p_{\text{crit}} = .0083$). The data from these six correlations is presented in Figure 3. Results showed that none of the correlations between anticipatory bias and WM or IC reached significance (all p 's > .043).

--- Insert Figure 3 about here ---

Results from the adult participants in the false-belief task replicated Ferguson et al. (2015), with participants showing significantly different visual biases between TB and FB conditions

1
2
3 from the pre-object window, suggesting an influence of Jane's perspective as soon as
4 participants heard whose perspective to take. As in Ferguson et al. (2015) adult participants
5 showed appropriate anticipatory looks to the reality location in TB trials. For FB trials they
6 only made appropriate biases to the initial location when the location was auditorily
7 available. Crucially, adolescents' data showed the same pattern as adults. Overall, the two
8 age groups' gaze bias developed in the same way over time, with the adolescents showing a
9 sensitivity to Jane's belief as early as adults did and appropriately anticipating the reality
10 container in TB trials. Interestingly, a main effect of group during the pre-object window
11 suggested that adults experienced a stronger egocentric bias initially than adolescents. In
12 other words, adolescents suffer less egocentric bias, indicating that not only are adolescents'
13 performance comparable to adults here, but perhaps may actually be better.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 As with the eye-movement data, we did not find any global differences in IC and
29 verbal WM, suggesting that our age groups were well matched on these skills. It is perhaps
30 worth noting that we did not find a significant correlation between complex IC scores and the
31 bias score, even in the FB condition. Such a correlation might be expected given that
32 participants need to inhibit their own knowledge about reality to infer the character's belief.³
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In sum, Experiment 1 investigated whether adolescents can reliably infer others'
41 (false) beliefs as spontaneously and early as adults. This paradigm allowed us to observe the
42 timecourse of predictive gaze in a more straightforward way than in Symeonidou et al. (2016)
43 but confirmed the conclusions of that paper, which is that when perspective information is
44 integrated in predictive inferences, this process occurs in the same timecourse for adolescents
45 and adults.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ³ Note that no visuospatial WM measure was collected in this study. Visuospatial WM continues to develop
57 during adolescence (e.g., Conklin et al., 2007; Dumontheil et al., 2011), and may help participants track the
58 movement of the characters and objects in the false-belief task used in this study. So any age group
59 differences may be driven by possible differences between the groups in visuospatial WM capacity.
60

1
2
3 As discussed above, the DT and the FB task are comparable in terms of the inferential
4 complexity involved; in both cases, an inference has to be made based on a first-order belief
5 of another agent, which differs from the participant's belief. Therefore, the question remains
6 whether there might a difference between adolescents and adults in a task that involves a
7 greater degree of ToM inferential complexity. A task with greater ToM inferential
8 complexity would require participants to predict or explain another person's behaviour based
9 on higher-order mental states – for example, beliefs about beliefs, desires about what other
10 people believe, and so forth. In Experiment 2, we aim to address this issue by testing
11 adolescents on a task that is arguably less demanding than the FB task in terms of EF
12 demands, but differs in terms of the complexity of the ToM inference. Specifically,
13 Experiment 2 investigates whether adolescents can use knowledge about a character's higher-
14 order preferences about other people's beliefs about their own preferences (secret desires) to
15 make complex ToM inferences and predict that character's subsequent behaviour as quickly
16 as adults.

37 Experiment 2

38 In Experiment 2 we adopted the visual world paradigm from Ferguson and Breheny (2011),
39 where participants were presented with two-sentence stories. The first sentence introduced a
40 property of the character, such as a personal preference, and a context in which either (1a)
41 that character is happy for others to know that property, or (1b) the character does not want
42 other people to know about that property. Therefore, in the *open* condition (1a) the basic
43 preference and higher-order desires match, whereas in the *secret* condition (1b) the
44 character's basic preferences and higher-order desires are in conflict.

- 45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58 1. a. Helen doesn't care who knows that she dislikes vegetables.
59
60

- b. Helen is very secretive about the fact that she dislikes vegetables.

The second sentence described the character performing an action that is consistent with the context described in the first sentence. For example, in a context such as (1a) Helen would behave in accordance with her personal preferences and appropriately eat something other than vegetables such as meat (2a). In contrast, in a context such as (1b) Helen would adapt her behaviour to fit with her desire to keep personal preferences a secret and would therefore eat vegetables (2b). Participants heard the second sentence while a visual display was presented which included images that were consistent with the character's two possible choices of action. Although one can predict the appropriate action based on the contextual information given in the first sentence, Ferguson & Breheny (2011) argue that both conditions involve higher-order ToM reasoning as the character's action is not only based on their basic preference but their desires concerning how they want to be viewed by others. Moreover, they observe that the *secret* condition may be more demanding as the character's basic preference (Helen's dislike of vegetables) and their high-order intention of keeping this preference a secret, are in conflict. This means that since both the basic preference and higher-order desires of the character are equally salient, when predicting the character's action, a participant has to ignore any predictions that are based on the character's basic preference and they have to make both inferences in order to make a correct prediction. While in the *open* condition, basic preferences and intentions point to the same target, in the *secret* condition they do not.

2.
 - a. When Helen goes to dinner parties she makes a show of eating meat.
 - b. When Helen goes to dinner parties she makes a show of eating vegetables.

1
2
3 The results from adult participants in Ferguson and Breheny (2011) showed that very
4 early on in the linguistic stimulus a difference in visual bias emerged between conditions,
5 despite the fact that the character's basic preference was the same in both contexts. That is,
6 participants exploited information about both of the character's higher-order desires to
7 predict the target prior to disambiguating information in both conditions. However, the bias
8 in the secret condition was slightly delayed in comparison to the open condition as
9 participants only showed a preference to the target from the post-ambiguous noun region (the
10 offset of 'dinner parties' and onset of 'makes a show'), suggesting that character's basic
11 preferences influenced expectations.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The 'secrets' paradigm is well suited to address the question raised above since
25 adults' gaze shows they are successful in rapidly generating predictions using high-order
26 ToM reasoning. In addition, according to Ferguson & Breheny (2011), the task has an
27 advantage over other complex ToM tasks in that it avoids interference from the 'curse of
28 knowledge' (Birch & Bloom, 2007). This is a state of affairs in which participants in a task
29 has a more informed perspective than the other person, i.e. there is conflicting knowledge
30 from the self-perspective grounded in the actual state of affairs. The secrets paradigm
31 involves stories that require participants to reason about others' behaviour based on shared
32 knowledge about 'reality' and personal preferences, without conflict from the linguistic input
33 or knowledge from the self-perspective. Because the task reduces these demands on IC and
34 other executive mechanisms while at the same time involving more complex, higher-order
35 ToM inferences, we can explore the development of ToM abilities from a different
36 perspective to the Director task and the False Belief Task. As in Experiment 1, participants'
37 IC and verbal WM abilities were measured. These measures will not only control for
38 individual differences in executive function abilities but they will be informative about our
39 assumptions concerning the kind of demands the secrets task imposes.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Participants

Fifty-two participants took part in this study, of which 17 were adults (24-36 years old, $M = 27.32$, $SD = 3.57$), 18 were older adolescents (14-18 years old, $M = 16.70$, $SD = 1.39$), and 17 were younger adolescents (9-13.9 years old, $M = 11.81$, $SD = 1.43$). Of these, 29 participants also took part in Experiment 1 (11 adults, 12 older adolescents, and 6 younger adolescents), in a separate testing session. Younger participants were included in this experiment than in Experiment 1 to allow us to investigate whether developmental differences may be limited to late childhood/early adolescence. The sample size for each group is comparable to the sample size per experiment in Altmann and Kamide (1999), and the total sample size exceeds that used in Ferguson and Breheny (2011)⁴. All were native English speakers, and were recruited and gave informed consent in the same manner as Experiment 1.

Stimuli and design

Secrets task The task design and stimuli were based on that used in Ferguson and Breheny (2011). The experiment employed a 2 x 3 mixed design, with context (open vs secret) as the within-participant factor, and age group (adult vs older adolescent vs younger adolescent) as the between-participants factor. Stimuli consisted of 16 sets of experimental pictures with their respective auditory description in one of two conditions, and were adapted from those used in Ferguson and Breheny (2011).

Table 5 shows an example of the experimental auditory stimuli and Figure 4 shows the corresponding visual display. Each visual stimulus contained four images: Character,

⁴ Note that a post-hoc power calculation showed that a minimum of 100 participants (calculated using the *simr* package in R; Green & MacLeod, 2016) would have been needed to detect a significant 2-way interaction with the significance level of $\alpha = .05$ on 80% of occasions (as suggested by Cohen, 1988). The current sample sizes yield an estimated power of 51% for Experiment 2. We discuss this limitation further in the General Discussion.

1
2
3 Open referent (pink car), Secret referent (green car), and an irrelevant distractor object. The
4 position of the four different types of pictures differed across items to prevent participants
5 from creating viewing strategies. The auditory stimulus for each item consisted of two
6 sentences. In the first sentence a fact about the story character (e.g. *Tom's favourite colour is*
7 *pink*) was introduced within an open or a secret context. Sentence two described an event
8 (e.g. *buying a new car*) and referred to an object that was consistent with the character's open
9 or secret intentions. All character's actions described in the second sentence were consistent
10 with their higher order intentions (i.e. to be open/secretive about their personal preferences).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 --- Insert Figure 4 about here ---
25
26
27

28 One version of each item was assigned to one of two lists and participants were
29 randomly assigned to one of these lists. Each list contained 16 unique experimental items,
30 eight in each condition (open and secret context). Sixteen filler trials, using similar visual
31 stimuli but no mental state inference, were randomly distributed in each list. Half the trials
32 were followed by a binary comprehension question to ensure participants were paying
33 attention (e.g. 'What type of vehicles were pictured? Convertibles < > Trucks').
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Individual measures* As in Experiment 1, inhibitory control was measured through a simple
45 and complex Go-NoGo task (accuracy and median correct response time), and verbal
46 working memory was measured using the backward Digit Span subtest WAIS-III (Wechsler,
47 1997).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Procedure

Participants were tested individually and completed the tasks (secrets, Go-NoGo, Digit Span) in a single session of approximately 45 minutes. The secrets task was always administered first, and procedures for presenting stimuli and recording eye movements was the same as in Experiment 1.

For the secrets task participants were given the following instructions as in Ferguson & Breheny (2011): “In this experiment you will hear short spoken passages and during the second sentence a picture will also be displayed. We are interested in how the pictures help you understand the spoken language”. A centrally-located fixation cross was presented at the beginning of each trial, and the trial was initiated when participants successfully fixated it for at least 1s without blinking. The fixation cross remained on the screen while participants heard the first sentence. The target picture was then presented, and after a 1000ms preview the relevant audio for sentence 2 was initiated. The picture remained on screen for 9s and sentence 2 ended approximately 1-2s before the end of the trial.

Eye-tracking data processing and analysis

Participant’s eye movements were tracked while the target picture was on screen, and were processed on a trial-by-trial basis relative to the respective image and sound onsets. For each image, four ROIs were specified around each object (Character, Open referent, Secret referent and Distractor). Any looks outside these areas were coded as background.

The data was then broken down into 20ms time bins and within each bin samples were binary coded as ‘1’ if they belonged to an ROI and ‘0’ if there were no looks on the ROIs. These samples were aggregated across participants and items to calculate visual preferences to the *open referent* and the *secret referent* for five consecutive time windows: i)

1
2
3 [ambiguous noun] (e.g. “car”), ii) [post-ambiguous noun], iii) [adverb] (e.g. “deliberately”),
4
5 iv) [transitive verb] (e.g. “choose”), and v) [disambiguating noun] (e.g. “pink”). Table 6
6
7 shows the average durations per condition for the word-based time windows.
8
9

10
11
12 --- Insert Table 6 about here ---
13
14
15
16

17 For each time-window a referent-preference score was calculated, as in Experiment 1 using:
18
19 $\log(\text{Open/Secret}) = \ln (P_{(\text{Open})} / P_{(\text{Secret})})$. $P_{(\text{Open})}$ refers to the sum of looks to the open referent
20 divided by the total number looks to all ROIs, and $P_{(\text{Secret})}$ is the sum of looks to the secret
21 referent divided by the total number of looks to all ROIs. The output is symmetrical around
22 zero, with positive scores suggesting a higher proportion of looks to the open referent, and
23 negative scores indicating a higher proportion of looks to the secret referent. Note that for
24 statistical analysis eye movements were synchronised to the absolute word onsets and offsets
25 on a trial-by-trial basis. The grand mean for the log-transformed referent bias score was
26 plotted to visualise the data (Figure 5), with eye movements resynchronized according to
27 individual word onsets (Altmann & Kamide, 2009; Ferguson et al., 2015).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 --- Insert Figure 5 about here ---
43
44
45
46

47 Statistical analyses were carried out with mixed effect regression models for each
48 time window separately: i) [ambiguous noun], ii) [post-ambiguous noun], iii) [adverb], iv)
49 [transitive verb], and v) [disambiguating noun]. The models were fitted using the ‘lmer’
50 function in R, and the referent-bias score was the dependent variable. Each model included
51 context (Open vs Secret) as a fixed effect, deviation coded as .5 vs -.5, respectively. Age
52 group was also a fixed effect, and was entered using two deviation coded contrast schemes:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Contrast 1 = Adult (1), Older Adolescent (-.5), Younger Adolescent (-.5); Contrast 2 = Adult
4
5 (0), Older Adolescent (.5), Younger Adolescent (-.5). This contrast coding allowed us to
6
7 compare the adult group with both adolescent groups together (Contrast 1), and compare the
8
9 older adolescent group with the younger adolescent group without the adult group (Contrast
10
11 2). Where post-hoc analyses were required to follow up on significant interactions, models
12
13 were re-levelled to include the condition of interest as the reference level. Models used the
14
15 maximal random effects structure, including random effects for participants and items, and
16
17 crossed random slopes for context by group on items and a random slope for context on
18
19 participants. Random effects were only removed where they lead to non-convergence due to
20
21 overparameterisation. As in Experiment 1, significant effects of context were followed up for
22
23 each time window using one sample t-tests to test whether the fixation bias for each context
24
25 condition was significantly different from zero, which would indicate *when* participants
26
27 showed a significant preference to fixate the open or secret referent. All tests used a
28
29 significance level of 5%.

37 Results

39 *Eye-tracking results*

40
41
42 Table 7 shows the fixed and random effects for the model adopted in each time window.

43
44 Table 8 shows the statistical results from the planned one-sample t-tests for each condition in
45
46 each time window where there was a significant effect of condition.

47
48
49
50
51 --- *Insert Table 7 about here* ---

52
53
54
55
56 --- *Insert Table 8 about here* ---

Analyses during the ambiguous noun (e.g. “car”) showed no significant effect of Age group (all p 's > .22), and a non-significant trend for Context ($p = .052$). Crucially however, there was a significant interaction between Context and Age group 1 (adult vs both adolescent groups) in this time window. Follow-up analyses tested the effect of context in each age group, and revealed significantly different biases in Open and Secret contexts in the adult group (Est. = .92, SE = .31, $t = 2.97$, $p = .005$), reflecting a significant bias to fixate the open referent within an open context, and a non-significant trend to fixate the secret referent within a secret context (see Table 8). In contrast, the adolescents (young and old combined) showed no difference between the two context conditions (Est. = .07, SE = .25, $t = .28$, $p = .778$), and no significant bias to either referent during secret or open trials (Table 8). The Context x Age Group 2 (younger vs older adolescent groups) interaction was not significant in this time window, showing that visual biases were equivalent between younger and older adolescents.

Analyses in the post-ambiguous noun (“and he”) and adverb (“deliberately”) time windows showed no significant effects or interactions. However, by the transitive verb (“chose”), analyses showed a significant effect of context, but no effects of Age group or any significant interactions. The post-hoc t-tests indicate that here, all participants showed a significant bias to the open referent within an open context but did not show a preference between open and secret referents in the secret context (see Table 8). During the disambiguating noun time window (“pink/green car”), there was a significant effect of context and no other effects or significant interactions (all p 's > .24). Post-hoc t-tests revealed that all participants showed significant visual biases to the appropriate referent (i.e. the open referent during the open context and the secret referent during the secret context).

To summarise, the eye movement data suggest that adults successfully used contextual information about the character's higher order desires to distinguish open and secret actions as soon as they heard the ambiguous noun (e.g. “car”). They correctly

1
2
3 anticipated reference to the open referent in the open condition (i.e. the pink car) but
4
5 crucially, they also correctly anticipated reference to the secret reference in the secret
6
7 condition (i.e. the green car). This suggests that adults not only showed a sensitivity to the
8
9 different contexts but used that information about the character's intentions to make
10
11 predictions. The weaker effect found in this adult group during the secret trials is consistent
12
13 with results from Ferguson et al. (2012). However, neither adolescent group seemed to show
14
15 sensitivity to the context until much later, during the transitive verb ("choose") which
16
17 precedes the disambiguating words, suggesting that they do not make inferences about the
18
19 perspective of the characters early on, like adults do.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Individual differences results*

27
28 Results for one way ANOVAs of all individual measures are shown in Table 9. The three age
29
30 groups did not differ in either the simple or complex IC measures (all p 's > .21). However,
31
32 the Digit Span task revealed a significant difference in working memory between age groups,
33
34 with Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc comparisons revealing that younger adolescents
35
36 performed worse than older adolescents ($p = .05$) and adults ($p = .003$), but that older
37
38 adolescents and adults did not differ ($p = .89$).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 --- Insert Table 9 about here ---
46
47
48

49 To further examine whether individual differences in IC or WM had an effect on
50
51 anticipatory looks to the correct target, and whether this differs depending on whether the
52
53 character intended to be open or secretive about their personal preference, Pearson
54
55 correlations were performed separately for each condition between the average bias score
56
57 during the ambiguous noun and participants' computed z-scores for IC (simple and complex
58
59
60

1
2
3 accuracy) and WM. Correlations were conducted for the ambiguous noun region (Figure 6)
4 because this is where the first evidence of context effects emerged in this study and Ferguson
5 & Breheny (2011), and age-group differences were found here. In addition, we conducted
6 correlations for the entire anticipatory window (from the ambiguous word until onset of
7 disambiguating word). As in Experiment 1, we did not run correlations using the median Go
8 response times since responses on Go trials do not require inhibitory control. The significance
9 level for each test was corrected for the six correlations using Bonferoni correction ($p_{crit} =$
10 .0083). Results showed that there were no significant correlations for any of the individual
11 measures and the bias score in either condition in the ambiguous noun region (all p 's > .11)
12 or the entire anticipatory region (all p 's > .37).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 --- Insert Figure 6 about here ---
28
29

30 31 Discussion

32
33 Results from Experiment 2 showed that adults anticipated the appropriate target long
34 before disambiguating information was presented (i.e. in the ambiguous 'car' region) in both
35 the *open condition*, when there was no conflict between the character's basic preferences and
36 high-order desires, as well as the *secret condition*, when there was a conflict between the
37 character's basic preference and high-order intentions. This pattern is in line with Ferguson
38 and Breheny (2011)'s findings. Crucially, younger and older adolescents showed a delay in
39 anticipating the target in both conditions, as distinct gaze biases for open and secret
40 conditions only emerged in the region immediately preceding the disambiguating information
41 (i.e. during 'chose').

42
43 Additional analyses of individual difference characteristics showed that while the
44 younger adolescents had poorer verbal WM than the older groups, there was no age-related
45 differences between older adolescents' and adults' inhibitory control and verbal working
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 memory performance. Thus, older adolescents were delayed relative to adults at anticipating
4 the character's actions despite comparable IC and verbal WM. None of the individual
5
6 measures correlated with anticipation, reflected in eye-gaze data.
7
8
9

10 11 12 General Discussion

13
14 In this paper, we have presented two visual-world studies involving adolescent and adult
15 groups. The studies were designed to measure incremental formation of participants'
16 expectations about a character's actions, given background information about their beliefs
17 and desires. The studies differed in terms of the social complexity of the scenarios, reflected
18 in the order of belief-desire reasoning required. In our first experiment, the character acts on a
19 simple first-order belief about an object's location, which could be true or false. In our
20 second experiment, the character is portrayed as having a first-order preference and a
21 second-order preference about what other people believe about that preference (i.e. a third-
22 order mental state representation). Conditions differ in terms of whether the character prefers
23 people to know about the first-order preference, or not. In both experiments, we successfully
24 replicated previous findings with adult groups (Ferguson et al., 2015b; Ferguson & Breheny,
25 2011). In both cases, adults were found to show sensitivity to a character's mental states
26 when anticipating their actions, in the earliest time region (i.e. they distinguished
27 expectations for the character's behaviour based on true and false beliefs in Experiment 1,
28 and based on first-order desires and an intention to deceive in Experiment 2).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Previous visual-world research has examined incremental anticipation of others'
50 mental states in older adolescents versus adults using a version of the Director task, the triples
51 task. This task is well known to be challenging even for adults, while other versions of the
52 Director task are less so. Specifically, the triples task compounds the 'pull of reality'
53 demands imposed by other versions of the Director task, with an additional demand of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ignoring attraction to the distractor object due to ‘bottom up’ linguistic processes (Heller et
4 al., 2016). Previous comparisons have shown that adolescents, including older adolescents,
5 are less likely to take the perspective of the director into account than adults. Differences in
6 outcomes between older children and adolescents, and adults on the triples director task
7 appears to be partly accounted by differences in executive function abilities, which are
8 required to a larger degree in the triples Director task (Symeonidou et al., 2016). A change-
9 of-location false-belief task, like less demanding pairs versions of the Director task, requires
10 only that participants ignore the ‘pull of reality’ and hence poses lesser executive function
11 demands. Our aim with our first experiment was to determine whether, given the lower
12 demands of a change-of-location false-belief task, but comparable first-order mental state
13 inferences, adolescents would show anticipation in the same timecourse as adults.
14 Experiment 1 showed that, in fact, adolescents’ gaze discriminated between True and False
15 belief conditions more robustly than adults in early time regions (i.e. the pre-object region).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Our assumptions about the stimuli in Experiment 2’s secrets task was that EF
34 demands are relatively low, in spite of the social complexity of the scenarios being described
35 (Ferguson & Breheny, 2011). The results of the second experiment supports this assumption.
36 Here we found no correlation between either measure of inhibitory control or verbal working
37 memory and anticipation. In particular, there was an absence of correlation even in the
38 ‘secret’ condition, where the character’s first-order and higher-order preferences were in
39 conflict. This absence is consistent with widespread thinking about previous Theory of Mind
40 research, which sees EF demands stemming from factors like the ‘pull of reality’ (Birch &
41 Bloom 2007; Ferguson & Breheny, 2012), response demands (Setoh et al., 2016; Wang et al.,
42 2016) or interference from bottom-up linguistic processes (Hannah et al., 2003; Heller et al.,
43 2016). Though these factors have been argued to affect outcomes in false-belief and Director
44 tasks, none are present in the secrets task.

1
2
3 Participants in Experiment 2 were presented with a character who has a preference
4 that is potentially less than socially acceptable. This character is either untroubled about other
5 people knowing about that preference, or does not want other people to know. The visual
6 world paradigm used in this study is a useful way to measure the timecourse in which
7 participants can integrate the incoming linguistic stimulus with background contextual
8 knowledge to generate expectations about upcoming discourse. Replicating previous results,
9 we found that our adult group showed clear anticipation of the likely course of events at the
10 earliest possible point in the linguistic input. The adolescents also showed some anticipation
11 of the character's response before disambiguation. These results therefore provide evidence
12 for an ability to make mental state inferences based on complex desires and intentions in late
13 childhood and adolescence.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 However, neither adolescent group displayed anticipation until much later in the
29 target sentence. We can conclude from these results that the younger age groups are delayed
30 in predicting outcomes, compared to adults. Based on a comparison between the older
31 adolescent group and adults, we cannot directly attribute these differences to differences in
32 EF abilities. While we took into account differences in working memory and inhibitory
33 control, adolescent and adult groups may differ in other ways that may have affected their
34 performance on the task, which is a limitation of this research. For example, performance of
35 adolescents and adults on reasoning tasks can be differently affected by the presence of an
36 experimenter (Wolf et al., 2015), and language development continues throughout childhood,
37 adolescence and adulthood (Nippold, 2006). Moreover, these more socially complex
38 scenarios may lead to more uncertainty for adolescents, in terms of what they expect the
39 character to do. One possibility is that adolescents and adults differ in the organisation and
40 availability of task relevant information. For example, adults have richer networks of
41 associations, and clearer biases, given social contextual cues. Another possibility is that
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adolescents generate less well-defined outcomes for scenarios than adults, due to differences
4
5 in weightings of prior probabilities (buying a pink car vs. green), and uncertainty about
6
7 background mental states, given observed behaviour.⁵ Viewing the results in these terms,
8
9 future research could examine to what extent adolescents are able to appreciate that others'
10
11 behaviours often result from complex, conflicting motivation. The development of this ability
12
13 to deal with conflicting desires and mental states may parallel the prolonged development of
14
15 the understanding and experience of mixed emotions (e.g., Burkitt, Watling, & Cocks, 2019;
16
17 Larsen, To, & Fireman, 2007).

21
22 This finding of a developmental difference in mental states inference between
23
24 adolescents and adults is in line with neuroimaging studies showing continued development
25
26 of the 'social brain' during adolescence (Blakemore, 2008). Our results indeed reveal that
27
28 ToM has not reached full maturity by adolescence; younger and older adolescents were
29
30 delayed relative to adults in anticipating the target in scenarios that required complex mental
31
32 state reasoning (Experiment 2). Importantly, while previous research on adolescent social
33
34 development has found that EF abilities can be a significant factor in accounting for
35
36 differences between children, adolescent and adult groups on tasks that call on ToM (Mills et
37
38 al., 2015; Symeonidou et al., 2016), the current age groups differences were not accounted
39
40 for by difference in simple or complex inhibitory control, or verbal working memory. Our
41
42 findings therefore are strong evidence of prolonged maturation of social reasoning about
43
44 complex mental states.
45
46
47
48

49
50 ⁵ For example, a Bayesian model of a participant's expectation for an outcome where the agent buys the green
51
52 car (o_g) or a pink car (o_p), given either 'out and proud' or 'secretive' context, C_o or C_s , might see the distribution
53
54 as a function of the likelihood of C , given observed behaviour and the prior probability as follows:

$$55 \quad i. \quad P(o|C) \propto P(C|o).P(o)$$

56
57 Successful anticipation of the more socially acceptable green-car choice, given a 'secretive' context would stem
58
59 from an awareness both of a greater prior probability of socially acceptable behaviour ($P(o_g) > P(o_p)$) and of a
60
sensitivity to the fact that observed behaviour often results as a compromise between complex, conflicting
desires ($P(C_s|o_g) > P(C_s|o_p)$). This discussion assumes a crudely simple analysis of a more complex state of
affairs. See Goodman et al. (2006) and Baker, Saxe & Tenenbaum (2009) for discussion.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nevertheless, we acknowledge the potential limitation of sample size; we simply may not have had sufficient power to accurately detect the age group x belief/context interaction effects in our experiments. In the current study, detecting a significant interaction with the significance level of $\alpha=.05$ on 80% of occasions (as suggested by Cohen, 1988) would have needed a minimum of 90 participants for Experiment 1, and 100 for Experiment 2 (calculated using the *simr* package in R; Green & MacLeod, 2016). It would have been very challenging to recruit and test these high numbers of participants, using the complex eye-tracking methods we used. The current sample sizes yield an estimated power of 41% for Experiment 1, and 51% for Experiment 2. While the lower sample sizes are somewhat mitigated by the use of linear mixed models where analyses control for both by-participant and by-item variation rather than aggregated across participants (thus improving power; Baayen, Davidson, & Bates, 2008), the power calculations noted above are based on this analysis approach and so the study is underpowered. Nevertheless, the results in the adult group broadly replicated the patterns seen in the experiments that we sought to replicate (Ferguson et al., 2015; Ferguson & Breheny, 2011), meaning that we can feel relatively confident that the reported findings are reliable. As a field, research on adolescent cognitive development should continue to aim for larger sample sizes.

Regarding the EF demands of the tasks reported in this paper, when correcting for multiple comparisons, we found no significant correlation overall between performance on the complex-IC task and the false-belief trials in Experiment 1. We note however that previous research finds that change-of-location FB tasks pose a ‘pull of reality’ challenge due to the location of the mentioned object being different to the target location (e.g. Apperly, Back, Samson, & France, 2008; German & Hehman (2006). It is interesting that none of the EF demands in this FB task resulted in a change of outcome, in terms of the timecourse of anticipation, between adolescents and adults. We can attribute this to the fact that demands of

1
2
3 FB tasks are not that great, compared perhaps to the more demanding triples versions of the
4
5 Director task. Whether a no-difference outcome would emerge between groups whose EF
6
7 scores actually differ is a question we leave to another time.
8
9

10 Moreover, results of Experiment 2 provide very clear evidence that factors outside of
11
12 EF differences can lead to differences in outcomes between groups of adolescents and adults.
13
14 As mentioned, we found no relation between anticipation and any EF measure. The older
15
16 adolescent group in this experiment did not differ to adults on these measures, and yet
17
18 outcomes were markedly different. These results are in line with views emerging in the
19
20 literature on older children and adolescents that there is more to social cognitive development
21
22 than simply differences in EF (Bradford, Brunsdon, & Ferguson, in press; Brunsdon,
23
24 Bradford, & Ferguson, in press; Dumontheil et al., 2010; Zhao et al., 2018). Our results
25
26 indicate ways forward for adolescent social-cognitive research which are sensitive to EF
27
28 abilities but which probe responses to more complex events, and the biases and expectations
29
30 that may underpin those responses.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 References

- 40
41 Altmann, G.T., & Kamide, Y. (2009). Discourse-mediation of the mapping between language
42
43 and the visual world: Eye movements and mental representation. *Cognition, 111*, 55–71.
44
45 Anderson P. (2002). Assessment and development of executive function (EF) during
46
47 childhood. *Child Neuropsychology, 8*, 71-82.
48
49 Apperly, I.A., Back, E., Samson, D., & France, L. (2008). The cost of thinking about false
50
51 beliefs: Evidence from adults' performance on a non-inferential theory of mind
52
53 task. *Cognition 106*, 1093–1108.
54
55 Apperly, I.A., Riggs, K.J., Simpson, A., Chiavarino, C., & Samson, D. (2006). Is Belief
56
57 Reasoning Automatic? *Psychological Science, 17*, 841–844.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Back, E., & Apperly, I.A. (2010). Two sources of evidence on the non-automaticity of true
4 and false-belief ascription. *Cognition*, *115*(1), 54–70.
5
6
7
8 Baker, C.L., Saxe, R., & Tenenbaum, J. (2009). Action understanding as inverse planning.
9
10 *Cognition*, *113*(3), 329–349.
11
12 Barr, D.J. (2008). Pragmatic expectations and linguistic evidence: Listeners anticipate but do
13 not integrate common ground. *Cognition*, *109*(1), 18–40.
14
15
16
17 Barr, D.J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. (2013). Random-effects structure for
18 confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*,
19 *68*, 255–278.
20
21
22
23
24 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects
25 Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1), 1–48.
26
27
28 Begeer, S., Bernstein, D.M., Aßfalg, A., Azdad, H., Glasbergen, T., Wierda, M., & Koot,
29 H.M. (2016). Equal egocentric bias in school-aged children with and without autism
30 spectrum disorders. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *149*, 134–145.
31
32
33
34
35 Birch, S.A.J., & Bloom, P. (2007). The curse of knowledge in reasoning about false-beliefs.
36 *Psychological Science*, *18*, 382–386.
37
38
39
40 Blakemore, S.-J. (2008). The social brain in adolescence. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *9*(4),
41 267–277.
42
43
44
45 Bradford, E., Brunsdon, V., & Ferguson, H.J. (in press). The neural basis of belief-attribution
46 across the lifespan: False-belief reasoning and the N400 effect. *Cortex*.
47
48
49 Bradford, E.E.F., Jentsch, I., Gomez, J.-C. (2015). From Self to Social Cognition: Theory of
50 Mind Mechanisms and their relation to Executive Functioning. *Cognition*, *138*, 21–34.
51
52
53
54 Bradford, E., Jentsch, I., Gomez, J., Chen, Y., Zhang, D., & Su, Y. (2018). Cross-Cultural
55 Differences in Adult Theory of Mind Abilities: A Comparison of Native-English
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Speakers and Native-Chinese Speakers on the Self/Other Differentiation Task. *Quarterly*
4 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 71, 2665–2676.
5
6
7
8 Brown-Schmidt, S. (2009). The role of executive function in perspective taking during online
9 language comprehension. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 16(5), 893–900.
10
11
12 Brown-Schmidt, S. (2012). Beyond common and privileged: Gradient representations of
13 common ground in real-time language use. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 27(1),
14 62–89.
15
16
17
18 Brown-Schmidt, S., Gunlogson, C., & Tanenhaus, M.K. (2008). Addressees distinguish
19 shared from private information when interpreting questions during interactive
20 conversation, 107(3), 1122–1134.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Brown-Schmidt, S., & Hanna, J. (2011). Talking in another persons shoes: Incremental
27 perspective-taking in language processing. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 2(1), 11–33.
28
29
30
31 Brunsdon, V., Bradford, E., & Ferguson, H.J. (in press). Sensorimotor mu rhythm during
32 action observation changes across the lifespan independently from social cognitive
33 processes. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*.
34
35
36
37 Bull, R., Phillips, L.H., & Conway, C.A. (2008). The role of control functions in mentalizing:
38 Dual-task studies of theory of mind and executive function. *Cognition*, 107, 663–672.
39
40
41
42
43 Burkitt, E., Watling, D., & Cocks, F. (2019). Mixed emotion experiences for self or another
44 person in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 75, 63–72.
45
46
47
48
49 Cane, J., Ferguson, H.J., & Apperly, I.A. (2017). Using perspective to resolve reference: the
50 impact of cognitive load and motivation. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology:*
51 *Learning, Memory, And Cognition*, 43, 591–610.
52
53
54
55
56 Carlson, S.M., Moses, L.J., & Breton, C. (2002). How specific is the relation between
57 executive function and theory of mind? Contributions of inhibitory control and working
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dumontheil, I., Roggeman, C., Ziermans, T., Peyrard-Janvid, M., Matsson, H., Kere, J., &
4
5 Klingberg, T. (2011). Influence of the COMT genotype on working memory and brain
6
7 activity changes during development. *Biological Psychiatry*, *70*(3), 222–229.
8
9
10
11 Epley, N., Morewedge, C.K., & Keysar, B. (2004). Perspective taking in children and adults:
12
13 Equivalent egocentrism but differential correction. *Journal of Experimental Social*
14
15 *Psychology*, *40*(6), 760–768.
16
17
18 Ferguson, H.J., Apperly, I., Ahmad, J., Bindemann, M., & Cane, J. (2015b). Task constraints
19
20 distinguish perspective inferences from perspective use during discourse interpretation
21
22 in a false-belief task, *139*, 50–70.
23
24
25 Ferguson, H.J., & Breheny, R. (2011). Eye movements reveal the time-course of anticipating
26
27 behaviour based on complex, conflicting desires. *Cognition*, *119*(2), 179–196.
28
29
30 Ferguson, H.J., & Breheny, R. (2012). Listeners' eyes reveal spontaneous sensitivity to
31
32 others' perspectives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 257–263.
33
34
35 Ferguson, H.J., Cane, J.E., Douchkov, M., & Wright, D. (2015b). Empathy predicts false-
36
37 belief reasoning ability: evidence from the N400. *Social Cognitive and Affective*
38
39 *Neuroscience*, *10*(6), 848–55.
40
41
42 Ferguson, H.J., Scheepers, C., & Sanford, A. (2010). Expectations in counterfactual and
43
44 theory of mind reasoning. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *25*, 297–346.
45
46
47 Garon, N., Bryson, S.E., & Smith, I.M. (2008). Executive function in preschoolers: A review
48
49 using an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*, 31–60.
50
51
52 Gathercole, S.E., Pickering, S.J., Ambridge, B., & Wearing, H. (2004). The structure of
53
54 working memory from 4 to 15 years of age. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 177–190.
55
56
57 Geangu, E., Gibson, A., Kaduk, K., & Reid, V.M. (2013). The neural correlates of passively
58
59 viewed sequences of true and false-beliefs. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*,
60
8, 432–437.

- 1
2
3 German, T.P., & Hehman, J.A. (2006). Representational and executive selection resources in
4
5 'theory of mind': Evidence from compromised belief-desire reasoning in old age.
6
7 *Cognition*, *101*, 129–152.
8
9
10 Goodman, N.D., Baker, C.L., Bonawitz, E.B., Mansinghka, V.K., Gopnik, A., Wellman, H.,
11
12 et al. (2006). Intuitive theories of mind: A rational approach to false belief. In
13
14 *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*
15
16 (pp. 1382–1390).
17
18
19 Green, P., & MacLeod, C. J. (2016). SIMR: an R package for power analysis of generalized
20
21 linear mixed models by simulation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *7*(4), 493–498.
22
23
24 Hanna, J.E., Tanenhaus, M.K., & Trueswell, J.C. (2003). The effects of common ground and
25
26 perspective on domains of referential interpretation. *Journal of Memory and Language*,
27
28 *49*(1), 43–61.
29
30
31 Happé, F.G.E. (1994). An advanced test of theory of mind: Understanding of story
32
33 characters' thoughts and feelings by able, mentally handicapped and normal children.
34
35 *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *24*, 129–154.
36
37
38 Heller, D., Grodner, D. & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008) [The Role of Perspective in Identifying](#)
39
40 [Domains of Reference](#). *Cognition*, *108*, 831–836.
41
42
43 Heller, D., Parisien, C. & Stevenson, S. (2016) [Perspective-taking behavior as the](#)
44
45 [probabilistic weighing of multiple domains](#). *Cognition*, *149*, 104–120.
46
47
48 Heyes, C. (2014). Submentalizing: I am not really reading your mind. *Perspectives in*
49
50 *Psychological Science*, *9*, 131–143.
51
52
53 Humphrey G, Dumontheil I. (2016). Development of risk-taking, perspective-taking, and
54
55 inhibitory control during adolescence. *Developmental Neuropsychology*. 41:59-76.
56
57
58 Keulers, E.H.H., Evers, E.A.T., Stiers, P., & Jolles, J. (2010). Age, sex, and pubertal phase
59
60 influence mentalizing about emotions and actions in adolescents. *Developmental*

1
2
3 *Neuropsychology*, 35, 555–569.
4

5 Keysar, B., Barr, D.J., Balin, J.A., & Brauner, J.S. (2000). Taking perspective in
6
7 conversation: The Role of Mutual Knowledge in Comprehension, *11*(1), 32–38.
8

9
10 Keysar, B., Lin, S., & Barr, D. J. (2003). Limits on theory of mind use in adults. *Cognition*,
11
12 89(1), 25–41.
13

14
15
16 Larsen, J. T., To, Y. M., & Fireman, G. (2007). Children’s understanding and experience of
17
18 mixed emotions. *Psychological Science*, 18(2), 186–191.
19

20
21 Lin, S., Keysar, B., & Epley, N. (2010). Reflexively mindblind: Using theory of mind to
22
23 interpret behavior requires effortful attention. *Journal of Experimental Social*
24
25 *Psychology*, 46(3), 551–556.
26
27

28
29 Luna, B., Garver, K.E., Urban, T.A, Lazar, N.A, & Sweeney, J.A. (2004). Maturation of
30
31 cognitive processes from late childhood to adulthood. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1357–
32
33 72.
34

35 McKinnon, M.C., & Moscovitch, M. (2007). Domain-general contributions to social
36
37 reasoning: Theory of mind and deontic reasoning reexplored. *Cognition*, 102, 179–218.
38

39
40 Meinhardt, J., Kühn-Popp, N., Sommer, M., & Sodian, B. (2012). Distinct neural correlates
41
42 underlying pretense and false-belief reasoning: evidence from ERPs. *NeuroImage*, 63,
43
44 623–631.
45

46
47 Mills, K.L., Dumontheil, I., Speekenbrink, M., & Blakemore, S-J. (2015). Multitasking
48
49 during social interactions in adolescence and early adulthood. *Royal Society Open*
50
51 *Science*, 2(11), 150117.
52

53
54 Nadig, A. S., & Sedivy, J. C. (2002). Evidence of perspective-taking constraints in children’s
55
56 on-line reference resolution. *Psychological Science*, 13, 329–336.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nielsen, M.K., Slade, L., Levy, J.P., & Holmes, A. (2015). Inclined to see it your way: Do
4
5 altercentric intrusion effects in visual perspective taking reflect an intrinsically social
6
7 process? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *68*, 1931–1951.
8
9
- 10 Nippold, M.A. (2006). Language development in school-age children, adolescents and adults.
11
12 Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics second Edition), p368–373.
13
14
- 15 Nilsen, E.S., & Graham, S.A. (2009). The relations between children’s communicative
16
17 perspective-taking and executive functioning. *Cognitive Psychology*, *58*(2), 220–249.
18
19
- 20 R Core Development Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical
21
22 computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from
23
24 <http://www.r-project.org>
25
- 26 Rubio-Fernández, P. (2016). The director task: A test of Theory-of-Mind use or selective
27
28 attention? *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*.
29
30
- 31 Rubio-Fernández, P. & Geurts, B. (2016). Don't mention the marble! The role of attentional
32
33 processes in false-belief tasks. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, *7*(4), 835–850.
34
35
- 36 Rubio-Fernández, P., & Glucksberg, S. (2012). Reasoning about other people’s beliefs:
37
38 Bilinguals have an advantage. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
39
40 *and Cognition*, *38*(1), 211–217.
41
- 42 Samson, D., Apperly, I.A., Braithwaite, J.J., Andrews, B.J., & Bodley Scott, S.E. (2010).
43
44 Seeing it their way: Evidence for rapid and involuntary computation of what other
45
46 people see. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*,
47
48 *36*, 1255–1266.
49
50
- 51 Santiesteban, I., Catmur, C., Hopkins, S., Bird, G. & Heyes, C.M. (2014). Avatars and
52
53 arrows: Implicit mentalizing or domain general processing? *Journal of Experimental*
54
55 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *40*, 929–937.
56
57
- 58 Schneider, D., Bayliss, A.P., Becker, S., & Dux, P.E. (2012). Sustained implicit belief
59
60

1
2
3 processing revealed by eye movements. *Experimental Psychology: General*, 141, 433–
4
5 438.

6
7
8 Schneider, D., Lam, R., Bayliss, A.P., & Dux, P.E. (2012). Cognitive load disrupts theory of
9
10 mind processing. *Psychological Science*, 23, 842–847.

11
12
13 Schneider, D., & Low, J. (2016). Efficient versus flexible mentalizing in complex social
14
15 settings: Exploring signature limits. *British Journal of Psychology*, 107, 26–29.

16
17
18 Schneider, D., Slaughter, V.P., & Dux, P.E. (2015). What do we know about implicit false-
19
20 belief tracking? *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22, 1–12.

21
22
23 Schneider, D., Slaughter, V.P., & Dux, P.E. (2017). Current evidence for automatic Theory of
24
25 Mind processing in adults. *Cognition*, 162, 27–31.

26
27
28 Sebastian, C.L., Fontaine, N.M.G., Bird, G., Blakemore, S.-J., Brito, S. a De, McCrory, E.
29
30 J.P., & Viding, E. (2012). Neural processing associated with cognitive and affective
31
32 Theory of Mind in adolescents and adults. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*,
33
34 7(1), 53–63.

35
36
37 Sedivy, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., Chambers, C. G., & Carlson, G. N. (1999). Achieving
38
39 incremental processing through contextual representation: Evidence from the processing
40
41 of adjectives. *Cognition*, 71, 109–147.

42
43
44 Setoh, P., Scott, R. M., & Baillargeon, R. (2016). Two-and-a-half-year-olds succeed at a
45
46 traditional false-belief task with reduced processing demands. *Proceedings of the*
47
48 *National Academy of Sciences*, 113(47), 13360–13365.

49
50
51 Shamay-Tsoory, S.G., Harari, H., Aharon-Peretz, J., & Levkovitz, Y. (2010). The role of the
52
53 orbitofrontal cortex in affective theory of mind deficits in criminal offenders with
54
55 psychopathic tendencies. *Cortex*, 46(5), 668–677.

56
57
58 Simmonds, D.J., Pekar, J.J., & Mostofsky, S.H. (2008). Meta-analysis of Go/No-go tasks
59
60 demonstrating that fMRI activation associated with response inhibition is task-

- 1
2
3 dependent. *Neuropsychologia*, 46(1), 224–32.
4
5 Surian, L., Surian, L., Caldi, S., Caldi, S., Sperber, D., & Sperber, D. (2007). Attribution of
6 beliefs by 13- month-old infants. *Psychological Science*, 18(7), 580–586.
7
8 Symeonidou, I., Dumontheil, I., Chow, W.-Y., & Breheny, R. (2016). Development of online
9 use of theory of mind during adolescence: An eye-tracking study. *Journal of*
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 van den Wildenberg, W.P.M., & van der Molen, M.W. (2004). Developmental trends in
18 simple and selective inhibition of compatible and incompatible responses. *Journal of*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 Vetter, N.C., Altgassen, M., Phillips, L., Mahy, C.E. V, & Kliegel, M. (2013). Development
26 of affective theory of mind across adolescence: disentangling the role of executive
27 functions. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 38(2), 114–25.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Völlm, B.A., Taylor, A.N., Richardson, P., Corcoran, R., Stirling, J., McKie, S., ... Elliot, R. (2006). Neuronal correlates of theory of mind and empathy: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study in a nonverbal task. *NeuroImage*, 29(1), 90–98.
- Wang, J.J., Frisson, S., Ali, M. & Apperly, I.A. (2015). Language complexity modulates 8- and 10-year-olds' success at using their theory of mind abilities in a communication task. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 149, 62–71.
- Wechsler, D. (1997). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Third Edition Manual* (3rd ed.). San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wellman, H.M., Cross, D., & Watson, J. (2001). Meta-analysis of theory-of-mind development: the truth about false-belief. *Child Development*, 72(3), 655–684.
- Wimmer, H., & Perner, J. (1983). Beliefs about beliefs: Representation and constraining function of wrong beliefs in young children's understanding of deception. *Cognition*, 13, 103–128.

1
2
3 Wolf, L. K., Bazargani, N., Kilford, E. J., Dumontheil, I., & Blakemore, S.-J. (2015). The
4 audience effect in adolescence depends on who's looking over your shoulder. *Journal of*
5 *Adolescence*, 43, 5–14.
6
7
8
9

10 Wu, S.L., & Keysar, B. (2007). The effect of culture on perspective taking. *Psychological*
11 *Science*, 18, 600–606.
12
13

14 Zhao, L., Wang, J.J. & Apperly, I.A. (2018). The cognitive demands of remembering a
15 speaker's perspective and managing common ground size modulate 8- and 10-year-olds'
16 perspective-taking abilities. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 174, 130–149.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Captions

Figure 1 Visual displays depicting key events in the videos during the false-belief task. Stage one shows the ‘start state’ where both Jane and Sarah are standing behind the table. Stage two was the first part of the video where Sarah moves the target object into one of the three containers. In stage 3, Sarah moves the object into one of the other containers while Jane was present in true-belief (TB) trials or after Jane had left in false-belief (FB) trials. Lastly, in stage 4 a picture of the ‘final state’ from the video was presented to participants while they listened to the audio sentence.

Figure 2 The average $\log(\text{reality}/\text{Belief})$ score for each condition and age group. Positive scores show a greater bias to look at the reality location and negative scores show a greater bias to look at the belief location. Note that the dashed and vertical lines indicate absolute onsets and average offsets of individual words in the target sentence.

Figure 3 Correlations between participants’ anticipatory bias score (y-axis) and each measure of executive function (x-axis), separately for the true-belief (TB, blue) and false-belief (FB, orange) conditions. IC: inhibitory control.

Figure 4 Example visual stimulus used in Experiment 2.

Figure 5 The average $\log(\text{open}/\text{secret})$ score for each condition and age group. Positive scores show a greater bias to look at the open referent and negative scores show a greater bias to look at the secret referent. Note that the dashed and vertical lines indicate absolute onsets and average offsets of words in the target sentence.

1
2
3 **Figure 6** Correlations between participants' anticipatory bias score (y-axis) and scores from
4 each individual measure (x-axis), separately for the open (blue) and secret (orange) condition.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1 Visual displays depicting key events in the videos during the false-belief task. Stage one shows the 'start state' where both Jane and Sarah are standing behind the table. Stage two was the first part of the video where Sarah moves the target object into one of the three containers. In stage 3, Sarah moves the object into one of the other containers while Jane was present in true-belief (TB) trials or after Jane had left in false-belief (FB) trials. Lastly, in stage 4 a picture of the 'final state' from the video was presented to participants while they listened to the audio sentence.





Figure 2 The average $\log(\text{reality}/\text{Belief})$ score for each condition and age group. Positive scores show a greater bias to look at the reality location and negative scores show a greater bias to look at the belief location. Note that the dashed and vertical lines indicate absolute onsets and average offsets of individual words in the target sentence.



43 **Figure 3** Correlations between participants' anticipatory bias score (y-axis) and each measure
 44 of executive function (x-axis), separately for the true-belief (TB, blue) and false-belief (FB,
 45 orange) conditions. IC: inhibitory control.
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60




Figure 4 Example visual stimulus used in Experiment 2.




Figure 5 The average log(open/secret) score for each condition and age group. Positive scores show a greater bias to look at the open referent and negative scores show a greater bias to look at the secret referent. Note that the dashed and vertical lines indicate absolute onsets and average offsets of words in the target sentence.




Figure 6 Correlations between participants' anticipatory bias score (y-axis) and scores from each individual measure (x-axis), separately for the open (blue) and secret (orange) condition.

Table 1 Average time window durations for each condition (timings in ms).

	TB	FB
<i>“Jane will look for the”</i>	735	740
<i>[object]</i>	868	879
<i>“in the”</i>	210	208
<i>“container”</i>	584	585
<i>“on the”</i>	211	220
<i>[location]</i>	1002	950

Table 2 Estimates and t-values for each time window of interest, where * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$.

		Intercept	Belief	Age group	Belief x Age group
[Preview]	β Est. (SE)	.72 (.40)	.11 (.22)	-.36 (.25)	.12 (.44)
	<i>t</i> -value	1.78	.49	-1.41	.28
[Pre-object]	β Est. (SE)	.52 (.35)	.52 (.19)	-.58 (.25)	.71 (.39)
	<i>t</i> -value	1.47	2.65 **	-2.35 *	1.84
[Object]	β Est. (SE)	.65 (.36)	1.08 (.21)	.29 (.30)	-.65 (.41)
	<i>t</i> -value	1.82	5.30 ***	.98	-1.59
"in the"	β Est. (SE)	.41 (.20)	1.03 (.18)	.01 (.22)	-.15 (.35)
	<i>t</i> -value	2.00	5.85 ***	.05	-.43
"container"	β Est. (SE)	.70 (.29)	1.72 (.22)	.15 (.31)	-.51 (.43)
	<i>t</i> -value	2.93 *	7.97 ***	.48	-1.19
"on the"	β Est. (SE)	.55 (.19)	1.59 (.30)	.22 (.30)	.38 (.35)
	<i>t</i> -value	2.84 **	9.10 ***	.72	1.10
[Location]	β Est. (SE)	.31 (.30)	2.79 (.21)	-.22 (.28)	.39 (.28)
	<i>t</i> -value	1.03	13.44 ***	-.81	.95

Table 3 One sample t-test results for each condition and time window where there was a significant effect of condition.

	df	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value
<i>[Pre-object]</i>			
TB	37	3.98	<.001***
FB	37	.73	.47
<i>[Object]</i>			
TB	37	5.76	<.001***
FB	37	-.17	.87
<i>“in the”</i>			
TB	37	5.71	<.001***
FB	37	-.94	.36
<i>“container”</i>			
TB	37	7.47	<.001***
FB	37	-1.00	.32
<i>“on the”</i>			
TB	37	7.59	<.001***
FB	37	-1.30	.20
<i>[Location]</i>			
TB	37	8.76	<.001***
FB	37	-5.01	<.001***

Table 4 Means and standard deviations of all individual measure scores and their respective one way ANOVA results.

		Mean (SD)		ANOVA	
		Adolescents	Adults	df	F
Inhibitory control	Simple Go NoGo (Acc)	-.08 (.13)	-.05 (.07)	1, 36	.44
	Complex Go NoGo (Acc)	-.25 (.14)	-.23 (.16)	1, 36	.19
	Simple Go (RT)	385 (46)	382 (23)	1, 36	.06
	Complex Go (RT)	434 (54)	422 (47)	1, 36	.52
Working memory	Digit Span	6.91 (2.02)	7.65 (2.34)	1, 36	1.10

Table 5 Examples of experimental sentences used in Experiment 2.

Open

Tom is always telling people that his favourite colour is pink

Last week Tom bought a new car and he deliberately chose a pink car.

Secret

Tom does not want anyone to know that his favourite colour is pink.

Last week Tom bought a new car and he deliberately chose a green car.

Table 6 Average time window durations for each condition (timings in ms).

	Open	Secret
[ambiguous noun]	534	541
[post-ambiguous noun]	480	502
[adverb]	825	836
[transitive verb]	597	612
[disambiguating noun]	1109	1081

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 7 Estimates and *t*-values for each time window of interest, where * *p* < .05 and *** *p* < .001.

		Intercept	Context	Age group 1: Adults vs Adolescents	Age group 2: Young vs Older Adolescents	Context x Age group 1	Context x Age group 2
Ambiguous noun	β Est. (SE)	.17 (.14)	.35 (.18)	-.16 (.14)	.10 (.24)	.57 (.26)	-.14 (.46)
	<i>t</i> -value	1.27	1.95	-1.13	.40	2.23 *	-.32
Post-ambiguous noun	β Est. (SE)	.09 (.12)	.13 (.17)	-.06 (.13)	-.08 (.22)	.38 (.25)	.40 (.43)
	<i>t</i> -value	.80	.73	-.47	-.36	1.55	.92
Adverb	β Est. (SE)	.13 (.17)	.34 (.20)	-.30 (.16)	.01 (.27)	-.21 (.28)	.18 (.50)
	<i>t</i> -value	.81	1.70	-1.91	.01	-.74	.36
Transitive verb	β Est. (SE)	.13 (.18)	.64 (.19)	.01 (.18)	-.18 (.30)	-.51 (.27)	.63 (.50)
	<i>t</i> -value	.74	3.33 ***	.02	.58	-1.87	1.29
Disambiguating noun	β Est. (SE)	.04 (.15)	1.93 (.19)	.08 (.13)	.13 (.23)	-.23 (.26)	.62 (.47)
	<i>t</i> -value	.29	10.37 ***	.62	.56	-.87	1.32

Table 8 One sample *t*-test results for each condition and time window where there was a significant effect of condition.

		df	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value
Ambiguous noun				
	<i>Adult</i>			
	Open	16	2.51	.02 *
	Secret	16	-1.87	.08
	<i>Adolescent</i>			
	Open	34	1.71	.10
	Secret	34	1.41	.17
Transitive verb				
	Open	51	2.73	.009 **
	Secret	51	-1.21	.23
Disambiguating noun				
	Open	51	6.86	< .001 ***
	Secret	51	-8.62	< .001 ***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 9 Means and standard deviations of all executive function measure scores and their respective one way ANOVA results, where ** $p < .01$.

		Mean (SD)			ANOVA	
		Adult	Older Adolescent	Younger Adolescent	df	F
Inhibitory control	Simple Go NoGo (Acc)	-.05 (.72)	-.08 (.14)	-.11 (.13)	2, 49	.95
	Complex Go NoGo (Acc)	-.21 (.16)	-.24 (.15)	-.32 (.22)	2, 49	1.59
	Simple Go (RT)	387 (19)	383 (47)	403 (56)	2, 49	1.01
	Complex Go (RT)	429 (50)	425 (53)	453 (72)	2, 49	1.14
Working memory	Digit Span	8.00 (2.26)	7.28 (1.96)	5.59 (1.80)	2, 49	6.40 **