Running head: Context and timing in children and adults

The dynamic effect of context on interval timing in children and adults

Quentin Hallez[1], Atser Damsma[2], Darren Rhodes[3,4], Hedderik Van Rijn[2], Sylvie Droit-Volet[1]

[1] University Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, Clermont-Ferrand, France

[2] University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

[3] University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

[4] Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, United Kingdom

Corresponding authors: Quentin Hallez, Université Clermont Auvergne, Laboratoire de psychologie sociale et cognitive, CNRS, UMR 6024, 34 avenue carnot, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand. E-mail. quentin.hallez@gmail.com.

2   **Abstract**: Human reproductions of time intervals are often biased towards previously
3   perceived durations, resulting in a central tendency effect. The aim of the current study was to
4   compare this effect of temporal context on time reproductions within children and adults.
5   Children aged from 5 to 7 years, as well as adults, performed a ready-set-go reproduction task
6   with a short and a long duration distribution. A central tendency effect was observed both in
7   children and adults, with no age-difference in the effect of global context on temporal
8   performance. However, the analysis of the effect of local context (trial-by-trial) indicated that
9   younger children relied more on the duration (objective duration) presented in the most recent
10 trial than adults. In addition, statistical analyses of the influence on temporal performance of
11 recently reproduced durations by subjects (subjective duration) revealed that temporal
12 reproductions in adults were influenced by performance drifts, i.e., their evaluation of their
13 temporal error, while children simply relied on the value of reproduced durations on the
14 recent trials. We argue that the central tendency effect was larger in young children due to
15 their noisier internal representation of durations: A noisy system led participants to base their
16 estimation on experienced duration rather than on the evaluation of their judgment.

17
20

21 **1. Introduction**
22 We live in a dynamic world with a plurality of temporal events and some of them that might
23 fluctuate in their temporal properties, going faster or slower than usual. Given that time is a
24 fundamental dimension of perception, action and cognition, we can assume that humans
25 continuously adjust their behaviour to these changing temporal properties of our physical
26 environment (Di Luca & Rhodes, 2016; Rhodes, 2018). The acquisition of the duration
27 associated to an event therefore depends on the temporal context of learning (Rattat & Tartas,
28 2017). This paper tests the degree to which our prior knowledge about the temporal properties
29 of the world is learnt and used at different developmental ages.
30   It is well documented in studies with human adults that temporal context influences
31 the estimation of different magnitudes, including temporal rhythm or duration (Adams &
32 Mamassian 2004; Battaglia, Jacobs & Aslin, 2003; ; Damsma, van der Mijn & van Rijn,
33 2018; Ernst & Banks, 2002; Jazayeri & Shadlen, 2010; Körding, Beierholm, Ma, Quartz,
34 Tenenbaum & Shams, 2007; McAuley & Jones, 2003, McAuley, Jones, Holub, Johnston &
35 Miller, 2006; Mamassian, Landy & Maloney, 2002; Miyazaki, Nozaki & Nakajima, 2005;
36 Petzschner, Maier & Glasauer, 2012; Shi & Burr, 2016; Stocker & Simoncelli, 2006;
37 Verstynen & Sabes, 2011). This phenomenon is illustrated by the central tendency effect
38 described by Hollingworth (1910), and known in the psychology of time as Vierordt's (1868)
39 law. According to Vierordt's law, in a task in which a range of time intervals have to be
40 reproduced, participants tend to overestimate the shortest durations and underestimate the
41 longest durations (Lejeune & Wearden, 2009). This bias in time estimates demonstrates that
42 the judgment of durations is not absolute, but relative to the centre of the distribution of tested
43 durations. The judgment of a given duration therefore depends on the previous encountered
44 durations.
45   According to the Bayesian theory of perceptual inference for time, the currently
46 perceived interval (the likelihood) is weighted with previous experience (the prior) to come to
47 a subjective estimation of duration (the posterior). So, in a temporal task with a sequence of
48 trials, there would be an "online prior" where the prior is updated on a trial-by-trial basis, with
49 a greater influence on the current estimate of more recent trials (Dyjas, Bausenhart & Ulrich,
50 2012; Di Luca & Rhodes, 2016; Lapid, Ulrich & Rammsayer, 2008; Taatgen & Van Rijn,
51 2011; van Rijn, 2016). In addition, the Bayesian view predicts that the noisier the time
52 estimates are, the more participants will rely on prior knowledge. As explained by Jazayeri
53 and Shadlen (2010, p. 1020), "the brain takes into account knowledge of temporal uncertainty
54 and adapts its time keeping mechanisms to temporal statistics in the environment". Indeed,
55 given that the standard deviation of temporal judgment increases with the length of durations
56 to be estimated, as indicated the scalar property of timing (for a review see Wearden, 2016), it
57 has been found that the central tendency effect is stronger for longer stimulus durations
58 (Cicchini, Arrighi, Cecchetti & Burr, 2012; Jazayeri & Shadlen, 2010).
59   The scalar variability of timing has been verified in young children in different tasks
60 (for recent reviews see Droit-Volet, 2013, 2016; Coull & Droit-Volet, 2018). In addition, the
61 variability in estimates has been systematically shown to be higher in young children than in
62 adults. We can therefore assume that the uncertainty in time judgments is higher in younger
63 children, and as such, they might rely on prior experience to a greater extent than adults do.
64 The few developmental studies on temporal reproduction showed a stronger temporal bias in
65 children, with a higher over- and underestimation of short and long durations, respectively
66 (Crowder & Hohle, 1970; Droit-Volet, Wearden & Zélanti, 2015; Szelag, Kowalska,
67 Rymarczyk & Pöppel, 2002). This typical temporal bias has been explained by the motor
68 component of this task (Droit-Volet, 2010). The higher overestimation of short durations in
69 young children compared to adults would be due to their motor responses that took more time
70 to complete, while the higher underestimation of long durations might be due to their motor

impulsivity. In line with these findings, some authors have warned against using this temporal task in young children (Droit-Volet, 2010; Indraccolo, Spence, Vatakis & Harrar, 2016). However, although the contribution of motor action in age-related differences in temporal reproduction cannot be excluded, we can also assume a stronger effect of prior knowledge on temporal reproduction in young children than in adults.

A recent study using the temporal reproduction task has been conducted in autistic and typically developed children aged from 6 to 14 years (Karaminis et al., 2016). The results replicated the central tendency effect in all age groups, with a stronger effect for younger participants. In addition, Bayesian modelling of the data suggested a higher reliance on the prior in young children than in adults. The autistic children showed a lower sensitivity to time, but did not rely more on prior knowledge than age-matched typical children to compensate for their temporal error. However, as reported the authors, unexpectedly, the context dependent effect was not consistent across age groups, being absent in children older than 10 years and adults (p. 3). This is likely due to the fact that younger children underestimated all durations, thereby reducing the context effect to which they may be subject (Hallez & Droit-Volet, 2017; Karaminis et al., 2016).

The aim of the present study was to replicate and extend these results on the effect of temporal context on temporal reproduction performance in children as young as 5 years old. Indeed, the originality of our study lays on the examination of the influence of temporal performance in children and adults. The *global* context (i.e., the range of presented intervals) was not the only focus however, as we also investigated the *local* context (i.e., the direct effect of recent trials), a distinction that has not yet been investigated from a developmental perspective. In the present study, children aged 5, 6 and 7 years, as well as adults, performed a "ready-set-go" reproduction task in which we manipulated the temporal context by using two different ranges of durations: a short and a longer range. To assess the effect of this global context manipulation, one duration in the two temporal ranges overlapped. We hypothesized an effect of temporal context on temporal performance for both children and adults, with the overlapping duration judged longer in the long than in the short context condition. In addition, because of the lower temporal sensitivity in young children, we expected that the effect of recent prior trials would be higher in children than in adults.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

A total of 24 five-year-olds (11 females), 31 six-year-olds (16 females), and 25 seven-year-olds (10 females) and 33 adults (27 females, mean age = 20.43, *SD* = 3.94) took part in this experiment. Children were recruited from different nursery and primary schools, whereas adults were Psychology students of the University Clermont Auvergne, all located in the municipality of Clermont-Ferrand, France. Children's parents as well as adult participants signed written informed consent for their participation in this experiment, which was carried out according to the principles of 1964 Helsinki's declaration and approved by the academy committee of the French National Education Ministry, and the ethics committee of research IRB-UCA, according to ethical standards of the French law.

2.2. Apparatus and stimuli

In a quiet room, participants were seated in front of a cathode screen on which all stimuli were presented. The screen was linked to a MSI Apach Pro computer that launched all experimental events and recorded responses using Psychtoolbox-3 (Brainard, 1997; Kleiner et al., 2007) in Matlab.

118   During an entire experimental block, a 0.8° fixation cross was presented at the centre of
119   the screen (Figure 1). In each trial, a *warning*, *ready* and *set* stimulus were presented. The
120   warning stimulus consisted of a 2.0° diameter black circle with the label 'ready', and appeared
121   on the left of the fixation cross at a random distance between 4.0° and 8.1°. The ready and set
122   stimuli consisted of a white 2.0° diameter circle. The ready circle was presented on the right
123   of the fixation cross at a random distance between 4.0° and 8.1°. The set circle was always
124   located 4.8° above the fixation cross.

125   **2.3.   Procedure**

126   All participants performed a ready-set-go reproduction task in two temporal contexts: one
127   with short durations and the other with long durations. The presentation order of this context
128   condition was counterbalanced across participants. The fulfilment of each of the two
129   conditions was done on two distinct days. The 0.9 s interval duration was presented in each
130   contextual condition, in order to examine whether the temporal reproduction of this target
131   duration was affected by the temporal context. In the "short" context condition, the interval
132   duration were 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8 and 0.9 s, and the "long" context condition 0.9, 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3
133   s. In each condition, the participants were given 4 blocks of 20 trials (a total of 80 trials), that
134   is 8 trials per interval duration. The presentation order of the interval durations was random.
135   Participants were given a demonstration before each temporal condition composed of 10 trials
136   (5 demonstrations and 5 practice trials), in which each duration of the context conditions was
137   presented twice.
138   Each trial started with a 1 s fixation cross (Figure 1). Then, the black *warning* circle was
139   presented to indicate that a new trial had started. This circle stayed on the screen during the
140   rest of the trial until the participant made a response. After a random interval between .25 and
141   .85 s, the white *ready* circle was presented for 0.1 s, marking the onset of the interval. Next,
142   the offset of the interval was indicated by the presentation of the white *set* circle for 0.1 s. The
143   task of the participants was to immediately reproduce this interval after the presentation of the
144   set circle by pressing spacebar to indicate the offset.
145   Insert Figure 1 about here

146   **2.4.   Data analysis**

147   A complete overview of the analyses and results can be found at osf.io/k3znf. For data
148   analysis, we excluded reproductions lower than 0.1 s and higher than 2.0 s, leading to the
149   exclusion of 6.0% of the total data (12.4, 8.3, 4.5 and 0.4% of the trials for the 5-, 6-, 7-year-
150   olds and adults, respectively). We modeled the data using Linear Mixed Models (LMMs)
151   using the *lme4* package in R (Bates, Maechler, Bolker & Walker, 2014). To test the overall
152   effect of fixed factors, we did model comparisons using likelihood ratio tests. If a fixed factor
153   improved the model fit, it was included. To make the interpretation of the effect of objective
154   duration more straightforward, we centered this continuous factor by subtracting the middle
155   interval (i.e., 0.9 s) from all values. *Subject* was always included as a random intercept term.
156   Next, we sequentially added random slopes for the significant fixed factors to the best model
157   and compared the more complex model with the simpler model using a likelihood ratio test.
158   Random slope terms were included if they improved the model. Post-hoc multiple
159   comparisons were computed using the *glht* function from the *multcomp* package (Hothorn et
160   al., 2013) and the *lsmeans* function from the *lsmeans* package in R (Lenth, 2016).
161   To quantify the evidence in favor of the null hypotheses (i.e. there is no effect of the particular
162   fixed factor), we calculated Bayes factors using the *lmBF* function from the *BayesFactor*
163   package in R (Morey, Rouder & Jamil, 2014). We will denote the evidence for the null
164   hypothesis (H_0) over the alternative hypothesis (H_1) as BF_{01}.

165 **3. Results**

166 **3.1. Mean in temporal reproduction**

167 Figure 2A shows the mean reproduction of interval durations for the different age
168 groups. As can be seen in Figure 2, the children overall showed a smaller slope and a larger
169 underestimation of longer intervals. We modelled the data starting with an LMM predicting
170 reproduction, with subject as a random intercept term. We found adding centered objective
171 duration improved the model fit ($\chi^2(1) = 558.43$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$), showing that
172 overall there was a positive, linear increase of reproductions with objective duration ($\beta =$
173 0.25, $t = 23.89$, $p < 0.001$). However, adding age group and the interaction between age group
174 and objective duration to the model also improved the model fit ($\chi^2(3) = 38.72$, $p < 0.001$,
175 $BF_{01} < 0.01$ and $\chi^2(3) = 1110.90$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$, respectively), indicating that there
176 was a difference between the age groups in the intercept and slope of the reproductions. Post-
177 hoc multiple comparison showed that the intercept (i.e., the reproduction of 0.9 s estimated by
178 the model) was higher for the adults compared to the 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds ($ps <$
179 0.001). In addition, the intercept of the 5-year-olds was higher than that of the 7-year-olds (p
180 < 0.001). There were no other intercept differences between the age groups ($ps > 0.078$). A
181 second post-hoc test showed that the slope was larger for the adults compared to the three
182 children groups ($ps < 0.001$), but there were no differences between the children groups ($ps >$
183 0.495).

184 Insert Figure 2 about here
185

186 **3.2. Variance in temporal reproduction**

187 We used the coefficient of variation (CV) as measure of the variability in temporal
188 reproductions. To this end, we calculated the CV per subject for each objective duration, as
189 the standard deviation of the average reproduction divided by the average reproduction.
190 Figure 2B shows the average CV per age group. An LMM predicting CV showed that age
191 group improved the fit significantly ($\chi^2(3) = 96.76$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$). A post-hoc
192 Tukey's HSD test showed that relative to all children groups, the adults had a smaller CV (ps
193 < 0.001). In addition, the 7-year-olds had a significantly smaller CV than the 5 year olds ($\beta =$
194 -0.08, $z = -3.48$, $p = 0.003$). All other comparisons were non-significant ($ps > 0.110$). Thus, in
195 summary, our results indicate that the CV decreased with age.

196 **3.3. Global context effect**

197 To test whether temporal reproductions were influenced by the global context
198 manipulation, we compared the reproductions of the short and the long context for the
199 overlapping duration (i.e., 0.9 s). Figure 3 shows the average difference between the short and
200 the long context at this interval duration for the different age groups. We found that, overall,
201 the temporal context predicted the reproductions of the overlapping interval significantly ($\chi^2(1) = 31.42$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$). Adding age group to the model improved the fit ($\chi^2(3) = 33.66$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$), indicating the reproduction differed significantly between
204 age groups. Post-hoc comparisons showed that the reproductions at the overlapping interval
205 were significantly longer for the long context compared to the short context for the 5-year-
206 olds ($\beta = 0.09$, $t = 2.15$, $p = 0.033$) and the adults ($\beta = 0.07$, $t = 1.99$, $p = 0.049$). There was
207 no significant difference for the 6- and the 7-year-olds ($ps > 0.130$). Crucially, however,
208 model comparison showed that the effect of context did not differ significantly between age
209 groups ($\chi^2(1) = 4.26$, $p = 0.235$, $BF_{01} = 67.15$).

210 Insert Figure 3 about here

3.4. Local context effects

3.4.1. Objective previous durations

To quantify the influence of previous presented durations on the current reproduction, we started with the model established previously, including reproduction as the dependent variable and objective duration, age group and context as fixed factors. In addition, the interaction between age group and context and age group and objective duration were included. To this model, we sequentially added objective previous durations (N-1, N-2, N-3, etc.). We found that N-1 and N-2 had a significant influence on the current reproduction ($\chi^2(1) = 37.15$, $p < 0.001$, $BF_{01} < 0.01$ and $\chi^2(1) = 4.56$, $p = 0.033$, $BF_{01} = 0.76$ respectively). However, N-3 did not improve the model fit ($\chi^2(1) = 0.28$, $p = 0.594$, $BF_{01} = 7.54$), so no previous durations beyond N-2 were included in the model.

Figure 4A shows the weight of the previous four objective trials on the current reproduction for the different age groups. Because only N-1 and N-2 were shown to be significant predictors in the model, we tested whether the weight of these factors differed between the age groups. We found that this was the case for N-1 ($\chi^2(3) = 8.58$, $p = 0.035$, $BF_{01} = 17.19$), although the Bayes factor suggests that there was more evidence for the absence of this difference. Post-hoc multiple comparisons showed that the effect of objective N-1 was stronger for 5-year-olds than for adults ($\beta = -0.16$, $z = -3.05$, $p = 0.012$). No other contrasts reached significance ($ps > 0.228$). There was no difference between age groups for N-2 ($\chi^2(3) = 6.98$, $p = 0.073$, $BF_{01} = 181.36$). In summary, reproductions were significantly influenced by previously presented intervals. In addition, this N-1 effect was stronger for the younger children compared to adults.

3.4.2. Subjective previous durations

Whereas participants might be influenced by recent *objective durations*, it is also possible that they rely on their subjective experience of this objective duration, i.e., their own temporal production (e.g., Schlichting et al., 2018). To test this idea, we again started with the previously established model mentioned in section 3.4.1, and sequentially added previous *subjective durations* (in trial N-1, N-2, N-3, etc.), that is, previous reproductions, to the model. We found that all previous subjective durations up to N-7 contributed significantly to the current reproduction ($\chi^2s(1) > 18.30$, $ps < 0.001$, $BFs_{01} < 0.01$). We decided that the effect of previous trials beyond N-7 could not be established reliably, because only less than half of the data could be used for these models.

Figure 4B shows the beta weights for the four most recent previous subjective durations for the different age groups. For presentation purposes, we decided to only show the weights up to N-4, nevertheless, a figure showing the weights up to N-7 can be found at https://osf.io/k3znf/. We found that weights of N-3 and N-6 differed significantly between the different age groups ($\chi^2(3) = 11.66$, $p = 0.009$, $BF_{01} = 30.21$ and $\chi^2(3) = 8.94$, $p = 0.030$, $BF_{01} > 100$). However, after adding the random slopes of duration, range, N-1 and N-2, post-hoc multiple comparisons showed that there were no significant differences between the age groups in the effect of N-3 ($ps > 0.276$). However, the effect of N-6 was larger for 6-year-olds than for 5-year-olds ($\beta = 0.08$, $z = 2.60$, $p = 0.045$). There were no other differences ($ps > 0.393$).

Although the participants in all age groups might rely on previous subjective durations, this effect could potentially reflect performance drift over the experiment. For example, in certain phases of the experiment, a participant might be less willing to make longer responses compared to other phases. To disentangle the influence of the previous subjective duration from this local performance drift, we calculated the relative error of the

259 reproduction in each trial (error = [reproduced duration - objective duration]/objective
260 duration) (see Schlichting et al., 2018). In the case of performance drift, we would expect that
261 a previous negative error (that is, a too short reproduction) in the previous trial would also
262 lead to negative error in the current trial. In contrast, if the current reproduction depends on
263 the actual previous subjective experience, we would expect that the relative error would
264 reflect the duration of the previous reproduction (that is, a more positive error if the previous
265 reproduction was long and a more negative error if the previous reproduction was long).

266   Starting with a model with relative error as the dependent variable, the same fixed
267 factors used in section 3.4.1 and subject as a random factor, we alternately added previous
268 reproductions (N-1, N-2, N-3, etc.) and relative error in the previous trials to the model. We
269 found that both the previous reproductions and the previous relative errors up to N-7
270 improved the model ($ps < 0.004$), indicating that some of the sequential effects can be
271 explained by performance drift, but there was still a significant influence of the actual
272 previous subjective duration.

273   Figures 4C and 4D show the influence of the relative error and the subjective duration
274 in the four most recent trials on the current reproduction. To test whether the weights differed
275 between the age groups, we sequentially and alternately added the interaction terms of the
276 previous subjective durations and age group, and of previous relative error and age group, to
277 the model. We found that for the effect of previous subjective duration was different for N-1
278 and N-3 ($\chi^2 s(3) > 8.28$, $ps < 0.041$, $BFs_{01} < 3.64$). In addition, the effect of the previous error
279 in N-1 and N-6 differed between age groups ($\chi^2 s(3) > 8.71$, $ps < 0.044$, $BFs_{01} < 1.49$). Post-
280 hoc multiple comparisons showed that the effect of subjective N-1 was lower for adults than
281 for 5- and 7-year-olds ($ps < 0.035$). For subjective N-3, no contrast reached significance ($ps >$
282 0.208). Post-hoc comparisons of the effect of relative error in N-1 showed that the effect was
283 lower for 5-year-olds compared to 6-year-olds and adults ($ps < 0.034$). The contrasts also
284 suggested a higher weight for adults compared to 6 and 7-year-olds, but these effects were
285 borderline significant ($ps < 0.091$). No contrast reached significance for the relative error in
286 N-6 ($ps > 0.192$).

287   To summarize, we found that previous subjective durations influenced the current
288 reproduction, but found no apparent differences between age groups in this respect. However,
289 when we disentangled the influence of previous subjective duration and performance drift, we
290 found adults had a higher influence of performance drift compared to the children. This
291 pattern is reversed when we looked at the weight of previous subjective duration: the children
292 (at least 5 and 7-year-olds) relied more on the previous subjective duration than the adults.

293
294   Insert Figure 4 about here
295

4. Discussion

297   In our study, children from 5 to 7 years old and adults performed a ready-set-go
298 reproduction task with two different duration distributions. Our results showed an
299 underestimation of reproduced durations as the length of durations increased, especially in
300 young children. This replicated the results found in most studies in children that employ
301 temporal reproduction task (e.g., Droit-Volet et al., 2015; Karaminis et al., 2016; Szelag et al.,
302 2002). This temporal underestimation suggests that factors related to motor impulsivity have
303 likely affected the children's temporal reproductions (Droit-Volet, 2010). This is consistent
304 with the results in rhythmic time interval tasks showing that young children have difficulty in
305 reproducing time intervals far from their Spontaneous Motor Tempo (McAuley et al., 2006;
306 Monier & Droit-Volet, 2016). Children indeed have reduced self-control capacities, and as
307 such, it is difficult for them to inhibit initial response (e.g. the dominant response) (Fox,
308 Henderson, Marshall, Nichols & Ghera, 2005; Klenberg, Korkman & Lahti-Nuuttila, 2001).

309 This consistent underestimation of long duration might limit the validity of Bayesian
310 modelling, because it is difficult to distinguish between effects coming from the motor
311 component and those resulting from the temporal prior.
312   Nevertheless, the underestimation bias obtained in our study could be considered in
313 our regression analyses of the age-related differences in the effect of temporal context on
314 performance. The decreased slope of reproductions for children compared to adults provides
315 evidence for a stronger central tendency effect in children. This is in concert with recent
316 studies showing that central tendency effects progressively decrease with age (Sciutti, Burr,
317 Saracco, Sandini & Gori, 2014; Karaminis et al., 2016). Furthemore, we found that the
318 variance in temporal reproduction (as quantified by the coefficient of variation) was higher in
319 all children compared the adults and in the 5-year-olds compared to the 7-year-olds. A higher
320 central tendency effect was thus observed in participants with a lower sensitivity to time.
321 These findings are in line with the idea that the noisier the internal representation of the
322 interval, the larger the central tendency effect will be (Jazayeri & Shadlen, 2010; Acerbi,
323 Wolpert & Vijayakumar, 2012).
324   In addition, our study suggests that this central tendency effect is due to a greater use
325 of prior presented durations in the experimental session. Indeed, our results showed an effect
326 of global context on temporal reproductions in all age groups: the overlapping duration (0.9 s)
327 was systematically judged longer in the long than in the short context condition. However,
328 despite the noisier reproductions and flatter slopes in the youngest children, we did not find
329 any statistical difference in this global context effect between the age groups. In contrast, our
330 results on the local (trial-by-trial) context effect revealed that the duration presented in the
331 most recent trials had a greater impact on the reproduction of a given duration in the children
332 than in the adults. However, our results revealed that only the most recently presented
333 durations (N-1 and N-2) influenced the participants' time judgments. In sum, the temporal
334 impact of objective duration presented in the previous trial was stronger for 5-year-olds than
335 for adults. If we consider the Bayesian framework, we could thus conclude that, because of a
336 highly noisy percept, the subjective estimation of the younger children is tilted toward
337 previous experiences (the prior) more than it is tilted toward the perceived interval (the
338 likelihood).
339   As a novel way of looking at the influence of subjective experience, we have not only
340 tested the effect of the objective durations presented on current time judgment, but also that of
341 previous subjective durations, i.e., the participants' own temporal reproduction. We
342 distinguished this effect from general drifts in performance by examining the unique
343 contribution of previous individual reproductions and the previous errors on the current
344 reproduction. We found that both of these factors had a continuing impact (at least up to N-7).
345 However, for the most recent previous trial (i.e., N-1), we found that the effect of both the
346 subjective duration and relative error differed between the age groups. Consistently with the
347 objective duration effect, the children (5 and 7 years) relied more on their previous subjective
348 duration than the adults. Contrariwise, the influence of previous relative error was higher for
349 the adults than for the children, indicating that the reproductions of adults were subject to
350 more reliable performance drifts. These novel findings suggest that, compared to adults,
351 children rely more on the temporal context than on the evaluation of their misjudgement. This
352 is in line with the idea that humans possessearly abilities for statistical learning (Karaminis et
353 al., 2016), since children continuously integrate priors into their current production. These
354 abilities have already been observed in infants and newborns (Kirkham et al., 2007, 2002;
355 Bulf et al., 2011). In contrast, learning from produced errors would emerge in great part later
356 during childhood, explaining the higher performance drift in adults with the development of
357 executive functions, that is, when children become able to evaluate their performance and
358 their evolution during learning. Indeed, among the different aspect of executive functions that

359 develop through childhood, one could notably cite that of error evaluation (Kirkham, Cruess
360 & Diamond, 2003), allowing children to apply knowledge to their own behaviour.
361   In summary, our results demonstrated that the central tendency effect in temporal
362 reproduction is stronger in children than in adults, and that children's current temporal
363 reproductions rely more on durations presented in recent trials. This finding can be linked to
364 the children's noisier representation of time. Consistent with Bayesian theory, a noisy timing
365 system led participants to further base their estimation on the previous experiences rather than
366 on the perceived stimulus. However, the influence of relative error (subjective produced
367 duration) was higher for the adults than for the children. This new finding suggests that,
368 unlike adults, children rely to a greater extent on the temporal context than on the evaluation
369 of their misjudgement. Future studies might further investigate whether the influence of
370 context in temporal judgment in children generalizes to different contexts and temporal tasks.

371 **References**

372 Acerbi, L., Wolpert, D. M., & Vijayakumar, S. (2012). Internal representations of temporal
373   statistics and feedback calibrate motor-sensory interval timing. *PLoS computational*
374   *biology*, *8*(11), e1002771.
375 Adams, W. J., & Mamassian, P. (2004). Bayesian combination of ambiguous shape
376   cues. *Journal of vision*, *4*(10), 7-7.
377 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). lme4: Linear mixed-effects models
378   using Eigen and S4. *R package version*, *1*(7).
379 Battaglia, P. W., Jacobs, R. A., and Aslin, R. N. (2003). Bayesian integration of visual and
380   auditory signals for spatial localization. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A. Opt. Image Sci. Vis.* 20,
381   1391–1397.
382 Bulf, H., Johnson, S. P., & Valenza, E. (2011). Visual statistical learning in the newborn
383   infant. *Cognition*, *121*(1), 127-132.
384 Brainard, D. H. (1997). The Psychophysics Toolbox, *Spatial Vision 10*:433-436.
385 Cicchini, G. M., Arrighi, R., Cecchetti, L., Giusti, M., & Burr, D. C. (2012). Optimal
386   encoding of interval timing in expert percussionists. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *32*(3),
387   1056-1060.
388 Crowder, A. M., & Hohle, R. H. (1970). Time estimation by young children with and without
389   informational feedback. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *10*(3), 295-307.
390 Coull, J., & Droit-Volet (In press). Explicit understanding of duration develops implicitly
391   through action. *Trends In Cognitive Sciences.*
392 Damsma, A., van der Mijn, R., & van Rijn, H. (2018). Neural markers of memory
393   consolidation do not predict temporal estimates of encoded items. *Neuropsychologica,*
394   *117*, 36-45. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.04.039
395 Di Luca, M., & Rhodes, D. (2016). Optimal perceived timing: Integrating sensory information
396   with dynamically updated expectations. *Scientific reports*, *6*, 28563.
397 Droit-Volet, S. (2010). Stop using time reproduction tasks in a comparative perspective
398   without further analyses of the role of the motor response: The example of
399   children. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *22*(1), 130-148.
400 Droit-Volet, S. (2013). Time perception in children: A neurodevelopmental
401   approach. *Neuropsychologia*, *51*(2), 220-234.
402 Droit-Volet, S. (2016). Development of time. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *8*,
403   102-109.
404 Droit-Volet, S., Wearden, J. H., & Zélanti, P. S. (2015). Cognitive abilities required in time
405   judgment depending on the temporal tasks used: a comparison of children and adults. *The*
406   *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *68*(11), 2216-2242.

407   Dyjas, O., Bausenhart, K. M., & Ulrich, R. (2012). Trial-by-trial updating of an internal
408   reference in discrimination tasks: Evidence from effects of stimulus order and trial
409   sequence. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, *74*(8), 1819-1841.
410   Ernst, M. O., & Banks, M. S. (2002). Humans integrate visual and haptic information in a
411   statistically optimal fashion. *Nature*, *415*(6870), 429.
412   Fox, N. A., Henderson, H. A., Marshall, P. J., Nichols, K. E., & Ghera, M. M. (2005).
413   Behavioral inhibition: linking biology and behavior within a developmental
414   framework. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, *56*, 235-262.
415   Hallez, Q., & Droit-Volet, S. (2017). High levels of time contraction in young children in dual
416   tasks are related to their limited attention capacities. *Journal of experimental child
417   psychology*, *161*, 148-160.
418   Hollingworth, H. The central tendency of judgment. J. Phil. Psychol. Sci. Meth. 7, 461–469
419   (1910).
420   Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., Westfall, P., Heiberger, R.M. & Schuetzenmeister, A. (2013)
421   Multcomp: Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric Models R Package Version
422   1.2‐18. http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/multcomp/index.html.
423   Indraccolo, A., Spence, C., Vatakis, A., & Harrar, V. (2016). Combined effects of motor
424   response, sensory modality, and stimulus intensity on temporal
425   reproduction. *Experimental brain research*, *234*(5), 1189-1198.
426   Jazayeri, M., & Shadlen, M. N. (2010). Temporal context calibrates interval timing. *Nature
427   neuroscience*, *13*(8), 1020.
428   Karaminis, T., Cicchini, G. M., Neil, L., Cappagli, G., Aagten-Murphy, D., Burr, D., &
429   Pellicano, E. (2016). Central tendency effects in time interval reproduction in
430   autism. *Scientific reports*, *6*.
431   Kirkham, N. Z., Slemmer, J. A., & Johnson, S. P. (2002). Visual statistical learning in
432   infancy: Evidence for a domain general learning mechanism. *Cognition*, *83*(2), B35-B42.
433   Kirkham, N. Z., Slemmer, J. A., Richardson, D. C., & Johnson, S. P. (2007). Location,
434   location, location: Development of spatiotemporal sequence learning in infancy. *Child
435   development*, *78*(5), 1559-1571.
436   Kirkham, N. Z., Cruess, L., & Diamond, A. (2003). Helping children apply their knowledge
437   to their behavior on a dimension‐switching task. *Developmental Science*, *6*(5), 449-467.
438   Kleiner M, Brainard D, Pelli D, 2007, "What's new in Psychtoolbox-3?" Perception 36 ECVP
439   Abstract Supplement.
440   Klenberg, L., Korkman, M., & Lahti-Nuuttila, P. (2001). Differential development of
441   attention and executive functions in 3-to 12-year-old Finnish children. *Developmental
442   neuropsychology*, *20*(1), 407-428.
443   Körding, K. P., Beierholm, U., Ma, W. J., Quartz, S., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Shams, L. (2007).
444   Causal inference in multisensory perception. *PLoS one*, *2*(9), e943.Lapid, E., Ulrich, R.,
445   & Rammsayer, T. (2008). On estimating the difference limen in duration discrimination
446   tasks: A comparison of the 2AFC and the reminder task. *Perception &
447   psychophysics*, *70*(2), 291-305.
448   Lejeune, H., & Wearden, J. H. (2009). Vierordt's The Experimental Study of the Time Sense
449   (1868) and its legacy. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *21*(6), 941-960.
450   Lenth, R. V. (2016). Least-Squares Means: The R Package lsmeans. *Journal of Statistical
451   Software, 69*(1), 1-33.
452   Mamassian, P., Landy, M., & Maloney, L. T. (2002). Bayesian modelling of visual
453   perception. *Probabilistic models of the brain*, 13-36.
454   McAuley, J. D., & Jones, M. R. (2003). Modeling effects of rhythmic context on perceived
455   duration: a comparison of interval and entrainment approaches to short-interval

timing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *29*(6), 1102.

McAuley, J., Jones, M., Holub, S., Johnston, H., & Miller, N. (2006). The time of our lives: Life span development of timing and event tracking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *135*(3), 348–367.

Miyazaki, M., Nozaki, D., & Nakajima, Y. (2005). Testing Bayesian models of human coincidence timing. *Journal of neurophysiology*, *94*(1), 395-399;

Monier, F., & Droit-Volet, S. (2018, first publication 2016). Synchrony and Emotion in Children and Adults. *International Journal of Psychology, 53*, 3, 184-193.

Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N., & Jamil, T. (2014). BayesFactor: Computation of Bayes factors for common designs. *R Package Version*, *0.9*(8).

Petzschner, F. H., Maier, P., & Glasauer, S. (2012). Combining symbolic cues with sensory input and prior experience in an iterative Bayesian framework. *Frontiers in integrative neuroscience*, *6*.doi

Rattat, A. C., & Tartas, V. (2017). Temporal categorization of familiar actions by children and adults. *Timing & Time Perception*, *5*(1), 61-76.

Rhodes, D. (2018). On the Distinction Between Perceived Duration and Event Timing: Towards a Unified Model of Time Perception. *Timing & Time Perception*, *6*(1), 90-123.

Schlichting, N., Damsma, A., Aksoy, E. E., Wächter, M., Asfour, T., & van Rijn, H. (2018). Temporal Context Influences the Perceived Duration of Everyday Actions: Assessing the Ecological Validity of Lab-Based Timing Phenomena. *Journal of Cognition*, *1*(1).

Sciutti, A., Burr, D., Saracco, A., Sandini, G. & Gori, M. Development of context dependency in human space perception. Exp. Brain Res. 232, 3965–3976 (2014).

Shi, Z., & Burr, D. (2016). Predictive coding of multisensory timing. *Current opinion in behavioral sciences*, *8*, 200-206.

Stocker, A. A., & Simoncelli, E. P. (2006). Noise characteristics and prior expectations in human visual speed perception. *Nature neuroscience*, *9*(4), 578.

Szelag, E., Kowalska, J., Rymarczyk, K., & Pöppel, E. (2002). Duration processing in children as determined by time reproduction: implications for a few seconds temporal window. *Acta Psychologica*, *110*(1), 1-19.

Taatgen, N., & van Rijn, H. (2011). Traces of times past: representations of temporal intervals in memory. *Memory & cognition*, *39*(8), 1546-1560.

van Rijn, H. (2016). Accounting for memory mechanisms in interval timing: A review. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 8: 245–249.

Verstynen, T., & Sabes, P. N. (2011). How each movement changes the next: an experimental and theoretical study of fast adaptive priors in reaching. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *31*(27), 10050-10059.

Vierordt, K. Der Zeitsinn nach Versuchen (Laupp, Tubingen, Germany, 1868). Walsh, V. (2003) A theory of magnitude: common cortical metrics of time, space and quantity. Trends Cogn. Sci. 7, 483–488 13

Wearden, J. (2016). *The psychology of time perception*. Springer.

504   Victor Hugo as well as the Elementary Schools Denis Diderot and Nestor Perret, all located in
505   Clermont-Ferrand. Thanks also to Warrick Roseboom for his help on this project.

506   **Figure captions**:

507   **Figure. 1.** Ready-set-go procedure: (a) temporal context, (b) procedure.
508   **Figure. 2.** Average reproductions of the durations (A) and CV value for the different age
509   groups. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.
510   **Figure. 3.** Average difference of the 0.9 s reproduction between the short and the long context
511   for the different age groups. Error bars represent the standard error.
512   **Figure. 4.** The weight of previous durations as quantified by the beta estimates of our linear
513   mixed models. Figure A shows the effect of previous *objective* duration on the current
514   reproduction, whereas figure B shows the effect of previous *subjective* duration on the current
515   reproduction. To disentangle performance drift from the effect of previous subjective
516   duration, Figure C and D shows the weights of the previous relative error and previous
517   reproduction on the current relative error, respectively.
518