

# Sussex Research

## Audio-visual crossmodal correspondences in domestic dogs (Canis familiaris)

Anna Teresa Korzeniowska, Holly Root-Gutteridge, Julia Simner, David Reby

#### Publication date

09-06-2023

#### Licence

This work is made available under the CC BY 4.0 licence and should only be used in accordance with that licence. For more information on the specific terms, consult the repository record for this item.

#### **Document Version**

Accepted version

#### Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Korzeniowska, A. T., Root-Gutteridge, H., Simner, J., & Reby, D. (2019). *Audio-visual crossmodal correspondences in domestic dogs (Canis familiaris)* (Version 1). University of Sussex. https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23472851.v1

### Published in

**Biology Letters** 

#### Link to external publisher version

https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2019.0564

#### Copyright and reuse:

This work was downloaded from Sussex Research Open (SRO). This document is made available in line with publisher policy and may differ from the published version. Please cite the published version where possible. Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. For more information on this work, SRO or to report an issue, you can contact the repository administrators at sro@sussex.ac.uk. Discover more of the University's research at https://sussex.figshare.com/

### ESM

#### Models: design and results

**Table 1** Model 1: Effect of congruency of the audio-visual stimulus and the order of presentation on the proportion of time spent tracing the stimulus as a % of duration of looking

Source	df1, df2	F	ρ
Intercept	1, 42.222	218.997	<0.0001
Congruent (Y/N)	1, 33.128	4.761	0.036
Order of presentation	1,33.128	0.507	0.481
Congruent * Order of	1, 42.222	0.602	0.442

#### presentation

*Note.* Linear Mixed Model (LMM) testing the effect of congruency of the visual stimulus and the order of presentation on the percentage of time the dog spent tracing, out of the total time he/she spent looking as fixed effects with dog ID as a random effect. The residuals from the model were normally distributed and the variance ratio did not exceed 2.

# **Table 2** Model 2: Effect of congruency of the audio-visual stimulus and the order of presentation time spent tracing the audio-visual stimulus

Source	df1, df2	F	p
Intercept	1,42.21	139.23	<0.0001
Congruent (Y/N)	1, 33.87	3.05	0.09
Order of presentation	1,33.87	0.13	0.72
Congruent * Order of	1,42.21	0.05	0.83
presentation			

Title: Audio-visual crossmodal correspondences in domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) Authors: Korzeniowska, A.T.\*, Simner, J., Root-Gutteridge, H., Reby, D.

*Note.* Linear Mixed Model (LMM) testing the effect of congruency of the visual stimulus and the order of presentation on the time spent tracing the stimulus as fixed effects with dog ID as a random effect. The residuals from the model were normally distributed and the variance ratio did not exceed 2.

#### Table 3 Model 3: Effect of congruency of the audio-visual stimulus and the order of

#### presentation on the duration of looking at the stimulus

Source	df1, df2	F	p
Intercept	1, 36.180	740.837	<0.0001
Congruent (Y/N)	1, 34.092	0.718	0.403
Order of presentation	1, 34.092	0.140	0.711
Congruent * Order of	1, 36.180	0.536	0.469

#### presentation

*Note.* Linear Mixed Model (LMM) testing the effect of congruency of the visual stimulus and the order of presentation on duration of looking at the stimulus as fixed effects with dog ID as a random effect. The residuals from the model were not normally distributed but the comparisons of the CIs from the model and a bootstrap did not show any discrepancies so the original model was retained. The variance ratio did not exceed 2.

#### **Exclusion criteria**

20 trials were excluded due to the dogs' failure to attend to the screen, 22 due to the dogs' overexcitement or anxiety, 71 due to dogs not looking at the screen at the start of the trial, 2 due to background noise, 7 due to the owner interacting with the dog during testing, 2 due to dogs losing interest too quickly to be able to code a behavioural response, 15 due to technical problems, 5 due to potential relevant medical problems such as ear or eye infections reported post testing. Overall 64 trials from 45 dogs aged 7-120 months (M=49.2, SD= 28.1) were included in the analysis.

#### Materials

The presentations were projected onto a wall with an overhead projector (Eiki Brilliant Projector LC-XB28) and a MacBook Pro laptop. The sound was played using two Behringer Europort MPA40BT speakers placed adjacent and on both sides of the wall onto which the animations were projected. An audio-visual animation of moving insects was projected in between each trial as a means of attracting the dogs' attention to the screen.

Dogs' behaviour was recorded using a SONY (Handycam XAVC 5 AVCHD Progressive) camera placed on a tripod in front and to the left of the dog. There was another camera (SONY Handycam AVCHD Progressive) placed in front and to the right of the dog which was sending a live feed to a screen monitor placed behind the dog and owner.

#### **Experimental set up**



The experimental set up: the dog was positioned in front of the owner and facing the projection, the experimenter was positioned behind the dog and owner.