The kleineWeltentdecker App - A Smartphone-Based Developmental Diary

Moritz M. Daum^{1*}, Marco Bleiker¹, Stephanie Wermelinger¹, Ira Kurthen¹, Laura Maffongelli², Katharina Antognini³, Miriam Beisert¹, and Anja Gampe^{1,4}

¹University of Zurich, Switzerland

²Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany

³University of Applied Sciences in Special Needs Education, Zurich, Switzerland

⁴University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

This version of the article has been accepted for publication at Behavior Research Methods, after peer review but is not the Version of Record and does not reflect post-acceptance improvements, or any corrections. The

Version of Record will available online at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01755-7>.

Date: 01/February/2022

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Moritz M. Daum <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4032-4574>, University of Zurich, Department of Psychology and Jacobs Center for Productive Youth Development, Developmental Psychology: Infancy and Childhood, Binzmuehlestrasse 14, Box 21, CH-8050 Zurich, Switzerland. Phone: +41 44 635 74 80, E-mail: moritz.daum@uzh.ch

Abstract

Today, a vast number of tools exist to measure development in early childhood in a variety of domains such as cognition, language, or motor, cognition. These tools vary in different aspects. Either, children are examined by a trained experimenter, or caregivers fill out questionnaires. The tools are applied in the controlled setting of a laboratory or in the children's natural environment. While these tools provide a detailed picture of the current state of children's development, they are at the same time subject to several constraints. Furthermore, the measurement of an individual child's change of different skills over time requires not only one measurement but high-density longitudinal assessments. These assessments are time-consuming, and the breadth of developmental domains assessed remains limited. In this paper, we present a novel tool to assess the development of skills in different domains, a smartphone-based developmental diary app (the *kleineWeltentdecker App*, henceforth referred to as the *APP*¹). By using the APP, caregivers can track changes in their children's skills during development. Here, we report the construction and validation of the questionnaires embedded in the APP as well as the technical details. Empirical validations with children of different age groups confirmed the robustness of the different measures implemented in the APP. In addition, we report preliminary findings, for example, on children's communicative development by using existing APP data. This substantiates the validity of the assessment. With the APP, we put a portable tool for the longitudinal documentation of individual children's development in every caregiver's pocket, worldwide.

Keywords: ambulatory assessment, experience sampling, longitudinal research design, smartphone application

¹ The German expression "kleine Weltentdecker" can be translated as "young world explorers".

The kleineWeltentdecker App - A Smartphone-Based Developmental Diary

1 Challenges in the Longitudinal Assessment of Development

2 The measurement of developmental change is challenging. Our current
3 knowledge about children's development results to a large extent from cross-sectional
4 studies. Mostly, different individuals of different ages are tested within a narrow time
5 window. This approach is vital for the assessment of age differences, but it only
6 provides a static picture of current developmental states. As a result, a large amount of
7 research in developmental psychology is dedicated to the description of children's
8 behaviour at different ages. It has therefore become somewhat conventional to describe
9 the earliest manifestations of particular abilities (Adolph et al., 2008). However, already
10 Vygotsky raised the concern that a cross-sectional approach primarily focuses on
11 age-dependent and stable endpoints in development (Vygotsky, 1978). Similarly,
12 Adolph and colleagues stated that this kind of research has resulted in "a gallery of
13 before and after snapshots, studio portraits of newborns, and fossilised milestones"
14 (Adolph et al., 2008, p. 527). With these static developmental pictures, little can be
15 learned about developmental processes.

16 To a certain degree, this shortcoming is compensated for by longitudinal research
17 paradigms. Here, the same individuals are tested multiple times at predefined
18 measurement points, for example, every month or every year. This approach provides
19 information about individual developmental trajectories by relating early and later
20 developing skills. However, this assumed "gold standard" approach has likewise
21 disadvantages. First, it remains unknown what happens between the different
22 measurement points. According to Adolph and colleagues, "sampling rates typically
23 used by developmental researchers may be inadequate to accurately depict patterns of
24 variability and the shape of developmental change" (Adolph et al., 2008, p. 527). That
25 is, when the sampling rate chosen is too low, it does not allow to identify whether a
26 developmental trajectory reflects a smooth and monotonic improvement, a non-linear
27 trend, or an accelerating or decelerating transformation. Second, even on a small scale,
28 longitudinal studies are often highly resource intensive. They require an extensive

amount of human and financial resources, and often a substantial amount of time. Third, the measurement points are usually determined based on the mean age at which certain developmental milestones are expected to be reached. This limits the validity of standard longitudinal research paradigms because the assumed mean age and the accordingly determined measurement point do not necessarily reflect a single individual's development (Hamaker, 2012). In addition, the actual moment in which a developmental change occurs is not captured with predefined measurement points.

To overcome this limitation, we present a new smartphone-based developmental diary approach that adapts the Age-of-Attainment (AoA) method (e.g., W. O. Eaton et al., 2014). The AoA method has its roots in event-centred approaches (e.g., Campbell & Weech, 1941; Wohlwill, 1973). It does not measure developmental processes by the presence or absence of a developmental milestone, for example, whether or not a 12-month-old already walks independently. Rather, it helps to identify the point in time of the emergence of the skill. This allows researchers to capture the individual age differences at which children reach a specific developmental milestone. As a result, the AoA method helps to shift age from being a predictor of other variables to being the outcome explained by those other variables (Wohlwill, 1973). The age at which children first reach a specific developmental milestone (e.g., independent walking) shows substantial inter-individual variability. Capturing this variability may reveal information about underlying developmental processes, for instance by informing about how skills acquired early relate to later ones (Bornstein et al., 2013; Dinehart & Manfra, 2013). Determining the AoA requires behavioural observation that is of higher frequency than the usual applied yearly or monthly observations (optimally, a 24/7 tracking of a child's development). For feasibility reasons, this requires outsourcing data collection from the controlled environment of a laboratory to the home environment of the children and their caregivers. Current technological developments, such as the widespread availability of smartphones, have the potential to overcome the limitations developmental research was facing so far and to facilitate the collection of comprehensive AoA data.

58 Skills do Not Develop Independently of Each Other

59 In the past, various researchers have described how to implement designs with
60 multiple outcome measures (Aslin, 2007; LoBue & Adolph, 2019; LoBue et al., 2020;
61 Morris et al., 2006). With the present APP, we aim to expand this view by focusing on
62 the second methodological and theoretical challenge of developmental research: Skills
63 do not develop in isolation. Neither, they develop independently from each other nor
64 independently of the environmental context, which also changes at the micro, meso, and
65 macro levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1992). On the contrary, when a particular skill in one
66 domain occurs or changes, skills in other domains often do not remain unaffected (e.g.,
67 Smith & Thelen, 2003).

68 Let's exemplify this with the development of basic motor skills: Motor
69 development results from the co-occurrence and interactions of basic maturation
70 processes such as the increased myelinisation of the cortical-spinal tract McGraw, 1943;
71 Zelazo, 1998, other physiological systems (muscle strength and the ability to balance
72 Adolph et al., 2003; Spencer et al., 2000), cognitive and perceptual skills,
73 social-emotional change (e.g., the motivation to move independently), experience
74 (adequate opportunities to practice the emerging skill), which are often influenced by
75 cultural and historical differences in child-rearing practices Adolph and Hoch, 2019.
76 Vice versa, the development of motor skills is strongly influenced and refined by
77 perceptual, cognitive, motivational skills as well as by cultural and historical differences
78 in child-rearing practices (Adolph & Hoch, 2019). And vice versa, the acquisition of
79 new motor skills lays the cornerstone for the emergence and refinement of skills in other
80 domains (Soska et al., 2015, for overviews, see Campos et al., 2000; Gredebäck et al.,
81 2021). For example, changes in locomotion result in changes in perception: Crawling
82 infants' look down at the floor to a great extent. In contrast, walking infants direct
83 their gaze at their caregivers and objects in the environment (Kretch et al., 2014).
84 Furthermore, locomotion influences infants' cognitive skills (Campos et al., 2000), such
85 as their mental rotation of objects: Crawling infants show better mental rotation than
86 non-crawling infants (Schwarzer et al., 2013). Mental rotation is further positively

influenced by the infants' general motor experience (Frick & Wang, 2013; Möhring & Frick, 2013). Also, fine-motor skills (Dinehart & Manfra, 2013) and early action experiences (Bornstein et al., 2013) are significantly related to later academic achievement. Concerning the cultural and historical context, it has been shown that the position in which children sleep (supine or prone) has an impact on the age of acquisition several of motor milestones. Compared to supine sleepers, prone sleepers start earlier rolling prone to supine, tripod sitting, creeping, crawling, and pulling to stand (Davis et al., 1998). The American Academy of Pediatrics recommended in 1992 that infants should be placed on their side or back for sleep (Pediatrics, 1992) to reduce the incidence of sudden infant death syndrome. With this intervention, the percentage of infants sleeping prone has decreased and, accordingly, the age when different motor skills are acquired has increased. This shows how the context in which children grow up provides different opportunities resulting in different developmental trajectories.

While knowledge about specific interrelations such as the ones just reported is increasing, the assessment of the development of the interrelations between skills in different domains and, in particular, their dynamic interaction over time remains limited. The developmental diary approach presented here implements the following features: It includes the development of skills in different domains (cognition, language, motor, and social and emotional skills). The temporal assessment is shorter compared to a large number of longitudinal studies. It relates the development of these different domains to each other. Finally, it considers contextual factors such as the language(s) spoken by the child and the caregivers, and the caregivers' cultural, educational, and economic background.

Goals of the kleineWeltentdecker App (APP)

To address these challenges, we developed the kleineWeltentdecker App (henceforth referred to as the APP), a smartphone-based digital developmental diary application. With the APP, we provide a tool to the caregivers to document the development of their children from age 0 to 6. At the same time, caregivers share the

115 data of their children’s development anonymously with our research unit (see also
116 section Data Security and Data Protection). With this participatory science approach
117 (“caregiver-as-a-researcher”), the APP allows acquiring and analysing longitudinal data
118 at a relatively high temporal resolution optimally at the exact moment when a
119 developmental change occurs. The following three goals drove the development of this
120 research tool and its related research.

121 *Goal 1: Establish a Comprehensive Data Set of Child Development From*
122 *Age 0 to 6, Within and Across Individuals*

123 Given the ubiquity of smartphones worldwide, the range of use of the APP is not
124 limited to specific regions or countries. This aspect facilitates the analysis of the
125 variability of behaviour and its development regarding contextual aspects such as
126 culture, SES, language background, and many other demographic and family factors.
127 The acquired data are therefore subject to analyses for the following major purposes:
128 1) It allows an in-depth analysis of the individual developmental trajectories of major
129 developmental domains. 2) It allows analysis of the dynamically changing interrelations
130 and inter-dependencies of the development in the individual domains. With this
131 approach, developmental trajectories can be compared within and between individuals,
132 or within and between cultures, which helps to identify developmental specificities and
133 universals.

134 *Goal 2: Account for the Variability on Development Across Cultures*

135 One issue of increasing importance in developmental science is the variability in
136 children’s development. Previous research on psychology in general and in
137 developmental psychology in particular is based on data from WEIRD (Western,
138 Educated, Industrialised, Rich, and Democratic) populations (e.g., Nielsen et al., 2017).
139 There is a growing number of researchers who argue that this approach undermines the
140 variability of behaviour and development across the globe. Henrich et al. (2010b) state
141 that their “findings suggest that members of WEIRD societies, including young
142 children, are among the least representative populations one could find for generalising

143 about humans” (p.61). A bias towards WEIRD samples may result in that findings,
144 which are specific to a particular culture, are falsely being interpreted as universal traits
145 (Henrich et al., 2010a; Nielsen et al., 2017). Accordingly, the second goal of the APP is
146 to provide a tool that is not (or at least much less) restricted to the collection of data
147 within a narrow range of participants but is - optimally - available world wide. In a first
148 step, we implemented the APP in four different languages: British English, French,
149 German, and Italian.

150 We are aware that, currently, the APP asks caregivers about their children’s
151 skills in a fixed and to some extent “WEIRD”-based order and children from different
152 cultures may develop in a different order. However, the current approach will help to
153 identify commonalities and differences between cultures and will be helpful to identify
154 developmental sequences that differ from norms based on WEIRD societies.

155 ***Goal 3: Outsourcing of Data Collection***

156 Collecting longitudinal data from different domains and from children aged 0 to
157 6 requires an enormous effort and is resource-intensive. With the APP, data collection
158 is outsourced to the caregivers of the child. This approach does not come without
159 challenges that will be addressed in greater detail in the section Goals and Challenges
160 in the Discussion below. Caregivers experience their children’s behaviour in more
161 instances and more varied situations than a laboratory setting can establish. These
162 different contexts might support the observation of the emergence a new skill. Several
163 features were implemented to facilitate caregiver evaluation: Caregivers receive
164 packages of questions that fit the child’s current age range in which the developmental
165 steps usually occur. The questions are enriched with information about possible
166 variations of the observable behaviour to facilitate answering the questions. Besides this
167 standard procedure, it is of course possible to answer questions that are not in these
168 packages. Like this, the predefined selection of questions, which is based on the mean
169 age of development, does not restrict answering questions that are outside of this age
170 window. Further, the questions are complemented with additional information about
171 the particular behaviour and how it is integrated into children’s development from a

broader perspective. This helps caregivers to evaluate whether or not their child already shows a certain skill or not.

To sum up, with the APP, caregivers are provided with a scientifically substantiated tool to document the development of their children between birth and the age of 6 years. It is designed to be intuitive and easy to use to facilitate continued and sustained documentation of development. The developmental steps and milestones are scientifically corroborated and have been tested for reliability by comparing them to standard instruments (see section Psychometric Properties of Scale, below).

In the following sections, we describe the different APP scales in more detail. We will explain the major participant target group of the APP, the construction of the different scales, ethics and data security, technical specifications and provide details on the psychometric properties of the APP.

Scale Protocol

Participants: Target Group

The target group of the APP are caregivers of children between 0 and 6 years. We conducted a survey among 799 Swiss caregivers who already participated with their children in one or more studies of our research unit. The results showed that > 85% of the caregivers would like to use a digital developmental diary app and > 95% of these would agree to share the data with the research unit. In general, caregivers seem to be open-minded to modern media and a substantial number of caregivers is willing to use the APP and share the collected data increasing the potential for acquiring data from a sample large enough to make reliable conclusions.

Content: Domains and Items

The questions implemented in the APP target the main domains in early childhood development: cognitive, language, motor, and social-emotional skills. To obtain a comprehensive picture about the context of each individual child's development, questions about caregiver education, country of birth, family constellation,

199 language exposure at home and in childcare, etc. are included. An overview of all
200 questions is available in the Open Science Framework (OSF; <https://osf.io/ar7xp/>).

201 Construction of Items

202 To be included in the APP, items had to fulfill two main characteristics: On the
203 one hand, developmental skills assessed within the APP need to be scientifically
204 relevant. That is, the skills have been documented in scientific papers on infant and
205 child development or are included in diagnostic tools to assess the development of the
206 skills of a child at a given age. On the other hand, the APP has to account for the fact
207 that the questions are not answered by trained experts but by caregivers who might not
208 be familiar with the jargon of developmental psychology. Accordingly, the assessment of
209 skills needs to be tailored in a way that it can easily yet still reliably be performed by
210 the caregivers, independent of their language skills and educational background. That
211 is, for all scales, the items were formulated so that they a) are easy to understand and
212 imply face validity, b) refer to the child's observable behaviour and do not require
213 implicit measurements, c) can be clearly, objectively, and reliably answered by the
214 caregivers' observation alone (avoiding sophisticated measurement techniques), d) refer
215 to materials which can be found in a usual household, and e) still ensure scientific
216 precision.

217 The construction procedure included the following three steps: 1) We started
218 with a comprehensive literature search collecting skills that typically develop in the first
219 6 years of life in the domains of cognitive, language, motor, and social-emotional
220 development. 2) All skills identified were evaluated with regard to whether it was
221 possible to formulate a question and corresponding answer options that are scientifically
222 relevant, precise, and unambiguous and at the same time feasible and understandable
223 for laypeople. This initial collection of potential items comprised 34 items on cognitive
224 development, 194 items on motor development, and 245 items on language development.
225 3) From these preliminary items, we created a first set of 'pre'-questionnaires and asked
226 caregivers of children between 3 and 78 months ($n = 1397$; $n_{girls} = 657$, $n_{boys} = 739$,

Table 1*Number of Items per Domain that were Included in the Final Version of the APP.*

Domain	Number of Items
Cognition	34
Language Skills (Syntax, Grammar)	157
Motor	176
Social / Emotional	151
Demographics	24
Total	630

227 $n_{other} = 1$, $M_{age} = 464$ days, $SE = 526$ days) to fill them out. Caregivers additionally
 228 provided feedback on whether a particular item was easy or difficult to assess or
 229 ambiguous in its formulation. Based on this feedback, 17 items were excluded from the
 230 final APP scale. Including the items of the social-emotional scale that were adapted
 231 from existing scales (e.g., the Infant Behavior Questionnaire - Revised (IBQ-R),
 232 Gartstein & Rothbart, 2003, see section “Social-Emotional Scale”, below), this process
 233 resulted in a total number of 630 items, see Table 1. The particular construction of the
 234 items in the four domains (*Scales*) is described in more detail in the following sections.

235 *Cognitive Scale*

236 The items of the cognitive scale are grouped according to the following
 237 constructs: sensori-motor development, problem solving, and numerical and categorical
 238 knowledge. The 19 sensori-motor items include questions on children’s object
 239 exploration and manipulation, reaching, attention, pointing, imitation, and pretend
 240 play. The 9 problem-solving items assess children’s object permanence, means-end
 241 behaviour, memory, and mastery of new problems. The 6 items on numerical and
 242 categorical knowledge include questions on children’s counting abilities, colour naming
 243 skills, and knowledge about object sizes and physical laws. For item construction, the
 244 cognitive scales of existing instruments such as Bayley Scales of Infant Development
 245 (Bayley, 1993), the Intelligence and Development Scales - Preschool (IDS-P; Grob

et al., 2013), and the Griffiths Scales of Childhood Development (Green et al., 2016) were screened and served as a basis for item selection. One item was created by the authors. It describes a behaviour that is commonly observed by caregivers and considered as a milestone in development but was not found in any developmental scale (CG34: “Can your child tie his/her own shoelaces?”). Each item sketches a concrete behaviour or instructs to provoke a certain behaviour. For details on answer options and examples of items see Appendix.

Language Scale

The following skills were implemented in the language scale: early pre-verbal, morphological, and syntactical skills as well as pragmatic skills. The 16 early pre-verbal skills include cooing, babbling, and the production of gestures such as pointing. The morphology scale consists of 23 items. It includes the flexion of adjectives, nouns for plural, and verbs for past and present tense. It further includes fusion of articles and pronouns or prepositions. The syntax scale comprises 65 items on the combination of clauses using conjunctions and relative clauses, Wh-questions, indirect speech and conditionals. To assess pragmatics skills, we implemented the Orion’s Pragmatic Language Skills Questionnaire (e.g., Ghahari et al., 2017), which assesses nonverbal communication, language production, conversational skills like topic maintenance and turn taking, speech conventions, and peer skills in 53 items. For all morphological and syntactical skills, we created prototypical sentences in which the target morphological flexion or syntactic construction word were highlighted. The sentences include every-day topics like caregivers working, children visiting playgrounds, reading books etc. The words used in the prototypical sentences to express these topics are all early acquired (in the first 2-3 years) by children as cross-validated with the MacArthur Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories (Fenson et al., 2007). For details on answer options and examples of items see Appendix.

272 *Motor Scale*

273 The motor scale includes fine- and gross-motor skills. The 78 fine-motor items
274 include visual-motor integration, grasping, and graphomotorics. The 98 gross-motor
275 items include stationary motor skills, locomotion, and object manipulation. Item
276 construction was geared towards existing scales such as the Peabody Developmental
277 Motor Scales: Second Edition (PDMS-2; Folio & Fewell, 2000) or the Bailey Scales of
278 Infant Development: Second Edition (BSID-II; Bayley, 1993). Scales were screened and
279 served as a basis for the decision which items to include in the diary. For all identified
280 motor skills, we created items that describe important motor milestones. For details on
281 answer options and examples of items see Appendix.

282 *Social-Emotional Scale*

283 The social-emotional scale includes measures of infants' and children's
284 temperament and attention as well as their Theory of Mind (ToM). Child temperament
285 is considered stable over time and a personality trait (Goldsmith & Campos, 1982;
286 Rothbart, 1981; Thomas & Chess, 1977; Zwickel, 2009). Therefore, it is assumed that
287 temperamental characteristics remain relatively stable within and across the first years
288 of life (Bornstein et al., 2019; Carnicero et al., 2000; Pedlow et al., 1993; Peters-Martin
289 & Wachs, 1984; Rothbart et al., 2000; Rubin et al., 2002). Therefore, unlike the items of
290 the other scales, the items in the social-emotional scale are only asked at one point in
291 time per scale and do not follow the AoA approach. Because ToM is often considered as
292 not being stable, in the next version of the APP, repeated presentations of particular
293 questionnaires will be implemented.

294 To assess the children's social-emotional development, we included four scales
295 measuring attention, early temperament, and social-cognitive development between the
296 ages of 3 months and 6 years: 1) The Infant Behavior Questionnaire for infants aged 3
297 to 12 months (IBQ-R, Gartstein & Rothbart, 2003). 2) The Early Childhood Behavior
298 Questionnaire (ECBQ, Putnam et al., 2006) for children between 18 and 36 months
299 (Putnam et al., 2006). 3) The Children's Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ) for children 3

years and older (Rothbart et al., 2001) that is suitable for the age range between 3 and 7 years. 4) The Children’s Social Understanding Scale (CSUS, Tahiroglu et al., 2014) to assess children’s ToM. For details on the measures and answer options see Appendix. For detailed information about the validity, and the reliability, we refer to the original publications mentioned.

Specifications of the APP

In the following, we first provide information about data security, storage, and ethical approval, followed by technical details about the programming structure and set of the APP.

Ethics and Data Security

Ethics Approval and Informed Consent

The study protocol and the procedures were approved by the local ethics committee (Reference Number 20.6.5) and are in accordance with the ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments. Caregivers are, for example, free to stop using the APP at any time without giving reasons for justification. All caregivers who intend to use the APP provide informed consent. No incentive other than the free use of the APP is provided to the children and their caregivers by the research unit Developmental Psychology at the Department of Psychology and the Jacobs Center for Productive Youth Development of the University of Zurich (henceforth referred to as *HOST*). When registering for the APP, a user explicitly agrees to the data processing as set out in the Terms of Use for the APP and the Privacy Policy by the University of Zurich (UZH). The HOST will continuously refine the APP. At some instances, this will lead to changes in the data processing by the HOST. Users will be notified of such changes in an appropriate manner (e.g., at the next login).

Data Security and Data Protection

After installation, declarations of consent under data protection law are obtained and a declaration is made as to which data are shared with the research unit

327 “Developmental Psychology” at the UZH and which is stored locally on the device but
328 not forwarded to the server. All non-local data are sent via authentication tokens to a
329 virtual server hosted and maintained by the IT Services of the UZH. Only UZH staff
330 responsible for the maintenance of the server, the programmers for update functions,
331 and authorised staff of the Department of Psychology and the Jacobs Center for
332 Productive Youth Development at the UZH have access to the data. The data security
333 strategy has been approved by the Data Security Office of the UZH and the Data
334 Security Office of the Canton of Zurich / Switzerland
335 (<https://www.zh.ch/de/politik-staat/datenschutz.html>). The data protection
336 declaration can be viewed under <https://t.uzh.ch/1dA>. Cooperating research units can
337 be granted access to parts of the data if they sign a data delivery contract with the
338 HOST and when they have received a declaration of consent from the participating
339 caregivers. All information about data protection is available on <https://osf.io/jxspz/>.

340 *Data Shared with the Researchers*

341 Data transmitted to the HOST is restricted to the information related to the
342 questions asked (see <https://osf.io/ar7xp/>). Other data are collected solely within the
343 APP and not synchronised with the HOST. This includes the e-mail address of the user,
344 the name of the child, any photo or video material collected, any individual comments
345 on specific developmental steps, own entries for personal events. These data are stored
346 locally and encrypted on the caregivers’ own mobile device. The HOST has no access to
347 these data.

348 **Technical Specifications**

349 *Operating Systems*

350 Front end and back end of the APP have been programmed and are maintained
351 by the companies Hybrid Heroes GmbH (Berlin, Germany,
352 <http://www.hybridheroes.de>) and Smartcode (Zürich, Switzerland,

Figure 1

Depiction of the APP navigation: (a) Home screen of user navigation, (b) item and answer options, (c) options to indicate the time since when a child shows a particular skill.

353 <http://www.smartcode.ch>) as a hybrid app that works for the operation systems iOS
 354 and Android.

355 *Graphical User Interface (GUI)*

356 The home screen of the APP includes the following sections (see Figure 1):
 357 1) *Settings*: Here, basic settings can be adjusted such as the frequency and time of push
 358 notifications to inform caregivers that new questions are available for the APP,
 359 username and password, and whether or not the development of one's own child shall be
 360 compared with the available norm values. 2) *Questions*: Caregivers are provided with
 361 the specific questions/ items about developing skills in the four domains. All items and
 362 milestones are illustrated with pictures. The visual appearance of the items is based on
 363 a stack of cards. Each card contains a question about a particular skill on the front
 364 side. Swiping the card to the left reveals the next card and item. A swiping movement
 365 to the right brings back the previous item. Each card can be flipped over to reveal

section 3) *Knowledge* on the back side that includes information about the skill at question and its typical development. 4) *Diary*: For the cognition and the motor scales, caregivers see the acquired skills of their children with the corresponding date of attainment². Caregivers who indicated in the Settings that they wished to compare their child's data with the available norm data can access this norm distribution derived from the whole population of children included in the APP. In the Diary section, caregivers can also add individual personal events that are not included in the set of questions (e.g., the appearance of the first tooth, the first day at the nursery, birthdays, etc). In this section, caregivers can furthermore upload pictures to enrich their diary. These individual personal events and pictures will not be shared with the HOST (see Ethics and Data Security). 5) *Further options*: Further pages contain core data of the children (date of birth, sex).

378 *Scientific Illustrations*

A scientific illustrator (Nadja Stadelmann, <http://www.nadjastadelmann.ch>) created illustrations for all items to visualise the corresponding skills. These illustrations visualise the domain (demographic information, socio-emotional skills) or a concrete developmental skill. She developed illustrations for four children of both sexes in different ages: at 4, 12, 24, and 48 months. Exemplary illustrations are shown in Figure 2. The children are depicted using a planar style, the caregivers are depicted using a linear style. This resulted in a strong focus on the child's behaviour. To illustrate the movements, single movement steps are colour highlighted using hue saturation lightness (see Figure 3 (b)). In some illustrations, the order of steps was accompanied with coloured arrows or numbers (see Figure 3 (c)). In the APP, the user can assign one of eight colours to a child. The illustrations are using this basic colour in combination with the hue saturation colour gradation.

² The respective answer options only allowed a systematic depiction of the AoAs for these two scales

Figure 2

Depiction of the four age groups: (a) An infant at 4 months, (b) an infant at 12 months, (c) a toddler at 24 months, and (d) a preschooler at 48 months

391 Answer Options

392 First, caregivers answer on a dichotomous scale whether their child has attained
 393 the skill (Yes) or not (No). If caregivers indicate “Yes”, they are further asked to
 394 indicate since when the child mastered the skill. The following options are available:
 395 “since today”, “for a few days”, “for 1-2 weeks”, “for 3-4 weeks”, “for more than 4
 396 weeks”, “since...(choose exact date)”, see Figure 1. For some of the scales (e.g., the

Figure 3

Exemplary Illustrations: (a) Child in planar style, adult in linear style, (b) movement of a child while moving from sitting to free standing, (c) additional information depicted by the duration in s.

language scale, the social-emotional scale), the answer format deviated from this general procedure, see Appendix for more information. For each item, the questions and the answering options are presented in combination with information about the qualitative criteria of the item and the represented skill. The wording depends on the respective items. For the small “experiments” the items ask whether “my child does x”?. For other skills, the items ask whether the child is in principle able to do x (e.g., “can stand on one leg”) because the child does not always stand on one leg but might have shown this behaviour already.

Procedure

Caregiver Information to Milestones

For all items in the final APP scale, we created informative content about the skills. We summarised precursors and the development around the milestone and provided examples and contextual information. Furthermore, advice and inputs are given on how to foster developmental progress and which training would best fit this developmental phase.

Languages

The APP is currently available in four different languages (German, French, Italian, British English). This includes three of the four languages spoken in Switzerland (except Rhaeto-Romance). Caregivers can choose in which language to use the APP. The range of languages can be expanded at any time, researchers around the globe are welcome to contact the authors.

Prompts and Repetition of Items

After installation, caregivers are prompted via push notifications periodically in time intervals between “once a week” and “once a month” to answer a short set of items about their children’s development. The time interval can be selected in the Settings section (see Graphical User Interface (GUI)). It is possible to answer items at any time. If the caregivers respond with “No” to a certain item, this question will be repeated

after a period of two weeks. The APP currently selects the items based on the earliest possible time (age in days) at which this skill was shown in a child from the data coming from the norm sample within the app. With this approach, children who have a comparably early AoA are not missed. To not miss children who have later AoAs, the questions are repeated until the caregiver indicate that the skill has been observed.

Psychometric Properties of Scale

In the following, information about the psychometric properties of the APP scales is provided including objectivity, reliability, construct validity, and criterion validity. We report the psychometric properties for the cognition, language, and motor scale (except for the pragmatic language skills assessed by the Orion's Pragmatic Language Skills Questionnaire, Ghahari et al., 2017). The psychometric properties of the social-emotional scales are well-documented in the respective publications mentioned above.

Participants

In the sample used to assess the psychometric properties, we included all APP data points provided by the caregivers until the date of data extraction (11 March 2020). The data were filtered for outliers and test users using the following exclusion criteria: 1) children were older than 6 years, 2) caregivers were younger than 20 years or older than 55 years³, 3) caregivers provided a highly unlikely birth country (e.g., Antarctica), 4) caregivers answered fewer than 10 questions, 5) the AoA of a skill was before the birth of the respective child⁴. The original sample consisted of 5067 children. The application of the filtering criteria resulted in a final validation sample of 2385 children (1112 girls, 1265 boys, and 8 children for whom caregivers chose 'other' as indication of sex). The mean age of the children at the date of data extraction was $M_{children} = 791$ days, $SE_{children} = 11$ days. In this validation sample, the APP was used

³ Because there were only very few caregivers outside of this age window we categorised them as test users.

⁴ In the latest version of the APP, it is no longer possible to indicate an impossible AoA.

by 1984 mothers, 294 fathers and 16 other caregivers, 91 did not answer this question.

The mean age of the APP user at the date of extraction was $M_{user} = 36$ years,

$SE_{user} = 0.08$ years.

For construct validation, we invited caregivers ($N = 256$) who filled out the 'pre'-questionnaires (see Participants: Target Group) for their children to participate in a lab study with their children. We compared caregivers' answers in the 'pre'-questionnaire to their child's performance in lab-based standardised tests. The validation sample for the cognitive scale included 74 children ($n_{girls} = 36$, $n_{boys} = 38$, $M_{age} = 734$ days, $SE = 42$ days). validation sample for the motor scale included 97 children ($n_{girls} = 46$, $n_{boys} = 51$, $M_{age} = 873$ days, $SE = 63$ days). The validation sample for the language scale included 85 children ($n_{girls} = 38$, $n_{boys} = 47$, $M_{age} = 1480$ days, $SE = 60$ days).

Analyses Plan

In the following sections, we describe the different psychometric properties of the APP scales. To analyse objectivity and criterion validity, we used different multi-level logistic regressions predicting either the AoA for the motor and cognitive items or the language scale index for language skills by domain (motor or cognition), caregiver education (mother and father), caregiver age (mother and father), app user (mother or father), sex of the child, and pregnancy week in which the child was born (see also Equation 1 in the Appendix). Details about the specific analyses are reported in the respective sections below. To measure construct validity, we predicted children's performance in lab-based tests with the answers of caregivers for the according items in the APP assessed via the 'pre'-questionnaires using multi-level regressions for the motor, cognition and language scale. As a reliability measure, we assessed the internal consistency by calculating Cronbach's α separately for the different scales and age ranges.

Table 2

Psychometric Values for the Assessment of the Objectivity and Criterion Validity for the Motor and Cognition Items: Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's Method.

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig. Level
Pregnancy _{Week}	20943	20943	1	1700.2	7.118	.008	**
Sex	517	259	2	1697.2	0.088	.916	
Age _{Mother}	206250	206250	1	1699.9	70.100	< .001	***
Age _{Father}	20175	20175	1	1697.5	6.857	.009	**
Education _{Mother}	15525	3105	5	1696.8	1.055	.384	
Education _{Father}	14553	2911	5	1693.0	0.989	.423	
APP _{User}	4803	2401	2	1697.1	0.816	.442	
Domain	103	103	1	206.0	0.035	.852	

Because there were only few cognitive items, we merged items of the motor and the cognitive items in this model and included domain as a factor. There was no effect of domain. The model accounted for 98.28% of the variance.

475 Objectivity

476 To assess objectivity, we analysed the influence of the APP users in our
 477 regression on the AoA in the motor, cognitive, and language scales. That is, we tested
 478 whether it made a difference whether the data were entered by mothers, fathers, or
 479 other users. The results showed that the factor APP user had no influence on the
 480 indicated AoA, see Tables 2 and 3.

481 Reliability

482 For all scales, we assessed the internal consistency by calculating Cronbach's α
 483 separately for the scales and age ranges. See Table A1 for an overview of the results in
 484 the single scales and age ranges. The results indicate a range between acceptable
 485 ($\alpha > .70$) and excellent ($\alpha > .90$) reliabilities for almost all age ranges for the domains
 486 of fine motor, gross motor, and language. Only the value for fine motor skills between

Table 3

Psychometric Values for the Assessment of Objectivity and Criterion Validity for the Language Items: Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's Method.

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig. Level
Age _{Days}	472779	472779	1	289.29	582.325	<.001	***
Pregnancy _{week}	1589	1589	1	387.45	1.957	.163	
Sex	4751	4751	1	410.92	5.852	.016	*
Age _{Mother}	95	95	1	321.50	0.118	.732	
Age _{Father}	362	362	1	315.64	0.446	.505	
Education _{Mother}	2053	513	4	321.49	0.632	.640	
Education _{Father}	1350	270	5	336.51	0.333	.893	
APP _{User}	2392	1196	2	310.82	1.473	.231	

The model accounted for 65.24% of the variance.

12 and 18 months was slightly below the acceptable value of $\alpha = .70$. The reliability scores for the cognition items were less solid and mostly ranged below $\alpha = .60$ with the exception of the age range between 3 and 6 months ($\alpha = .81$).

Validity

Construct Validity

Each scale was validated for different age groups. We used the pre-questionnaire (see Participants: Target Group) to assess caregivers' answers to items of the APP and compared them to children's behaviour in the corresponding items of existing scales (see below for details on which scales were chosen) using logistic regressions. We followed the procedures and scoring guidelines of the existing scales.

For the motor scale, we tested children's motor skills with the motor items of the Bayley Scales for Infant and Toddler Development III (BSID-III, Bayley, 2005) up to 42 months and with the Peabody Developmental Motor Scales (PDMS, Rhonda Folio & Fewell, 2000) for children older than 42 months. For the cognitive scale, we used the items of the cognitive scale of the BSID-III (Bayley, 2005). For the language scale, we

used the “Test zum Satzverstehen von Kindern” [*Test of Sentence Understanding of Children*] (TSVK, Siegmüller et al., 2011) to assess syntactic and morphological skills and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-4, Dunn & Dunn, 2007) to assess children’s vocabulary size.

Multi-level logistic regressions were calculated to predict children’s motor and cognitive performance in the lab (i.e., whether or not children showed the respective behaviour when assessed in the lab) for each item individually by the answers the caregivers provided in the pre-questionnaire of the APP. The regression controlled for children’s age and the time span between the dates when caregivers answered the APP question and when their child was tested in the lab. For the *Motor Scale*, the caregivers’ answers significantly predicted the children’s lab performance, $estimate = 1.671, SE = 0.196, z = 8.548, p < .001$, as well as age, $estimate = 0.093, SE = 0.027, z = 3.476, p < .001$. The model accounted for 51.62% of the variance. This was not the case in the *Cognitive Scale*, where caregivers’ answers neither predicted children’s performance in the lab, $estimate = 0.212, SE = 0.427, z = 0.496, p = .620$, nor age, $estimate = 0.019, SE = 0.030, z = 0.632, p = .527$.

For linguistic skills, we calculated the grammar scale index, summing up the usage frequencies of each item, that is, how often each item occurred in a child’s language production. With this grammar scale index, we predicted the total PPVT score and the TSVK score collected in the lab. Both the PPVT and the TSVK score were calculated following the instructions in the corresponding manuals. We ran linear regressions on the TSVK and the PPVT scores controlling for the time span between both tests, $M = 58$ days, $SD = 27$ days. Results showed that the grammar scale index significantly predicted the TSVK score, $estimate = 1.450, SE = 0.469, z = 3.092, p = .003$, and the delay $estimate = -0.065, SE = 0.021, z = -2.999, p = .004$. The model accounted for 27.05% of the variance. Similarly, the grammar scale significantly predicted the PPVT score, $estimate = 18.321, SE = 7.451, z = 2.459, p = .024$. However, we did find no effect of

531 delay, $estimate = -0.496$, $SE = 0.546$, $z = -0.907$, $p = .376$. The model accounted for
532 41.42% of the variance. In sum, the standardised lab test performances were predicted
533 by caregivers' answers to the language scale questions of the APP, which shows
534 excellent content and predictive validity.

535 *Criterion Validity*

536 We investigated criterion validity by predicting the AoA outcomes and language
537 scores with factors that typically effect development. Here, we tested the pregnancy
538 week a child was born, child's sex, age and education of father and mother, and the
539 APP user (i.e., whether father, mother, or another caregiver provided the data) and
540 entered them into the model. The results are shown in Table 2 (Motor Scale and
541 Cognitive Scale), and Table 3 (Language Scale). For the motor and the cognition scale,
542 we found that AoA was predicted by the pregnancy week with births in earlier
543 pregnancy weeks being associated with later AoA, and effects of caregiver age, with
544 older caregivers showing later AoA, an effect that was stronger for mothers' age than
545 fathers' age. We found no effects for domain (cognition, motor), child's sex, caregiver
546 education, and APP user. For the language scale, we found that boys were evaluated as
547 having poorer language skills than girls and language skills increased with age, see
548 Table 3. In sum, factors that typically effect development such as pregnancy week or
549 gender also influenced the scores that were obtained by the caregivers. We therefore
550 conclude that the APP has sufficient construct validity.

551 Our analyses of the psychometric properties of the APP indicate a sufficient
552 objectivity, reliability, and validity for the motor and language scales. For the cognition
553 scale, reliability and validity measures need to be improved in future versions of the
554 APP by editing, including, or excluding individual items (see Discussion).

555 **Initial and Preliminary Findings**

556 To further substantiate the validity of the items used and the general method of
557 ambulatory assessment based on a digital developmental diary, we present some initial
558 findings of what can be measured and whether and how previously reported findings are

replicated. First, we present some data that describe the sample drawn for the current purpose (see Descriptive Data and Demographics, date of data extraction: 11 March 2020). Second, we present a preliminary replication of the relationship of non-verbal and verbal communication skills (see Communicative Skills, below).

Descriptive Data and Demographics

Caregiver answered on average 75 questions, ranging between 10 and 285. The mean duration between registration and last usage (i.e., the mean length of usage) is 4.32 months, ranging between 1 months and 16 months. On average, caregivers filled in questions on 2.44 different days per month, ranging between 0.15 and 16 days. Caregivers answered questions on average every 21 days ($M = 21.43$ days, $SE = 0.31$). Per day, caregivers answered on average 3.01 questions ($SE = 0.06$) questions in cognitive development, 12.53 questions ($SE = 0.22$) in motor development, 7.06 questions ($SE = 0.25$) in language, 2.89 questions ($SE = 0.12$) in social-emotional development, 3.27 questions on physical measures and 10.7 questions ($SE = 0.1$) on background variables.

Further, as an example of geographical distribution, we collected data on the countries of birth and living, see Table A2. Currently, most of the users live in Switzerland (54%) and Germany (38%), in total 88 countries of residence were indicated. Finally, as one example for demographic variables, caregivers are asked to indicate how their child was born, either via natural birth or via Caesarean section. The Swiss Federal Statistical Office (Statistik, 2020) reports for the year 2017 that almost one third (32.3%) of all newborns ($n = 85.990$) in Switzerland were born by Caesarean section. The data collected in our APP reveal the percentage of 32.4% ($n = 790$ out of $N = 2437$). The two percentages are almost identical, with no statistical difference between them, $\chi^2 = 0.009, p = .931$. While we don't claim that the data generated by the unsupervised APP use are representative for the population, it seems that they approximate population statistics in such key variables.

586 Communicative Skills

587 Finally, we present data on a developmental psychological aspect of the APP
 588 data: The development of the interrelation between non-verbal and verbal
 589 communication. Previous research in laboratory settings reported a longitudinal
 590 relation between joint attention and language development (Farrant & Zubrick, 2012;
 591 Morales et al., 2005). Children who had low levels of joint attention during infancy were
 592 significantly more likely to have poor receptive vocabulary around age of 5 (Farrant &
 593 Zubrick, 2012). Also, children with lower scores in pointing at the age of 12 months
 594 (pointing only with open hand but not yet with index finger) were at risk for language
 595 delay one year later (Lüke et al., 2017). The analysis of a subset of infants ($n = 198$,
 596 $n_{girls} = 97$, $n_{boys} = 101$) taken from the APP data indicated that the onset of early joint
 597 attention ability (i.e., child is looking from an object to caregivers and back)
 598 significantly predicted the age at which infants spoke their first words,
 599 $\beta = 0.51, p < .001, F(3, 194) = 50.28, p < .001, R^2 = 0.44$. There was no main effect of
 600 infants' sex, $\beta = -21.81, p = .563$, nor an interaction of sex and early joint attention,
 601 $\beta = 0.06, p = .495$. Infants who showed joint attention earlier in life also spoke sooner
 602 (see Figure 4). This is in line with the above mentioned previous findings that infants'
 603 developing non-verbal social-cognitive skills are longitudinally related to their emerging
 604 language skills.

605 Discussion

606 In this paper, we present a new tool for the assessment of children's development
 607 from birth to the age of 6 years. Via the use of a smartphone-based developmental
 608 diary application (the kleineWeltentdecker App, referred to as the APP), caregivers can
 609 track the emergence and the development of their children's skills in four major
 610 developmental domains. The empirical validations of the reliability of the procedures
 611 with children of different age groups have (except for the cognition items) confirmed the
 612 robustness of the different measures implemented in the APP. In the following, we
 613 discuss the psychometric properties, the goals, and the challenges of the APP.

Figure 4

Relationship between AoA of Sharing Attention as an indicator of early joint attention ability and the AoA of First Word as an indicator of early language skills. Individual data points (blue) and box plots are illustrated.

614 Psychometric Properties

615 The assessment of the psychometric properties resulted in an overall positive
 616 outcome. The high *objectivity* of the data is indicated by the fact that no differences
 617 were found between the AoAs and the usage frequency between mothers, fathers, and
 618 other caregivers, which was the case in all scales.

619 Reliability

620 The assessment of *reliability* resulted in mixed findings and the reliability
 621 critically depended on the scale tested. Reliability was excellent for the language scale

and good for the motor scale. There is room for improvement with respect to the cognition scale, for which the reliability was generally below acceptability.

There several potential reasons that can explain the non-optimal results for the cognition scale. First, the scale consists of fewer items ($n = 34$) compared to the other scales (all $ns > 100$), which might result in a larger variability of the results. Second, the range of tested skills is relatively broad and thus heterogeneous. It ranges from simple sensori-motor items to more complex tasks on memory or problem-solving. Third, and probably most important, the items often involve the instructions for caregivers to conduct a little “experiment” with their children. For example, basic memory functions are assessed via the following item: “Try this little experiment: Put 3 pairs of shuffled memory cards picture-side up on a table in two rows. Ask [Childname] to remember where each card is. Then, turn over the cards one by one so that the pictures are no longer visible. Now ask [Childname] where the paired pictures are, one by one.” (Item CG32). While the instructions are formulated as easy-to-understand, caregiver-friendly, and unambiguous as possible, there is still room for variation in how exactly caregivers perform these experiments and how the child’s behaviour is interpreted. Also, the relatively high cost for the caregiver to perform the task (e.g., getting up and searching for memory cards) might have prompted a positive response even though the skill had not yet been developed. Other instruments that assess children’s cognitive development require trained examiners to perform the assessment. Findings from citizen science research are helpful to shed more light on this increase of variability: On the one hand, citizen scientists can perform collections of valid basic data even when given only a brief training (Darwall & Dulvy, 1996; C. Evans et al., 2005; Fore et al., 2001; Graham et al., 1996). On the other hand, data validity is decreased when citizen scientists are confronted with more complex questions and observation tasks, such as observations in astronomy (Balcom, 2015). In general, without proper training in experimental protocols, citizen scientists (such as the caregivers who use the APP can be compared to) are more likely to introduce variability into their data (Danielsen et al., 2005; M. Eaton et al., 2002). Applied to the present set of cognitive items, it might be the

case that they are in general more difficult to evaluate than the motor or language items. To conclude, the data collected with the current cognition items are not yet as reliable as the other scales. Further developments are required to improve this scale.

654 *Validity*

Our analyses on construct and criterion validity yielded no effects of caregiver education on the data. This indicates that caregivers of all educational backgrounds respond similarly to the questions. Caregiver education is only a rough estimate for a more global assessment of caregivers' socio-economic status (SES). We will, therefore, evaluate whether a more differentiated assessment of SES (e.g., asking for income and other aspects) is required and likewise feasible and accepted by caregivers. The present data showed that children's sex had a significant effect on their language development. Girls generally had earlier language AoAs than boys. This finding is well-established in the field: Girls produce sounds and use words at an earlier age, have larger vocabularies, greater grammatical complexity, and read sooner than boys (Bornstein et al., 2004; Lange et al., 2016; Lisi et al., 2002; D. I. Miller & Halpern, 2014; Reilly et al., 2019; Stolt et al., 2008). Interestingly, the AoA was related to the caregiver age. Children of older caregivers had later AoAs. Previous research reports that caregiver income related to better problem solving and language scores (Yeung et al., 2002) and that caregiver job loss had an impact on their children's performance in school (e.g., Rege et al., 2011; Stevens & Schaller, 2011), an effect that seems already visible even before children enter school (Mari & Keizer, 2020). Caregiver income and their SES increase with caregiver age (e.g., Featherman et al., 1988; McInahan, 2004; Powell et al., 2006; Ross & Mirowsky, 1999). Children from older caregivers should therefore have earlier AoAs than children from younger caregivers. In light of this tendency, the present data are in contrast with this previous data. However, the analysis of the demographics indicated that the general level of education of the caregivers using the APP was relatively high and variability was relatively low. Previous research shows that caregiver education and children's outcome are considered at a bivariate level only, the relationship can be curvilinear and disadvantageous for children with comparatively young or old caregivers

680 (e.g., Powell et al., 2006). However, when considering additional factors such as SES or
681 family structure, the pattern typically becomes linear and caregiver age becomes
682 positively linked to child outcomes. These aspects require further attention as the
683 amount and the quality of the data increase. In general, the results of the analysis of
684 the psychometric properties are promising. This is particularly the case for the motor
685 and language scale whereas the results for the cognition scale are more heterogeneous.

686 Goals and Challenges

687 In the introduction, we formulated three major goals. We aim 1) to establish a
688 comprehensive data set of child development, 2) to have tool that accounts for the
689 variability on development across cultures beyond WEIRD countries, and 3) to
690 outsource data collection to caregivers. In the following, we discuss how the APP can
691 help researchers to reach these goals and the challenges that have yet to be met.

692 *Goal 1: Establish a Comprehensive Data Set of Child Development From* 693 *Age 0 to 6, Within and Across Individuals*

694 With the APP, we aim to obtain data that inform about the variability of
695 behaviour and its development in relation to contextual aspects. The APP measures
696 children's competencies in the cognitive, language, motor, and social-emotional domains
697 of development. Furthermore, questions on children's culture, SES, and language
698 background offer information on their environment. The analysis of data acquired by
699 the APP is not limited by time-consuming processes of manual coding of behavioural
700 data. For the analysis, it does not make a big difference whether the data set includes
701 30 or 30.000 participants. The data of the APP will provide information that goes far
702 beyond what has been called the "taking snapshots of developmental outcomes"
703 approach (Adolph et al., 2008; Caspi et al., 1996), and has the potential to substantially
704 increase our understanding of developmental processes. The APP uses an
705 Age-of-Attainment (AoA) approach (W. O. Eaton et al., 2014) that is centred on the
706 date of emergence of a developmental skill. Individuals differ in their AoAs. This
707 particular variability is of key interest because it provides evidence about how long it

708 takes individuals to reach a particular skill and to move to the next skill. That is, it
709 allows evaluating individual differences in the chronological AoA and the temporal
710 distances between the AoA of two (or more) different skills. Eventually, this allows a
711 detailed description of individual developmental trajectories and the identification of
712 the interrelations between skills within and across domains. These descriptions of
713 developmental trajectories are essential for the advancement of theories about children's
714 development and the acquired data will help to significantly increase our understanding
715 of developmental change in childhood.

716 *Goal 2: Account for the Variability on Development Across Cultures*

717 Previous research in developmental psychology has to a large extent been based
718 on WEIRD populations, which has recently been criticised (e.g., Nielsen et al., 2017).
719 Therefore, variability of behaviour and development is underestimated. The approach of
720 the APP allows moving beyond sampling from highly homogeneous (often WEIRD)
721 populations to a sample of large variability with respect to cultures and social contexts.
722 Data collected with the APP allows comparing development within and between
723 cultures and drawing conclusions from highly diverse samples. This approach helps to
724 fulfil the plea raised by, for example, Nielsen and colleagues (2017) that a “complete
725 understanding of the ontogeny and phylogeny of the developing human mind depends
726 on sampling diversity” (p.32), which receives further and increasing support by
727 numerous other researchers (Clegg & Legare, 2016; Henrich et al., 2010c; Legare &
728 Harris, 2016; Nielsen & Haun, 2016; van Schaik & Burkart, 2011). This sort of data as
729 measured by the APP is essential to broaden our theoretical understanding about which
730 aspects of the development of skills and traits are universal and which culture-specific.

731 *Goal 3: Outsourcing of Data Collection*

732 With the APP, we outsource data collection of longitudinal high-density data to
733 caregivers. With this, we aim to reduce the enormous personal and financial resources
734 associated with such data collection. Moving data collection from the controlled setting
735 of a laboratory to the “real, noisy world” and from the hands of trained and

736 experienced experimenters to the caregivers comes with several challenges. Previous
737 research suggests that, at least for motor and language skills, caregiver checklist diaries
738 are concordant with experimenter home visits (e.g., Bodnarchuk & Eaton, 2004). The
739 present validation of the motor scales converges with this finding. But given the not
740 optimal results from the validation of the cognitive scales, some scepticism regarding
741 the reliability of caregiver reports might remain. In the following, we present three
742 current challenges and the approaches of how they have been or will be addressed in
743 future refinements of the APP. The solutions might not be final and experience and
744 time will provide a more detailed view on how and how not to address the challenges
745 satisfactorily.

746 *Challenge 1: Infrequent Use of the APP*

747 Research designs that use online surveys and smartphone applications are
748 attractive. They come at relative low cost and offer great flexibility (Barrios et al.,
749 2011; J. R. Evans & Mathur, 2005; Fan & Yan, 2010; Fricker & Schonlau, 2002;
750 Kaplowitz et al., 2004; LaRose & Tsai, 2014). At the same time, they are subject to
751 lower completion rates than conventional survey methods (Börkan, 2010; Jones & Pitt,
752 1999; Manfreda et al., 2008; Sax et al., 2003; Shih & Fan, 2008). It is therefore likely
753 that a substantial number of caregivers will not use the APP regularly. This will result
754 in a large amount of missing data. There may be ways that help to increase caregivers'
755 commitment. Incentives such as monetary compensation (Frick et al., 1999), loyalty
756 points (Göritz, 2008), or sweepstakes offering of a certain monetary value (LaRose &
757 Tsai, 2014) have been shown to increase commitment in online studies (as indicated by
758 an increase in response rate to invitations and completion rate, but see Göritz (2006)
759 for null results). For an extensive overview of psychological and data collection via
760 internet, the reader is referred to the extant literature (e.g., Birnbaum, 2004; Manfreda
761 et al., 2008; Reips, 2002; Shih & Fan, 2008). However, given the already large number
762 of participating caregivers (> 4.000; March 2020), it is not feasible to offer any form of
763 monetary incentive to all users.

One potential option is to offer caregivers to participate in a lottery that takes place periodically where caregivers can win a voucher that can be used worldwide (e.g., in online music or book stores). Lotteries seem to have a positive impact on participant commitment (LaRose & Tsai, 2014). Participation in the lottery could be automatised or applied as an incentive if caregivers contributed a predetermined number of data points within a given period. A second option is to implement the APP as a supplementary measure in a more controlled setting of an existing ongoing longitudinal study. In such a setting, a smaller number of caregivers who agreed to take part in a study can be motivated via incentives more easily and reminded repeatedly to answer the questions. With this approach, the usage and data of “unsupervised” caregivers can be compared to a highly controlled sample of caregivers, which will provide further insights to the interrelation between use and data quality. Two examples for this second option are first, the study Children and digital media (KiDiM; “Kinder und Digitale Medien”, 2021) by the Marie Meierhofer Institute in Zurich, Switzerland. Here, APP data complements the collection of longitudinal data on children’s media use. Second, in a planned study on the relation between nutrition and cognitive development, currently prepared by the USZ Neonatology section (LEARN; Natalucci et al., 2021), APP data will be used as a continuous measure of the children’s development between the specified measurement times. One major aim for the future will be to use the data coming from “supervised” and “unsupervised” users to identify different user behaviour, its impact on the data quality, and ways to impute missing data. High-resolution data from “supervised” users will thereby serve as a basis to impute missing data of the low-resolution data of the “unsupervised” users.

Challenge 2: General Reliability of Questionnaire Data

One might in general be sceptical about the reliability of the data caregivers report. They might be inclined to answer the questions about the development of their children too optimistically for reasons of social desirability. Previous research on the reliability between laboratory assessments and caregiver reports revealed inconsistent effects. Whereas caregiver scores often correlate with professional assessment they

likewise tend to be a poor predictor of infants at risk of developmental delay (e.g., Emond et al., 2005). Caregiver report and experimenter home visit observations seem to converge when assessing the development of motor skills. For example, the Parent Milestone Report Form has been shown to be a reliable and valid instrument to assess infants' development of a number of gross motor skills via caregiver report (Adolph et al., 2008; Bodnarchuk & Eaton, 2004). Similarly, Miller and colleagues (2017) showed no differences in the evaluation of receptive, expressive language, and fine motor skills between caregiver report and direct assessment via experts. Further, laboratory tests and experimenter home visits often underestimate children's early linguistic abilities (Bates, 1993) and adults are generally good in estimating skills. Self-reports, for example in language proficiency evaluation, converge with objective measures in adults (e.g., Marian et al., 2007). Furthermore, the current approach receives support by the fact that caregivers are with their children in many more and highly variable situations than a laboratory setting is able to establish. This makes it more likely that they observe the skill that the APP asks for and that caregivers' assessment of their children is close in time to the first occurrence of a skill. In contrast, when caregivers are asked to assess the emergence of their children's first words (around the age of 12 months) retrospectively, these estimates show only weak reliability that decreases with increasing age of their children ($r = 0.27$ at age 3 and $r = -0.11$ at age 5, Majnemer & Rosenblatt, 1994). The analysis of the APP user objectivity was generally successful, the results showed that the factor "APP user" had no influence on the AoA identified. However, one issue needs to be discussed more critically. While the reliability was evaluated by two independent observers, a caregiver via the questionnaire and a researcher in the controlled laboratory environment, this was not the case in the objectivity rating, which may have caused selection effects (e.g., fathers who are more involved in raising their children might be more inclined using the APP and might, therefore, be better observers). This is a limitation for larger conclusions concerning objectivity. However, for those caregivers who have been using the APP so far, this does not seem to be a major problem.

In general, while caregivers may be susceptible to social desirability effects, they are still likely the most reliable source to determine whether or not a skill is in their child's repertoire (Sachse & Suchodoletz, 2008). Caregivers are in the unique position to observe and interact with their children across many different situations. This makes them likely to report the particular moment when a skill was observed for the first time. The everyday interaction of caregivers with their children is furthermore not subject to issues with child motivation and cooperation and has been established as a valuable way to quickly and cost-effectively add information important for the detection of developmental delays (e.g., Nordahl-Hansen et al., 2014). These aspects result in an increased application of caregiver reports for routine developmental screening that are particularly helpful for the identification of children at risk for developmental delays, a procedure that is in accordance with the recommendations by the American Academy of Pediatrics (e.g., Emerson et al., 2016; Johnson & Myers, 2007).

With respect to reliability, the current approach represents a trade-off between feasibility and reliability. Optimally, caregivers would answer the question about the emergence of a particular skill at several instances, repeated over several days to account for the variability of the emergence of a particular skill (Adolph et al., 2008). However, workload for the caregivers is already substantial in the current version of the APP with up to 20 questions per notification. A further increase of this number will result in a significant decrease of the number of participating caregivers. The current approach relies on the fact that caregivers are required to answer the questions about the development of their children in intervals of one week or one month. Considering these circumstances, we are confident the APP a valuable and important tool that avoids false negatives. Caregivers observe their children in a variety of different situations and, triggered by the particular question posed by the APP, might bring their children in situations in which the new skill is likely to be observed. It is important to emphasise that the present scales will not replace any diagnosis of clinical symptoms or developmental delays, which need an in-depth diagnosis of an expert psychologist and/or paediatrician.

851 Finally, to reliably assess the emergence of a developing skill, measuring daily
852 fluctuations would be optimal. The APP is not designed to fulfil this purpose but to
853 assess whether and when a child shows a skill with a defined quality. This approach is
854 inspired by developmental assessment tools like the Bailey Scales (Bayley, 2005) and by
855 the AoA approach (W. O. Eaton et al., 2014). The collected AoAs are snapshots,
856 subject to fluctuations over time. However, the questions are answered by the caregivers
857 not on the basis of a single observation at one point in time but on their everyday
858 observation of their children. The advantage of this approach is to collect data from a
859 large number of children in a relatively easy and convenient way and to be closer in
860 time to the actual AoA of a skill than traditional approaches.

861 *Challenge 3: Assessment of Language Skills*

862 While the APP may document children's development in the cognitive, motor,
863 and social-emotional domain, the measures on language development are not yet
864 comprehensively integrated. The current assessment of linguistic skills does not yet
865 include vocabulary. In an initial version of the APP, we included this aspect with almost
866 2.000 items being asked to caregivers. The feedback caregivers provided indicated that
867 they became tired quickly of answering the vocabulary items due to the sheer number of
868 questions about single words their child might or might not speak at a given point in
869 time. For this reason, we removed the vocabulary section in the current version. One
870 potential approach to this challenge was recently introduced by Mayor and Mani (2019).
871 These authors presented a new methodological approach through which an estimation of
872 a child's vocabulary score (as assessed by the MacArthur Communicative Development
873 Inventories, CDI; Fenson et al., 2007) can be obtained by combining caregiver responses
874 on a limited set of words sampled randomly from the full CDI with the information
875 about how many children do or do not speak a particular word extracted from the
876 WordBank database (Frank et al., 2017). The findings show that using a reduced list of
877 only 25 words provided an accurate estimate of a child's vocabulary size for American
878 English, German, and Norwegian. Implementing an algorithm similar to the one used

879 by Mayor and Mani (2019) can be one way to improve the procedure by substantially
880 reducing the number of vocabulary items. This is a plan for future implementation.

881 To sum up the challenges, there are reasons that caregiver assessment will be
882 both more and less precise than laboratory assessment. Collecting more data, asking
883 feedback from participating caregivers, and using this information to adjust items
884 accordingly will help to increase reliability in the future. For example, with more data
885 analysed, a “real” effect may become visible and the influence of individual children on
886 the data becomes less substantial.

887 Anticipated Outcome and Significance

888 Given the ubiquity of smartphones worldwide, smartphone applications
889 increasingly serve as digital support devices. With the developmental diary application
890 presented here, we put a portable data acquisition tool in the pocket of caregivers. The
891 value of this approach is high (in times of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in which this
892 paper was partially written, even more so). It includes longitudinal data of a potentially
893 large-scale, population-based sample. The sample size is not restricted to areas or by
894 limited (financial and human) resources. This approach allows to move beyond
895 sampling from highly homogeneous (often WEIRD) populations to a sample of great
896 variability with respect to cultures and social contexts. The data collected with the
897 APP allow comparing development within and between cultures and drawing
898 conclusions from highly diverse samples. Eventually, this allows a detailed description
899 of individual developmental trajectories, and the identification of the interrelations
900 between skills within and across domains. With the approach presented here, data are
901 collected from more children in more places at a higher frequency than it is possible
902 with moderated testing, either in-person or online. The descriptions of developmental
903 trajectories derived from these data are essential for the advancement of theories about
904 children’s development and the acquired data will help to increase our understanding of
905 developmental change in childhood.

906 Disclosures

907 Author Contributions

908 M. M. Daum, K. Antognini, M. Beisert, M. Bleiker, A. Gampe, I. Kurthen,
909 L. Maffongelli, and S. Wermelinger jointly generated the idea for the APP. All authors
910 contributed to the development of the different scales, A. Gampe and S. Wermelinger
911 wrote the analysis code and analysed the data, M. M. Daum wrote the first draft of the
912 manuscript, and all authors critically edited it. All authors approved the final
913 submitted version of the manuscript.

914 Conflict of Interest

915 The authors declare that there were no conflicts of interest with respect to the
916 authorship or the publication of this article.

917 Acknowledgments

918 We express our deep gratitude to a large number of people who were
919 substantially involved in the development of the APP: Rico Leuthold
920 (<http://www.smartcode.ch>) for programming the backend of the APP and Jan Gerwin
921 and Christian Justus (<http://www.hybridheroes.de>) for programming the frontend,
922 Christof Täschler (<http://www.christoftaeschler.ch>) for the UI/UX design, and Nadja
923 Stadelmann (<http://www.nadjastadelmann.ch>) for the scientific illustrations. Andrea
924 Grössbauer, Eva Pouwer, and Robert Weniger for their support in data protection
925 matters, Nadia Steiner for her support with legal questions, Ingo Jörissen, Jacqueline
926 Martinelli, Stefan Mischke, and Frank Schleich for their support with the UZH servers,
927 and Wolfgang Henggeler and Patrick Sticher for the trademark registration. Ramona
928 Abrecht, Ingo Besserlich, Leonie Hartmann, and Christina Tschan inserted the
929 questions and answers and worked on the knowledge texts, Sonja Brunschweiler has
930 proofread them. Jonas Gähwiler, Maximilian Haas, Natascha Helbling, Mirella
931 Manfredi, Matthew Rockey, and Virginie Rusca for various translation work. Nicole
932 Besson, Alexandra Ritter, Rebekka Rüesch, Isabella Schwyzer, and Nicole Zahnd have

933 validated the answers given by the caregivers by testing children in our lab. Julia
934 Brehm, Kerstin Clausen, Julia Fenkl, Ebru Ger, Sarah Hauser, Karin Hollermayer,
935 Liridona Hoti, Lara Keller, Lea Mörsdorf, Petra Moser, Fiona Pugin, Meret Roth,
936 Larissa Stuber, and Freya Zacher for testing the APP again and again and providing
937 useful inputs. Finally Lisa Wagner and Sabrina Beck for commenting on a previous
938 version of this manuscript. Without the help of all these people involved, this project
939 would not have been possible.

940 **Funding**

941 The project was supported by the Department of Psychology
942 (<http://www.psychologie.uzh.ch>) and the Jacobs Center for Productive Youth
943 Development (<http://www.jacobscenter.uzh.ch>) of the University of Zurich.

944 **Open Practices Statement: Data availability, materials, and online resources**

945 The items of all the scales and information about data protection are available
946 on <https://osf.io/ar7xp/>. The data sets generated during and/or analysed during the
947 current study are not publicly available due to the current data protection guidelines,
948 see section Data Security and Data Protection but are available from the corresponding
949 author on reasonable request.

950 **Ethical approval**

951 The study protocol and the procedures were approved by the local ethics
952 committee (Reference Number 20.6.5) and are in accordance with the ethical standards
953 of the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments. Caregivers are, for example,
954 free to stop using the APP at any time without giving reasons for justification. All
955 caregivers who intend to use the APP provide informed consent. No incentive other
956 than the free use of the APP is provided to the children and their caregivers by the
957 Research Unit Developmental Psychology at the Department of Psychology and the
958 Jacobs Center for Productive Youth Development of the University of Zurich (HOST).
959 When registering for the APP, a user explicitly agrees to the data processing as set out

960 in the Terms of Use for the APP and the Privacy Policy by the University of Zurich.
961 The HOST will continuously refine the APP. At some instances, this will lead to
962 changes in the data processing by the HOST. Users will be notified of such changes in
963 an appropriate manner (e.g., at the next login).

References

- Adolph, K. E. & Hoch, J. E. (2019). Motor development: Embodied, embedded, enculturated, and enabling. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70(1), 141–164. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102836>
- Adolph, K. E., Vereijken, B. & Shrout, P. E. (2003). What changes in infant walking and why [eprint: <https://srcd.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1467-8624.7402011>]. *Child Development*, 74(2), 475–497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.7402011>
- Adolph, K. E., Young, J. W., Robinson, S. R. & Gill-Alvarez, F. (2008). What is the shape of developmental change? *Psychological Review*, 115(3), 527–543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.115.3.527>
- Aslin, R. N. (2007). What's in a look? *Developmental Science*, 10(1), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-7687.2007.00563.X>
- Balcom, B. (2015). Improving crowdsourcing and citizen science as a policy mechanism for NASA. *New Space*, 3(2), 98–116. <https://doi.org/10.1089/space.2015.0017>
- Barrios, M., Villarroya, A., Borrego, Á. & Ollé, C. (2011). Response rates and data quality in web and mail surveys administered to PhD holders. *Social Science Computer Review*, 29(2), 208–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439310368031>
- Bates, E. (1993). Comprehension and production in early language development: Comments on savage-rumbaugh et al. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 58(3), 222–242.
- Bayley, N. (1993). *Bayley scales of infant development* (2nd). Psychological Corporation.
- Bayley, N. (2005). *Bayley scales of infant and toddler development* (Third). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Birnbaum, M. H. (2004). Human research and data collection via the internet. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55(1), 803–832. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141601>
- Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). *The children's communication checklist version 2 (CCC-2)* psychological corporation. Psychological Corporation.

- 993 Bodnarchuk, J. L. & Eaton, W. O. (2004). Can parent reports be trusted?: Validity of
 994 daily checklists of gross motor milestone attainment. *Journal of Applied*
 995 *Developmental Psychology*, 25(4), 481–490.
 996 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2004.06.005>
- 997 Börkan, B. (2010). The mode effect in mixed-mode surveys: Mail and web surveys.
 998 *Social Science Computer Review*, 28(3), 371–380.
 999 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439309350698>
- 1000 Bornstein, M. H., Hahn, C.-S. & Suwalsky, J. T. D. (2013). Physically developed and
 1001 exploratory young infants contribute to their own long-term academic
 1002 achievement. *Psychological Science*, 24(10), 1906–1917.
 1003 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613479974>
- 1004 Bornstein, M. H., Hahn, C.-S. & Haynes, O. M. (2004). Specific and general language
 1005 performance across early childhood: Stability and gender considerations
 1006 [Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd]. *First Language*, 24(3), 267–304.
 1007 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723704045681>
- 1008 Bornstein, M. H., Hahn, C.-S., Putnick, D. L. & Pearson, R. (2019). Stability of child
 1009 temperament: Multiple moderation by child and mother characteristics. *British*
 1010 *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 37(1), 51–67.
 1011 <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12253>
- 1012 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). Ecological systems theory. *Six theories of child development:*
 1013 *Revised formulations and current issues* (pp. 187–249). Jessica Kingsley
 1014 Publishers.
- 1015 Campbell, R. V. D. & Weech, A. A. (1941). Measures which characterize the individual
 1016 during the development of behavior in early life. *Child Development*, 12(3),
 1017 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1125721>
- 1018 Campos, J. J., Anderson, D. I., Barbu-Roth, M. A., Hubbard, E. M., Hertenstein, M. J.
 1019 & Witherington, D. (2000). Travel broadens the mind. *Infancy*, 1(2), 149–219.
 1020 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327078IN0102_1

- 1021 Carnicero, J. A. C., Pérez-López, J., Salinas, M. D. C. G. & Martínez-Fuentes, M. T.
1022 (2000). A longitudinal study of temperament in infancy: Stability and
1023 convergence of measures. *European Journal of Personality*, 14(1), 21–37.
1024 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0984\(200001/02\)14:1<21::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(200001/02)14:1<21::AID-PER367>3.0.CO;2-A)
1025 [PER367>3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(200001/02)14:1<21::AID-PER367>3.0.CO;2-A)
- 1026 Cascales, T. (2011). *Questionnaire sur le comportement du nourrisson – forme révisée.*
1027 *french translation of gartstein, & rothbart's, infant behavior questionnaire –*
1028 *revised.*
- 1029 Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Thornton, A., Freedman, D., Amell, J. W., Harrington, H.,
1030 Smeijers, J. & Silva, P. A. (1996). The life history calendar: A research and
1031 clinical assessment method for collecting retrospective event-history data.
1032 *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 6(2), 101–114. [https:](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1234-988X(199607)6:2<101::AID-MPR156>3.3.CO;2-E)
1033 [//doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1234-988X\(199607\)6:2<101::AID-MPR156>3.3.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1234-988X(199607)6:2<101::AID-MPR156>3.3.CO;2-E)
- 1034 Clegg, J. M. & Legare, C. H. (2016). A cross-cultural comparison of children's imitative
1035 flexibility. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(9), 1435–1444.
1036 <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000131>
- 1037 Cozzi, P., Putnam, S. P., Menesini, E., Gartstein, M. A., Aureli, T., Calussi, P. &
1038 Montiroso, R. (2013). Studying cross-cultural differences in temperament in
1039 toddlerhood: United states of america (US) and italy. *Infant Behavior and*
1040 *Development*, 36(3), 480–483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2013.03.014>
- 1041 Danielsen, F., Burgess, N. D. & Balmford, A. (2005). Monitoring matters: Examining
1042 the potential of locally-based approaches. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, 14(11),
1043 2507–2542. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-005-8375-0>
- 1044 Darwall, W. R. T. & Dulvy, N. K. (1996). An evaluation of the suitability of
1045 non-specialist volunteer researchers for coral reef fish surveys. mafia island,
1046 tanzania — a case study. *Biological Conservation*, 78(3), 223–231.
1047 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(95\)00147-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(95)00147-6)
- 1048 Davis, B. E., Moon, R. Y., Sachs, H. C. & Ottolini, M. C. (1998). Effects of sleep
1049 position on infant motor development. *Pediatrics*, 102(5), 1135–1140.

- 1050 Dinehart, L. & Manfra, L. (2013). Associations between low-income children's fine
 1051 motor skills in preschool and academic performance in second grade. *Early*
 1052 *Education and Development*, 24(2), 138–161.
 1053 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2011.636729>
- 1054 Dunn, L. M. & Dunn, D. M. (2007). *PPVT-4 - peabody picture vocabulary test*
 1055 (4th ed.). Hogrefe, Verlag für Psychologie. Retrieved April 27, 2018, from <https://www.testzentrale.ch/shop/peabody-picture-vocabulary-test-4-ausgabe.html>
 1056
- 1057 Eaton, M., Gregory, R. & Farrar, A. (2002). Bird conservation and citizen science
 1058 counting, caring and acting. *Ecosystem*, 23, 5–13.
- 1059 Eaton, W. O., Bodnarchuk, J. L. & McKeen, N. A. (2014). Measuring developmental
 1060 differences with an age-of-attainment method. *SAGE Open*, 4(2),
 1061 2158244014529775. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014529775>
- 1062 Emerson, N. D., Morrell, H. E. R. & Neece, C. (2016). Predictors of age of diagnosis for
 1063 children with autism spectrum disorder: The role of a consistent source of
 1064 medical care, race, and condition severity. *Journal of Autism and Developmental*
 1065 *Disorders*, 46(1), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2555-x>
- 1066 Emond, A., Bell, J. C. & Heron, J. (2005). Using parental questionnaires to identify
 1067 developmental delay. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 47(9),
 1068 646–648. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0012162205001271>
- 1069 Evans, C., Abrams, E., Reitsma, R., Roux, K., Salmonsens, L. & Marra, P. P. (2005).
 1070 The neighborhood nestwatch program: Participant outcomes of a citizen-science
 1071 ecological research project. *Conservation Biology*, 19(3), 589–594.
 1072 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00s01.x>
- 1073 Evans, J. R. & Mathur, A. (2005). The value of online surveys [Publisher: Emerald
 1074 Group Publishing Limited]. *Internet Research*, 15(2), 195–219.
 1075 <https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240510590360>
- 1076 Fan, W. & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A
 1077 systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 132–139.
 1078 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.10.015>

- 1079 Farrant, B. M. & Zubrick, S. R. (2012). Early vocabulary development: The importance
1080 of joint attention and parent-child book reading. *First Language*, 32(3), 343–364.
1081 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723711422626>
- 1082 Featherman, D. L., Spenner, K. I. & Tsunematsu, N. (1988). Class and the socialization
1083 of children: Constancy, change, or irrelevance? *Child development in life-span*
1084 *perspective* (pp. 67–90). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 1085 Fenson, L., Bates, E., Dale, P. S., Marchman, V. A., Reznick, J. S. & Thal, D. J.
1086 (2007). *MacArthur-bates communicative development inventories*. Paul H.
1087 Brookes Publishing Company Baltimore, MD.
- 1088 Folio, M. R. & Fewell, R. R. (2000). *Peabody developmental motor scales, second edition*
1089 *(PDMS-2)*. PRO-ED, Inc.
- 1090 Fore, L. S., Paulsen, K. & O’Laughlin, K. (2001). Assessing the performance of
1091 volunteers in monitoring streams. *Freshwater Biology*, 46(1), 109–123.
1092 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2001.00640.x>
- 1093 Frank, M. C., Bergelson, E., Bergmann, C., Cristia, A., Floccia, C., Gervain, J.,
1094 Hamlin, J. K., Hannon, E. E., Kline, M., Levelt, C., Lew-Williams, C., Nazzi, T.,
1095 Panneton, R., Rabagliati, H., Soderstrom, M., Sullivan, J., Waxman, S. &
1096 Yurovsky, D. (2017). A collaborative approach to infant research: Promoting
1097 reproducibility, best practices, and theory-building. *Infancy*, (22), 421–435.
1098 <https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12182>
- 1099 Frick, A., Bächtiger, M.-T. & Reips, U.-D. (1999). Financial incentives, personal
1100 information and drop-out rate in online studies. *Dimensions of Internet science*,
1101 209–219.
- 1102 Frick, A. & Wang, S.-H. (2013). Mental spatial transformations in 14- and 16-month-old
1103 infants: Effects of action and observational experience. *Child development*.
1104 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12116>
- 1105 Fricker, R. D. & Schonlau, M. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of internet
1106 research surveys: Evidence from the literature [Publisher: SAGE Publications
1107 Inc]. *Field Methods*, 14(4), 347–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152582202237725>

- 1108 Gartstein, M. A. & Rothbart, M. K. (2003). Studying infant temperament via the
 1109 revised infant behavior questionnaire. *Infant Behavior & Development*, 26(1),
 1110 64–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(02\)00169-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(02)00169-8)
- 1111 Ghahari, S., Hassani, H. & Purmofrad, M. (2017). Pragmatic competency and
 1112 obsessive–compulsive disorder: A comparative assessment with normal controls.
 1113 *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 46(4), 863–875.
 1114 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-016-9467-6>
- 1115 Goldsmith, H. H. & Campos, J. J. (1982). Toward a theory of infant temperament. In
 1116 R. N. Emde & R. J. Harmon (Eds.), *The development of attachment and*
 1117 *affiliative systems* (pp. 161–193). Springer US. Retrieved April 1, 2020, from
 1118 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-4076-8_13
- 1119 Göritz, A. S. (2006). Cash lotteries as incentives in online panels. *Social Science*
 1120 *Computer Review*, 24(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439305286127>
- 1121 Göritz, A. S. (2008). The long-term effect of material incentives on participation in
 1122 online panels. *Field Methods*, 20(3), 211–225.
 1123 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X08317069>
- 1124 Goupil, L. (n.d.). *Questionnaire sur le comportement de la petite enfance*.
 1125 [https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
 1126 [descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
- 1127 Graham, K., Collier, B., Bradstreet, M. & Collins, B. (1996). Great blue heron (ardea
 1128 herodias) populations in ontario: Data from and insights on the use of
 1129 volunteers. *Colonial Waterbirds*, 19(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1521805>
- 1130 Gredebäck, G., Gottwald, J. M. & Daum, M. M. (2021, March 26). *How our hands*
 1131 *shape our minds: Six developmental pathways* [type: article]. PsyArXiv.
 1132 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/378rz>
- 1133 Green, E., Stroud, L., Bloomfield, S., Cronje, J., Foxcroft, C., Hunter, K. & Venter, D.
 1134 (2016). *Griffiths scales of child development (3rd ed.)* Hogrefe Ltd.
- 1135 Grob, A., Reimann, G., Gut, J. & Frischknecht-Brunner, M.-C. (2013). *IDS-p -*
 1136 *intelligence and development scales - preschool – hogrefe verlag*. Hogrefe Verlag.

- 1137 Hamaker, E. L. (2012). Why researchers should think “within-person”: A paradigmatic
1138 rationale. In M. R. Mehl & T. S. Connor (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods*
1139 *for studying daily life* (pp. 43–61). Guilford.
- 1140 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. (2010a). Beyond WEIRD: Towards a
1141 broad-based behavioral science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2), 111.
1142 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x10000725>
- 1143 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. (2010b). Most people are not WEIRD.
1144 *Nature*, 466(7302), 29–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>
- 1145 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. (2010c). The weirdest people in the world?
1146 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2), 61–83.
1147 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- 1148 Johnson, C. P. & Myers, S. M. (2007). Identification and evaluation of children with
1149 autism spectrum disorders. *Pediatrics*, 120(5), 1183–1215.
1150 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-2361>
- 1151 Jones, R. & Pitt, N. (1999). Health surveys in the workplace: Comparison of postal,
1152 email and world wide web methods. *Occupational Medicine*, 49(8), 556–558.
1153 <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/49.8.556>
- 1154 Kaplowitz, M. D., Hadlock, T. D. & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail
1155 survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 94–101.
1156 <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh006>
- 1157 *Kinder und digitale medien*. (2021). Retrieved August 23, 2021, from
1158 <https://www.mmi.ch/de-ch/forschung/f%C3%BCr-studententeilnehmende/kidim>
- 1159 Kirchhoff, C. & Fuchs, C. (n.d.). *Early childhood behavior questionnaire (ECBQ)*
1160 *fragebogen zum verhalten im kleinkindalter*. Universitätsklinikum Ulm.
1161 [https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
1162 [descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
- 1163 Koglin, U. & Petermann, F. (2007). *German version of the CBQ very short form*.
1164 Universität Bremen.

- 1165 Kretch, K. S., Franchak, J. M. & Adolph, K. E. (2014). Crawling and walking infants
1166 see the world differently. *Child Development*, 85(4), 1503–1518.
1167 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12206>
- 1168 Kristen, S., Eisenbeis, H., Thoermer, C. & Sodian, B. (2007). *Temperamentsfragebogen*
1169 *für babys- revidierte form*.
- 1170 Lafortune, F., Dery, M. & Verlaan, P. (n.d.). *Questionnaire sur les comportements des*
1171 *enfants - questionnaire court*.
- 1172 Lange, B. P., Euler, H. A. & Zaretsky, E. (2016). Sex differences in language
1173 competence of 3- to 6-year-old children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37(6),
1174 1417–1438. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716415000624>
- 1175 LaRose, R. & Tsai, H.-y. S. (2014). Completion rates and non-response error in online
1176 surveys: Comparing sweepstakes and pre-paid cash incentives in studies of online
1177 behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34, 110–119.
1178 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.01.017>
- 1179 Legare, C. H. & Harris, P. L. (2016). The ontogeny of cultural learning. *Child*
1180 *Development*, 87(3), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12542>
- 1181 Lisi, A. V. M.-D., Lisi, A. M.-D. & Lisi, R. D. (2002). *Biology, society, and behavior:*
1182 *The development of sex differences in cognition*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- 1183 LoBue, V. & Adolph, K. E. (2019). Fear in infancy: Lessons from snakes, spiders,
1184 heights, and strangers. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(9), 1889–1907.
1185 <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000675>
- 1186 LoBue, V., Reider, L. B., Kim, E., Burriss, J. L., Oleas, D. S., Buss, K. A.,
1187 Pérez-Edgar, K. & Field, A. P. (2020). The importance of using multiple
1188 outcome measures in infant research. *Infancy*, 25(4), 420–437.
1189 <https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12339>
- 1190 Lüke, C., Grimminger, A., Rohlfing, K. J., Liszkowski, U. & Ritterfeld, U. (2017). In
1191 infants' hands: Identification of preverbal infants at risk for primary language
1192 delay. *Child Development*, 88(2), 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12610>

- 1193 Majnemer, A. & Rosenblatt, B. (1994). Reliability of parental recall of developmental
1194 milestones. *Pediatric Neurology*, 10(4), 304–308.
1195 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0887-8994\(94\)90126-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0887-8994(94)90126-0)
- 1196 Manfreda, K. L., Bosnjak, M., Berzelak, J., Haas, I. & Vehovar, V. (2008). Web surveys
1197 versus other survey modes: A meta-analysis comparing response rates.
1198 *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 79–104.
1199 <https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530805000107>
- 1200 Mari, G. & Keizer, R. (2020). Parental job loss and early child development in the great
1201 recession. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/2596e>
- 1202 Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K. & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The language experience
1203 and proficiency questionnaire (LEAP-q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals
1204 and multilinguals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50(4),
1205 940–967. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2007/067\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2007/067))
- 1206 Matricardi, G. (n.d.). *Questionario sul comportamento dei bambini (versione breve)*.
1207 [https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
1208 [descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/](https://research.bowdoin.edu/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/the-childrens-behavior-questionnaire/)
- 1209 Mayor, J. & Mani, N. (2019). A short version of the MacArthur–bates communicative
1210 development inventories with high validity. *Behavior Research Methods*, 51(5),
1211 2248–2255. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1146-0>
- 1212 McGraw, M. B. (1943). *The neuromuscular maturation of the human infant*. Columbia
1213 University Press.
- 1214 McInahan, S. (2004). Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second
1215 demographic transition. *Demography*, 41(4), 607–627.
1216 <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2004.0033>
- 1217 Miller, D. I. & Halpern, D. F. (2014). The new science of cognitive sex differences.
1218 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(1), 37–45.
1219 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.10.011>

- 1220 Miller, L. E., Perkins, K. A., Dai, Y. G. & Fein, D. A. (2017). Comparison of parent
 1221 report and direct assessment of child skills in toddlers. *Research in Autism*
 1222 *Spectrum Disorders*, 41-42, 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2017.08.002>
- 1223 Möhring, W. & Frick, A. (2013). Touching up mental rotation: Effects of manual
 1224 experience on 6-month-old infants' mental object rotation. *Child Development*,
 1225 84(5), 1554–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12065>
- 1226 Montirosso, R., Cozzi, P., Putnam, S. P., Gartstein, M. A. & Borgatti, R. (2011).
 1227 Studying cross-cultural differences in temperament in the first year of life:
 1228 United states and Italy. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(1),
 1229 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025410368944>
- 1230 Morales, M., Mundy, P., Crowson, M. M., Neal, A. R. & Delgado, C. E. F. (2005).
 1231 Individual differences in infant attention skills, joint attention, and emotion
 1232 regulation behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29(3),
 1233 259–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250444000432>
- 1234 Morris, A. S., Robinson, L. R. & Eisenberg, N. (2006). Applying a multimethod
 1235 perspective to the study of developmental psychology. In M. Eid & E. Diener
 1236 (Eds.), *Handbook of multimethod measurement in psychology*. American
 1237 Psychological Association.
- 1238 Natalucci, G., Reinelt, T., Koller, B. M. & Suppiger, D. (2021). *Long-term effects of*
 1239 *early nutrition on child development (LEARN)*. Retrieved August 23, 2021, from
 1240 [https://www.usz.ch/fachbereich/neonatologie/forschung/ngn-](https://www.usz.ch/fachbereich/neonatologie/forschung/ngn-researchcenter/current-research-projects/)
 1241 [researchcenter/current-research-projects/](https://www.usz.ch/fachbereich/neonatologie/forschung/ngn-researchcenter/current-research-projects/)
- 1242 Nielsen, M., Haun, D. B. M., Kärtner, J. & Legare, C. H. (2017). The persistent
 1243 sampling bias in developmental psychology: A call to action. *Journal of*
 1244 *Experimental Child Psychology*, 162, 31–38.
 1245 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.017>
- 1246 Nielsen, M. & Haun, D. (2016). Why developmental psychology is incomplete without
 1247 comparative and cross-cultural perspectives. *Philosophical Transactions of the*

- 1248 *Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 371(1686), 20150071.
- 1249 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0071>
- 1250 Nikolaizig, F. (2007). *Temperamentsfragebogen für kinder [german translation of the*
- 1251 *childhood behavior questionnaire]*.
- 1252 <http://www.bowdoin.edu/~sputnam/rothbart-temperament->
- 1253 [questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/childrens-behavior-questionnaire.html](http://www.bowdoin.edu/~sputnam/rothbart-temperament-questionnaires/instrument-descriptions/childrens-behavior-questionnaire.html)
- 1254 Nordahl-Hansen, A., Kaale, A. & Ulvund, S. E. (2014). Language assessment in children
- 1255 with autism spectrum disorder: Concurrent validity between report-based
- 1256 assessments and direct tests. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 8(9),
- 1257 1100–1106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2014.05.017>
- 1258 Pediatrics, A. A. o. (1992). American academy of pediatrics task force on infant
- 1259 positioning and SIDS. *Pediatrics*, 89, 1120–1126.
- 1260 Pedlow, R., Sanson, A., Prior, M. & Oberklaid, F. (1993). Stability of maternally
- 1261 reported temperament from infancy to 8 years. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(6),
- 1262 998–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.29.6.998>
- 1263 Peters-Martin, P. & Wachs, T. D. (1984). A longitudinal study of temperament and its
- 1264 correlates in the first 12 months. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7(3),
- 1265 285–298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(84\)80044-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(84)80044-2)
- 1266 Powell, B., Steelman, L. C. & Carini, R. M. (2006). Advancing age, advantaged youth:
- 1267 Parental age and the transmission of resources to children. *Social Forces*, 84(3),
- 1268 1359–1390. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2006.0064>
- 1269 Putnam, S. P., Gartstein, M. A. & Rothbart, M. K. (2006). Measurement of
- 1270 fine-grained aspects of toddler temperament: The early childhood behavior
- 1271 questionnaire. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 29(3), 386–401.
- 1272 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2006.01.004>
- 1273 Putnam, S. P., Helbig, A. L., Gartstein, M. A., Rothbart, M. K. & Leerkes, E. J.
- 1274 (2014). Development and assessment of short and very short forms of the infant
- 1275 behavior questionnaire-revised. *Journal of Persality Assessment*, 96(4), 445–458.
- 1276 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2013.841171>

- 1277 Putnam, S. P., Jacobs, J., Gartstein, M. A. & Rothbart, M. K. (2010). Development
1278 and assessment of short and very short forms of the early childhood behavior
1279 questionnaire.
- 1280 Putnam, S. P. & Rothbart, M. K. (2006). Development of short and very short forms of
1281 the children's behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 87(1),
1282 103–113. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8701_09
- 1283 Rege, M., Telle, K. & Votruba, M. (2011). Parental job loss and children's school
1284 performance. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 78(4), 1462–1489.
1285 <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdr002>
- 1286 Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L. & Andrews, G. (2019). Gender differences in reading and
1287 writing achievement: Evidence from the national assessment of educational
1288 progress (NAEP). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 445.
- 1289 Reips, U.-D. (2002). Standards for internet-based experimenting. *Experimental*
1290 *Psychology*, 49(4), 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1026//1618-3169.49.4.243>
- 1291 Rhonda Folio, M. & Fewell, R. R. (2000). *Peabody developmental motor scales, 2nd*
1292 *edition*. PRO-ED, Inc.
- 1293 Ross, C. E. & Mirowsky, J. (1999). Parental divorce, life-course disruption, and adult
1294 depression. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(4), 1034–1045.
1295 <https://doi.org/10.2307/354022>
- 1296 Rothbart, M. K. (1981). Measurement of temperament in infancy. *Child Development*,
1297 52, 569–578. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129176>
- 1298 Rothbart, M. K., Ahadi, S. A., Hershey, K. L. & Fisher, P. (2001). Investigations of
1299 temperament at three to seven years: The children's behavior questionnaire.
1300 *Child Development*, 72(5), 1394–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00355>
- 1301 Rothbart, M. K., Derryberry, D. & Hershey, K. (2000). Stability of temperament in
1302 childhood: Laboratory infant assessment to parent report at seven years. In
1303 V. J. Molfese & D. L. Molfese (Eds.), *Temperament and personality development*
1304 *across the life span* (pp. 85–119). Erlbaum.

- 1305 Rubin, K. H., Burgess, K. B. & Hastings, P. D. (2002). Stability and social-behavioral
 1306 consequences of toddlers' inhibited temperament and parenting behaviors. *Child*
 1307 *Development*, 73(2), 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00419>
- 1308 Sachse, S. & Suchodoletz, W. v. (2008). Early identification of language delay by direct
 1309 language assessment or parent report? *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral*
 1310 *Pediatrics*, 29(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1097/DBP.0b013e318146902a>
- 1311 Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K. & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and
 1312 nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education*,
 1313 44(4), 409–432. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024232915870>
- 1314 Schwarzer, G., Freitag, C., Buckel, R. & Lofruthe, A. (2013). Crawling is associated
 1315 with mental rotation ability by 9-month-old infants. *Infancy*, 18(3), 432–441.
 1316 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2012.00132.x>
- 1317 Shih, T.-H. & Fan, X. (2008). Comparing response rates from web and mail surveys: A
 1318 meta-analysis. *Field Methods*, 20(3), 249–271.
 1319 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X08317085>
- 1320 Siegmüller, J., Kauschke, C., von Minnen, S. & Bittner, D. (2011). *Test zum*
 1321 *satzverstehen von kindern*. Elsevier.
- 1322 Smith, L. B. & Thelen, E. (2003). Development as a dynamic system. *Trends in*
 1323 *Cognitive Sciences*, 7(8), 343–348.
 1324 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(03\)00156-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00156-6)
- 1325 Soska, K. C., Robinson, S. R. & Adolph, K. E. (2015). A new twist on old ideas: How
 1326 sitting reorients crawlers. *Developmental Science*, 18(2), 206–218.
 1327 <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12205>
- 1328 Spencer, J. P., Vereijken, B., Diedrich, F. J. & Thelen, E. (2000). Posture and the
 1329 emergence of manual skills. *Developmental Science*, 3(2), 216–233.
 1330 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7687.00115>
- 1331 Statistik, B. f. (2020). *Reproduktive Gesundheit*. Retrieved January 22, 2020, from
 1332 [https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/gesundheit/](https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/gesundheit/gesundheitszustand/reproduktive.html)
 1333 [gesundheitszustand/reproduktive.html](https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/de/home/statistiken/gesundheitszustand/reproduktive.html)

- 1334 Stevens, A. H. & Schaller, J. (2011). Short-run effects of parental job loss on children's
1335 academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(2), 289–299.
1336 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.10.002>
- 1337 Stolt, S., Haataja, L., Lapinleimu, H. & Lehtonen, L. (2008). Early lexical development
1338 of finnish children: A longitudinal study. *First Language*, 28(3), 259–279.
1339 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723708091051>
- 1340 Tahiroglu, D., Moses, L. J., Carlson, S. M., Mahy, C. E., Olofson, E. L. &
1341 Sabbagh, M. A. (2014). The children's social understanding scale: Construction
1342 and validation of a parent-report measure for assessing individual differences in
1343 children's theories of mind. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(11), 2485–2497.
1344 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037914>
- 1345 Thomas, A. & Chess, S. (1977). *Temperament and development*. Brunner/Mazel.
- 1346 van Schaik, C. P. & Burkart, J. M. (2011). Social learning and evolution: The cultural
1347 intelligence hypothesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
1348 *Biological Sciences*, 366(1567), 1008–1016.
1349 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0304>
- 1350 Vonderlin, E., Ropeter, A. & Pauen, S. (2012). Erfassung des frühkindlichen
1351 temperaments mit dem infant behavior questionnaire revised. *Zeitschrift für*
1352 *Kinder- und Jugendpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 40(5), 307–314.
1353 <https://doi.org/10.1024/1422-4917/a000187>
- 1354 Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*.
1355 Harvard University Press.
- 1356 Wellman, H. M. (2007). Understanding the psychological world: Developing a theory of
1357 mind. *Blackwell handbook of childhood cognitive development* (pp. 167–187).
1358 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from
1359 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9780470996652.ch8>
- 1360 Wohlwill, J. F. (1973). *The study of behavioral development*. Academic Press.

- 1361 Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R. & Brooks–Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young
1362 children’s development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child*
1363 *Development*, 73(6), 1861–1879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.t01-1-00511>
1364 Zelazo, P. R. (1998). McGraw and the development of unaided walking. *Developmental*
1365 *Review*, 18(4), 449–471. <https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1997.0460>
1366 Zwickel, J. (2009). Agency attribution and visuospatial perspective taking. *Psychonomic*
1367 *Bulletin & Review*, 16(6), 1089–1093. <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.16.6.1089>

1368

Appendix

1369 Details on Scales

1370 In the following sections, we describe the answer options of the cognitive,
1371 language, motor, and social-emotional scale in more detail and give examples of answer
1372 options and items of each scale. All the items of all scales are available on
1373 <https://osf.io/ar7xp/>.

1374 *Cognitive Scale*

1375 **Answer options.** Caregivers are asked to indicate whether or not they
1376 observe the behaviour in question. We display answer options in a dichotomous manner.
1377 The positive option is “Yes” and, to be unambiguous, relevant factors of the respective
1378 behaviour are additionally outlined concisely for some items. Hence, the answer options
1379 include exact success criteria which have to be met (e.g., counting 3 or more objects).
1380 The negative option is “No” and, where necessary, alternative behaviour which would
1381 not justify a positive choice is sketched (e.g., counting less than 3 objects). As in the
1382 questions for the motor scale, if caregivers indicate “Yes”, they are asked to additionally
1383 indicate since when the child mastered the skill, see Figure 1.

1384 **Exemplary items.** To illustrate, we exemplarily describe one item for each
1385 construct. An early *sensori-motor* item on exploration behaviour asks: “Does your
1386 child play with or examine his/her fingers?”. Caregivers can answer with either “Yes,
1387 when my child is calmly lying on his/her back, my child plays with his/her hands or
1388 examines them (turning them around, opening and closing them)” or “No”. One of the
1389 first *Problem-solving* items assesses means-end behaviour: “Does your child pull at flat
1390 objects (e.g., a cloth or blanket) to grasp a toy that is lying on it?”. This item has the
1391 answer alternatives: “Yes” or “No, my child moves towards the toy”. A *Numerical and*
1392 *categorical knowledge* item investigates children’s counting abilities: “Can your child
1393 count out 10 objects (e.g., building blocks)?”. Caregivers can answer with “Yes, my
1394 child says “one” to the first object, “two” to the second and “three” to the third, etc.”
1395 or “No”.

1396 *Language Scale*

1397 **Answer options.** For each sentence of the morphological and syntactical
 1398 items, caregivers are instructed to indicate how often their child produces such or a
 1399 similar sentence. The questions can be answered via a 5-point Likert scale (never; less
 1400 than once a week; at least once a week, but not every day; once or twice a day; more
 1401 than twice a day) similar to the Children’s Communication Checklist – 2 (CCC2,
 1402 Bishop, 2003).

1403 **Exemplary items.** To illustrate, we provide some examples for items and
 1404 prototypical sentences. An item for *Gestures* asks for: “Does [Child’s Name] point at
 1405 objects that [Child’s Name] wants or would like to show you?”. An item for *Morphology*
 1406 assesses one of the plural forms in Swiss German like this: “Holsch üsi **Jackene**?”
 1407 (Engl. “Can you bring our **jackets**?”). An item for *Syntax* conjunctions includes the
 1408 following sentence: “Wämmer wiiterspüle **oder** wetsch es Buech aluege?” (Engl. “Do we
 1409 want to keep playing **or** should we look at a book?”).

1410 *Motor Scale*

1411 **Answer options.** For each item a dichotomous scale is used with which the
 1412 caregivers are asked to indicate whether their child has attained the skill (Yes) or not
 1413 (No). If caregivers indicate “Yes”, they are further asked to indicate since when the
 1414 child mastered the skill, see Figure 1.

1415 **Exemplary items.** To illustrate, we provide some examples for typical items.
 1416 *Visual-motor integration* items assess eye-hand coordination with objects: “My child
 1417 can stack 5 building blocks” and without objects: “My child can clap his/her hands”.
 1418 Specific *Grasping* items assess the way objects are grasped and held how a child uses
 1419 his/her hands for grasping: “My child can grasp a rattle, lying on his/her back”.
 1420 *Graphomotorics* items assess how the child uses pencils to draw and write: “My child
 1421 imitates me drawing a line”. *Stationary motor skills* items assess body posture: “When
 1422 I place my child on his/her tummy and shake a rattle, he/she rotates his head to locate
 1423 the rattle”. *Locomotion* items assess movement in space: “My child can roll from back

1424 to tummy”. *Object manipulation* items assess the manipulation of a ball: “When I sit on
 1425 the floor with my child and roll a ball towards him/her, he/she will roll the ball back to
 1426 me”.

1427 *Social-Emotional Scale*

1428 **Details on questionnaires.** In the following sections, we provide additional
 1429 information of the established questionnaires, which are used to assess children’s
 1430 social-emotional development in the APP.

1431 ***Infant Behavior Questionnaire - Revised (IBQ-R)*.** The original IBQ
 1432 was developed by Rothbart (1981) and revised as IBQ-R by Gartstein and Rothbart
 1433 (2003). The full version of the IBQ-R includes 14 scales and 191 items. For feasibility
 1434 and efficiency reasons, we implemented the Very Short Form version (Putnam et al.,
 1435 2014, IBQ-R-VSF,) that includes 37 items in 3 broad scales (Positive
 1436 Affectivity/Surgency, Negative Emotionality, Orienting/Regulatory Capacity). For the
 1437 non-English versions, we used the available translations (German: Kristen et al., 2007
 1438 and slightly revised by Vonderlin et al., 2012; Italian: Montirosso et al., 2011; French:
 1439 Cascales, 2011).

1440 ***Early Childhood Behavior Questionnaire (ECBQ)*.** The ECBQ was
 1441 developed by Putnam et al. (2006). The original questionnaire includes 18 scales and
 1442 201 items. We used the very short form version (Putnam et al., 2010) that includes 36
 1443 items in 3 scales (similar to the IBQ-R-VSF: Positive Affectivity/Surgency, Negative
 1444 Emotionality, Orienting/Regulatory Capacity). For the non-English versions, we used
 1445 the available translations (German: **fuchs_early_nodate**; Kirchhoff and Fuchs, n.d.;
 1446 French: Goupil, n.d.; Italian: Cozzi et al., 2013).

1447 ***Children’s Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ)*.** The CBQ was developed by
 1448 Rothbart et al. (2001). The original questionnaire includes 15 scales and 195 items. We
 1449 used the very short form version (Putnam & Rothbart, 2006) that includes 36 items and
 1450 3 scales (similar as in the IBQ-R-VSF: Surgency, Negative Affect, and Effortful
 1451 Control). For the non-English versions, we used the available translations (German:

1452 Koglin and Petermann, 2007; Nikolaizig, 2007; French: Lafortune et al., n.d.; Italian:
1453 Matricardi, n.d.).

1454 ***Children’s Social Understanding Scale (CSUS)***. Children’s ToM is
1455 usually measured via a range of laboratory paradigms that assess the understanding of
1456 mental states such as beliefs, desires, emotions, and intentions (e.g., Wellman, 2007).
1457 We implemented the CSUS (Tahiroglu et al., 2014), a caregiver-report ToM measure. It
1458 includes 6 scales (belief, knowledge, perception, desire, intention, emotion) with a total
1459 of 42 items which have been shown to be a measure of individual differences in children’s
1460 ToM with very high internal consistency, test–retest reliability, and predictive validity.

1461 **Answer options.** The items used in the different scales describe behaviour
1462 that frequently occur in everyday contexts (e.g., “When being dressed or undressed,”
1463 “When playing outdoors”, “When told no”). Accordingly, caregivers are asked to
1464 indicate how often their child showed a particular behaviour during the last week (i.e.,
1465 the past seven days) on a 7-point Likert-style format ranging from “never” to “always”.
1466 We applied the same scales as used in the original questionnaires.

1467 Equation used for analyses of psychometric properties

1468 To analyse the objectivity and criterion validity of the APP, we used different
 1469 multi-level logistic regressions predicting either the AoA for the motor and cognitive
 1470 items or the language scale index for language skills by domain (motor or cognition),
 1471 caregiver education (mother and father), caregiver age (mother and father), app user
 1472 (mother or father), sex of the child, and pregnancy week in which the child was born 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{AoA/Language Index} \sim \\
 & \text{Domain} + \text{Education}_{\text{Father}} + \text{Education}_{\text{Mother}} + \\
 & \text{Age}_{\text{Father}} + \text{Age}_{\text{Mother}} + \\
 & \text{APP}_{\text{User}} + \text{Sex}_{\text{Child}} + \text{PregnancyWeek}_{\text{Child}} + (1|\text{Item})
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Table A1

Internal Consistency (Cronbach's α) for Cognition, Language, Fine Motor, and Gross Motor Items for Different Age Ranges.

Scale	Age Range (Months)	α
Cognition	3 - 6	0.81
Cognition	6 - 12	0.449
Cognition	12 - 18	0.424
Cognition	18 - 24	0.421
Cognition	24 - 36	0.575
Cognition	36 - 48	0.334
Language	24 - 36	0.985
Language	36 - 48	0.982
Language	48 - 72	0.982
Fine Motor	3 - 6	0.918
Fine Motor	6 - 12	0.831
Fine Motor	12 - 18	0.653
Fine Motor	18 - 30	0.742
Fine Motor	30 - 44	0.817
Fine Motor	44 - 72	0.835
Gross Motor	3 - 6	0.9
Gross Motor	6 - 12	0.889
Gross Motor	12 - 18	0.738
Gross Motor	18 - 30	0.748
Gross Motor	30 - 44	0.755
Gross Motor	44 - 72	0.812

Table A2

Number of Users (Total, Mothers, and Fathers) of the 15 Countries with the Largest Numbers of Users.

Country	Total	$n(\text{Mothers})$	$n(\text{Fathers})$
Switzerland	2472	1227	1245
Germany	1827	918	909
Austria	68	35	33
Italy	52	31	21
Poland	35	12	23
United States	23	12	11
Turkey	22	14	8
Russia	21	9	12
United Kingdom	18	15	3
Romania	18	8	12
Spain	18	12	6
Bosnia	17	6	11
France	15	9	6
Kazakhstan	15	2	13
Kosovo	13	7	6