



HAL
open science

A multidimensional evaluation of the benefits of an ecologically realistic training based on pretend play for preschoolers' cognitive control and self-regulation: From behavior to the underlying theta neuro-oscillatory activity

Nicolas Adam, Agnès Blaye, Rasa Gulbinaite, Sylvain Chabé-Ferret, Chloé Farrer

► To cite this version:

Nicolas Adam, Agnès Blaye, Rasa Gulbinaite, Sylvain Chabé-Ferret, Chloé Farrer. A multidimensional evaluation of the benefits of an ecologically realistic training based on pretend play for preschoolers' cognitive control and self-regulation: From behavior to the underlying theta neuro-oscillatory activity. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 2022, 216, 10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105348 . hal-03727822

HAL Id: hal-03727822

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03727822>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Title

A multidimensional evaluation of the benefits of an ecologically realistic training based on pretend-play on preschoolers' cognitive control and self-regulation: From behavior to the underlying theta neuro-oscillatory activity

Nicolas Adam^{1,2*}, Agnès Blaye^{2,3}, Rasa Gulbinaite^{4,5}, Sylvain Chabé-Ferret^{6,7} &, Chloé Farrer^{1,2,7}

¹ Université de Toulouse, Centre de recherche Cerveau et Cognition, Toulouse, France

² Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France

³ Université Aix-Marseille, Laboratoire de Psychologie Cognitive, UMR 7290, Marseille, France

⁴ Université de Lyon, Centre de Recherche en Neurosciences, Lyon, France

⁵ Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale U1028, Lyon, France

⁶ Toulouse School of Economics, INRAE, University of Toulouse Capitole, Toulouse, France

⁷ Institute for Advanced Studies in Toulouse, Toulouse, France.

* Corresponding Author:

Chloé Farrer

Centre de Recherche Cerveau & Cognition, CNRS CERCO UMR 5549, CHU Purpan - Pavillon Baudot, 1, place du Dr. Baylac, BP 25202, 31052 Toulouse Cedex.

chloe.farrer@cnrs.fr

(+33) 5 62 74 61 25

Word count

Text from introduction to reference (minus table and figure placement indication): 11475 words

Authorship statements (according to the CRedits Roles)

Nicolas Adam: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Validation; Visualization; Writing- Original draft; Writing- Review & editing. Agnès Blaye: Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Methodology; Project administration; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Writing- Original draft; Writing- Review & editing. Rasa Gulbinaite: Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing- Review & editing. Sylvain Chabé-Ferret: Data curation; Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing- Review & editing. Chloé Farrer: Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Funding acquisition; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Writing- Original draft; Writing- Review & editing.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the children, their parents and the employees of the three schools where this research was conducted, Villebourbon, Leo Ferre and Venerque schools. Special thanks to Nathalie Delpoux, Fanny Haiart and Marie-Pierre Sansac-Mora. We also thank Sabrina Boukoussa and Sylvie Lille who completed their internship as part of this project. Finally, we thank Sasskia Brüers, Florence Bara, Paul Seabright, Jean-François Camps, Viviane Bouysse, Stéphane Respaud, Deborah Leong, Helena Bodrova, and the federal education authority in Montauban, for their help at different stages of this research.

The present research was funded by a private donation of a philanthropic not-for-profit foundation to CF (grant number R142068).

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

1. Introduction

Development of self-regulation allows children to behave deliberately through the management and modulation of their emotions, thoughts, and actions (Nigg, 2017). Self-regulation relies in part on cognitive control (Bailey & Jones, 2019; Nigg, 2017), a set of partially independent top-down cognitive processes that support goal-directed behavior (Diamond, 2013; Miyake et al., 2000), and involve functions like working memory (updating and manipulating information in memory), response inhibition (inhibiting automatic responses) and cognitive flexibility (switching between task-sets). Cognitive control is important for many aspects of children's daily functioning and academic achievement (Blair & Razza, 2007; McClelland et al., 2000). Individual differences in cognitive control in early childhood partly explain differences in school readiness (Blair, 2002; McClelland et al., 2000), and children with poorer cognitive control have a greater risk to fall behind as soon as they enter school (Blair, 2002; McClelland et al., 2000). This influence is explained by the involvement of cognitive control in school learning (Bull & Scerif, 2001; St Clair-Thompson & Gathercole, 2006) and in children's self-regulatory behavior, which allows them to comply with rules, regulate their emotions and behave in socially appropriate ways (Blair & Raver, 2015). There is, therefore, a great interest in promoting cognitive control of children before they enter school to help them improve their self-regulatory behavior and limit the achievement gap they may have later on (Blair & Raver, 2012; Diamond et al., 2007). This is even more crucial for children facing poverty or adversity, given the growing evidence that poverty-related gaps in school achievement can be explained in part by its adverse effects on children's self-regulation development (Blair & Raver, 2012; Evans & Rosenbaum, 2008). The present study aims to address two questions: what training programs of cognitive control are also effective in promoting children's self-regulation, and what brain mechanisms explain these effects? A list of interventions and training programs to improve children's self-regulation has been proposed by Diamond and Ling (2016). One of these authors' conclusions is that training programs that engage cognitive control while simultaneously addressing children's emotional, social, and physical needs are the most efficient at improving children's self-regulation. However, the brain mechanisms that account for the impact of improved cognitive control on self-regulation are still under-studied. Examining the influence of training on brain mechanisms underlying cognitive control could be a promising avenue of research that has not been explored yet.

1 Evaluations of early interventions and training programs aimed at improving children's
2 cognitive control have yielded inconsistent results on self-regulation, in part because of
3 differences in the content of training activities and the context in which these activities occur.
4 Karbach Unger (2014) defined three cognitive control training types: i) strategy-based
5 training, which teaches children certain strategies to help them regulate their behavior; ii)
6 cognitive task-based training, which uses cognitive control tasks to directly and specifically
7 target cognitive control capabilities; iii) and ecologically realistic training, in which children
8 engage cognitive control in conditions close to real-life situations that also involve social and
9 emotional processes.

10 Strategy-based training that teach children to use private speech or develop breathing habits,
11 help them regulate their behavior, (Berk et al., 2006; Elias and Berk, 2002; Whitebread, 2010)
12 and contribute to their performance in cognitive control in task-switching tasks (Bryck &
13 Mayr, 2005; Emerson & Miyake, 2003). Other strategy-based training that provide children
14 some guidance to a reflection about the relevant instructions and dimensions of the tasks are
15 also effective at enhancing cognitive control (Espinet et al., 2013). Cognitive control task-
16 based training improves children's performance in working memory, response inhibition, and
17 cognitive flexibility (Kloo & Perner, 2003; St Clair-Thompson et al., 2010; Thorell et al.,
18 2009), although mixed results have been obtained for inhibition (Rueda et al., 2005, 2012;
19 Thorell et al., 2009). This training also has impact on brain mechanisms of cognitive control,
20 although it is unclear to what extent these brain changes explain the effects of training on
21 cognitive control. Changes have been reported on cortical thickness (Haier et al., 2009), as
22 well as on brain activity and functional connectivity (Haier et al., 2009; Jolles & Crone, 2012;
23 Rueda et al., 2004, 2012). Training of inhibition and attentional control have been associated
24 with effects on the amplitude, the latency, and the localization of the N2 event-related
25 potential, a neural marker of cognitive control (Pietto et al., 2018; Rueda et al., 2005, 2012),
26 as well as with an increase in effective connectivity between the frontal and parietal areas
27 involved in cognitive control network (Astle et al., 2015). Training effects on children's brains
28 have also led to brain structure and brain functioning patterns that are more similar to those of
29 older children, suggesting that training may stimulate the development of cognitive control
30 network (Jolles & Crone, 2012). However, despite its effects on cognitive control and its brain
31 mechanisms, there is very little evidence that cognitive-task-based training is beneficial for
32 children's academic and self-regulatory skills as very few studies have reported some effects
33 on these skills (Melby-Lervåg & Hulme, 2013; Thorell et al., 2009; Titz & Karbach, 2014).

1 Ecologically realistic training that also addresses children's social, emotional, and academic
2 needs has been shown to improve academic and self-regulatory skills (Bryck & Fisher, 2012;
3 Diamond & Lee, 2011; Diamond & Ling, 2016). This training approach is in line with the
4 theoretical framework proposed by Bailey and Jones (2019), according to which the
5 development of more elaborate self-regulatory skills in the social, emotional, and cognitive
6 domains (e.g., emotion regulation, perspective taking) is supported by the progressive
7 integration of cognitive control with other domain-specific skills and knowledge (e.g., the
8 development of emotion regulation is supported by the integration of inhibition with emotion
9 knowledge). Following this view, an effective approach to helping children develop their self-
10 regulatory skills through cognitive control training would consist of targeting cognitive
11 control interactions with other domain-specific skills and knowledge. This could be achieved
12 by integrating cognitive control training into school and/or social activities to improve
13 cognitive control interaction with social, emotional, and learning processes. This approach is
14 also in line with the view that effective training must foster the emergence of effective
15 connections between cognitive control brain regions and more specialized regions involved in
16 specific skills and knowledge (Amso & Scerif, 2015).

17 The Tools of the Mind early childhood curriculum follows this line (Bodrova & Leong,
18 2018). This curriculum, based on Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective and carried out by
19 several generations of post-Vygotskian scholars (Karpov & Karpov, 2005; Vygotsky, 1978)
20 emphasizes the role of social interactions in child development and learning. In this
21 curriculum, cognitive control is seen as a central mechanism for children's academic and self-
22 regulatory skills and is at the core of some teaching and learning activities. Randomized-
23 controlled trials–based evaluations of this curriculum have shown improved performance in
24 working memory, set-shifting, and inhibition in both preschoolers (Diamond et al., 2007,
25 2019) and school-aged children (Blair & Raver, 2014), as well as improved vocabulary and
26 mathematics (Barnett et al., 2008; Blair & Raver, 2014; Diamond et al., 2007, 2019) and
27 better self-regulation, with less externalized behavior and better conflict resolution skills
28 (Barnett et al., 2008), although mixed findings on these skills were also obtained in two
29 studies (Wilson & Farran , 2012, Lonigan & Phillips, 2012). At the same time, children's
30 cognitive and social-emotional gains were smaller when isolated Tools of the Mind activities
31 were added to another curriculum used in preschool (Diamond & Ling, 2016). Among the
32 program's activities, pretend play holds a special place for its role in the development of
33 children's self-regulation (Bodrova et al., 2013; Slot et al., 2017; Vygotsky, 1933), although
34 the causal role of pretend-play in child's development is still debated (see Lillard et al., 2013

1 for a review). Pretend play consists of solitary or group activities where children establish a
2 play scenario, select and coordinate their roles, and plan all the actions to be performed
3 (Vygotsky, 1933). When several children are involved in pretend play, they engage cognitive
4 control across various cognitive, social, and emotional domains (Bodrova et al., 2013;
5 Bodrova & Leong, 2006; Slot et al., 2017; Vygotsky, 1933). For example, children hold in
6 working memory information related to the play scenario and their roles, they use inhibitory
7 control to refrain from acting inappropriately with the ongoing play and mental flexibility to
8 adapt their actions to the changes of the play. Pretend play also allows children to exert
9 cognitive control in the social and emotional domains, to take turns, consider other children's
10 ideas, resolve conflict, and regulate their emotions and feelings (Galyer & Evans, 2001).

11 While inconsistent findings have been obtained regarding the associations between executive
12 functions and pretend play (see Lillard et al., 2013 for a review), evaluations of children's
13 self-regulation and cognitive control during play show that children as young as three years of
14 age rely more upon these skills when their pretend play is more mature (e.g., increased
15 complexity of the roles and the scenario, use of pretense). Play maturity is correlated with
16 performance in working memory, inhibition, set-shifting, higher-level executive functions like
17 planning and conflict resolution (Carlson et al., 2014; Vieillevoye & Nader-Grosbois, 2008),
18 as well as with children's emotional self-regulation, (Elias & Berk, 2002; Galyer & Evans,
19 2001; Gilpin et al., 2015). Furthermore, two studies have shown that when preschoolers were
20 trained to engage regularly in pretend play, improvements in working memory, inhibition, and
21 flexibility (Thibodeau et al., 2016; Traverso et al., 2015) were observed after the training,
22 with larger effects for children who were highly engaged in the play (Thibodeau et al., 2016),
23 suggesting that enrolling preschoolers in pretend play can be an efficient way of training their
24 cognitive control. However, it is unknown whether it can also benefit children's self-
25 regulatory behavior.

26

27 In the present study, we assessed whether a training using pretend play could improve
28 children's self-regulation. We also assessed whether these improvements were explained by
29 some changes in the brain mechanisms of cognitive control. Based on Diamond and Ling's
30 (2016) conclusion, we propose that pretend play might be an effective approach to promote
31 children's self-regulation because it engages various instances of control across cognitive,
32 social, and emotional domains. Furthermore, building on the idea that training must foster the
33 emergence of effective connections between cognitive control brain regions and more
34 specialized brain regions involved in specific skills and knowledge (Amso & Scerif, 2015),

1 we further propose that better coordination between brain regions involved in control and
2 more specialized regions would explain these training effects. A possible neural candidate is
3 the midfrontal theta oscillatory activity within the frequency range of 4-8 Hz (MFT), a neural
4 mechanism of cognitive control in adults (Cavanagh & Frank, 2014; Cohen & Cavanagh,
5 2011), school-aged children (Adam et al., 2020) and preschoolers (Adam et al., 2020; Liu et
6 al., 2014). MFT is thought to serve as a general neural mechanism of cognitive control
7 because it has been associated with various tasks that engage cognitive control, such as
8 conflict processing and novelty (Cavanagh & Frank, 2014, for a review). This general role has
9 also been shown across preschoolers and school-aged children, for inhibiting a dominant
10 response and shifting of task-set (Adam et al., 2020). MFT supports the temporal organization
11 of brain computations involved in detecting the need for control and implementing control
12 across brain areas involved in more specialized processes of the task (Cavanagh & Frank,
13 2014; Cohen, 2016; Duprez et al., 2020). Given the role of MFT in coordinating the
14 implementation of control across more specialized areas, and its involvement in various
15 instances of cognitive control, we hypothesized that the effects of ecologically realistic
16 training, such as pretend play, on children's cognitive control and self-regulatory behavior
17 could be explained by some changes in mid frontal theta oscillatory activity. Training effects
18 could be observed on MFT power, which reflects the degree of engagement of cognitive
19 control (Jensen & Tesche, 2002; Nigbur et al., 2011; Richardson et al., 2018) or on MFT
20 latency, which reflects the time for theta oscillatory activity to set up, and therefore to engage
21 cognitive control.

22
23 Therefore, the present study aims to assess the effects of ecologically realistic training, using
24 pretend play, on preschoolers' cognitive control and self-regulation, and to reveal the brain
25 mechanisms of these effects. The training activities were inspired by the pretend play
26 activities used in Tools of the Mind classrooms. We created a set of pretend play activities
27 using low-cost materials and designed to be ecologically realistic and to fit the context of
28 French preschool classrooms. This 'Tools-inspired' intervention was evaluated using a
29 randomized controlled trial-based approach where children were randomly assigned to a
30 training group with pretend play activities or an active control group where children were
31 provided with manual activities. Pretend play-based training consisted of helping the child
32 play with an increasing maturity level to engage more cognitive control. We tested whether
33 the use of scaffolding strategies to increase children's play maturity, along with rich social and
34 emotional experiences, were enough to improve children's cognitive control and self-

1 regulation, and influence MFT oscillatory activity. Training effects were assessed using a
2 multilevel assessment at the cognitive, brain, and behavioral levels with measures of cognitive
3 control, MFT power and latency, behavioral self-regulation, and play maturity collected
4 before and after the training.

5 6 7 8 2. Material and methods

9 10 2.1. Schools and Participants

11 The study was conducted in two French pre-kindergarten schools located in disadvantaged
12 districts of the city of Montauban. These schools were part of the French education priority
13 networks that provide additional resources for strengthening educational and pedagogical
14 action to French school districts that face the greatest social difficulties. An oral agreement to
15 participate in the study was obtained from school administrations. The two schools had,
16 respectively, three and four pre-kindergarten classrooms (see Supp. Mat. A for more
17 information on the schools).

18 Families were informed of the study through a written document sent to them and during an
19 information meeting. They accepted the random assignment of their children to the training or
20 the control group and provided written informed consent for children to participate in both the
21 intervention and evaluation parts of the study. Children gave verbal assent. A separate consent
22 form for collecting EEG measures in children was provided to families. Only children for
23 whom parents provided their written consent were tested with EEG. This study was approved
24 by the local ethics committee (N° 2-15038).

25
26 A total of 70 preschool children were initially included in the study (mean age $M = 61.2$
27 months, $SD = 6.6$, range = 48.4–71.8 months, 37 boys and 33 girls). Children included in the
28 study were from four classrooms (two in each school). The data from ten children were
29 excluded from the study due to family relocation ($N=1$), long absence during the intervention
30 ($N=3$), or inability or refusal to perform the cognitive task ($N=6$). The final sample was of 60
31 children ($M = 61.5$ months, $SD = 6.3$, 31 boys and 29 girls).

32
33 All children were assessed at two time points: at fall, within 6 weeks before the
34 intervention starting (Pre-test), and at spring, within 6-weeks (with a mean delay of twenty-six

1 days) following the training (Post-test). Assessments were conducted on two non-consecutive
2 days in a quiet classroom of the school. In one assessment session, a fluid intelligence test, a
3 receptive vocabulary test, and a motor self-regulation task were administered in a
4 counterbalanced order between children. The other session involved a cognitive control task
5 and EEG testing. Each session took less than one hour to complete. Questionnaires on
6 children's self-regulatory skills were collected from parents at both time points. Parents were
7 blind to their child's condition and were given one month to complete the questionnaires.

10 2.2.Measures

12 2.2.1. Vocabulary ability

13 Receptive vocabulary ability was assessed with the EVIP (Dunn et al., 1993), the French
14 version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Scale. It is adapted to children aged two to six
15 years old and requires them to access and retrieve words from memory. Children were
16 presented with four pictures and had to point to the picture corresponding to the
17 experimenter's word. Raw scores were calculated based on the number of correct responses
18 and were then normalized for age.

20 2.2.2. Fluid intelligence

21 Fluid intelligence was assessed using the Raven Colored Progressive Matrices (CPM), a
22 child-friendly version of the Raven's Matrices (Raven, 1947). This standardized test is a
23 multiple-choice test that requires children to complete a series of incomplete patterns.
24 Children are presented with an incomplete pattern from which a single piece is missing. They
25 must select the missing piece, among six possible ones, that best completes the pattern.
26 Children were presented with three sets of increasing difficulty, each containing 12 patterns.
27 The score was the total number of correct responses and was normalized for age.

29 2.2.3. Motor self-regulation task

30 The Head-To-Toes-Task (H3T, Cameron Ponitz et al., 2008) was used to assess children's
31 motor self-regulation. It is appropriate for children aged four to eight years old and requires
32 children to execute an action given by an examiner (i.e., touch your head or touch your toes)
33 and then to switch the rules by acting oppositely (touch his/her head when asked to touch his/
34 her toes). A total of 10 actions were given to the child. A correct behavior (a direct, unhesitant

1 response to the instruction) was scored two; a self-correcting behavior was scored one, and an
2 error was scored zero. The total score was between 0 and 20.

3 4 2.2.4. Self-regulatory behavior

5 Self-regulatory behavior was assessed with the French version of the Behavioral Rating
6 Inventory of Executive Functions (BRIEF, Roy et al., 2013) and with the socio-affective
7 profile (PSA, Dumas et al., 1997). These questionnaires allow assessing children's self-
8 regulation in their home setting during daily activities. They were completed by the parents.

9
10 The BRIEF questionnaire assesses children's and adolescents' behavior aged 5 to 18 years. It
11 provides scores measuring different aspects of self-regulation. We used the Behavioral
12 Regulation Index (BRI), that reflects children's cognitive flexibility and their capacity to
13 regulate their emotions and behavior. We only used the raw scores because some of the
14 children were too young (four years old) to compute their standardized scores and because we
15 directly compared measures between our training and control groups.

16
17 The PSA describes children's emotional and behavioral tendencies. It provides scores on the
18 child's social competence, internalizing behavior, externalizing behavior, and general
19 adaptation. We used the General Adaptation score (GAS) of the socio-affective profile
20 questionnaire (PSA), a composite score that reflects children's abilities to interact positively
21 with others and express their emotions in a socially appropriate manner. This questionnaire is
22 appropriate for children aged two to six years old.

23
24 Psychometrics statistics (validity and reliability), descriptive statistics and correlations among
25 the measures selected are provided in Supplemental Material B, C and D.

26 27 2.2.5. Sociodemographic information

28 Parents provided information relative to the family environment (number of children,
29 language spoken at home), and information about them (level of education, occupation, salary
30 range), and their child (age of entrance at school, prematurity, health problems). The
31 demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

32
33 Insert table 1 here please

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

2.2.6. Maturity of pretend play

Pretend play maturity is positively associated with cognitive control and emotional self-regulation (Carlson et al., 2014; Slot et al., 2017). Pretend play maturity was assessed using the rubric consistent with the Vygotskian/Post-Vygotskian views of play (Elkonin, 2005; Vygotsky, 1967). We evaluated five criteria of the original grid (Leong & Bodrova, 2012, Bodrova & Leong, 2018) describing the play's critical aspects (play planning, language use, props use, scenario complexity, and roles complexity). Each of these criteria evolves along five stages as children's play maturity increases. We evaluated all criteria using the five-stage grid, which was converted into a five-level scale. The lowest scores corresponded to less mature play levels and higher scores to more mature levels of play. As a result, each criterion of children's play was scored between 1 and 5.

Pretend play maturity was evaluated by observing groups of four children playing together for fifteen minutes without adult supervision. Each group was evaluated by the two experimenters who supervised pretend play activities. The choice to have the same experimenters conducting and assessing the play activities was justified by the need for good expertise in pretend play to evaluate the play's criteria accurately. Indeed, the experimenters know well the scenarios and the corresponding actions, roles, and props that can be used during play; they can therefore better recognize the elements of the play that inform about the maturity of the play criteria. However, to limit the potential bias of having the same experimenters evaluating children (Lillard et al., 2013), and to ensure the confidence in the maturity of pretend play scoring, we used the following coding procedure. First, groups of four children were created by mixing children of the training group with children of the control group. Second, all children were assessed by two experimenters, one of whom was blind to the child's condition. Therefore, the coding was partially blind as all children were evaluated by one experimenter who was blind to their condition. Third, after the play session, the experimenters questioned children about their play to adjust their scoring of the play (i.e; they asked children whether they played a role, had a scenario...see Sup Mat E). Then, the two experimenters discussed the scores they assigned to each child and then assigned the final scores (average of the two independent scores). Finally, the play sessions were video recorded to allow for additional assessments if necessary. For example, if the independent scores differed by more than three points (this occurred for two children), (see Supp Mat E for more information on the evaluation of play maturity).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

2.2.7. Cognitive control task

Cognitive control was assessed using the mixed condition of the Hearts & Flowers task (Davidson et al., 2006; Diamond et al., 2007) as it is the most sensitive to differences in cognitive control for 4- and 5-year-old children (e.g., Diamond & Lee, 2011). This task allows assessing cognitive control in different conditions of interference (see Figure 1). The interference could occur at the response level (between two motor responses) or the task-set level (between two task-sets). There were four interference conditions: the null interference condition (cC) did not involve any interference. In the response interference condition (iI), children had to inhibit the dominant motor response. In the task-set interference condition (iC), children had to inhibit the previous task-set and switch to the current one. Finally, in the task-set and response interference condition (cI), children had to switch of task-set and inhibit a dominant motor response (see Figure 1 for more detailed information on the task). Accuracy (percentage of correct responses) and mean reaction times were calculated for each condition.

Insert Figure 1 here please

2.3.EEG procedure

EEG measures were collected from 48 children (mean age = 61.4 months, SD = 6.4). Data were recorded for 25 children in the training group and 23 children in the control group. EEG testing and material were first presented to children. Once the child was comfortable with the material, the experimenter installed the EEG cap while the child watched a cartoon. EEG recording and pre-processing parameters were the same as those used by Adam et al., (2020). A Biosemi Active-Two amplifier system with 64-channels positioned according to the 10-20 International system was used. Continuous data were epoched from -1500 to 3000ms relative to the stimulus onset. Epochs containing ocular and motor artifacts during the baseline or stimulus presentation time were rejected. Thereafter, independent component analysis (ICA) was performed (Delorme & Makeig, 2004), and components that did not account for brain activity (eye-blinks, horizontal eye-movements, or muscle activity) were subtracted from the data (Chaumon et al., 2015). Only correct response trials were included in the analysis. Errors, post-errors, anticipatory responses, and warm-up trials (first trial of each block) were removed from the data. Children who were excluded from the behavioral analyses were also excluded from the EEG analyses.

1 We isolated midfrontal theta (MFT) activity using optimal spatial filters - a weighted
2 combination of all channels - designed to maximize power in the theta band (Cohen, 2017;
3 Duprez et al., 2020; Gulbinaite et al., 2017; Zuure et al., 2020). Interference-related brain
4 activity was extracted during cognitive control processing (stimulus-locked analysis) time
5 windows (Cavanagh et al., 2012; Gulbinaite et al., 2014). Please refer to Adam et al., 2020 for
6 an exhaustive presentation of the analytical EEG procedure.

7

8 The surface Laplacian, using laplacian perrinX function (Cohen, 2014), was applied to
9 artifact-free data prior to analysis to increase the topographical specificity and attenuate
10 volume conduction (Kayser & Tenke, 2015). Time-frequency decomposition was performed
11 by convolving stimulus-locked single-trial data from all electrodes with complex Morlet
12 wavelets, which increased from 2 to 40 Hz in 40 logarithmically spaced steps, and wavelet
13 cycles varied from 3 to 6 in logarithmically spaced steps.

14 From the resulting complex signal, an estimate of frequency band-specific power at each time
15 point was defined as the squared magnitude of the result of the convolution. Single-trial
16 power values were then averaged across trials for each condition separately, and then
17 normalized relative to the condition-average baseline period (-400 to -100ms) using a decibel
18 (dB) transform at each frequency:

$$19 \text{ dB power} = 10 \times \log_{10}[\text{power}/\text{baseline}]$$

20 Conversion to a dB scale ensures that data across all frequencies, time points, electrodes,
21 conditions, and participants were in the same scale and thus were comparable. The use of a
22 short baseline window was the most appropriate approach to avoid a contamination of the
23 previous trial activity over subsequent trials as reported in previous studies (150ms to 200ms
24 of baseline window between -350ms to -50ms before the stimulus onset (Cohen & Cavanagh,
25 2011; Cohen & Ridderinkhof, 2013; Cohen & Donner, 2013).

26

27 To examine changes in children's theta activity as a function of interference condition, we
28 compared children's MFT power amplitude for each interference conditions (between
29 assessment times and groups). This approach belongs to the class of “guided” as opposed to
30 “blind” (e.g., independent component analysis) source-separation methods (Cheveigné &
31 Arzounian, 2015; Nikulin et al., 2011). Because the data were firstly pooled over interference
32 conditions, the window selection was orthogonal to the effects that we were interested in
33 (Cohen & Gulbinaite, 2017). The spatial filter was designed in a way that was blind to the
34 interference condition of any given trial. For each participant, a single component with the

1 typical midfrontal spatial peak and theta-band temporal dynamics (phasic theta power
2 increase following stimulus onset) was identified and selected for further analyses. In cases
3 when no single MFT component could be identified, participant was excluded from further
4 analysis. Finally, 38 children were included in the EEG analyses for the pre-assessment (20
5 for training group and 18 for control group), and 41 children for the post-assessment (22 for
6 training group and 19 for control group).

7
8 Task-related brain activity was extracted on an individual basis during the time window where
9 cognitive control was implemented (stimulus-locked analysis; Cavanagh et al., 2012;
10 Gulbinaite et al., 2014). We first identified individual theta power peak on data averaged
11 across conditions within a large, 200ms to 1,500ms, time window. The latency of this peak
12 was used as the individual theta latency measure. Then, for each participant, a shorter time
13 window was determined around the identified theta power amplitude peak in both frequency
14 (± 1 Hz) and time (± 150 ms). The theta measures were computed by averaging baseline mean-
15 corrected power values of midfrontal theta component into the participant-specific time
16 window (both for average MFT power and average MFT power by condition).

20 2.4.Intervention

21 Children were randomly assigned to a training group (N=31) or a control group (N=29). They
22 were then grouped into small groups of four to five children each, mixing boys and girls and
23 children of different classes and ages. The training and control activities lasted forty-five
24 minutes and were held two times a week, on the same days and at the same time. The duration
25 and frequency of our training were similar to those used in cognitive control task-based
26 training (see Diamond & Lee, 2011).

27 Both training and control activities were carried out in quiet rooms of the school. Two
28 experimenters conducted the training activities, and students in Psychology (Master level)
29 conducted the control activities. The intervention lasted 10 weeks, for a total duration of 15
30 hours. Children attended an average of 16 sessions (range 9-18) for the training group and
31 15.4 sessions (range 8-18) for the control group.

33 2.2.1. Training activities

1 Training activities were inspired by the pretend play activities used in Tools of the Mind
2 classrooms (Leong & Bodrova, 2012, Bodrova & Leong, 2018). However, since our play
3 activities were not part of a curriculum and were conducted as a separate training, they differ
4 in some aspects from the pretend play of Tools of the Mind (see Supp. Mat. F for more
5 information on the differences between the present intervention and Tools of the Mind
6 curriculum). Play activities were built from key elements of pretend play: the scenario
7 content, the scenario actions, the play roles, and the props provided to children (Leong &
8 Bodrova, 2012, Bodrova & Leong, 2018). Training activities evolved over the intervention to
9 challenge cognitive control and self-regulatory skills continually. The evolution of training
10 relied on the approach to assessing and scaffolding play (Bodrova & Leong, 2018) as well as
11 on strategies developed for the intervention (see (see Supp. Mat. G for more information on
12 scaffolding strategies). Scaffolding strategy was adapted to each child based on their pre-
13 training assessment of play maturity. Training activities also took into account key success
14 factors of efficient training (Diamond & Ling, 2016): children's motivation (the scenario of
15 the play was renewed each week to maintain children's interest in the game), the intensity of
16 the training (the play activity lasted 45 minutes to give children enough time to play) and the
17 increase in training complexity (the scenario evolved over the intervention, with more realistic
18 scenarios at the beginning of the intervention and more fantastic scenarios at the end, as
19 fantasy pretend play requires greater cognitive control resources than realistic pretend play
20 (Thibodeau et al., 2016). Finally, the experimenters' role in creating the scenario evolved over
21 the training with a more experimenter-directed scenario at the beginning of the training and a
22 more child –directed scenario at the end. Children were indeed encouraged and helped to be
23 more and more involved in creating the scenario over the training period.

24

25 Children were trained and scaffolded by the experimenters who had an expertise with pretend
26 play prior the training. The experimenters set up the pretend play training sessions of the
27 present study during a pilot study conducted in another school the year before. Each training
28 session was composed of three steps.

29 i) The briefing (10 minutes). Each session started with presenting the play scenario to
30 children, by reading a story, posting pictures on the wall, or using videos. This presentation
31 allowed all children to have the same information. The experimenter then described the play
32 area with its different parts (the play area was adapted to the scenario with the delimitation of
33 different zones, selection of appropriate accessories, furniture...). Children were then asked to
34 choose one play role and describe the actions they would like to perform. To help children

1 remember the story, their roles, and their actions, we used a storyboard with pictograms
2 representing the characters with their actions. Additional pictograms representing other
3 characters and actions were also displayed to help children develop the scenario. Finally, a
4 play map representing the different locations of the play area was also displayed.

5 ii) Pretend play session (25 minutes). During play, children had to play their roles and
6 execute the corresponding actions. Children were encouraged to play with one another but
7 they were not forced to do so if they preferred to act out their roles independently. The
8 experimenter supervised the play and helped children act out the scenario, use the props and
9 interact with other children to improve their play maturity.

10 iii) The debriefing (10 minutes). Children were gathered in front of the experimenter. They
11 were encouraged to recall the play scenario, their roles, and the actions they executed. They
12 were also encouraged to discuss other evolutions of the play for the forthcoming play session.

14 2.4.2. Control activities

15 Control activities consisted of art craft activities (i.e., drawing, modeling clay...). The control
16 activities had the same duration and were run with the same group size than the training
17 activities. Furthermore, children of the control group received the same support and help
18 from the experimenter than children in the training group (the experimenter was always
19 present, he helped children when necessary and encouraged them to play together, without
20 forcing them if they did not want to). Control activities were supervised by Master students in
21 Psychology with a major in Developmental Psychology who had experiences with conducting
22 group activities with children.

25 2.5. Experimental design

26 The training was evaluated using a pairwise randomized controlled trial. Within each
27 classroom children were grouped into pairs according to their cognitive control, vocabulary,
28 and fluid intelligence (using the normalized EVIP, CPM, and dots scores). Pairs were formed
29 by minimizing the total sum of a Mahalanobis distance between children from the same class
30 and the same EEG category (with or without EEG testing). Optimal pairs were computed
31 using a non-directed search algorithm sampling randomly pairs within strata and looking for
32 the minimum total distance. Randomization to the training or control condition was conducted
33 at the child level. Within each pair, we selected at random (using a pseudo-Random Number
34 Generator algorithm) one child to be in the training group and the other to be in the control

1 group. This pairwise design was also constrained to ensure similar demographics
2 characteristics (for age and sex) between our groups. Finally, to control for potential
3 differences in teacher's characteristics and experiences on training outcomes, randomization
4 was conducted in each classroom. Therefore, children of each pair had the same teacher and
5 had sociodemographic characteristics, fluid intelligence, cognitive control, and vocabulary
6 performance as similar as possible.

7
8 Analysis of the experimental results was conducted using a linear model with both pair and
9 children as effects, ensuring that all pre-post comparisons were done within pair, and a group
10 factor was coded as 0 for control and 1 for training group. For some variables, the pre-post
11 comparison is much noisier than the post variable because of large amounts of measurement
12 error. In such case, we chose to report results from within pair comparison of post outcomes.

13 We chose a pairwise design in order to increase the precision of our experiment as much as
14 possible. However, in a pairwise design, any attrition dramatically affects the sample size
15 because, for each child lost from the initial sample, the paired children were also excluded.
16 Eventually, the final analysis included 26 pairs of children (52 children in total). We also
17 assessed whether training effects on cognitive control (accuracy and reaction times) and MFT
18 (MFT power and latency) differed according to the interference type to resolve, by adding an
19 interference condition (iI, iC, cI, cC) as a fixed effect in the model. When needed, planned
20 contrast analyses were further conducted to compare brain and cognitive measures between
21 groups. Finally, additional analyses were conducted without the pair factor on the whole
22 participant's sample. Results did not differ from the pairwise analyses. All analyses were run
23 with R software (R Core Team, 2014). We reported effect sizes using Cohen's d (in standard
24 deviation), with its associated standard error and 95% confidence interval. The effect size is
25 considered large when Cohen's d is around .8, a medium effect size for d around .5, and small
26 and minimal effects for d around .2 and below. We also reported the t-values and their
27 associated p-values with the number of subjects and pairs included in the analyses. Additional
28 analyses were conducted without the pair factor on the whole participant's sample. Results did
29 not differ from the pairwise analyses and are presented in supplemental material H.

30 31 2.5.1. Power analysis and pre-registration

32 The minimum detectable effect size was calculated for the main outcome (mean accuracy for
33 cognitive control). The standard error of the training effect estimator, including pair fixed
34 effect, is of 0.122, which implies a minimum detectable effect size (for one-sided t-test of size

1 5% and power 80%) of 0.303. We made no deviations to the pre-analysis plan, except for
2 analyzing maturity of play, dealing with missing observations and choosing the most precise
3 estimators between the pre-post and post comparisons.

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1257/rct.2787-2.1>
6
7
8
9

10 3. Results

11 3.1. Baseline differences

12 As already detailed, training and control groups were formed to ensure similar performance
13 for cognitive control (mean accuracy across all conditions), vocabulary, and fluid intelligence
14 before the training. We also checked if potential differences between control and training
15 groups on other outcome variables were present before the training. Two-tailed unpaired
16 student t-tests showed that both groups were well-matched regarding MFT power, MFT peak
17 latency, the maturity of play, and self-regulation (all t ; $-1.44 < t < 1.28$; all $p > 0.08$).

18 3.2. Training effects

19 The evaluation of pretend play-based training was conducted on children's play maturity,
20 cognitive control, midfrontal theta oscillatory activity, and self-regulatory behavior. The
21 Cohen's d are reported in Figure 2 and Table 2)

22
23
24
25 Insert Figure 2 here please

26
27 Insert Table 2 here please
28
29

30 3.2.1. Behavioral measures

31 3.2.1.1. Maturity of play

32 We first assessed whether scaffolding strategies for helping children play were effective at
33 improving their maturity of play. An effect of training was found on the five criteria of play
34 maturity. Higher scores for training group compared to the control group were observed on

1 planning ($t(20) = 3.11, p < .01; d = 0.85$; role : $t(20) = 2.49, p < .05; d = 0.78$) ; propels ($t(20)$
2 $= 2.57, p < .01; d = 0.76$; language ($t(20) = 3.94, p < .01; d = 1.03$) ; and scenario ($t(20) =$
3 $3.25, p < .01; d = 0.93$). These effects were important as the effect sizes were found to exceed,
4 or to be close to the Cohen's convention for a large effect size ($d = .8$).

5

6 3.2.1.2. Self-regulatory behavior

7 We then examined whether the training benefitted children's self-regulatory behavior in their
8 daily life activities. Self-regulation measures were obtained from parents' reports of their
9 children's behavior using i) the Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI), of the BRIEF
10 questionnaire, and ii) the General Adaptation score (GAS) of the socio-affective profile
11 questionnaire (PSA). No training effect was observed on the BRI index ($t(7) = 0.72, p = .497,$
12 $d = 0.35, 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.60; 1.31]$). For the PSA, an increase of GAS score was observed for the
13 control group ($t(8) = -2.53, p < .05; d = -0.57, 95\% \text{ CI}[-1.02; -0.13]$). However, these results
14 must be taken with caution as these analyses were conducted on smaller groups (8 and 7 pairs
15 of parents for the BRIEF and the PSA, respectively). Indeed, we had to exclude some parents'
16 reports from the analyses because of incomplete or inappropriately completed questionnaires.
17 These parents were not used to complete questionnaires on their child's behaviour and daily
18 life, and had poor French language skills. Support and help (explanation of the questions and
19 translation in their mother tongue) was provided to them but it was not sufficient to get more
20 completed questionnaires. Finally, no training effect was observed on the motor dimension of
21 self-regulation ($t(26) = -0.70, p = .49, d = -0.18, 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.70; 0.33]$). Overall, these results
22 showed that pretend play training did not benefit children's self-regulatory behavior.

23

24 3.2.2. Cognitive measures

25 3.2.2.1. Cognitive control

26 Effect of training on children's cognitive control was assessed using a task that required
27 resolving an interference occurring at the motor level (inhibiting a dominant motor response)
28 or the task set-level (shifting from one task-set to another task-set). Overall, the training did
29 not benefit children's cognitive control as no significant differences between training and
30 control groups were observed on mean accuracy, ($t(26) = 0.02, p = .99, d = 0.0; 95\% \text{ CI}[-$
31 $0.55; 0.56]$) and response times ($t(26) = -1.01, p = .32; d = -0.22; 95\% \text{ CI}[-0.66; 0.21]$).
32 Assessing the impact of training on each condition of interference, we did not obtain any
33 training effects on motor-interference conditions and task-set interference conditions (for
34 accuracy: all, $t(26): -0.91 < t > -0.07; p: .37 < p > .94$; $d: -0.23 < d > -0.02$; for RT: all, $t(26): -$

1 1.61 < t > -0.37; p: .12 < > .71; -.41 < d > -0.10) , (see Figure 3). These results show that pretend
2 play training did not improve children's cognitive control, irrespective of the interference
3 condition.

4
5 Insert Figure 3 here please
6
7

8 3.2.2.2. Fluid intelligence and vocabulary

9 We also examined the effects of the training on children's fluid intelligence and vocabulary.
10 We found no effects of the training on these measures (EVIP: $t(26) = -0.23$; $p = .82$; $d = -0.06$;
11 95% IC[-0.55;0.44]; CPM: $t(26) = 1.41$; $p = .17$; $d = 0.35$ 95% IC[-0.14;0.83]), showing that
12 children's nonverbal IQ and vocabulary did not benefit from pretend play training.

13 14 3.2.3. Brain measures

15 3.2.3.1. Mid frontal theta power and latency

16 Effects of pretend play-based training on brain mechanisms of cognitive control were
17 assessed on MFT power, which reflects the engagement of cognitive control (Cavanagh et al.,
18 2011; Nigbur et al., 2011), and MFT latency, which reflects the time at which theta oscillatory
19 activity reaches its maximal power. Overall, there were no effect of the training on mean
20 midfrontal theta power ($t(14) = -0.94$, $p = 0.37$, $d = -0.21$; 95% IC[-0.63;0.22]) and on mean
21 latency MFT ($t(14) = -0.02$; $p = .98$, $d = -0.01$; 95% IC[-0.90;0.88]) (see Figure 4). We also
22 assessed training effects in each interference condition, no training effects were observed on
23 MFT power and MFT latency (see the statistics in Table 2). These results indicate that pretend
24 play training did not influence MFT activity (see Figure 3).

25
26 Insert Figure 4 here please
27
28

29 4. Discussion

30 Ecologically realistic training of cognitive control, which emphasizes the importance of
31 training cognitive control while taking into account children's social, physical, and emotional
32 needs, is viewed as one of the most effective approaches for promoting children's self-
33 regulatory skills (Diamond & Ling, 2016). However, it is unknown whether self-regulation
34 improvement is explained by some changes in the brain mechanisms of cognitive control. We

1 implemented an ecologically realistic training program based on pretend play, and we
2 evaluated its effects on preschoolers' self-regulatory behavior, cognitive control, and a neural
3 mechanism of this control, the mid frontal theta oscillatory activity (MFT). Our intervention
4 was inspired by the approach to assessing and scaffolding pretend play advocated by the
5 authors of Tools of the Mind (Bodrova & Leong, 2018; Leong & Bodrova, 2012). This
6 approach when implemented in the conjunction with other activities designed to support
7 cognitive control has shown benefits on children's cognitive control and self-regulatory
8 behavior (Blair et al., 2018; Diamond et al., 2007, 2019). Therefore, we assessed whether the
9 same beneficial outcomes would be achieved with our pretend play intervention, also
10 examining the brain mechanisms underlying these effects. We conducted a multilevel
11 evaluation to compare preschoolers' brain activity and behavioral and cognitive performance
12 between a training group who received pretend play-based training and an active control
13 group who received manual art activities.

14 The principle of cognitive control training based on pretend play is to help children improve
15 their play's maturity because more mature play implies greater use of cognitive control
16 resources. Using scaffolding strategies for play, we show that a low-dosage play training can
17 increase the maturity level of pretend play in most vulnerable children. Training effects were
18 observed on several criteria of play maturity: the richness of the scenario, with more elaborate
19 and complex situations, mixing realistic and fantasy play elements; the roles complexity, with
20 children playing different roles associated with the same scenario; the plan of the play, with
21 more elaborate planning before the play; and the use of language to describe scenarios, roles,
22 and actions during the play. However, the improvement in the children's play's maturity did
23 not benefit children's self-regulation in their daily activities, nor did it influence cognitive
24 control and midfrontal theta oscillatory activity.

25 A higher level of play maturity is associated with increased performance in cognitive control
26 (Carlson et al., 2014; Slot et al., 2017; Vieillevoye & Nader-Grosbois, 2008), but there is little
27 evidence that pretend play is effective for training preschooler's cognitive control. Only two
28 studies have shown that regularly engaging children in pretend play increases their inhibition
29 and set-shifting performance (Thibodeau et al., 2016; Traverso et al., 2015). However, play
30 criteria (scenarios, roles, actions, language, and props) were not assessed in these two studies;
31 it is therefore unclear whether these effects were explained by an improvement in one or
32 several of these criteria. In the present study, we showed that an increase in play maturity was
33 insufficient to improve children's cognitive control. Cognitive control was assessed with tasks
34 requiring resolving an interference occurring at the level of motor response (inhibiting a

1 predominant motor response) and/or the task-set level (shifting between two tasks-sets). Our
2 pretend play-based training did not affect children's cognitive control performance for
3 resolving interference at the motor level or the task-set level. Therefore, our present results
4 showed that regularly engaging cognitive control in pretend play training activities was
5 insufficient to improve its efficiency. Other studies have reported training effects only in task
6 conditions that required higher cognitive control resources and were the most challenging for
7 children (Diamond et al., 2007; Schmitt et al., 2015). For preschool children, resolving an
8 interference at the task-set level is more difficult than resolving an interference at the motor
9 level, as evidenced by slower and less accurate responses (Adam et al., 2020; Davidson et al.,
10 2006). However, we did not observe any training effects in the task-set interference condition,
11 suggesting that pretend play-based training was not effective in improving children's
12 cognitive control even in conditions that required greater cognitive control resources.

13 Cognitive control training can have an impact on brain mechanisms of cognitive control.
14 These effects were obtained with cognitive control task-based training (Espinete et al., 2013;
15 Rueda et al., 2005) in children as young as three years old (Rueda et al., 2005, 2012). The
16 impact of ecologically realistic training on brain mechanisms of cognitive control is very
17 poorly known as very few studies have investigated these effects, and none of them have used
18 pretend play. Only one study showed that training preschoolers to interact with a doll to teach
19 it the rule of a shifting task increased brain activity within the lateral prefrontal cortex
20 (Moriguchi et al., 2015), a cognitive control brain area. However, in the present study, we did
21 not observe any training effect on midfrontal theta oscillatory activity (MFT), a neural
22 mechanism of cognitive control. Training did not impact the power amplitude of mid frontal
23 theta activity, showing that the training had no effect on the engagement of control in the task.
24 Other studies have reported brain activation patterns after training similar to that observed in
25 older children (Rueda et al., 2005), suggesting that training may accelerate cognitive control
26 development (Jolles & Crone, 2012). This development is associated with shorter MFT
27 latency between preschool and school ages (Adam et al., 2020), indicating that MFT is set up
28 more rapidly in school-aged children than preschoolers. However, we did not observe any
29 training effect on MFT latency, suggesting that pretend play did not either affect the time
30 required to set up MFT activity, and therefore the time for engaging cognitive control.

31 Another main objective of the present study was to assess whether pretend play-based training
32 benefits children's self-regulatory behavior in their daily lives. Indeed, regular engagement of
33 cognitive control in the cognitive, social, and emotional domains has been proposed to explain
34 the transfer effects of cognitive control training on children's self-regulatory behavior

1 (Diamond & Lee, 2011; Moreau & Conway, 2014). Furthermore, early childhood
2 interventions that emphasized pretend play were shown to benefit children's self-regulation in
3 social contexts, with a reduction in externalized behavior and an improvement in conflict
4 resolution capacity (Barnett et al., 2008). Pretend play provides children with appropriate
5 experiences for engaging cognitive control in the social and emotional domains. For example,
6 children had to take turns, refrain from acting impulsively to let another child act, or manage
7 frustration or excitement. However, parents' evaluations of their child's behavior during daily
8 activities did not reveal any training effects on children's self-regulatory behavior. Our
9 findings, therefore, suggest that providing children with play activities that also meet their
10 social and emotional needs is insufficient to improve their self-regulation.

11 We propose that the absence of training effects on cognitive control, MFT and self-regulation
12 can be explained by the intensity and the content of our play training. Training intensity is a
13 crucial factor for effective training (Diamond & Ling, 2016) and is determined by training
14 frequency (how often training is delivered) and training duration (how long training is
15 provided). Although the intensity of our training was sufficient to improve the maturity of
16 play, it might have been insufficient to improve children's cognitive control and self-
17 regulation. Indeed, a long duration and a high frequency of training are necessary for
18 regularly activating cognitive control brain networks (Diamond & Ling, 2016; Jaeggi et al.,
19 2008) and coordinating them with specialized processes on which cognitive control operates
20 (Amso & Scerif, 2015). In the present study, the training duration and frequency were the
21 same as those used in cognitive task-based training that were shown to be effective (Diamond
22 & Ling, 2016). In cognitive task-based training, cognitive control operates on a few elements
23 that are repeated throughout the training. Consequently, cognitive control interacts with the
24 same specialized processes throughout training. However, in our training, cognitive control
25 was engaged in various situations involving cognitive, social, and emotional processes,
26 greatly increasing the variety of specialized processes with which cognitive control interacts.
27 Therefore, the intensity of our intervention might not have been high enough to improve the
28 efficiency of cognitive control and its interactions with the various specialized processes
29 activated during the play. Differences in intensity could also explain differences in training
30 effects between our pretend play-based training and other play-based interventions for which
31 improvements in cognitive control was obtained. For example, in Tools curriculum, children
32 attended classrooms five days a week for at least forty weeks (Barnett et. al., 2008, Diamond
33 et al., 2007). Furthermore, the entire classroom reflected the current play theme which
34 provides children with additional opportunities for play interactions which happen through the

1 day (Bodrova & Leong, 2006). While some of these activities directly target cognitive
2 control, others provide children with practice in self-regulation as they engage in social
3 interactions and literacy- or math-related activities. Therefore, the positive effects of the
4 curriculum on cognitive control could also be explained by other curriculum tools that assist
5 child's self-regulatory behavior (Lillard et al., 2013). In the present study, the training was
6 delivered for ten weeks and children had no time specifically allocated to pretend play outside
7 these training opportunities as pretend play was not integrated into the classroom curriculum.
8 As a result, children did not have access to additional activities to play, and therefore had
9 fewer opportunities to engage their cognitive control and practice self-regulation.

10 The content of our play intervention could also explain the lack of beneficial effects on
11 children's self-regulation. In other play-based interventions that have shown training effects
12 on self-regulation, children also had opportunities to engage in activities that appeal to their
13 metacognitive skills (Bodrova & Leong, 2006). During play, they learned some self-reflective
14 strategies to enable them to reflect and become aware of their own and others' actions and
15 their consequences on others. They also learned self-regulatory strategies to regulate their
16 behavior, such as using private speech or developing breathing habits, (Berk et al., 2006; Elias
17 & Berk, 2002; Whitebread, 2010). Children were not provided with some strategies to
18 regulate their own behavior in our play intervention, as a consequence it might have reduced
19 the effectiveness of our play intervention on children's self-regulation.

20 Several recommendations can be proposed for future studies on the role of pretend play
21 training on cognitive control and self-regulation. First, future studies should take into account
22 the limitations of the present study regarding the duration and the frequency of the training as
23 well as the absence of metacognitive strategies and address their effects on cognitive control
24 and self-regulation. Second, the multidimensional approach of the present study should be
25 generalized in future studies to better understand the effects of training on the cognitive,
26 neural and behavioral dimensions as well as their interactions. In particular, the neural effects
27 should be further investigated as the neural mechanisms of pretend play training, and
28 ecologically realistic training in general, remain largely unknown. Finally, future studies
29 should involve an evaluation of all play criteria to better understand how the training impacts
30 the different dimensions of the play as well as characterize their effects on cognitive control
31 and self-regulation.

34 5. Conclusion

1 The present study evaluated the effects of pretend play-based training on children's cognitive
2 control, mid frontal theta oscillatory activity, and self-regulation. Although the training
3 improved the child's play's maturity, reflecting the child's greater autonomy in the play
4 context, the training did not affect children's cognitive control, its underlying brain
5 mechanisms, and their self-regulatory behavior in everyday life. These results show that
6 providing children with cognitive control training activities embedded in socially salient
7 conditions might not be enough for improving their cognitive control and self-regulation. The
8 intensity of training, and the use of metacognitive strategies may be key factors for
9 ecologically realistic training to improve children's cognitive control and self-regulatory
10 behavior.

11

12 6. References

13 Adam, N., Blaye, A., Gulbinaite, R., Delorme, A., & Farrer, C. (2020). The role of midfrontal
14 theta oscillations across the development of cognitive control in preschoolers and school-age
15 children. *Developmental Science*, 2, desc.12936. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12936>

16 Amso, D., & Scerif, G. (2015). The attentive brain: insights from developmental cognitive
17 neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 16(10), 606–619.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn4025>

19 Astle, D. E., Barnes, J. J., Baker, K., Colclough, G. L., & Woolrich, M. W. (2015). Cognitive
20 Training Enhances Intrinsic Brain Connectivity in Childhood. *Journal of Neuroscience*,
21 35(16), 6277–6283. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4517-14.2015>

22 Bailey, R., & Jones, S. M. (2019). An Integrated Model of Regulation for Applied Settings.
23 *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 22(1), 2–23. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-019-00288-y)
24 019-00288-y

25 Barnett, W. S., Jung, K., Yarosz, D. J., Thomas, J., Hornbeck, A., Stechuk, R., & Burns, S.
26 (2008). Educational effects of the Tools of the Mind curriculum: A randomized trial. *Early*
27 *Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 299–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2008.03.001>

28 Berk, L. E., Mann, T. D., & Ogan, A. T. (2006). Make-Believe Play: Wellspring for
29 Development of Self-Regulation.

30 Blair, C. (2002). School readiness: Integrating cognition and emotion in a neurobiological
31 conceptualization of children's functioning at school entry. In *American Psychologist* (Vol.
32 57, Issue 2, pp. 111–127). American Psychological Association. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.2.111)
33 066X.57.2.111

1 Blair, C., McKinnon, R. D., & Daneri, M. P. (2018). Effect of the tools of the mind
2 kindergarten program on children's social and emotional development. *Early Childhood*
3 *Research Quarterly*, 43, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.01.002>

4 Blair, C., & Raver, C. (2012). Child development in the context of adversity. *American*
5 *Psychologist*, 67(4), 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027493>.Child

6 Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2014). Closing the Achievement Gap through Modification of
7 Neurocognitive and Neuroendocrine Function: Results from a Cluster Randomized Controlled
8 Trial of an Innovative Approach to the Education of Children in Kindergarten. *PLoS ONE*,
9 9(11), e112393. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112393>

10 Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2015). School Readiness and Self-Regulation: A Developmental
11 Psychobiological Approach. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1), 711–731.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015221>

13 Blair, C., & Razza, R. P. (2007). Relating effortful control, executive function, and false
14 belief understanding to emerging math and literacy ability in kindergarten. *Child*
15 *Development*, 78(2), 647–663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01019.x>

16 Bodrova, E., Germeroth, C., & Leong, D. J. (2013). Play and Self-Regulation: Lessons from
17 Vygotsky. *American Journal of Play*, 6(1), 111–123. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1016167>

18 Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2006). *Tools of the mind*. Pearson Australia Pty Limited.

19 Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2018). Tools of the Mind: A Vygotskian Early Childhood
20 Curriculum. In M. Fleer & B. van Oers (Eds.), *International Handbook of Early Childhood*
21 *Education* (pp. 1095–1111). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0927-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0927-7_56)
22 [7_56](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0927-7_56)

23 Bryck, R. L., & Fisher, P. a. (2012). Training the brain: Practical applications of neural
24 plasticity from the intersection of cognitive neuroscience, developmental psychology, and
25 prevention science. *American Psychologist*, 67(2), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024657>

26 Bryck, R. L., & Mayr, U. (2005). On the role of verbalization during task set selection:
27 Switching or serial order control?. *Memory & Cognition*, 33(4), 611–623.

28 Bull, R., & Scerif, G. (2001). Executive functionin as a predictor of children's mathematics
29 ability: Inhibition, switching, and working memory. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 19(3),
30 273–293. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326942DN1903>

31 Cameron Ponitz, C. E., McClelland, M. M., Jewkes, A. M., Connor, C. M. D., Farris, C. L., &
32 Morrison, F. J. (2008). Touch your toes! Developing a direct measure of behavioral regulation
33 in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(2), 141–158.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2007.01.004>

1 Carlson, S. M., White, R. E., & Davis-Unger, A. C. (2014). Evidence for a relation between
2 executive function and pretense representation in preschool children. *Cognitive Development*,
3 29(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2013.09.001>

4 Cavanagh, J. F., & Frank, M. J. (2014). Frontal theta as a mechanism for cognitive control.
5 *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(8), 414–421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.012>

6 Cavanagh, J. F., Wiecki, T. V., Cohen, M. X., Figueroa, C. M., Samanta, J., Sherman, S. J., &
7 Frank, M. J. (2011). Subthalamic nucleus stimulation reverses mediofrontal influence over
8 decision threshold. *Nature Neuroscience*, 14, 1462. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2925>

9 Cavanagh, J. F., Zambrano-Vazquez, L., & Allen, J. J. B. (2012). Theta lingua franca: A
10 common mid-frontal substrate for action monitoring processes. *Psychophysiology*, 49(2),
11 220–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2011.01293.x>

12 Chaumon, M., Bishop, D. V. M., & Busch, N. A. (2015). A practical guide to the selection of
13 independent components of the electroencephalogram for artifact correction. *Journal of*
14 *Neuroscience Methods*, 250, 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2015.02.025>

15 Cheveigné, A. De, & Arzounian, D. (2015). Scanning for oscillations. *Journal of Neural*
16 *Engineering*, 12(6). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2560/12/6/066020>

17 Cohen, Michael X. (2016). Midfrontal theta tracks action monitoring over multiple interactive
18 time scales. *NeuroImage*, 141, 262–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.07.054>

19 Cohen, Michael X. (2017). Comparison of linear spatial filters for identifying oscillatory
20 activity in multichannel data. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 278, 1–12.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2016.12.016>

22 Cohen, Michael X., & Cavanagh, J. F. (2011). Single-Trial Regression Elucidates the Role of
23 Prefrontal Theta Oscillations in Response Conflict. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2(FEB), 1–12.
24 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00030>

25 Cohen, Michael X., & Gulbinaite, R. (2017). Rhythmic entrainment source separation:
26 Optimizing analyses of neural responses to rhythmic sensory stimulation. *NeuroImage*,
27 147(November 2016), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.11.036>

28 Cohen, Michael X., & Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2013). EEG Source Reconstruction Reveals
29 Frontal-Parietal Dynamics of Spatial Conflict Processing. *PLoS ONE*, 8(2).
30 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057293>

31 Cohen, Michael X, & Donner, T. H. (2013). Midfrontal conflict-related theta-band power
32 reflects neural oscillations that predict behavior. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 110(12), 2752–
33 2763. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00479.2013>

34 Cohen, Mike X. (2014). Analyzing neural time series data: theory and practice. MIT press.

1 Davidson, M. C., Amso, D., Anderson, L. C., & Diamond, A. (2006). Development of
2 cognitive control and executive functions from 4 to 13 years: Evidence from manipulations of
3 memory, inhibition, and task switching. *Neuropsychologia*, *44*(11), 2037–2078.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.02.006>

5 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: An open source toolbox for analysis of single-
6 trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *Journal of Neuroscience*
7 *Methods*, *134*(1), 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>

8 Diamond, A. (2013). Executive Function. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *64*, 135:168.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385157-4.01147-7>

10 Diamond, A., Barnett, W. S., Thomas, J., & Munro, S. (2007). THE EARLY YEARS:
11 Preschool Program Improves Cognitive Control. *Science*, *318*(5855), 1387–1388.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1151148>

13 Diamond, A., Lee, C., Senften, P., Lam, A., & Abbott, D. (2019). Randomized control trial of
14 Tools of the Mind: Marked benefits to kindergarten children and their teachers. *PLoS ONE*,
15 *14*(9), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222447>

16 Diamond, A., & Lee, K. (2011). Interventions Shown to Aid Executive Function
17 Development in Children 4 to 12 Years Old. *Science*, *333*(6045), 959–964.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204529>

19 Diamond, A., & Ling, D. S. (2016). Conclusions about interventions, programs, and
20 approaches for improving executive functions that appear justified and those that, despite
21 much hype, do not. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *18*, 34–48.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2015.11.005>

23 Dumas, J. E., LaFrenière, P. J., Capuano, F., & Durning, P. (1997). Profil Socio-Affectif
24 (PSA): Évaluation des compétences sociales et des difficultés d’adaptation des enfants de 2
25 ans à 6 ans.

26 Dunn, L. M., Dunn, L. M., & Thériault-Whalen, C. M. (1993). *Échelle de vocabulaire en*
27 *images Peabody: EVIP*. Psycan.

28 Duprez, J., Gulbinaite, R., & Cohen, M. X. (2020). Midfrontal theta phase coordinates
29 behaviorally relevant brain computations during cognitive control. *NeuroImage*, *207*, 116340.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116340>

31 Elias, C. L., & Berk, L. E. (2002). Self-regulation in young children: Is there a role for
32 sociodramatic play? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *17*(2), 216–238.
33 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(02\)00146-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(02)00146-1)

1 Elkonin, D. B. (2005). The psychology of play. *Journal of Russian & East European*
2 *Psychology*, 43(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10610405.2005.11059245>

3 Emerson, M. J., & Miyake, A. (2003). The role of inner speech in task switching: A dual-task
4 investigation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 48(1), 148-168.

5 Espinet, S. D., Anderson, J. E., & Zelazo, P. D. (2013). Reflection training improves
6 executive function in preschool-age children: Behavioral and neural effects. *Developmental*
7 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4, 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2012.11.009>

8 Evans, G. W., & Rosenbaum, J. (2008). Self-regulation and the income-achievement gap.
9 *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 504–514.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2008.07.002>

11 Galyer, K. T., & Evans, I. M. (2001). Pretend Play and the Development of Emotion
12 Regulation in Preschool Children. *Early Child Development and Care*, 166(1), 93–108.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0300443011660108>

14 Gilpin, A. T., Brown, M. M., & Pierucci, J. M. (2015). Relations between fantasy orientation
15 and emotion regulation in preschool. *Early Education and Development*, 26(7), 920–932.

16 Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). *Behavior rating inventory of*
17 *executive function: BRIEF*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

18 Gulbinaite, R., van Rijn, H., & Cohen, M. X. (2014). Fronto-parietal network oscillations
19 reveal relationship between working memory capacity and cognitive control. *Frontiers in*
20 *Human Neuroscience*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00761>

21 Gulbinaite, R., van Viegen, T., Wieling, M., Cohen, M. X., & VanRullen, R. (2017).
22 Individual Alpha Peak Frequency Predicts 10 Hz Flicker Effects on Selective Attention. *The*
23 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 37(42), 10173–10184. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1163-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1163-24)
24 [17.2017](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1163-17.2017)

25 Haier, R. J., Karama, S., Leyba, L., & Jung, R. E. (2009). MRI assessment of cortical
26 thickness and functional activity changes in adolescent girls following three months of
27 practice on a visual-spatial task. *BMC Research Notes*, 2. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-28)
28 [2-174](https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-2-174)

29 Jaeggi, S. M., Buschkuhl, M., Jonides, J., & Perrig, W. J. (2008). Improving fluid
30 intelligence with training on working memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
31 *Sciences*, 105(19), 6829–6833. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0801268105>

32 Jensen, O., & Tesche, C. D. (2002). Frontal theta activity in humans increases with memory
33 load in a working memory task. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 15(8), 1395–1399.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2002.01975.x>

1 Jolles, D. D., & Crone, E. a. (2012). Training the developing brain: a neurocognitive
2 perspective. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6(April), 1–13.
3 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00076>

4 Karbach, J., & Unger, K. (2014). Executive control training from middle childhood to
5 adolescence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(MAY), 322–335.
6 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00390>

7 Karpov, J. V, & Karpov, Y. V. (2005). *The Neo-Vygotskian Approach to Child Development*.
8 Cambridge University Press.

9 Kayser, J., & Tenke, C. E. (2015). On the benefits of using surface Laplacian (current source
10 density) methodology in electrophysiology. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 97(3),
11 171–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.06.001>

12 Kloo, D., & Perner, J. (2003). Training Transfer Between Card Sorting and False Belief
13 Understanding: Helping Children Apply Conflicting Descriptions. *Child Development*, 74(6),
14 1823–1839. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-8624.2003.00640.x>

15 LaFrenière, P. J., Dumas, J. E., Capuano, F., & Dubeau, D. (1992). Development and
16 validation of the Preschool Socioaffective Profile. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(4), 442–450.

17 Leong, D. J., & Bodrova, E. (2012). Assessing and scaffolding make-believe play. *YC Young*
18 *Children*, 67(1), 28–34.

19 Lillard, A. S., Lerner, M. D., Hopkins, E. J., Dore, R. A., Smith, E. D. & Palmquist, C.
20 M.(2013). The impact of pretend play on children's development: a review of the evidence.
21 *Psychological Bulletin*;139(1):1-34. doi: 10.1037/a0029321.

22 Liu, Z. X., Woltering, S., & Lewis, M. D. (2014). Developmental change in EEG theta
23 activity in the medial prefrontal cortex during response control. *NeuroImage*, 85, 873–887.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.08.054>

25 Lonigan, C. J., & Phillips, B. M. (2012). Comparing Skills-Focused and Self-Regulation
26 Focused Preschool Curricula: Impacts on Academic and Self-Regulatory Skills. Society for
27 Research on Educational Effectiveness.

28 McClelland, M. M., Morrison, F. J., & Holmes, D. L. (2000). Children at Risk for Early
29 Academic Problems: The Role of Learning-Related Social Skills. *Early Childhood Research*
30 *Quarterly*, 15(3), 307–329.

31 Melby-Lervåg, M., & Hulme, C. (2013). Is working memory training effective? A meta-
32 analytic review. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(2), 270–291.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028228>

1 Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D.
2 (2000). The Unity and Diversity of Executive Functions and Their Contributions to Complex
3 “Frontal Lobe” Tasks: A Latent Variable Analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, *41*(1), 49–100.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0734>

5 Moreau, D., & Conway, A. R. A. (2014). The case for an ecological approach to cognitive
6 training. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*(7), 334–336.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.03.009>

8 Moriguchi, Y., Sakata, Y., Ishibashi, M., & Ishikawa, Y. (2015). Teaching others rule-use
9 improves executive function and prefrontal activations in young children. *Frontiers in*
10 *Psychology*, *6*(June), 894. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00894>

11 Nigbur, R., Ivanova, G., & Stürmer, B. (2011). Theta power as a marker for cognitive
12 interference. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *122*(11), 2185–2194.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.03.030>

14 Nigg, J. T. (2017). Annual Research Review: On the relations among self-regulation, self-
15 control, executive functioning, effortful control, cognitive control, impulsivity, risk-taking,
16 and inhibition for developmental psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
17 *Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *58*(4), 361–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12675>

18 Nikulin, V. V., Nolte, G., & Curio, G. (2011). A novel method for reliable and fast extraction
19 of neuronal EEG/MEG oscillations on the basis of spatio-spectral decomposition.
20 *NeuroImage*, *55*(4), 1528–1535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.01.057>

21 Pietto, M. L., Giovannetti, F., Segretin, M. S., Belloli, L. M. L., Lopez-Rosenfeld, M., Goldin,
22 A. P., Fernández-Slezak, D., Kamienkowski, J. E., & Lipina, S. J. (2018). Enhancement of
23 inhibitory control in a sample of preschoolers from poor homes after cognitive training in a
24 kindergarten setting: Cognitive and ERP evidence. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*,
25 *13*(November), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2018.11.004>

26 R Core Team. (2014). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.
27 <http://www.r-project.org/>

28 Raven, J. C. (1947). Raven’s progressive matrices test. *London: HK Lewis*.

29 Raven, J. (1989). The Raven Progressive Matrices: A review of national norming studies and
30 ethnic and socioeconomic variation within the United States. *Journal of Educational*
31 *Measurement*, *26*(1), 1-16.

32 Richardson, C., Anderson, M., Reid, C. L., & Fox, A. M. (2018). Development of inhibition
33 and switching: A longitudinal study of the maturation of interference suppression and reversal

1 processes during childhood. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 34, 92–100.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.002>

3 Roy, A., Fournet, N., Roulin, J. L., & Le Gall, D. (2013). BRIEF-Inventaire d'Evaluation
4 Comportementale des Fonctions Exécutives (Adaptation Française de Gioia GA, Isquith PK,
5 Guy SC, Kenworthy L). *Paris: Hogrefe France Editions*.

6 Rueda, M. R., Checa, P., & Cómbita, L. M. (2012). Enhanced efficiency of the executive
7 attention network after training in preschool children: Immediate changes and effects after
8 two months. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, S192–S204.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2011.09.004>

10 Rueda, M. R., Fan, J., McCandliss, B. D., Halparin, J. D., Gruber, D. B., Lercari, L. P., &
11 Posner, M. I. (2004). Development of attentional networks in childhood. *Neuropsychologia*,
12 42(8), 1029–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2003.12.012>

13 Rueda, M. R., Rothbart, M. K., McCandliss, B. D., Saccomanno, L., & Posner, M. I. (2005).
14 Training, maturation, and genetic influences on the development of executive attention.
15 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(41),
16 14931–14936. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0506897102>

17 Schmitt, S. A., McClelland, M. M., Tominey, S. L., & Acock, A. C. (2015). Strengthening
18 school readiness for Head Start children: Evaluation of a self-regulation intervention. *Early*
19 *Childhood Research Quarterly*, 30(PA), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.08.001>

20 Slot, P. L., Mulder, H., Verhagen, J., & Leseman, P. P. M. (2017). Preschoolers' cognitive
21 and emotional self-regulation in pretend play: Relations with executive functions and quality
22 of play. *Infant and Child Development*, 26(6), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2038>

23 St Clair-Thompson, H. L., & Gathercole, S. E. (2006). Executive functions and achievements
24 in school: Shifting, updating, inhibition, and working memory. *Quarterly Journal of*
25 *Experimental Psychology*, 59(4), 745–759. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210500162854>

26 St Clair-Thompson, H., Stevens, R., Hunt, A., & Bolder, E. (2010). Improving children's
27 working memory and classroom performance. *Educational Psychology*, 30(2), 203–219.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410903509259>

29 Thibodeau, R. B., Gilpin, A. T., Brown, M. M., & Meyer, B. A. (2016). The effects of
30 fantastical pretend-play on the development of executive functions: An intervention study.
31 *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 145, 120–138.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2016.01.001>

1 Thorell, L. B., Lindqvist, S., Nutley, S. B., Bohlin, G., & Klingberg, T. (2009). Training and
2 transfer effects of executive functions in preschool children. *Developmental Science*, *12*(1),
3 106–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00745.x>

4 Titz, C., & Karbach, J. (2014). Working memory and executive functions: effects of training
5 on academic achievement. *Psychological Research*, *78*(6), 852–868.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-013-0537-1>

7 Traverso, L., Viterbori, P., & Usai, M. C. (2015). Improving executive function in childhood:
8 evaluation of a training intervention for 5-year-old children. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
9 *6*(April), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00525>

10 Valencia, R. R. (1984). Reliability of the Raven coloured progressive matrices for Anglo and
11 for Mexican-American children. *Psychology in the Schools*, *21*(1), 49-52.

12 Vieillevoys, S., & Nader-Grosbois, N. (2008). Self-regulation during pretend play in children
13 with intellectual disability and in normally developing children. *Research in Developmental*
14 *Disabilities*, *29*(3), 256–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2007.05.003>

15 Vygotsky, L. S. (1933). Play and its Role in the Mental Development of the Child. *Voprosy*
16 *Psikhologii*, *6*, 1–18.

17 Vygotsky, L. S. (1967). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. *Soviet*
18 *Psychology*, *5*(3), 6–18.

19 Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In S. A. Books (Ed.),
20 *Readings on the Development of Children* (Gauvain &, pp. 34–40).

21 Whitebread, D. (2010). Play, metacognition and self-regulation. *Play and Learning in the*
22 *Early Years*, 161–176.

23 Wilson, S. J., & Farran, D. C. (2012). Experimental Evaluation of the Tools of the Mind
24 Preschool Curriculum. *Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness*.

25 Zuure, M. B., Hinkley, L. B., Tiesinga, P. H. E., Nagarajan, S. S., & Cohen, M. X. (2020).
26 Multiple midfrontal thetas revealed by source separation of simultaneous MEG and EEG.
27 *Journal of Neuroscience*, *40*(40), 7702–7713. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0321-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0321-20.2020)
28 [20.2020](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0321-20.2020)

29
30
31
32
33

1 i. Figures and Tables

Demographic measures	Training group				Control group			
	16 boys - 15 girls				15 boys - 14 girls			
	N	Mean	SD	Range	N	Mean	SD	Range
Age (months)	31	60,5	6,4	48,2 - 70,9	29	62,6	6,1	52,2 - 71,4
Household monthly salary (€)	23	2152	1175	1000 - 3000	19	2368	1297	1000 - 5000
Mother Education (years)	21	12,1	5,9	9 - 17	18	11,9	5,7	5 - 15
Father Education (years)	22	10,7	5,4	5 - 15	14	10,9	4,8	5 - 17

Children's measures	N	Mean	SD	Range	N	Mean	SD	Range
fluid Intelligence (CPM)	31	19,6	6,3	8 - 30	29	20,4	6,1	10 - 29
Language comprehension (EVIP)	31	105,2	21,7	67 - 160	29	105,5	23	62 - 147

2

3 Table 1 Demographic characteristics for the training and control groups and performances for
 4 the Colored Progressive Matrices (CPM) and the French version of the Peabody Picture
 5 Vocabulary Scale (EVIP) in the pre-training assessment.

6


7

Level	Outcome	N (pairs)	t	p	Cohen D	low IC	high IC
Maturity of play	Planning (PG)	20	3,11	0,006	0,85	0,31	1,39
	Role (PG)	20	2,49	0,022	0,78	0,17	1,40
	Propels (PG)	20	2,57	0,019	0,76	0,18	1,34
	Langage (PG)	20	3,94	0,001	1,03	0,52	1,55
	Scenario (PG)	20	3,25	0,004	0,93	0,37	1,49
Self-regulatory Behavior	H3T	26	-0,70	0,490	-0,18	-0,70	0,33
	BRI (BRIEF)	7	0,72	0,497	0,35	-0,60	1,31
	GAS (PSA)	8	-2,53	0,040	-0,57	-1,02	-0,13
Cognitive Control	Response Time	26	-1,01	0,320	-0,22	-0,66	0,21
	cC trials	26	-0,88	0,389	-0,19	-0,62	0,24
	cl trials	26	-0,37	0,712	-0,10	-0,61	0,42
	iC trials	26	-0,54	0,596	-0,12	-0,57	0,32
	il trials	26	-1,61	0,120	-0,41	-0,91	0,09
	Accuracy	26	0,02	0,987	0,00	-0,55	0,56
	cC trials	26	-0,15	0,886	-0,05	-0,68	0,59
	cl trials	26	-0,91	0,370	-0,23	-0,73	0,27
	iC trials	26	-0,07	0,942	-0,02	-0,57	0,53
	il trials	26	-0,13	0,898	-0,04	-0,62	0,55
Midfrontal theta	Power	14	-0,94	0,371	-0,21	-0,63	0,22
	cC trials	14	-0,09	0,929	-0,02	-0,42	0,38
	cl trials	14	-0,60	0,557	-0,19	-0,80	0,43
	iC trials	14	-0,70	0,496	-0,26	-1,00	0,47
	il trials	14	-1,14	0,275	-0,39	-1,06	0,28
	Latency	14	-0,02	0,985	-0,01	-0,90	0,88

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Table 2: Statistics of the training effect for each level of analysis


The effect is represented through the cohen's D with associated 95% confidence interval, t and p-values are also reported as well as the number of pairs of children considered for each result. (PG: Propels Grid; H3T: Head to Toes Task; BRI: Behavioral Regulation Index; GAS: General Adaptation score; PSA: Socio-Affective Profile questionnaire; cC: null interference condition; ii: response interference condition; iC: task-set interference condition; il: task-set and response interference condition).



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15


Figure 1: Experimental paradigm of the Heart and flower Task

Children were presented with a central black fixation cross (70 mm diameter, 1°), with either a red heart or a red flower (30 mm diameter, 4.3°) appearing on the left or the right (20mm, 2.87°) of the fixation cross. Children were instructed to respond as fast as possible when a stimulus (a heart or a flower) appeared. They had to press the key on the same side as the heart (compatible trials) and on the side opposite the flower (incompatible trials). Compatible and incompatible trials were randomly presented, resulting in trials where children had to switch of task-set and trials in which the task-set was maintained. The stimulus remained on the screen until a response was made, or up to a maximal time duration of 2500ms. Once the children gave a response, they received visuo-auditory feedback with a low-pitched tone of 500ms accompanied by a surprised face for an incorrect response or an absence of response, and a high-pitched tone of 500ms accompanied by a happy face for a correct response. There were 8 blocks of 16 trials each.



1
2 Figure 2: Visualization of the training effect with regard of the level of analysis
3 The effect is represented through the cohen's D and its associated 95% confidence interval.
4 Each level of analysis is composed of a set of outcomes (indicated by a variable) relying on a
5 set of measures and tasks (symbolized by the color of the variable). (PG: Propels Grid; PSA:
6 Socio-Affective Profile questionnaire; BRIEF: Behavioral Rating Inventory of Executive
7 Functions; H3T: Head to Toes Task; HF: Heart and Flower Task; GAS: General Adaptation;
8 BRI: Behavioral Regulation Index; RT: Response time).


9
10
11



1
 2 Figure 3: Visualization of the training effect associated to the Heart and Flower Task at the
 3 cognitive control and midfrontal theta levels.

4 The effect is represented through the cohen's D and it associated 95% confidence interval for
 5 Accuracy, Response Time (RT) and Midfrontal Theta Power for each interference condition
 6 (cC : null interference condition; ii: response interference condition; iC: task-set interference
 7 condition; iI: task-set and response interference condition).

8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

Figure 4: Visualization of the training effect at the level of the midfrontal theta (MFT) component underlying the realization of the Heart and Flower task
 a) Topographic electroencephalogram maps showing the increase of voltage (relatively to the baseline) of the MFT component in post training for training and control groups; b) Power spectra of the MFT component (with standard deviation) for all conditions averaged in pre and post training for training group (in blue) and control group (in orange) ; c) Latency of the peak of the MFT component (with standard deviation) for all conditions averaged in pre and post training for training and control groups