

**What are the building blocks of parent-infant coordinated attention in free-flowing interaction?**

Journal:	<i>Infancy</i>
Manuscript ID	HIFC-2019-0103.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	coordinated attention, eye-tracking, human interaction, language development, gaze patterns

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Abstract**

The present article investigated the composition of different joint gaze components used to operationalize various types of coordinated attention between parents and infants and which types of coordinated attention were associated with future vocabulary size. Twenty-five 9-month-old infants and their parents wore head-mounted eye trackers as they played with objects together. With high-density gaze data, a variety of coordinated attention bout types were quantitatively measured by combining different gaze components, such as mutual gaze, joint object looks, face looks and triadic gaze patterns. The key components of coordinated attention that were associated with vocabulary size at 12 and 15 months included the simultaneous combination of parent triadic gaze and infant object looking. The results from this article are discussed in terms of the importance of parent attentional monitoring and infant sustained attention for language development.

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

### Introduction

Parents and infants during a social interaction look at each other and jointly at objects that are the topic of the interaction. A large literature on coordinated attention shows that looking patterns to one's social partner and to objects of joint interest are essential to successful human communication and for infants' language learning (Bakeman & Adamson, 1994; Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005, 2008; Carpenter et al., 1998; Morales et al., 1998; Tomasello & Farrar, 1986; Tomasello & Todd, 1983). However, despite considerable research and interest in these patterns of parent-infant joint looking, there are distinct emphases in different literature areas on the key components of parent-infant coordinated attention that support infant learning (Adamson, Bakeman, Suma, & Robins, 2019; Yu, Suanda, Smith, 2019). The current study examines a large variety of parent-infant coordinated attention bout types in face-to-face free play interactions and the association with future vocabulary size.

### The Many Views on Coordinated Attention

The traditional (and expansive) literature on coordinated attention focused on infants' social skills – how infants look to the parent face and then follow parent gaze to an object, as well as how infants initiate joint interest in an object by looking at the partner's face to check the partner's response. (Baldwin, 1995; Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005, 2008; Bruner, 1983; Carpenter et al., 1998). Much (but not all) of the empirical evidence on these patterns of looking derive from experimental discrete trial studies (Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005, 2008). The focus on triadic attention – looks to the partner's face and to objects – derives, in part, from both mature communicative behaviors (Tomasello, 1999) and theories of communication focused on the listener's goal of determining the referential intent of a speaker (Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005, 2008;

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 Carpenter et al., 1998; Morales, Mundy, & Rojas, 1998; Senju, Csibra, Johnson, 2008). From  
4  
5 this perspective, a sequential pattern of *infant* looking that includes both looks to the parent face  
6  
7 and to the object is critical because the infant must monitor parent behavior to establish  
8  
9 coordinated attention and to determine referential intent.  
10  
11

12 A second, and equally expansive literature, has focused on how well parents monitor an  
13  
14 infant's behavior and interests, as well as how parental responsiveness supports coordinated  
15  
16 attention and word learning (LeMonda, Bornstein, & Baumwell, 2001). These findings suggest  
17  
18 that word learning is enhanced when parents do not direct their infant's attention to an object  
19  
20 when naming an object but instead uses their child's self-directed attention to an object as the  
21  
22 signal as to when to name an object (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015; McCathren, Yoder, & Warren,  
23  
24 1995; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 1998; Tomasello & Farrar, 1986; Harris, Jones, Brookes, & Grant,  
25  
26 1986; Golgate, Walker-Andrews, Bahrick, 2001; Zukow-Goldring, 1990). From this  
27  
28 perspective, a pattern of *parent* looking behavior that attends to and follows infant gaze, and then  
29  
30 talks about the object, would be critical because the parent must monitor infant looking behavior  
31  
32 so as to coordinate their attention with infant attention and to name objects at the right moment  
33  
34 for infant learning.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 A third and more recent literature derives from temporally precise measures of parent and  
41  
42 infant gaze during social interactions and the *objective* definition of joint attention in terms of  
43  
44 gaze directed to the same object at the same time (Yu & Smith, 2016a, 2017; Suarez-Rivera,  
45  
46 Smith, & Yu, 2019; Wass et al., 2018). For example, Wass et al. (2018), compared gaze patterns  
47  
48 during joint and solo play and observed that infants increased their attention to objects in joint  
49  
50 play with a caregiver compared to solo play, suggesting the parent's behaviors help support their  
51  
52 infant's sustained attention onto the objects. These studies showed that during these social  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 interactions, infants rarely look to parent faces, although parents look to infant faces, and that  
4  
5 key factors for infant word learning in these interactions is infant sustained attention to objects  
6  
7 when parents name them (Pereira, Smith, & Yu, 2014; Yu, Suanda, & Smith, 2019). From this  
8  
9 perspective, the pattern of *infant* looking to objects during naming events is the critical  
10  
11 component because it is the infant who must link the name to the attended object.  
12  
13

14  
15 Finally, there is a fourth pattern of joint looking behavior that has been of considerable  
16  
17 interest to developmental researchers: mutual gaze (Blass, Lumeng, & Patil, 2017; Franchak,  
18  
19 Hoehl et al., 2014; Kretch, & Adolph, 2018; Klinnert, Campos, Sorce, Emde, & Svejda, 1983;  
20  
21 Leong et al., 2017; Niedźwiecka, A., Ramotowska, S., & Tomalski, 2018; Piazza, Hasenfratz,  
22  
23 Hasson, & Lew-Williams, 2018; Striano, Reid, & Hoehl, 2006; Yamamoto, Sato, & Itakura,  
24  
25 2019). Although not directly linked to parent naming of objects, gaze patterns in which parent  
26  
27 and infant jointly look to each other's faces are critical components of parent-infant interactions  
28  
29 in early development (e.g., Lavelli & Fogel, 2005; Tronick & Cohn, 1989). Mutual gaze is  
30  
31 central to shared emotional affect and affiliation (Feldman, 2007), plays a role in emotional  
32  
33 regulation (MacLean et al., 2014; Klinnert, Campos, Sorce, Emde, & Svejda, 1983) and  
34  
35 attentional control (Niedźwiecka, A., Ramotowska, S., & Tomalski, 2018), and is often a marker  
36  
37 of communicative intent (Senju & Csibra, 2008).  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 All these looking behaviors during parent-infant social interactions may be important  
44  
45 components of parent-infant interactions and contribute to the quality of the interactions and  
46  
47 infant learning from those interactions. However, these joint looking behaviors have been studied  
48  
49 in isolation because different researchers focused on specific types of coordinated attention. As a  
50  
51 result, we know very little about these different components of joint looking naturally occur in  
52  
53 free-flowing parent-infant interactions. Therefore, we created a free-flowing interaction context  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 where infants and their caregivers sat at a table and played with a set of toys. In doing so, this  
4  
5 particular interaction context afforded the infants and caregivers to have visual access to toys on  
6  
7 the table and each other's faces, allowing for natural distributions of visual gaze to emerge. Note  
8  
9 that recent research has also looked at gaze patterns of infants and their caregivers in other  
10  
11 diverse interactional contexts (Franchak, Kretch, & Adolph, 2018; Yamamoto, Sato, & Itakura,  
12  
13 2019), and therefore, gaze patterns might differ as a function of interaction context. Finally, we  
14  
15 also do not know if individual differences in all or some of these gaze patterns are related to  
16  
17 individual differences in early word learning. Accordingly, the main goals of the present study  
18  
19 were to (1) determine the relative frequencies of different types of coordinated attention that are  
20  
21 made up from different compositions of gaze patterns in a table top free-flowing interaction and  
22  
23 (2) determine the predictive relation between those types of coordinated attention and infant  
24  
25 vocabulary size.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 To answer these questions, we used head-mounted eye trackers to simultaneously  
32  
33 measure the gaze of parents and their nine-month-old infants as they jointly played with toys.  
34  
35 Nine-months-olds were chosen because this is an age at which joint attention first emerges and in  
36  
37 which large and well-documented individual differences that predict *later* vocabulary are  
38  
39 reported (Adamson & Bakeman, 1991; Carpenter, et al., 1998; Yu, Suanda, Smith, 2019). From  
40  
41 the two streams of parent and infant gaze, we objectively defined seven mutually-exclusive and  
42  
43 comprehensive joint gaze types that encompass four perspectives discussed above and linked  
44  
45 those patterns to later language learning outcomes.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Previous work has chosen specific terms when operationalizing particular types of  
51  
52 coordinated attention. For example, *coordinated joint engagement* (Bakeman & Adamson, 1984)  
53  
54 referred to when an infant coordinated with their attention with another person and an object for  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 a particular duration (~3s). In another example, *supported joint engagement* includes an  
4  
5 asymmetrical interaction like when a parent produces overt behaviors like demonstrating an  
6  
7 action that then supports coordinated attention (Adamson, Bakeman, & Deckner, 2004; Bakeman  
8  
9 & Adamson, 1984; Kasari et al., 2010). For the current paper, we chose the term, ‘coordinated  
10  
11 attention’ with the goal to be inclusive to the various types of coordinated attention that have  
12  
13 been used in previous literature.  
14  
15

### Methods

#### Participants

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 26 parent-infant dyads participated (15 female and 11 male). The mean age of infants  
22  
23 when participating in the parent-infant interaction component of the study was 9.21 months  
24  
25 ( $SD=0.23$ ; Min=9 months, 15 days; Max=10 months, 1 day). One dyad was excluded due to  
26  
27 having an outlier 2.5 SDs above the mean on one of the variables, therefore, the final sample  
28  
29 included 25 parent-infant dyads. 8 additional infants began the study but refused to wear the  
30  
31 measuring equipment. The gender combinations of the parent-infant dyads included: 2 male-  
32  
33 male dyads, 1 male-female dyads, 13 female-female dyads, and 9 female-male dyads. The entire  
34  
35 sample of infants was broadly representative of Monroe County, Indiana (84% European  
36  
37 American, 5% African American, 5% Asian American, 2% Latino, 4% Other) and consisted of  
38  
39 predominantly working- and middle-class families. Infants were recruited through birth records  
40  
41 and community organizations (e.g., museums, children’s outreach events) that serve a diverse  
42  
43 population. Parent reports of vocabulary were collected three and six months after the laboratory  
44  
45 visit when the infants were 12 months old ( $M=12$  months, 15 days;  $SD= 6$  days; Min=12 months,  
46  
47 3 days; Max=12 months, 27 days) and 15 months old ( $M=15$  months, 15 days;  $SD= 8$  days;  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 Min=15 months, 1 day; Max=16 months, 3 days). We measured vocabulary at these two  
4  
5 intervals to ensure the reliability of our vocabulary measures and robustness of our findings  
6

### 8 **Stimuli**

9  
10 Two sets of three toys (car, cup, and train; and duck, plane, and boat) were used during  
11  
12 the parent infant play session. Each toy in each set was a unique uniform color (red, blue, green).  
13  
14 The toys were chosen because they had been used in previous pilot tests and were observed to  
15  
16 promote engaging infant-parent play for this particular age group.  
17  
18

### 19 **Experimental setup**

20  
21 Parents and their infants sat across from each other at a table (61cm x 91cm x 64cm). The  
22  
23 infants sat in a custom high-chair and the parents sat on the floor. Both infants and parents wore  
24  
25 head-mounted eye trackers (positive science, LLC). The head-mounted eye-tracking system  
26  
27 includes two cameras: (1) An infrared camera that is placed just below and is pointed to the right  
28  
29 eye records eye images, and (2) A scene camera that is placed low on the forehead and is pointed  
30  
31 outwards captures the user's first-person view (90° visual field). Each eye tracking system  
32  
33 recorded egocentric-view video and gaze direction (x-, y-coordinates) in that view, sampled at  
34  
35 30Hz. Another camera (30Hz) was mounted above the table and provided a bird's eye view of  
36  
37 the dyadic interaction (see Yu & Smith (2013) for additional technical details).  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Procedure**

43  
44 Parents and infants were fitted with the eye-tracking gear (see Figure 1). Once the eye-  
45  
46 tracking gear was securely affixed to the participants, a calibration phase was completed. To  
47  
48 collect calibration points for each eye-tracker, an experimenter directed the infant's attention  
49  
50 toward a toy that was only used for calibration while another experimenter recorded the moment  
51  
52 the child attended to the location of the toy. This procedure was repeated 15 times with the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

calibration toy placed in various locations on the tabletop. A similar procedure was used to calibrate the parent’s eye tracker. The calibration procedure took approximately five minutes.




Figure 1. An infant and parent playing with a set of toys during a naturalistic free-flowing interaction. Both participants wore a head-mounted eye tracking system that recorded eye gaze data from a first-person view. Crosshairs indicated frame-by-frame gaze direction. Two gaze streams from the parent and infant indicate region of interest fixations. The bracket corresponds to which ROIs the infant and parent were gazing towards: the infant’s and parent’s gaze were on the red object. White blocks indicate when an infant or parent is not looking at either an object or face.

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

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

Once the calibration phase was complete, an experimenter placed one of the object sets on the table and the first play trial began. During object play, all three objects within a set were on the table and parents were instructed to engage with their infant as they naturally would. If an object was knocked off of the table, an experimenter seated in the corner would promptly place the object back onto the table. After approximately 90 seconds of play, an experimenter swapped out the objects with the second set of objects, and the second trial began. The ordering of object sets was counterbalanced across dyads. This procedure was repeated and dyads completed up to four trials for a total of six minutes of play. Not all dyads completed the full play session. Twenty-three dyads completed all four trials and two dyads completed three trials, for a total average playtime of five minutes, eight seconds. Parents were encouraged to play with their infants as they naturally would at home so behaviors were not restricted such as object naming, object touching, object holding, etc. Overall, natural toy play behaviors were observed such as the parents naming the objects and the infant and parent playing with objects together.

**Data processing**

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Eye-tracking software yielded scene camera footage with crosshairs superimposed, this footage was then sampled at a rate of 30 frames per second, using an in-house coding program, trained coders blind to the hypotheses of the study annotated frame-by-frame the target of gaze. Calibration of gaze data was carefully processed and evaluated by trained experimenters. After processing of calibration was complete, each video was evaluated for accuracy and gaze data were recalibrated, if needed. The current study followed the best practices for calibration of head-mounted eye-tracking data communicated by Slone et al. (2018). For frames from the infant perspective, roughly 25% of frames were not codable either due to eye-tracking failure or

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 the infant was off task and looking elsewhere than the regions of interest. Overall, over 10,000  
4 frames were coded for each infant-parent play session.  
5  
6

7  
8 Four regions of interest (ROIs) were defined: three toy objects and the partner's face.  
9  
10 ROIs were manually coded frame-by-frame from a first-person view video. Coders  
11  
12 independently coded either the infant's ROIs or the caregiver's ROIs. An ROI was annotated  
13  
14 when a cross-hair overlapped on any portion of an object or face (see Figure 1). If one ROI (e.g.,  
15  
16 blue object) went in front of another ROI (e.g., face), coders used the context before/after the  
17  
18 instance to determine the proper ROI. To assess reliability, a second coder coded a randomly-  
19  
20 selected 10% of the frames with 95% agreement.  
21  
22

### **Vocabulary size**

23  
24  
25  
26 Parents completed the infant version of the MacArthur-Bates Communicative  
27  
28 Development Inventory (Fenson et al., 1994) when the infants were 12 and 15 months old. We  
29  
30 used total receptive vocabulary as our measure of vocabulary scores at each age.  
31  
32

### **Parent naming events**

33  
34  
35  
36 Speech from the parent was transcribed into spoken utterances. Among utterances that  
37  
38 included the names of the toys were designated at naming events.  
39

### **Gaze measures**

40  
41  
42 The analyzed data begin as gaze streams to the partner's face, or to one of the three  
43  
44 objects in play. We operationally defined gaze to an object as coordinated attention behavior by  
45  
46 requiring, first, at least 500 ms of coordinated attention to the same object at the beginning of the  
47  
48 bout (see Yu & Smith, 2013) while also allowing the inclusion of looks to the partner's face for  
49  
50 up to five additional seconds. Moreover, we also allowed a maximum gap of 1 s between two  
51  
52 identical ROIs when no other ROIs were coded. These restrictions were to ensure temporal  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

continuity between two looks to the same object while allowing for brief looks to the face of the partner and/or brief instances when no ROI was coded. To be inclusive of all types of coordinated attention, the definition required that both participants looked at the same object but could also include short or long looks by either participant to the face of the partner as shown in Figure 2. Table 1 provides an operational definition of the seven coordinated attention types:




Figure 2. Overview of coordinated attention bout types. (A) An example of coupled ROI streams from one infant (first row) and parent (second row), and bouts of coordinated attention (third row). Solid coordinated attention bouts depict ‘object-oriented coordinated attention’ and coordinated bouts with diagonal lines depict ‘face-oriented attention’. (B) Examples of seven types of coordinated attention (from left to right): Mutual Gaze, Parent: Object/Infant: Face, Parent: Face/Infant: Object, Parent: Triadic/Infant: Triadic, Parent: Triadic/Infant: Object, Parent: Object/Infant: Triadic, and Parent: Object/Infant: Object. White space reflects gaze to object ROIs other than the partner’s face or target ROI.

COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

**Table 1.** Operational definitions of the seven coordinated attention bout types.

Coordinated Attention Types	Definition
Mutual Gaze	Simultaneous fixations of infant and parent face ROIs.
Parent:Face/Infant:Object	Simultaneous fixations of parent looking at infant’s face and infant looking at any object ROI.
Parent:Object/Infant:Face	Simultaneous fixations of infant looking at parent’s face and parent looking at any object ROI.
Parent:Triadic/Infant:Triadic	<i>Only</i> continuous alignment towards the same object ROI that also included looks to the face ROI from both parent and infant for less than 5s.
Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object	<i>Only</i> continuous alignment towards the same object ROI that also included looks to the face ROI from parent for less than 5s.
Parent:Object/Infant:Triadic	<i>Only</i> continuous alignment towards the same object ROI that also included looks to the face ROI from infant for less than 5s.
Parent:Object/Infant:Object	<i>Only</i> continuous alignment towards the same object ROI that did not include any face looks from either parent or infant.

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

**Results****How frequently do different types of coordinated attention occur?**

The seven coordinated attention bout types accounted for almost 50% of total interaction time ( $M=48\%$ ,  $SD=11\%$ ), clearly showing a strong role for looks to objects and to faces in parent-infant interactions. Table 2 provides the amount of total play that the dyads were in different types of coordinated attention as well as the relative proportions of coordinated attention types. We focus primarily on the amount of time spent in each coordinated attention bout type and therefore, the following analyses incorporate the proportion and relative proportion properties. More specifically, proportions were computed as the total amount of time in each type of coordinated attention bout compared to the total trial time for each dyad and relative proportions were computed as the total amount of time in each type of coordinated attention bout compared to the overall amount of time in any type of coordinated attention bout. We did not have specific hypotheses for average duration and rate of each bout type. Two components of coordinated attention account for a majority of the total amount of time spent in coordinated attention: Parent:Face/Infant:Object (relative proportion:  $M=31\%$ ,  $SD=16\%$ ) and Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object (relative proportion:  $M=31\%$ ,  $SD=14\%$ ). The Parent:Face/Infant:Object type was principally made up of cases in which the infant looked at the object and the parent looked at the infant's face (without looking at the object). The Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object type was principally made up by cases in which the infant looked only to the object and the parent looked at the infant's face and the object. Also noteworthy is that infants rarely looked to their parent's face either when their parent was looking at an object (Parent:Object/Infant:Face:  $M=3\%$ ,  $SD=2\%$ ) or when they were jointly looking at the same

COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

object as their parent (Parent:Object/Infant:Triadic:  $M=0.005\%$ ,  $SD=.01\%$ ). Moreover, only 12 dyads displayed any amount of Parent:Object/Infant:Triadic coordinated attention.

Table 2. Properties of attention and coordinated attention types.

Attention Types	Proportion	Relative Proportion	Duration (s)	Rate (per minute)
<i>Object</i>				
Parent	0.33 (0.12)		0.62 (0.17)	31.81 (9.06)
Infant	0.86 (0.06)		1.87 (0.58)	29.61 (7.29)
<i>Face</i>				
Parent	0.54 (0.14)		0.82 (0.28)	41.50 (11.01)
Infant	0.08 (0.05)		1.25 (0.59)	4.35 (3.22)
<i>Coordinated Attention</i>				
Overall	0.48 (0.11)	1.00	1.23 (0.31)	30.53 (6.75)
Mutual Gaze	0.06 (0.05)	0.13 (0.11)	0.92 (0.29)	3.80 (2.72)
Parent:Object/Infant:Face	0.03 (0.02)	0.07 (0.06)	0.45 (0.19)	3.52 (2.85)
Parent:Face/Infant:Object	0.15 (0.07)	0.31 (0.16)	0.60 (0.22)	15.37 (5.42)
Parent:Triadic/Infant:Triadic	0.05 (0.04)	0.10 (0.08)	2.47 (0.81)	2.60 (1.53)
Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object	0.15 (0.08)	0.31 (0.14)	2.45 (0.87)	2.50 (1.53)
Parent:Object/Infant:Triadic	0.005 (0.01)	0.01 (0.03)	0.56 (1.04)	0.16 (0.29)
Parent:Object/Infant:Object	0.03 (0.03)	0.07 (0.08)	1.15 (0.28)	2.58 (1.69)

Note. Means and standard deviations (in parentheses). Proportion measures the overall proportion of time in bout. Duration is the average duration of bouts. Rate measures the number of bouts per minute.

**For the frequently-occurring types of coordinated attention, which types were associated with future vocabulary size?**

Vocabulary size at 12 months of age ( $Min=10$ ,  $Max=185$ ,  $Mean=83$ ,  $Median=82$ ,  $SD=50$ ) was positively correlated with vocabulary size at 15 months of age ( $Min=18$ ,  $Max=206$ ,  $Mean=134$ ,  $Median=142$ ,  $SD=54$ ),  $r(24)=0.83$ ,  $p<.001$ . Median vocabulary size at 12 months of

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 age (Median = 82) was between the 50% and 60% percentiles of the full American English  
4  
5 Words and Gestures Form (Understanding) dataset from Wordbank (Frank, Braginsky,  
6  
7 Yurovsky, & Marchman, 2016). Median vocabulary size at 15 months of age (Median = 142)  
8  
9 was between the 40% and 50% percentiles. Data were downloaded on 4/21/20.  
10  
11

12 For looking bouts (independent of coordinated attention), infants' proportion of looking  
13  
14 at objects positively correlated with vocabulary size at 12 months ( $r=.59, p=.002$ ) and 15 months  
15  
16 ( $r=.61, p=.001$ ), whereas proportion of infant looking at faces was negatively correlated with  
17  
18 vocabulary size at 12 months ( $r=-.56, p=.003$ ) and 15 months ( $r=-.56, p=.003$ ).  
19  
20

21 The proportion of overall coordinated attention correlated with vocabulary size at 12  
22  
23 months ( $r=.46, p=.019$ ) but not at 15 months ( $r=.29, p=.153$ ). The two most frequent types of  
24  
25 coordinated attention, accounting for 62% of total time in overall coordinated attention, were (1)  
26  
27 Parent:Face/Infant:Object and (2) Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object. Table 3 reports the zero-order  
28  
29 correlations between coordinated attention proportions and future vocabulary size. Despite the  
30  
31 high proportion of total coordinated attention across the two frequent types, only the proportion  
32  
33 of time in Parent:Face/Infant:Object correlated with vocabulary size at 12 months ( $r=.53,$   
34  
35  $p=.006$ ) and 15 months ( $r=.44, p=.049$ ) (see Figure 3). All data and code are available here:  
36  
37 [https://osf.io/6kc5d/?view\\_only=a7aa63ce44704d458fda70e37d7a597f](https://osf.io/6kc5d/?view_only=a7aa63ce44704d458fda70e37d7a597f).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

Table 3. Zero-order correlations between coordinated attention proportions and vocabulary size at 12 months and 15 months.

Type	12 Months	15 Months
Overall	$r=.46, p=.019$	$r=.29, p=.153$
Mutual Gaze	$r=-.16, p=.437$	$r=-.21, p=.314$
Parent: Object/Infant: Face	$r=-.33, p=.104$	$r=-.24, p=.243$
Parent: Face/Infant: Object	$r=.32, p=.118$	$r=.22, p=.281$
Parent: Triadic/Infant: Triadic	$r=-.006, p=.974$	$r=-.09, p=.664$
Parent: Triadic/Infant: Object	$r=.53, p=.006$	$r=.44, p=.049$
Parent: Object/Infant: Triadic	$r=-.02, p=.915$	$r=.15, p=.458$
Parent: Object/Infant: Object	$r=.07, p=.744$	$r=.08, p=.707$

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE




Figure 3. Scatter plots (with the best-fitting regression lines) show correlations between proportion of time in Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object coordinated attention and MCDI at 12 months (left) and 15 months (right). Ribbons reflect  $\pm$  95% CIs.

**For the frequently-occurring types of coordinated attention, which types were associated with more in-the-moment object naming by the parent?**

To aid in understanding what other potentially important behaviors might occur during different types of coordinated attention, we conducted a post-hoc, exploratory analysis to determine the amount of object naming a parent produces during coordinated attention. Previous research suggested that a key factor of infant word learning is that when an infant sustains attention on an object, a parent names the object (Pereira, Smith, & Yu, 2014; Yu, Suanda, & Smith, 2019). Of the two most frequently-occurring coordinated attention types, only Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object coordinated attention was associated with future vocabulary size. To

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 determine why this type of coordinated attention, but not the other frequently-occurring  
4  
5 coordinated attention type (Parent:Face/Infant:Object), might be more associated with future  
6  
7 vocabulary size, we calculated the proportion of coordinated attention bouts that included parent  
8  
9 naming of the object jointly attended to by the infant and parent (target). We also calculated the  
10  
11 proportion of coordinated attention bouts that included parent naming of an object that was not  
12  
13 jointly attended to by the infant and parent (nontarget). We chose to use the proportion of  
14  
15 coordinated attention bouts that included naming instances because such a measure controls for  
16  
17 differences in other properties of coordinated attention that vary across the two frequently-  
18  
19 occurring coordinated attention bout types, namely, average bout duration and bout frequency.  
20  
21 Overall, parents named objects approximately eight times per minute ( $M=8.23$  per/minute,  
22  
23  $SD=2.83$ ). The proportion of coordinated attention bouts that included instances of parent  
24  
25 naming was higher for Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object coordinated attention bouts ( $M=50\%$ ,  
26  
27  $SD=18\%$ ) compared to Parent:Face/Infant:Object coordinated attention bouts ( $M=38\%$ ,  
28  
29  $SD=15\%$ ),  $t(24)=3.26$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $d=0.80$ . Overall, Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object coordinated  
30  
31 attention bouts had higher instances of parent naming of the target object, further leading to the  
32  
33 suggestion that the gaze behaviors that make up Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object coordinated  
34  
35 attention are important pathways for the relationship between coordinated attention and future  
36  
37 vocabulary size (see Table 4).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

Table 4 Proportion of object attention and coordinated attention bouts that include an instance of parent naming for target and nontarget naming.

<i>Type</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Nontarget</i>
Mutual Gaze	0.41 (0.15)	0.07 (0.09)
Parent: Object/Infant: Face	0.48 (0.14)	0.09 (0.08)
Parent: Face/Infant: Object	0.38 (0.11)	0.15 (0.10)
Parent: Triadic/Infant: Triadic	0.06 (0.22)	0.0 (0.0)
Parent: Triadic/Infant: Object	0.50 (0.18)	0.07 (0.08)
<i>Parent: Object/Infant: Triadic</i>	0.16 (0.37)	0.0 (0.0)
<i>Parent: Object/Infant: Object</i>	0.30 (0.27)	0.07 (0.08)

### General Discussion

Coordinated attention represents an important but complex behavior for an infant developing in a social world. By definition, coordinated attention necessarily includes gaze patterns from an infant and a parent. The present study provides three new contributions for understanding the nature of early coordinated attention and its role in language development. First, from all of the potential and theorized combinations of components that make up various types of coordinated attention, only two account for a majority of the time infants and their parents spend in coordinated attention: when parents are looking to their infant's face while their infant was looking at an object (Parent:Face/Infant:Object) and when parents are looking to their infant's face *during* object-oriented coordinated attention (Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object). Second, of the coordinated attention bout types that frequently occurred, only the variability of time spent in coordinated attention that includes when parent's looks to their infant's face *during* object-oriented coordinated attention (Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object) is correlated with future vocabulary size. Third, parents name the object their infant is looking at more often during bouts of

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 coordinated attention that includes when parent's looks to their infant's face *during* object-  
4  
5 oriented coordinated attention (Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object).  
6

7  
8 Many theoretical discussions of coordinated attention (Baldwin, 1995; Bruner, 1983;  
9  
10 Carpenter et al., 1998) have centered on the infant's ability to follow parent eye gaze and to infer  
11  
12 parent momentary interests and thus referential intent. Several empirical investigations further  
13  
14 demonstrate that the ability of parents and infants to coordinate attention in social interactions  
15  
16 has also been shown to be highly predictive of later vocabulary development (Bakeman &  
17  
18 Adamson, 1994; Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005, 2008; Carpenter et al., 1998; Morales et al., 1998;  
19  
20 Tomasello & Farrar, 1986; Tomasello & Todd, 1983). Putting these two together would seem to  
21  
22 suggest that one route to fostering vocabulary growth in children with small vocabularies would  
23  
24 be to focus on the infant's deficiencies of reading parents' interests. The present results suggest  
25  
26 an alternative route. The present results show that two pieces of coordinated attention critical for  
27  
28 language development are: the prevalence of simultaneous parent monitoring of infant gaze and  
29  
30 infant attention to objects during bouts of object-oriented coordinated attention. The significance  
31  
32 of this finding derives in part from the well-documented link between individual differences in  
33  
34 coordinated attention and individual differences in concurrent and future vocabulary size (e.g.,  
35  
36 Carpenter et al., 1998; Mundy, Sigman, & Karsari, 1990; Tomasello & Todd, 1983) and from the  
37  
38 well-documented links between individual differences in vocabulary and cognitive and linguistic  
39  
40 skills (Marchman & Fernald, 2008) and later school achievement (Murphy, Rowe, Ramani,  
41  
42 Silverman, 2014). It is therefore critical to understand the environments and situations where  
43  
44 vocabulary learning do and do not occur.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 If the reason for why coordinated attention correlates with future vocabulary size is  
52  
53 because coordinated attention taps into an infant's emerging ability to infer referential intent, we  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 should expect to observe a higher frequency of infants looking to their parent's face (e.g.,  
4 Parent:Object/Infant:Face, Parent:Triadic/Infant:Triadic, or Parent:Object/Infant:Face). A  
5  
6 stronger test of this conclusion would be in the form of adding additional variants of coordinated  
7  
8 attention that include when infants and parents lead and/or follow into a bout of coordinated  
9  
10 attention (Mundy & Newell, 2007). Nevertheless, the results observed in the current study,  
11  
12 including that infants primarily fixate their gaze on objects and not their parent's face, point to a  
13  
14 rethinking of the infant's role in coordinated attention for language development at different  
15  
16 phases of development.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Consistent with other previous research that spans across different parent-infant  
23  
24 interaction contexts (e.g., Carpenter et al., 1998; Deák, Krasno, Triesch, Lewis, & Sepeta, 2014;  
25  
26 de Barbaro, Johnson, Forster, & Deak, 2015; Yu & Smith, 2013; Yu & Smith, 2016a, 2016b), in  
27  
28 the current study, we observed that infants rarely looked to their parent's face. This is an  
29  
30 important observation because previous research has observed that attentional skills like an  
31  
32 infant's ability to follow the gaze of an adult during a discrete trial is predictive of later  
33  
34 vocabulary (Brooks & Melzoff, 2005, 2008; Morales, Mundy, & Rojas, 1998). The reason for  
35  
36 this disparity is an open question and future research should focus on better understanding the  
37  
38 similarities and differences between experimental contexts such as free play and discrete trials  
39  
40 during coordinated attention (e.g. Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2017).  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The finding that a specific type of coordinated attention made of two component  
46  
47 behaviors – infant attention to objects while parent is attending to the same object and also  
48  
49 monitoring the attention of the infant – correlates with later vocabulary size is consistent with the  
50  
51 literature showing that parent responsiveness and infant sustained attention are important for  
52  
53 concurrent and future language development. Recent research found that infant sustained  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 attention during bouts of joint attention strongly predicted future vocabulary size (Yu, Suanda,  
4 Smith, 2018). Parental monitoring and subsequent following behaviors have been shown to lead  
5  
6 to enhanced word learning (Tamis-LeMonda & Bornstein, 1994; Tamis-LeMonda, Kuchirko,  
7  
8 Song, 2014; Tomasello & Farrar, 1986). One explanation for this is that responsive parents seize  
9  
10 opportunistic moments wherein infants attend to a target object by providing verbal referents and  
11  
12 accompanying deictic gestures to objects in their infant's visual attention. For infants to link  
13  
14 visual objects and their referents, what is important is that their visual attention on the target  
15  
16 object is temporally aligned with parent naming (Yu & Smith, 2012; Golgate, Walker-Andrews,  
17  
18 Bahrick, 2001; Zukow-Goldring, 1990; Yu, Suanda, Smith, 2018) and results from our  
19  
20 exploratory analyses add further elaboration suggesting that parents name the object their infant  
21  
22 is looking at more often during bouts of coordinated attention that includes when parent's looks  
23  
24 to their infant's face *during* object-oriented coordinated attention (Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The observation that parental monitoring and infant object attention during coordinated  
32  
33 attention are two critical components that drive the relationship between coordinated attention  
34  
35 and future vocabulary size at this particular developmental period provides a starting point for a  
36  
37 unifying explanation of the roles of the parent and the infant for the creation of important word  
38  
39 learning moments. It was entirely possible that the variability of other types of coordinated  
40  
41 attention bouts would be correlated with increases in future vocabulary size, in addition to the  
42  
43 coordinated attention bout where infant attention to objects while parent is attending to the same  
44  
45 object and also monitoring the attention of the infant. However, a critical observation is that  
46  
47 parental monitoring of infant attention *outside* of object-oriented coordinated attention bouts  
48  
49 occurred frequently (Parent:Face/Infant:Object: 31% of all coordinated attention) but did not  
50  
51 correlate with future vocabulary size. The key feature that bridges the parent's role (attentional  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 monitoring) and the infant's role (attention to object) is the emergent object-oriented coordinated  
4  
5 attention of the dyad.  
6

7  
8 A few limitations are noteworthy. Our decision to include face looks instead of looks to  
9  
10 the partner's eyes constrain our interpretation of coordinated looking. Specifically, an  
11  
12 interpretation of mutual gaze should include looks to any part of the partner's face. Moreover,  
13  
14 the interactive context structured in the laboratory was not the natural setting in which infants  
15  
16 and their parents are typically interacting within. Ongoing efforts in our lab are moving towards  
17  
18 more naturalistic, lab-based interactions that simulate home-like contexts and minimize possible  
19  
20 impacts of data collection methods such as the use of eye-tracking equipment. Future research  
21  
22 should determine whether the patterns of results documented in the current study generalize to  
23  
24 more naturalistic interactions. Moreover, although our analytic protocol took advantage of high-  
25  
26 density temporal streams of behavior, the sample size of the current study was limited and future  
27  
28 research in this domain should work to achieve larger samples when possible. Finally, given the  
29  
30 multimodal nature of the interactive context, future work should investigate the role of other  
31  
32 behaviors that might play a role in coordinated attention above and beyond the gaze patterns of  
33  
34 objects and partners' faces, such as holding behaviors, object passing, and gaze behaviors  
35  
36 independent of coordinated attention. Given the experimental design of the current study, namely  
37  
38 that it consisted of joint play, it is difficult to disentangle gaze patterns that would be completely  
39  
40 independent of a social partner's gaze patterns even during bouts of infant gaze that did not  
41  
42 include parent looking at any of the ROIs. Future research could experimentally control for  
43  
44 effects of coordinated attention on independent gaze patterns like infant sustained attention by  
45  
46 implementing an experimental design similar to Wass et al. (2018) which included joint play and  
47  
48 solo play sessions for each dyad.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3           Research spanning decades has provided important insights into the patterns of  
4  
5 coordinated attention, and what those patterns can predict in later development. Previous work  
6  
7 has carefully chosen specific terminology when operationalizing particular types of coordinated  
8  
9 attention. For example, Bakeman and Adamson (1984) coded behavior as *coordinated joint*  
10  
11 *engagement* if an infant coordinated their attention with another person and an object for  
12  
13 particular duration (~3s) with brief attentional shifts elsewhere for less than 3s. In another  
14  
15 example, the coding of *supported joint engagement* includes an asymmetrical interaction such  
16  
17 that the parent is producing overt behaviors that support the coordinated attention such as  
18  
19 demonstrating an action with the object (Adamson, Bakeman, & Deckner, 2004; Bakeman &  
20  
21 Adamson, 1984; Kasari et al., 2010). Our decision to choose the term ‘coordinated attention’ was  
22  
23 motivated by the goal to be inclusive to various types of coordinated attention that have been  
24  
25 used in previous literature. The observation that one particular type of coordinated attention,  
26  
27 Parent:Triadic/Infant:Object, correlated with later vocabulary development, is consistent with  
28  
29 Bakeman and Adamson (1984)’s description of supported joint engagement.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35           Past research suggests that it is very likely that the role of the infant changes such that, at  
36  
37 9-months-of-age, there are very few fixations to the parent’s face, but going into the second year  
38  
39 of life, infants increase the frequency of alternating their gaze from their parents’ face and  
40  
41 objects in the environment (Bakeman & Adamson, 1984; Carpenter et al., 1998): a behavior that  
42  
43 has been found to be an important predictor of language outcomes later in development  
44  
45 (Carpenter et al., 1998; Mundy et al., 2007). Moreover, infant’s sustained attention to objects  
46  
47 increases in frequency and duration throughout the first and second year of life (Ruff & Lawson,  
48  
49 1990), which adds even more nuance to the developing role of the infant during complex  
50  
51 interaction with parents. It is possible that increases in both infants’ alternating gaze between  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 their parents' faces and objects in addition to increased and prolonged bouts of sustained  
4  
5 attention provide the context where more complex social interactions lead to diverse language  
6  
7 learning moments. Therefore, it is important to consider the results from the current study in the  
8  
9 context of one particular age range during development and to motivate future investigations into  
10  
11 the developmental trajectories of the patterns of gaze across infants and parents that are the  
12  
13 building blocks of coordinated attention.  
14  
15

16  
17 In summary, previous research studying social interactions between parents and infants  
18  
19 has suggested various patterns of gaze behaviors. The current study highlighted the distribution  
20  
21 of components that make up different types of coordinated attention that actually occur during  
22  
23 parent-infant interaction and which types of coordinated attention are associated with future  
24  
25 vocabulary size. Critically, the current study provided results consistent with a new explanation  
26  
27 for this period of infancy: coordinated attention is comprised of multiple component behaviors  
28  
29 and the key components that are associated with future vocabulary size are momentary parental  
30  
31 monitoring of infant visual attention and infant attention to the target object during object-  
32  
33 oriented coordinated attention. These results point to the critical roles of parent and infant that  
34  
35 are afforded by emergent temporary bouts of coordinated attention and unify two important roles  
36  
37 of the parent-infant dyad known to be associated with later vocabulary size: parent  
38  
39 responsiveness and infant sustained attention.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Adamson, L. B., Bakeman, R., Suma, K., & Robins, D. L. (2019). An expanded view of joint  
6 attention: Skill, engagement, and language in typical development and autism. *Child*  
7  
8 *development, 90*(1), e1-e18  
9  
10  
11  
12 Adamson, L. B., & Bakeman, R. (1991). The development of shared attention during infancy. In  
13  
14 R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*, Vol. 8 (pp. 1–41). London: Jessica Kingsley  
15  
16 Press.  
17  
18  
19 Adamson, L. B., Bakeman, R., & Deckner, D. F. (2004). The development of symbol-infused  
20  
21 joint engagement. *Child development, 75*(4), 1171-1187.  
22  
23  
24 Bakeman, R., & Adamson, L. B. (1984). Coordinating attention to people and objects in mother-  
25  
26 infant and peer-infant interaction. *Child development, 1278-1289*.  
27  
28  
29 Baldwin, D. A., Moore, C., & Dunham, P. J. (1995). Understanding the link between joint  
30  
31 attention and language. *Joint attention: Its origins and role in development*, 131- 158.  
32  
33  
34 Beier, J. S., & Spelke, E. S. (2012). Infants' developing understanding of social gaze. *Child*  
35  
36 *Development, 83*(2), 486-496.  
37  
38  
39 Blass, E. M., Lumeng, J., & Patil, N. (2017). Influence of mutual gaze on human infant affect.  
40  
41 In *Gaze-Following* (pp. 113-141). Psychology Press.  
42  
43  
44 Brooks, R., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2005). The development of gaze following and its relation to  
45  
46 language. *Developmental science, 8*(6), 535-543.  
47  
48  
49 Brooks, R., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2008). Infant gaze following and pointing predict accelerated  
50  
51 vocabulary growth through two years of age: A longitudinal, growth curve modeling study.  
52  
53 *Journal of child language, 35*(01), 207-220.  
54  
55  
56 Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. New York: Norton.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

- 1  
2  
3 Carpenter, M., Nagell, K., Tomasello, M., Butterworth, G., & Moore, C. (1998). Social  
4  
5 cognition, joint attention, and communicative competence from 9 to 15 months of age.  
6  
7 *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, i-174.  
8  
9  
10 Deak, G. O., Krasno, A. M., Triesch, J., Lewis, J., & Sepeta, L. (2014). Watch the hands: infants  
11  
12 can learn to follow gaze by seeing adults manipulate objects. *Developmental Science*, 17(2),  
13  
14 270-281.  
15  
16  
17 de Barbaro, K., Johnson, C. M., Forster, D., & Deák, G. O. (2015). Sensorimotor decoupling  
18  
19 contributes to triadic attention: A longitudinal investigation of mother– infant–object  
20  
21 interactions. *Child development*.  
22  
23  
24 Feldman, R. (2007). On the origins of background emotions: From affect synchrony to symbolic  
25  
26 expression. *Emotion*, 7(3), 601.  
27  
28  
29 Fenson, L., Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., Bates, E., Thal, D. J., Pethick, S. J., ... & Stiles, J. (1994).  
30  
31 Variability in early communicative development. *Monographs of the society for research in*  
32  
33 *child development*, i-185.  
34  
35  
36 Gogate, L. J., Walker-Andrews, A. S., & Bahrick, L. E. (2001). The intersensory origins of  
37  
38 word-comprehension: an ecological–dynamic systems view. *Developmental Science*, 4(1), 1-  
39  
40 18.  
41  
42  
43 Hirsh-Pasek, K., Adamson, L. B., Bakeman, R., Owen, M. T., Golinkoff, R. M., Pace, A., ... &  
44  
45 Suma, K. (2015). The contribution of early communication quality to low-income children's  
46  
47 language success. *Psychological Science*, 26(7), 1071-1083.  
48  
49  
50  
51 Hoehl, S., Michel, C., Reid, V. M., Parise, E., & Striano, T. (2014). Eye contact during live  
52  
53 social interaction modulates infants' oscillatory brain activity. *Social Neuroscience*, 9(3),  
54  
55 300-308.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

- 1  
2  
3 Hsu, H. C., & Fogel, A. (2003). Stability and transitions in mother-infant face-to-face  
4  
5 communication during the first 6 months: a microhistorical approach. *Developmental*  
6  
7 *psychology*, 39(6), 1061.  
8  
9
- 10 Kasari, C., Gulsrud, A. C., Wong, C., Kwon, S., & Locke, J. (2010). Randomized controlled  
11  
12 caregiver mediated joint engagement intervention for toddlers with autism. *Journal of autism*  
13  
14 *and developmental disorders*, 40(9), 1045-1056.  
15  
16
- 17 Klinnert, M. D., Campos, J. J., Sorce, J. F., Emde, R. N., & Svejda, M. A. R. I. L. Y. N. (1983).  
18  
19 Emotions as behavior regulators: Social referencing in infancy. In *Emotions in early*  
20  
21 *development* (pp. 57-86). Academic Press.  
22  
23
- 24 Landry, S. H., Smith, K. E., & Swank, P. R. (2006). Responsive parenting: establishing early  
25  
26 foundations for social, communication, and independent problem-solving skills.  
27  
28 *Developmental psychology*, 42(4), 627.  
29  
30
- 31 Lavelli, M., & Fogel, A. (2005). Developmental changes in the relationship between the infant's  
32  
33 attention and emotion during early face-to-face communication: the 2-month  
34  
35 transition. *Developmental psychology*, 41(1), 265.  
36  
37
- 38 Leong, V., Byrne, E., Clackson, K., Georgieva, S., Lam, S., & Wass, S. (2017). Speaker gaze  
39  
40 increases information coupling between infant and adult brains. *Proceedings of the National*  
41  
42 *Academy of Sciences*, 114(50), 13290-13295.  
43  
44
- 45 MacLean, P. C., Rynes, K. N., Aragón, C., Caprihan, A., Phillips, J. P., & Lowe, J. R. (2014).  
46  
47 Mother–infant mutual eye gaze supports emotion regulation in infancy during the still-face  
48  
49 paradigm. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 37(4), 512-522.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

- 1  
2  
3 Marchman, V. A., & Fernald, A. (2008). Speed of word recognition and vocabulary knowledge  
4  
5 in infancy predict cognitive and language outcomes in later childhood. *Developmental*  
6  
7 *science*, 11(3).  
8  
9
- 10 McCathren, R. B., Yoder, P. J., & Warren, S. F. (1995). The role of directives in early language  
11  
12 intervention. *Journal of early intervention*, 19(2), 91-101.  
13  
14
- 15 Morales, M., Mundy, P., & Rojas, J. (1998). Following the direction of gaze and language  
16  
17 development in 6-month-olds. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 21(2), 373-377.  
18  
19
- 20 Mundy, P., Sigman, M., & Kasari, C. (1990). A longitudinal study of joint attention and  
21  
22 language development in autistic children. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*,  
23  
24 20(1), 115-128.  
25
- 26 Mundy, P., Block, J., Delgado, C., Pomares, Y., Van Hecke, A. V., & Parlade, M. V. (2007).  
27  
28 Individual differences and the development of joint attention in infancy. *Child*  
29  
30 *development*, 78(3), 938-954.  
31  
32
- 33 Mundy, P., & Newell, L. (2007). Attention, joint attention, and social cognition. *Current*  
34  
35 *directions in psychological science*, 16(5), 269-274.  
36  
37
- 38 Murphy, P. K., Rowe, M. L., Ramani, G., & Silverman, R. (2014). Promoting critical- analytic  
39  
40 thinking in children and adolescents at home and in school. *Educational Psychology Review*,  
41  
42 26(4), 561-578.  
43  
44
- 45 Niedźwiecka, A., Ramotowska, S., & Tomalski, P. (2018). Mutual gaze during early mother–  
46  
47 infant interactions promotes attention control development. *Child development*, 89(6), 2230-  
48  
49 2244.  
50
- 51 Pereira, A. F., Smith, L. B., & Yu, C. (2014). A bottom-up view of toddler word learning.  
52  
53 *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 21(1), 178-185.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

- 1  
2  
3 Piazza, E. A., Hasenfratz, L., Hasson, U., & Lew-Williams, C. (2018). Infant and adult brains are  
4  
5 coupled to the dynamics of natural communication. *bioRxiv*, 359810.  
6  
7  
8 Ruff, H. A., & Lawson, K. R. (1990). Development of sustained, focused attention in young  
9  
10 children during free play. *Developmental psychology*, 26(1), 85.  
11  
12 Senju, A., & Csibra, G. (2008). Gaze following in human infants depends on communicative  
13  
14 signals. *Current Biology*, 18(9), 668-671.  
15  
16  
17 Senju, A., Csibra, G., & Johnson, M. H. (2008). Understanding the referential nature of looking:  
18  
19 Infants' preference for object-directed gaze. *Cognition*, 108(2), 303-319.  
20  
21  
22 Slone, L. K., Abney, D. H., Borjon, J. I., Chen, C. H., Franchak, J. M., Percy, D., ... & Yu, C.  
23  
24 (2018). Gaze in action: Head-mounted eye tracking of children's dynamic visual attention  
25  
26 during naturalistic behavior. *JoVE (Journal of Visualized Experiments)*, (141), e58496.  
27  
28  
29 Striano, T., Reid, V. M., & Hoehl, S. (2006). Neural mechanisms of joint attention in  
30  
31 infancy. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 23(10), 2819-2823.  
32  
33  
34 Suarez-Rivera, C., Smith, L. B., & Yu, C. (2019). Multimodal parent behaviors within joint  
35  
36 attention support sustained attention in infants. *Developmental psychology*, 55(1), 96.  
37  
38  
39 Tamis-Lemonda, C. S., Bornstein, M. H., Kahana-Kalman, R., Baumwell, L., & Cyphers, L.  
40  
41 (1998). Predicting variation in the timing of language milestones in the second year: An  
42  
43 events history approach. *Journal of Child Language*, 25(3), 675-700.  
44  
45  
46 Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Bornstein, M. H. (1994). Specificity in mother-toddler language-play  
47  
48 relations across the second year. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(2), 283.  
49  
50  
51 Tamis LeMonda, C. S., Bornstein, M. H., & Baumwell, L. (2001). Maternal responsiveness and  
52  
53 children's achievement of language milestones. *Child development*, 72(3), 748-767.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

1  
2  
3 Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Kuchirko, Y., & Tafuro, L. (2013). From action to interaction: Infant  
4  
5 object exploration and mothers' contingent responsiveness. *IEEE Transactions on*  
6  
7 *Autonomous Mental Development*, 5(3), 202-209.

8  
9  
10 Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Kuchirko, Y., & Song, L. (2014). Why is infant language learning  
11  
12 facilitated by parental responsiveness?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(2),  
13  
14 121-126.

15  
16  
17 Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Kuchirko, Y., Luo, R., Escobar, K., & Bornstein, M. H. (2017). Power in  
18  
19 methods: language to infants in structured and naturalistic contexts. *Developmental*  
20  
21 *science*.<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

22  
23  
24 Tomasello, M., & Todd, J. (1983). Joint attention and lexical acquisition style. *First language*,  
25  
26 4(12), 197-211.

27  
28  
29 Tomasello, M., & Farrar, M. J. (1986). Joint attention and early language. *Child development*,  
30  
31 1454-1463.

32  
33  
34 Tronick, E. Z., & Cohn, J. F. (1989). Infant-mother face-to-face interaction: Age and gender  
35  
36 differences in coordination and the occurrence of miscoordination. *Child development*, 85-  
37  
38 92.

39  
40  
41 Wass, S. V., Clackson, K., Georgieva, S. D., Brightman, L., Nutbrown, R., & Leong, V. (2018).  
42  
43 Infants' visual sustained attention is higher during joint play than solo play: is this due to  
44  
45 increased endogenous attention control or exogenous stimulus capture? *Developmental*  
46  
47 *science*, 21(6), e12667.

48  
49  
50 Yamamoto, H., Sato, A., & Itakura, S. (2019). Eye tracking in an everyday environment reveals  
51  
52 the interpersonal distance that affords infant-parent gaze communication. *Scientific*  
53  
54 *reports*, 9(1), 1-9.



## COORDINATED ATTENTION AND LANGUAGE

- 1  
2  
3 Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2012). Embodied attention and word learning by toddlers. *Cognition*,  
4  
5 125(2), 244-262.  
6  
7  
8 Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2013). Joint attention without gaze following: Human infants and their  
9  
10 parents coordinate visual attention to objects through eye-hand coordination. *PloS one*, 8(11),  
11  
12 e79659.  
13  
14  
15 Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2016a). Multiple Sensory-Motor Pathways Lead to Coordinated Visual  
16  
17 Attention. *Cognitive science*.  
18  
19  
20 Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2016b). The social origins of sustained attention in one-year-old human  
21  
22 infants. *Current Biology*, 26(9), 1235-1240.  
23  
24  
25 Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2017). Hand–Eye Coordination Predicts Joint Attention. *Child*  
26  
27 *Development*, 88(6), 2060-2078.  
28  
29  
30 Yu, C., Suanda, S. H., & Smith, L. B. (2018). Infant sustained attention but not joint attention to  
31  
32 object at 9 months predicts vocabulary at 12 and 15 months. *Developmental Science*.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60