

Dyadic Drumming Across the Lifespan Reveals a Zone of Proximal Development in Children

Anna Kleinspehn-Ammerlahn and Michaela Riediger
Max Planck Institute for Human Development

Florian Schmiedek
Humboldt Universität zu Berlin and Max Planck Institute
for Human Development

Timo von Oertzen, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger
Max Planck Institute for Human Development

Many social interactions require the synchronization—be it automatically or intentionally—of one’s own behavior with that of others. Using a dyadic drumming paradigm, the authors delineate lifespan differences in interpersonal action synchronization (IAS). Younger children, older children, younger adults, and older adults in same- and mixed-age dyads were instructed to drum in synchrony with their interaction partner at a constant, self-chosen tempo. Adult-only dyads showed the highest and children-only the lowest levels of IAS accuracy. It is important to note that children improved reliably in IAS accuracy when paired with older partners. The observed age-related differences in IAS accuracy remained reliable after statistically controlling for individual differences in the ability to synchronize to a metronome and for between-dyad differences in tempo. The authors conclude that IAS improves from middle childhood to adulthood and that adult interaction partners may facilitate its development.

Keywords: action synchronization, zone of proximal development, interpersonal coordination, lifespan, intergenerational interaction

The need to coordinate one’s own behavior with that of others pervades social life. Salient examples include playing music, participating in team sports, or dancing. Collective play, everyday communication, and various bonding behaviors also rely on implicit or intentional forms of coordinated behavior. Even in antagonistic activities, such as boxing or soccer, individuals need to coordinate with each other to compete effectively (Marsh, Richardson, Baron, & Schmidt, 2006). A fundamental dimension of socially coordinated behavior is the ability to intentionally adapt the *timing* of one’s own behavior to the timing of others’ actions.

In the following, we refer to this ability as interpersonal action synchronization (IAS).

The ontogeny of IAS is largely unknown. Certain forms of interpersonal synchronization are present at birth (for review, see Feldman, 2007; cf. Condon & Sander, 1974a, 1974b; Crown, Feldstein, Jasnow, Beebe, & Jaffe, 2002). Furthermore, preschool children show higher synchronization accuracy in social (i.e., with another person) than in nonsocial contexts (i.e., with a mechanical timekeeper; Kirschner & Tomasello, 2009). Also, some psychological and developmental disorders, such as schizophrenia or autism, have been linked to difficulties in social interactions, including their dynamic aspects (e.g., Davalos, Kiskey, & Freedman, 2005; Frith & Wolpert, 2003; Nadel, 2004). The aim of this study was to delineate lifespan differences in the ability to synchronize one’s actions with another person of the same or of a different age. We were particularly interested in finding out whether IAS accuracy depends on the age composition of the dyad.

Individuals need to synchronize their actions in a wide range of situations and with different partners. Some researchers have proposed that individuals are endowed with an inherent rate of activity, or *preferred tempo*, which reflects biological and contextual factors (Boltz, 1994; Frischeisen-Köhler, 1933). According to this view, interaction partners need to adjust their internal states with each other to achieve synchronization (e.g., Nowak, Vallacher, & Zochowski, 2005). Thus, IAS can be understood as a reciprocal entrainment process (e.g., Haken, Kelso, & Bunz, 1985; Schmidt, Richardson, Arsenault, & Galantucci, 2007). This process is facilitated by sensorimotor abilities, such as perceptual awareness and motor skills, as well as declarative and procedural knowledge about the social world.

This article was published Online First January 10, 2011.

Anna Kleinspehn-Ammerlahn, Timo von Oertzen, Shu-Chen Li, and Ulman Lindenberger, Center for Lifespan Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany; Michaela Riediger, Center for Lifespan Psychology and Max Planck Research Group, “Affect Across the Lifespan,” Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany; Florian Schmiedek, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany, and Center for Lifespan Psychology, Max Planck Institute for Human Development.

Florian Schmiedek is now at the German Institute for International Educational Research (DIPF), Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt, Germany.

We thank Oliver Lütke and Alexander Robitzsch for their valuable support in analyzing the data, Julia Delius for improving the English, and Andreas Brandmaier for helpful discussions.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anna Kleinspehn-Ammerlahn or Ulman Lindenberger, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Lentzeallee 94, 14195 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: kleinspehn@mpib-berlin.mpg.de, kleinspehn@ammerlahn.de, or lindenberger@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

Lifespan Differences in Correlates of Interpersonal Action Synchronization

Procedural and declarative social knowledge accumulate more or less steadily throughout the lifespan. Several theorists have claimed that inferring the intentions of interaction partners helps individuals to accurately anticipate that person's behavior (e.g., Blakemore & Decety, 2001). For instance, Schaffer (1977) argued that infants are not capable of dyadic actions before they have acquired the concept of intentionality (see also Tomasello, Carpenter, Call, Behne, & Moll, 2005; Tomasello & Racoczy, 2003). Presumably, intentions begin to generate conscious awareness of specific action components in the first years of life (e.g., Meltzoff, 1995). Knowledge about one's own and others' psychological processes (e.g., thoughts, intentions) continues to accumulate across the later parts of the lifespan (e.g., Happé, Winner, & Brownell, 1998; Schindler & Staudinger, 2005; Staudinger & Pasupathi, 2000).

In contrast, sensorimotor abilities, such as perceptual and motor skills, improve throughout childhood, peak in young adulthood, and decline thereafter (e.g., Bloch, 1998; Dempster, 1992; Hommel, Li, & Li, 2004; Kail, 1991; Li, Lindenberger, Hommel, Aschersleben, Prinz, & Baltes, 2004; Salthouse, 1984, 1996; Thelen, 1993). Age differences in individuals' synchronization abilities have been studied using mechanical time keepers (e.g., metronomes; Aschersleben, 2002; Aschersleben & Prinz, 1995; Drake, Jones, & Baruch, 2000; Drewing, Aschersleben, & Li, 2006; Fraisse, 1980; Repp, 2005; Wing & Kristofferson, 1973). According to this literature, the lifespan development of synchronization abilities follows an inverse U-shaped function (e.g., Drewing et al., 2006). Tempo discrimination, tempo adaptation, and rhythmic performance have already been observed in neonates and 2- and 4-month-old infants (e.g., Baruch & Drake, 1997; Condon & Sander, 1974a, 1974b; Demany, McKenzie, & Vurpillot, 1977; Pouthas, Provasi, & Droit, 1996). Furthermore, at the age of 4–5 years, children are able to synchronize their clapping to an externally timed tempo (e.g., Drake et al., 2000; Fitzpatrick, Schmidt, & Lockman, 1996). There is additional evidence suggesting that older children's tapping variability when synchronizing their finger tapping to an externally prescribed tempo is lower than that of younger children, and hence their synchronization accuracy, higher (e.g., Drake et al., 2000; Smoll, 1974a, 1974b; Volman & Geuze, 2000). Some empirical evidence suggests that the precision of internal time keepers shows little or no decline with advancing adult age (Drewing et al., 2006; Pouthas, Vanneste, Jacquet, & Gerard, 1998), but synchronization ability in more complex tasks declines from early to late adulthood (Jagacinski, Greenberg, Liao, & Wang, 1993; Krampe, Engbert, & Kliegl, 2001).

This study investigates basic aspects of interpersonal action synchronization in a situation that contains relatively few contextualized social cues. Hence, we assume that the impact of declining sensorimotor abilities would outweigh the potential cumulative benefits of lifelong experience in interpersonal interactions. On the basis of these considerations, we predict that dyads composed of younger adults will show the highest levels of IAS accuracy of all possible dyadic combinations of younger children, older children, younger adults, and older adults.

Exploring the Zone of Proximal Development in Interpersonal Action Synchronization

Our second major hypothesis is based on the Vygotskian notion of the *zone of proximal development* (Vygotsky, 1933; cf. van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991). The zone of proximal development is generally defined as the distance between *actual* development, examined through independently solved tasks, and *potential* development, examined through tasks solved under the assistance of, or in cooperation with, older or more experienced partners (e.g., van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991). According to Vygotsky (1933), what children can do with the assistance of others is even more indicative of their developmental status than what they can do alone (e.g., Brown, Metz, & Campione, 1996).

To date, most of the available empirical studies investigating the zone of proximal development compared individual with collaborative planning strategies during problem-solving tasks (e.g., Brown, Ellery, & Campione, 1998; Rogoff, Malkin, & Gilbride, 1984). For example, with respect to planning imaginary errands, 9-year-old children showed more sophisticated planning strategies in posttests after having collaborated with adults compared with after having collaborated with age-peers (Radziszewska & Rogoff, 1991). Also, 5-year-olds evinced more efficient imaginary route planning when working together with their mothers than when working with age peers (Gauvain & Rogoff, 1989). However, empirical evidence for a zone of proximal development in other domains of functioning and in more basic sensorimotor skills is lacking.

Here, we apply the concept of the zone of proximal development to the development of IAS to arrive at the second major hypothesis of this study. We expect that the presence of an adult interaction partner will improve IAS in children. In other words, if IAS increases during childhood and peaks in younger adulthood, and if interacting with a more competent partner facilitates IAS, then children should show higher levels of IAS when synchronizing with an older partner than when synchronizing with a younger or same-age partner.

The Dyadic Drumming Paradigm

To investigate the two major hypotheses of this study, we assessed *dyadic drumming* in same- and mixed-age dyads. The drumming paradigm used here was derived from the tapping paradigm, which has been widely used to study individual (i.e., nondyadic) sensorimotor synchronization abilities (for review, see Repp, 2005; see also Aschersleben & Prinz, 1995; Fraisse, 1980; Wing & Kristofferson, 1973). In the tapping paradigm, participants are typically instructed to tap with their index finger in synchrony with mechanic timekeepers (i.e., stable metronome frequencies). Synchronization accuracy is measured as the temporal distance between the finger tap and the metronome click. In the dyadic drumming paradigm used here, pairs of individuals are asked to drum in synchrony with each other at a stable frequency with which they feel comfortable, only receiving auditory feedback from each other. The dyadic or shared goal is implemented by explicitly instructing individuals to synchronize with each other, and the discrepancy between the two individuals' drumming sequences is used to measure IAS accuracy.

IAS can be defined as bidirectional entrainment between two or more interaction partners (e.g., Kelso, 1984; Schmidt, Carello, &

Turvey, 1990). The *Haken-Kelso-Bunz Dynamic Model* (Haken et al., 1985), which is often used to represent interlimb coordination within individuals, posits two competing coordination attractors: one in-phase (symmetric movements) and the other anti-phase (alternate movements). In-phase coordination is generally more stable than anti-phase coordination, both in individual and dyadic contexts, and performance stability in both coordination modes has been found to decline as tapping frequency increases (e.g., Kelso, 1984; Schmidt et al., 1990; Schmidt, Christianson, Carello, & Baron, 1994; Schmidt & Turvey, 1994). The purpose of the present study was to investigate natural adjustment processes that occur between individuals when synchronizing with each other to reach a shared goal, while at the same time reducing the complexity of synchronization processes as they naturally occur in everyday interactions (e.g., Boker, Cohn, Theobald, Matthews, Brick, & Spies, 2009; Boker & Rotondo, 2003). Therefore, in the present study, individuals were asked to synchronize symmetrically (i.e., in-phase) at a tempo with which they felt comfortable.

Furthermore, some studies focused on the question whether individual synchronization differs with regard to the nature of the external stimuli used. Bartlett and Bartlett (1959) and Repp and Penel (2004) showed that synchronizing with auditory stimuli (e.g., a metronome) is more accurate than synchronizing with visual stimuli. In addition to this difference favoring auditory modality, the auditory paradigm used here also allows for a relatively tight control of interaction parameters, as the entire flow of information between the two members of a dyad is contained in the temporal distribution of the drum beats.

The available evidence indicates that fine motor skills increase in childhood (Thelen, 2000) and decline in normal aging (Jagacinski et al., 1993; Salthouse, 1984). Drumming (i.e., forearm movements) puts lower demands on fine motor skills than does tapping (i.e., finger movements). Given that we wished to minimize the influence of age-related differences in fine motor skills on the assessment of IAS, we used drumming instead of a tapping task.

In sum, to explore the development of temporal aspects of intentionally coordinated behavior between two individuals, we used a drumming paradigm to assess IAS accuracy of children and adults in same- and mixed-age dyads. On the basis of the lifespan trajectories of relevant sensorimotor skills and social knowledge, we predicted that younger adults would show the highest levels of IAS accuracy, especially when paired with younger adults in same-age dyads. In line with the Vygotskian notion of the zone of proximal development (e.g., Vygotsky, 1933), we also predicted that children would increase their IAS accuracy when paired with older individuals.

Method

Participants

A total of 72 female individuals aged 5, 12, 20–30, and 70–80 years participated in the study ($n = 18$ per age group). Participants were recruited from the participant pool of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany, via newspaper advertisements and through posters and flyers distributed in kindergartens and sports clubs. All participants were German-speaking inhabitants of Berlin, Germany, and from a middle-class background. Most of the younger children (89%) had just entered

elementary school, and all older children were currently in sixth grade of lower (33%) or higher (67%) secondary school options in the early tracking German school system. All younger adults were high-school or university graduates; among the older adults, 50% held a comparable degree, reflecting cohort differences in education.

We decided to include only female participants for two reasons. First, synchronization abilities develop at different rates in girls and boys, with girls being more accurate than boys in synchronizing with mechanical time keepers (e.g., Hiscock, Kinsbourne, Samuela, & Krause, 1985; Wolff & Hurwitz, 1976). Investigating these differences would have required including sex as a design factor, putting further requirements on sample size to maintain appropriate statistical power. Second, a design with individuals from both sexes would have required the analysis of differences in the sex composition of the dyads (cf. Schmid Mast, 2004). Again, the inclusion of a second design factor at the dyad level would have necessitated a considerably larger number of participants and dyads.

All participants were right-handed, without active musical experience (i.e., children were not learning an instrument, and adults had no practice for at least 10 years), had normal hearing, and had full functional mobility in both hands. The samples were age-typical in performance on measures of perceptual speed (items correct on the Digit-Symbol Test [Wechsler, 1981]: 12-year-olds $M = 87.4$, $SD = 6.9$; younger adults $M = 64.4$, $SD = 8.5$; older adults $M = 43.6$, $SD = 8.6$) and verbal knowledge (Vocabulary Test—HAWIK [Wechsler, 1991]: 12-year-olds $M = 30.9$, $SD = 9.0$; Spot-a-Word-Test [Lehrl, 1989]: younger adults $M = 19.9$, $SD = 5.4$; older adults $M = 27.1$, $SD = 3.4$). Younger children received 60 euros for their participation in the study (six sessions), and older children and adults received 75 euros (seven sessions). The institute's Ethics Committee approved the study.

Overview of Study Design

The experiment consisted of one initial session for the assessment of covariates, in which younger (preschool) children did not participate (as they were not yet able to fill out questionnaires), followed by six experimental sessions. Covariates were assessed in small groups of two or three individuals, and included sociodemographic information, self- and personality questionnaires, and cognitive tasks. In the first experimental session, individual synchronization performance was measured in nine different metronome conditions. This was followed by four dyadic sessions in which participants drummed together with a different partner in each session, one per age group. Thus, each individual's synchronization performance was assessed in one same-age and three mixed-age dyads, amounting to 144 dyadic sessions. The order of same- and mixed-age dyads was counterbalanced across participants. Each session consisted of two blocks of eight trials (45 s and 60 drumbeats recorded from at least one individual). The mean time between sessions was about eight days ($M = 8.4$, $SD = 5.1$). The time range between sessions did not differ significantly by age composition of dyad, $F(9, 288) = .39$, *ns*. Drumming partners had not met each other before participating together in a dyadic session and two partners of a given dyad did not share any other dyadic drumming partner in the study. The final experimental session was

identical to the first and again served to assess individual synchronization to a metronome.

Paradigm and Measures

Covariate session. Besides sociodemographic characteristics and well-established cognitive tasks on perceptual speed and verbal knowledge (e.g., Digit-Symbol Test; Wechsler, 1981), the covariate session also comprised a set of questionnaires assessed for other purposes, such as the NEO (Costa & McCrae, 1992), which was administered to adults only and is not reported here.

Individual drumming with a timekeeper (Experimental Sessions 1 and 6). At the beginning of the individual experimental sessions, participants' preferred tempo was assessed by asking participants to drum at the stable frequency they felt most comfortable with. Four trials of at least 60 drumbeats and 45 s were recorded. In the individual synchronization conditions, participants had to synchronize to computer-generated drumbeats of three different tempi presented through soundproof headphones: (a) 419-ms interstimulus interval, (b) 757-ms interstimulus interval and (c) the mean value of each participants own preferred tempo. Each tempo was presented first in stable, metronome-like conditions and afterwards in two different degrees of variability (low, high) meant to represent "human-like" variability in drumming performance in counterbalanced order across participants.¹ In the resulting nine conditions with four trials each, trial length was at least 60 stimuli and 45 s. Synchronization accuracies with the metronome were highly correlated between the stable and variable conditions ($r = .93, p < .01$). For the purpose of the control-analysis reported below, we used the mean aggregate of individuals' synchronization performance in the first experimental session as an indicator of individuals' ability to synchronize with a mechanical timekeeper.

Dyadic drumming (Experimental Sessions 2–5). In the dyadic drumming paradigm, pairs of individuals were asked to drum with as accurate synchronization to each other as possible, at a constant frequency they felt comfortable with. Participants were separated from each other by a partition screen to exclude the influence of nonverbal interactional cues and drummed with drumsticks on digital drums. They received digitalized auditory feedback of their own and their partner's drum sounds through soundproof earphones. To increase the similarity of synchronization stimuli between the metronome and dyadic conditions, participants heard their own drum sounds as digital drumbeats in either one of two frequencies (high, low). The low drum sound had already been used as the drumming-feedback sound in the individual sessions, and the high drum sound had formerly been used as the metronome signal. Each participant was assigned to the low and high drum sound twice, respectively, in the four dyadic sessions. The order of the sound assignment was randomized across participants. Acceleration sensors (BIOVISION; single axis, sensitivity: 50 g) attached to the top end of the drumsticks were used to measure their movements. Data were recorded with a data logging card (National Instruments M 16 E; range = $-10/+10$ V) in a personal computer with an Intel Pentium 4 processor (2.8 GHz; 1 GB RAM, Windows XP Service Pack 2).

Measure of asynchrony. The lack of synchronization accuracy when drumming with a metronome or another person, respectively, was operationalized by a newly developed measure of

asynchrony. This measure compares two time series of drumbeats, one from a target person A and the other from the metronome or interacting person B, by calculating the distance between the two series as costs of transforming one series into the other to reach perfect synchrony. This is done by either shifting drumbeats to later or earlier points in time, or by inserting or deleting drumbeats (see Appendix A for a formal description). The algorithm automatically pairs drumbeats such that an optimal trade-off between shifting and inserting missing drumbeats is assumed, that is, the algorithm minimizes the cost function. This optimization is achieved by dynamic programming (e.g., Corman, Leiserson, & Rivest, 1994). Kreuz, Haas, Morelli, Abarbanel, and Politi (2007) compared various measures of synchronization in the context of neural spike train synchrony. The six different synchrony measures were all highly correlated. Furthermore, they found that the edit distance as applied in this study was the best spike-based measure of synchrony in a clustering simulation. The scale of this measure is symmetrical (i.e., it is unimportant which time series functions as Series 1 or Series 2). Transfer costs are expressed in milliseconds and indicate the duration of the needed time shifts and the additional costs for insertion or deletion of drumbeats, which corresponded to half the mean drumbeat interval of the series of question. The novel metric implemented has several methodological advantages over more traditionally used metrics, most importantly, its independence from speed changes and its ability to match corresponding taps.² The asynchrony measure has a minimum of 0, indicating perfect synchrony, and no fixed maximum. Figure 1A displays the degree of instantaneous asynchrony, pooled within 200-ms intervals, for a younger child drumming with another younger child. In contrast, Figure 1B displays the degree of asynchrony when the same child is drumming with a younger adult. Asynchrony sum scores were calculated for each trial, and reflect cumulative asynchrony in the course of the trial. These sum scores were averaged across trials and log-transformed to better approximate a normal distribution. The log-transformed score of average asynchrony served as the dependent variable in this study. Figures 1C and 1D show how asynchrony accumulates over time. The mean dyadic asynchrony of the present sample was $M = 8.65$ ($SD = 0.63$). The same algorithm was applied to calculate a measure of individualized synchronization performance in the first individual experimental condition used as control variable ($M = 8.81, SD = 0.55$).

¹ In accordance with the finding that older adults show higher variability than younger adults when continuously tapping a specific frequency (Krampe, Mayr, & Kliegl, 2005), the interstimulus intervals (ISI) presented were randomly and independently drawn from normal distributions, with $M = \text{ISI}$ and variances $\text{ISI}_{\text{younger}} = 0.00163 \times \text{ISI} - 243$ and $\text{ISI}_{\text{older}} = 0.00134 \times \text{ISI} - 99$. Each ISI was only based on the previous stimulus, that is, the correlation between the lags was zero.

² To relate the asynchrony score introduced here to measures used in earlier studies, we also performed all analyses in this article with the average relative phase of each dyad as the dependent variable. The overall patterns of results were identical for the two measures, but effect sizes were considerably larger with the asynchrony measure introduced here.




Figure 1. Asynchrony in dyadic drumming: Illustrative example. A. The degree of instantaneous asynchrony in milliseconds, pooled within 200-ms intervals, for a younger child drumming with another younger child. B. The degree of asynchrony when the same child is drumming with a younger adult. For each trial, asynchrony is summed over time to obtain a measure of overall asynchrony. These sum scores were averaged across trials within conditions, and log-transformed to better approximate a normal distribution. The log-transformed score of average asynchrony served as the dependent variable in this study. C and D Asynchrony accumulating over time.

Statistical Procedures

We applied multilevel modeling techniques to accommodate for the hierarchical structure of the data (Hox, 2002; Snijders & Bosker, 1999). These models allow the separate consideration of two levels of variance: the dyadic level (i.e., differences in dyadic performance related to differences between dyads) and the individual level (i.e., differences in dyadic performance related to differences between individuals within dyads). It is important to note that these models also allow the representation of dependencies between dyads. Such dependencies are present in this data set, as each participant was paired with four different partners.

The models were estimated using WinBUGS 1.4.1 (Windows Bayesian Inference Using Gibbs Sampling; Lunn, Thomas, Best, & Spiegelhalter, 2000). We used Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) modeling (e.g., Gelman & Hill, 2007). MCMC fit multilevel models that are too complex to be estimable with a maximum likelihood (ML) approach using currently available software packages. The MCMC method generates a large number of simulated random draws from conditional distributions of all the parameters, for example, by means of a Gibbs sampling algorithm (e.g., Gelman & Hill, 2007; Gill, 2002; Spiegelhalter, Thomas,

Best, & Lunn, 2003). Parameter estimations are continuously updated by drawing values from the respective distributions assuming that the current estimated values for the other parameters are true. The basic principle is that once these repeated updates have run long enough, they will approach the desired posterior distribution (Gill, 2002). It is then possible to calculate the posterior mean of this distribution as the best point estimate for each parameter.

There are mainly two estimation criteria that we refer to in the result section to identify meaningful results of the estimation procedure: the Bayesian credible interval (BCI) and the Deviance information criterion (DIC). As a parameter estimation criterion, the BCI is the posterior probability interval in which an estimated parameter t lies with a specified probability. In analogy to confidence intervals in ML statistics, the BCI is based on the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile points of the posterior distribution. That is, the true value of the estimated parameter lies within this interval with a probability of .95 (Gelman & Hill, 2007; Spiegelhalter, Best, Carlin, & van der Linde, 2002). BCIs not including zero as possible values can be interpreted as estimated parameter values that are reliably different from zero (i.e., in short: *reliable effects*).

The DIC, as an indicator of model fit, is a generalization of the Akaike information criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1973) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC; Schwarz, 1978) for complex hierarchical models (Congdon, 2006; Gelman & Hill, 2007; Spiegelhalter et al., 2002).³ The DIC consists of two additive components. The first is a goodness-of-fit measure of the estimated model, that is, the mean deviance over all n simulated parameter vectors. The better the model fits the data, the smaller the value of this measure is. Second, it includes an additional penalty term for increasing model complexity (i.e., it specifies the effective number of parameters). Generally speaking, when comparing two or more models, a lower absolute value of the DIC can be interpreted as a model with a higher model fit. To evaluate differences in model fit, a preliminary rule of thumb has been proposed: $\text{Diff}_{\text{DIC1-DIC2}} \geq 10$: important difference; $\text{Diff}_{\text{DIC1-DIC2}} = 5\text{--}10$: substantial difference; $\text{Diff}_{\text{DIC1-DIC2}} < 5$: noninterpretable difference (Spiegelhalter et al., 2003).

Model Notation

The simplest multilevel model separates the variance components at the individual and the dyadic level (i.e., differentiates between variance in dyadic asynchrony explained by differences between individuals and between dyads) and can be formulated as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + u_j [p1_i] + u_j [p2_i] + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

with

$$u_j \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2).$$

This model is a varying-intercept model with normally distributed dyadic and individual-level errors, where Y_i represents the dyadic asynchrony for the dyad i and β_0 represents the average dyadic asynchrony across all dyads in the whole sample. The model postulates the asynchrony within a dyad to be an additive effect of each individual's influence on the dyadic outcome; $p1_i$ refers to the first person in the dyad i , and $p2_i$ refers to the respective second person. That is, the variability in the dyadic outcome, which is related to the differences between individuals, is divided equally between the two individuals (i.e., $u_j [p1_i]$ and $u_j [p2_i]$). The average individual performance across its four dyads was extracted from the respective dyadic outcomes by estimating u_j for each individual. The prior distribution of the u_j was set to a normal distribution with zero mean. The value of the respective estimated variance parameter σ_u^2 refers to the variance component between individuals. The variance component that was related to differences between dyads was indicated by the estimated value of the parameter σ_ε^2 .⁴ This first model assumes that variance in dyadic asynchrony is explained solely by differences between individuals and between dyads. It is therefore possible to discriminate proportions of the total variance that are related to differences between and within dyads (i.e., between individuals). Thus, this model was used as a baseline model (i.e., an *unconditional model*) for further model comparison. Appendix B documents the WinBUGS program code used to implement the model.

Specifying differences between age-group compositions. It was further possible to include additional predictors at the dyadic level. Dummy-coded variables that referred to each of the 10 possible dyadic age-group compositions were included as predictors (fixed effects) to further explain variance in dyadic asynchrony across dyads. In the respective model, it was postulated that the intercepts varied across dyads due to the age-group composition of the respective dyad:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i = & \beta_0 + u_j [p1_i] + u_j [p2_i] + \beta_1 \times YCYC + \beta_2 \\ & \times YCOC + \beta_3 \times YCYA + \beta_4 \times YCOA + \beta_5 \\ & \times OCOC + \beta_6 \times OCYA + \beta_7 \times OCOA + \beta_8 \\ & \times YAOA + \beta_9 \times OAOA + \varepsilon_i \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$u_j \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2).⁵$$

Follow-up analyses: Controlling for individual synchronization abilities. To control for differences in individual synchronization abilities (i.e., with a mechanical time keeper), a final model (Model 3) included both the dyadic age-group compositions (at the dyadic level) and the predictor individual asynchrony (at the individual level). The model was equivalent to Model 2, except that each individual's sensorimotor synchronization performance was introduced as a fixed effect at the individual level, that is, u_j was further specified as $u_j \sim N(a \times \text{individual asynchrony}, \sigma_u^2)$.

Results

By using multilevel modeling techniques, we aimed to investigate differences in IAS accuracy of same-age and mixed-age dyads of different ages. To establish a baseline model against which to evaluate differences between dyadic age-group compositions, a varying intercept model (Model 1) was fitted to discriminate proportions of total variance as related to differences (a) between dyads and (b) between individuals within dyads. The dependent variable was dyadic asynchrony, the inverse of IAS accuracy. Table 1 shows the estimates for the variance components (i.e., posterior means) of dyadic asynchrony along with the BCIs of the

³ In models with negligible prior information, the estimation of the DIC is equivalent to the AIC.

⁴ Noninformative prior distributions were specified for all fixed and random effects in the model: $\beta_0 \sim N(0, 1,000,000)$, $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 \sim \Gamma(0.001, 100)$, and $\sigma_u^2 \sim \Gamma(0.001, 100)$, assuming that variances were gamma-distributed to avoid negative values.

⁵ YC = younger child; OC = older child; YA = younger adult; OA = older adult; reference category = YAYA combination. Noninformative prior distributions were specified for all fixed, $\beta_0 - \beta_9 \sim N(0, 1,000,000)$, and random effects, $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 \sim \Gamma(0.001, 100)$; $\sigma_u^2 \sim \Gamma(0.001, 100)$, in the model.

corresponding models.⁶ The mean of the posterior distribution of the intercept ($M = 8.65$) represents the grand-mean of dyadic asynchrony across all dyads (β_0). The value refers to the mean value of asynchrony between two individuals within one session. Comparing the means of the posterior distributions of the variance components at each level indicates that 24% of the total explained variance in dyadic asynchrony could be attributed to differences between dyads ($\sigma_e^2 = 0.06$), whereas 76% could be related to differences between individuals within dyads ($\sigma_u^2 = 0.19$). Therefore, it can be concluded that more than three times as much of the total variance in dyadic synchronization accuracy was explained by differences between individuals than by differences between dyads.

Figure 2 reports the degree of dyadic asynchrony for each of the 10 possible dyadic age-group combinations across the 16 trials of the dyadic sessions. Dyads including children showed higher dyadic asynchrony and higher variance between trials than did dyads not including children. At the same time, younger adults drumming with younger adults showed the lowest dyadic asynchrony. To statistically analyze differences between dyadic age-group compositions, a second model (Model 2) was fitted with dyadic age-group compositions as dummy-coded predictor variables at the dyadic level and the dyadic combination of younger adults with younger adults as reference group (also see Table 2, left column). The mean of the posterior distribution for the intercept (β_0 ; $M = 7.93$) indicates the mean dyadic asynchrony for the reference group of younger adults drumming with younger adults. Estimated means of the posterior distributions of all other age-group compositions showed positive deviations from the intercept, indicating higher values of dyadic asynchrony relative to the reference dyads consisting of younger adults only. Younger children drumming with younger children showed the highest degree of dyadic asynchrony relative to the reference group, $\beta_{0(YCYC)} = 7.93 + 1.71 = 9.64$. All discrepancies in dyadic asynchrony between a given dyadic age-group combination and the reference group of younger adults drumming with younger adults differed reliably from zero, with two exceptions. The two exceptions involved the age-group combinations younger adult–older adult and older adult–older adult. Taken together, these results indicate that younger and older adults did not differ from each other in IAS accuracy. Direct comparison between the two models suggested a better fit for Model 2 ($\Delta_{DIC} = 65.91$), indicating that the age composition of the dyads was reliably related to differences in IAS accuracy. Specifically, including age composition as a predictor accounted for 33%

Table 1

Model 1: Characteristics of Between-Person and Between-Dyad Variance in Dyadic Asynchrony ($N = 144$)

Variable	M	95% BCI
Fixed effects		
Intercept	8.65	(8.45, 8.86)
Random effects (variance components)		
Between dyads	0.06	(0.04, 0.08)
Between individuals	0.19	(0.13, 0.27)
DIC	59.75	

Note. BCI = Bayesian credible interval; DIC = Deviance information criterion; bold = estimated value reliably different from zero.




Figure 2. Dyadic asynchrony as a function of age-group composition of dyad. Higher values correspond to less synchronous dyadic drumming. Error bars refer to the Bayesian credible interval of the mean, which ranges from the 2.5th to the 97.5th percentile points of the posterior distribution. YC = younger child; OC = older child; YA = younger adult; OA = older adult.

of the explained variance at the dyadic level and for 84% of the explained variance at the individual level.

Our second major hypothesis was that children would benefit from synchronizing with older persons. Thus we predicted that children would show lower asynchrony when paired with older interaction partners than when paired with a same-age peer. Therefore, Model 2 was set up again, with same-age dyads of either younger or older children as the reference groups (Model 2a and Model 2b; see Table 2, right columns). As reported above, younger children drumming with younger children showed the highest dyadic asynchrony ($M = 9.64$). Moreover, in line with the second hypothesis, the three types of dyads pairing a younger child with an older partner attained higher IAS accuracy than dyads consisting of younger children only. At the same time, the dyadic combinations including one younger child did not differ reliably among each other. For example, differences in dyadic asynchrony were not reliable when younger children were paired with either younger or older adults.

When analyzing the data with the older child–older child dyad as reference group, we found that older children reliably decreased in IAS accuracy when paired with a younger child, $\beta_{0(YCOC)} = 8.53 + 0.70 = 9.23$. At the same time, their IAS accuracy increased reliably relative to the older child–older child dyad when drumming either with younger adults, $\beta_{0(OCYA)} = 8.53 - 0.25 = 8.28$, or older adults, $\beta_{0(OAOA)} = 8.53 - 0.20 = 8.33$; differences between older children drumming with younger adults and older children drumming with older adults were not reliable. In sum, both younger and older children's dyadic drumming performance benefited from the presence of younger or older adults in the dyad.

We also observed reliable age-group differences in nondyadic, individualized synchronization performance as assessed with a metronome, $F(3, 68) = 44.91$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .67$. Relative to the other three age groups, younger children showed the lowest indi-

⁶ BCIs not including "0" as possible values can be interpreted as reliable effects.

Table 2

Models 2, 2a, and 2b: Variance in Dyadic Asynchrony Explained by Dyadic Age-Group Compositions With Different Reference Groups ($N = 144$)

Variable	Model 2 reference: Younger adult–younger adult		Model 2a reference: Younger child–younger child		Model 2b reference: Older child–older child	
	<i>M</i>	95% BCI	<i>M</i>	95% BCI	<i>M</i>	95% BCI
Fixed effects						
Intercept	7.93	(7.72, 8.13)	9.64	(9.43, 9.85)	8.53	(8.32, 8.73)
Dyadic age-group compositions						
Younger child–younger child	1.71	(1.41, 2.00)	—	—	1.11	(0.82, 1.21)
Younger child–older child	1.30	(1.04, 1.55)	-0.42	(-0.61, -0.22)	0.70	(0.50, 0.89)
Younger child–younger adult	1.20	(1.00, 1.39)	-0.51	(-0.71, -0.32)	0.60	(0.34, 0.85)
Younger child–older adult	1.24	(0.99, 1.50)	-0.47	(-0.66, -0.27)	0.65	(0.39, 0.90)
Older child–older child	0.60	(0.31, 0.89)	-1.11	(-1.41, -0.82)	—	—
Older child–younger adult	0.35	(0.16, 0.55)	-1.36	(-1.62, -1.10)	-0.25	(-0.44, -0.05)
Older child–older adult	0.40	(0.15, 0.66)	-1.31	(-1.57, -1.05)	-0.20	(-0.40, -0.00)
Younger adult–younger adult	—	—	-1.71	(-2.01, -1.41)	-0.60	(-0.90, -0.30)
Younger adult–older adult	0.12	(-0.08, 0.31)	-1.59	(-1.85, -1.33)	-0.48	(-0.74, -0.22)
Older adult–older adult	0.08	(-0.22, 0.38)	-1.63	(-1.93, -1.33)	-0.52	(-0.81, -0.22)
Variance components						
Between dyads	0.04	(0.03, 0.05)	0.04	(0.03, 0.05)	0.04	(0.03, 0.05)
Between individuals	0.03	(0.02, 0.05)	0.03	(0.02, 0.05)	0.03	(0.02, 0.05)
DIC	-6.16		-6.23		-6.20	

Note. BCI = Bayesian credible interval; DIC = Deviance information criterion; bold = estimated value reliably different from zero. Em dashes indicate that the respective variable was not included as fixed effect in the model.

individualized synchronization performance ($M = 9.55$, $SD = 0.17$). Older children showed lower individualized synchronization performance ($M = 8.74$, $SD = 0.29$) than did younger adults ($M = 8.37$, $SD = 0.41$), and both younger adults and older children did not differ significantly from older adults ($M = 8.60$, $SD = 0.37$).

In follow-up analyses, we added individualized synchronization performance (i.e., the individual's ability to synchronize with stable and variable frequencies provided by a metronome) as a covariate in the dyadic analyses to statistically control for individual differences in sensorimotor aspects of synchronization performance. Relative to the results reported above, differences in dyadic asynchrony between the dyadic combinations were slightly reduced in magnitude but remained reliable. Specifically, although individualized synchronization performance accounted for 20%–31% of the differences between dyadic age-group compositions, its inclusion did not lead to a substantial improvement in model fit ($\Delta_{DIC} = 0.78$). The rank-order of age-combination differences in dyadic asynchrony also remained stable after including each dyad's mean drumming tempo as a fixed effect at the dyadic level. Here, the mean dyadic tempo did not show a reliable effect on dyadic asynchrony and including it as covariate in the model did not substantially improve the model fit ($\Delta_{DIC} = 2.20$). Absolute differences between the partners' preferred tempi did not account for a reliable proportion of variance in dyadic asynchrony in further follow-up analyses. In other words, the observed effect of age composition of dyads on IAS accuracy could neither be statistically accounted for by differences in sensorimotor aspects of synchronization abilities nor by differences in mean dyadic or individual drumming tempi.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to investigate age-related differences in IAS from middle childhood to early old age using a

dyadic drumming paradigm. Previous research had shown that nonintentional forms of interpersonal synchronization appear early in development (e.g., Condon & Sander, 1974a, 1974b; Feldman, 2007) and accompany social interactions throughout the lifespan (e.g., Sebanz, Bekkering, & Knoblich, 2006; van Baaren, Holland, Kawakami, & van Knippenberg, 2004). Intentional interpersonal synchronization, or IAS, is assumed to play an important role in social development and social interactions, but its lifespan trajectory is largely unknown. Here, we explored IAS by assessing same-age and mixed-age dyads with a newly developed dyadic drumming paradigm.

The main results of the present study can be summarized as follows. In line with the first hypothesis, same-age dyads with two younger adults showed higher IAS accuracy than dyads that included one or two children. For dyads that only included adults, IAS accuracy was not reliably related to age group. In line with the second hypothesis, both younger and older children showed higher synchronization accuracy with an older partner. This effect remained reliable after controlling for individual synchronization performance and drumming tempo.

Empirical findings from previous research suggest that task-relevant sensorimotor abilities and experience-based social skills improve throughout childhood and peak in younger adulthood, followed by an aging-related decline (e.g., Drewing et al., 2006; Happé et al., 1998; Krampe, Engbert, & Kliegel, 2002; Pouthas et al., 1998). Hence, we hypothesized that younger adults would show the highest levels of IAS accuracy, especially when synchronizing with a partner of their own age group. Our results confirm the hypothesized advantage of younger adults over children but do not support the predicted age-associated decline in IAS accuracy in adulthood.

Several factors may have hampered the detection of adult age differences in IAS accuracy in this study. In natural interactions, individuals need to detect and implicitly or explicitly commit them-

selves to shared goals (e.g., Bratman, 1992; Searle, 1990), and they need to implement synchronized behavior as a means for reaching the shared goal. In the present experimental paradigm, the shared goal was specified beforehand. This may have facilitated the synchronization process, as it reduced the number of action alternatives. Also, in contrast to previous studies (e.g., Drewing et al., 2006; Krampe et al., 2002), older adults did not differ reliably from younger adults in individual synchronization performance. In addition, participants only received *auditory* feedback of the other person's actions. This also differentiates from naturally occurring interactions, in which it is necessary to combine feedback from different channels. Thus, the simplicity of the drumming task may have contributed to the lack of adult age differences in IAS accuracy.

In line with our second hypothesis, both younger and older children showed higher IAS accuracy when drumming with adults than when drumming with their age-matched peers. This finding is consistent with the notion that older individuals activate children's zone of proximal development (e.g., Vygotsky, 1933), allowing them to reach levels of performance that they would not reach without a facilitating social context. It is also in line with the idea that intergenerational interactions, such as (grand)parents–child, teacher–pupil, or expert–novice dialogues, may provide a major impetus in development across the lifespan (e.g., Kessler & Staudinger, 2007).

We acknowledge that the mechanisms mediating the performance-enhancing influence of adults on children's IAS accuracy remain to be identified. Some of these mechanisms may reflect explicit or implicit role assignments in interpersonal processes (e.g., Schmid Mast & Hall, 2003; Smelser, 1961). As Brown and Reeve (1987) noted, children and adults may differ in goal structure when working together on a problem. For instance, it seems likely that adults in the present study sought to display a type of synchronization behavior that enabled children to improve their synchronization performance. For example, given that stable rhythmic patterns in interaction processes facilitate the partner's anticipation of future actions (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1987; Warner, 2002), adults may have stabilized their performance to restrict children's variability in performance, allowing them to adjust more easily to their frequency of performance. Hence, future work should be directed at discovering the dynamic properties of the interaction between the two partners that allow the zone of proximal development to evolve (Boker, 2002; Boker & Rotondo, 2003).

The present results also suggest that age differences in IAS accuracy are not entirely determined by individual differences in individualized synchronization performance as assessed by synchronization to a metronome. This result supports the claim that a reliable amount of variance in IAS accuracy is an emergent property of the interaction dynamics, which are influenced by the age composition of the dyads in ways yet unknown. In interpersonal interactions, individuals continuously need to adjust their own actions to the actions of others, which in turn are also influenced by the interaction partner (e.g., Boker et al., 2009; Nowak et al., 2005; Tognoli, Lagarde, de Guzman, & Kelso, 2007). In the context of the present task, coupled oscillators may provide a viable model for delineating age-based differences in interaction dynamics (e.g., Ashenfelter, Boker, Waddell, & Vitanov, 2009; Boker & Laurenceau, 2007).

Outlook

Given the central importance of IAS for the capability of humans to perform joint actions and cooperate socially, it is surprising how little is known about its ontogeny. In this study, we sought to break new ground in the developmental study of IAS by instructing same-age and mixed-age dyads to synchronize their drumbeats as accurately as possible. This study provides an initial sketch of IAS development across the lifespan and poses a number of further questions for future research. First, the sample was restricted to girls and women. Hence, the degree to which the present results generalize to boys and men is not known. Second, the results presented in this article focus on synchronization using auditory feedback. Interpersonal action synchronization may be less difficult if visual feedback is available, especially for children. Third, the results of our study document children's short-term gains in IAS accuracy when interacting with an adult partner. Future research needs to address whether these benefits persist longitudinally and generalize to other social tasks requiring a high degree of IAS accuracy. Fourth, empirical work on intergenerational contexts that are supposed to provide zones of proximal development (e.g., child–parent, child–grandparent, or pupil–teacher) may benefit from paying greater attention to developmental changes in IAS. And finally, the neuronal correlates of IAS (Lindenberger, Li, Gruber, & Müller, 2009) need to be investigated from a developmental perspective.

References

- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. N. Petrov & F. Csaki (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Information Theory* (pp. 267–281). Budapest, Hungary: Akademiai Kiado.
- Aschersleben, G. (2002). Temporal control of movements in sensorimotor synchronization. *Brain and Cognition*, *48*, 66–79. doi:10.1006/brcg.2001.1304
- Aschersleben, G., & Prinz, W. (1995). Synchronizing actions with events: The role of sensory information. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *57*, 305–317.
- Ashenfelter, K. T., Boker, S. M., Waddell, J. L., & Vitanov, N. (2009). Spatiotemporal symmetry and multifractal structure of head movements during dyadic conversation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *35*, 1072–1091. doi:10.1037/a0015017
- Bartlett, N. R., & Bartlett, S. C. (1959). Synchronization of a motor response with an anticipated sensory event. *Psychological Review*, *66*, 203–218. doi:10.1037/h0046490
- Baruch, C., & Drake, C. (1997). Tempo discrimination in infants. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *20*, 573–577. doi:10.1016/S0163-6383(97)90049-7
- Blakemore, S. J., & Decety, J. (2001). From the perception of action to the understanding of intention. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *2*, 561–567. doi:10.1038/35086023
- Bloch, H. (1998). Sensory-motor coordinations: Their relation to cognition. In F. Simion & G. Butterworth (Eds.), *The development of sensory, motor and cognitive capacities in early infancy: From perception to cognition* (pp. 257–275). Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Boker, S. M. (2002). Consequences of continuity: The hunt for intrinsic properties within parameters of dynamics in psychological processes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *37*, 405–422. doi:10.1207/S15327906MBR3703_5
- Boker, S. M., Cohn, J. F., Theobald, B.-J., Matthews, I., Brick, T., & Spies, J. (2009). Effects of damping head movement and facial expression in

- dyadic conversation using real-time facial expression tracking and synthesized avatars. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 364, 3485–3495. doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0152
- Boker, S. M., & Laurenceau, J.-P. (2007). Coupled dynamics and mutually adaptive context. In T. D. Little, J. A. Bovaird, & N. A. Card (Eds.), *Modeling contextual effects in longitudinal studies* (pp. 299–324). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Boker, S. M., & Rotondo, J. L. (2003). Symmetry building and symmetry breaking in synchronized movement. In M. I. Stamenov & V. Gallese (Eds.), *Mirror neurons and the evolution of brain and language* (pp. 163–171). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Boltz, M. G. (1994). Changes in internal tempo and effects on the learning and remembering of event durations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 20, 1154–1171. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.20.5.1154
- Bratman, M. E. (1992). Shared cooperative activity. *The Philosophical Review*, 101, 327–341. doi:10.2307/2185537
- Brown, A. L., Ellery, S., & Campione, J. C. (1998). Creating zones of proximal development electronically. In J. G. Greeno & S. V. Goldman (Eds.), *Thinking practices in mathematics and science learning* (pp. 341–367). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brown, A. L., Metz, K. E., & Campione, J. C. (1996). Social interaction and individual understanding in a community of learners: The influence of Piaget and Vygotsky. In A. Tryphon & J. Voneche (Eds.), *Piaget-Vygotsky: The social genesis of thought* (pp. 145–170). Oxford, England: Francis and Taylor.
- Brown, A. L., & Reeve, R. A. (1987). Bandwidths of competence: The role of supportive contexts in learning and development. In L. S. Liben (Ed.), *Development and learning: Conflict or congruence?* (pp. 173–223). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Condon, W. S., & Sander, L. W. (1974a). Neonate movement is synchronized with adult speech: Interactional participation and language acquisition. *Science*, 183, 99–101. doi:10.1126/science.183.4120.99
- Condon, W. S., & Sander, L. W. (1974b). Synchrony demonstrated between movements of the neonate and adult speech. *Child Development*, 45, 456–462. doi:10.2307/1127968
- Congdon, P. (2006). *Bayesian statistical modelling* (2nd ed.). Chichester, England: Wiley. doi:10.1002/9780470035948
- Corman, T. H., Leiserson, C. E., & Rivest, R. L. (1994). *Introduction to algorithms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Factor Inventory: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Crown, C. L., Feldstein, S., Jasnow, M. D., Beebe, B., & Jaffe, J. (2002). The cross-modal coordination of interpersonal timing: Six-week-olds infants' gaze with adults' vocal behavior. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 31, 1–23. doi:10.1023/A:1014301303616
- Davalos, D. B., Kiskey, M. A., & Freedman, R. (2005). Behavioral and electrophysiological indices of temporal processing dysfunction in schizophrenia. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry & Clinical Neurosciences*, 17, 517–525. doi:10.1176/appi.neuropsych.17.4.517
- Demany, L., McKenzie, B., & Vurpillot, E. (1977). Rhythm perception in early infancy. *Nature*, 266, 718–719. doi:10.1038/266718a0
- Dempster, F. N. (1992). The rise and fall of the inhibitory mechanism: Toward a unified theory of cognitive development and aging. *Developmental Review*, 12, 45–75. doi:10.1016/0273-2297(92)90003-K
- Drake, C., Jones, M. R., & Baruch, C. (2000). The development of rhythmic attending in auditory sequences: Attunement, referent period, focal attending. *Cognition*, 77, 251–288. doi:10.1016/S0010-0277(00)00106-2
- Drewing, K., Aschersleben, G., & Li, S.-C. (2006). Sensorimotor synchronization across the life span. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30, 280–287. doi:10.1177/0165025406066764
- Feldman, R. (2007). Parent–infant synchrony: Biological foundations and developmental outcomes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 340–345. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00532.x
- Fitzpatrick, P., Schmidt, R. C., & Lockman, J. J. (1996). Dynamical patterns in the development of clapping. *Child Development*, 67, 2691–2708. doi:10.2307/1131747
- Fraisse, P. (1980). Les synchronisations sensori-motrices aux rythmes [Sensorimotor synchronization to rhythms]. In J. Requin (Ed.), *Anticipation et comportement* (pp. 233–257). Paris, France: Centre Nationale.
- Frischeisen-Köhler, I. (1933). *The personal tempo: A study in hereditary biology*. Oxford, England: Thieme.
- Frith, C. D., & Wolpert, D. M. (2003). Introduction [Special Issue: Decoding, imitating and influencing the actions of others: The mechanisms of social interaction]. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 358, 431–434. doi:10.1098/rstb.2002.1260
- Gauvain, M., & Rogoff, B. (1989). Collaborative problem solving and children's planning skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 139–151. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.25.1.139
- Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2007). *Data analysis using regression and multi-level/hierarchical models*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, J. (2002). *Bayesian methods: A social and behavioral sciences approach*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Haken, H., Kelso, J. A. S., & Bunz, H. (1985). A theoretical model of phase transition in human hand movements. *Biological Cybernetics*, 51, 347–356. doi:10.1007/BF00336922
- Happé, F. G., Winner, E., & Brownell, H. (1998). The getting of wisdom: Theory of mind in old age. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 358–362. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.34.2.358
- Hiscock, M., Kinsbourne, M., Samuels, M., & Krause, A. E. (1985). Effects of speaking upon the rate and variability of concurrent finger tapping in children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 40, 486–500. doi:10.1016/0022-0965(85)90079-7
- Hommel, B., Li, K. Z. H., & Li, S.-C. (2004). Visual search across the life span. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 545–558. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.40.4.545
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jagacinski, R. J., Greenberg, N., Liao, M.-J., & Wang, J. (1993). Manual performance of a repeated pattern by older and younger adults with supplementary auditory cues. *Psychology and Aging*, 8, 429–439. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.8.3.429
- Kail, R. (1991). Developmental change in speed of processing during childhood and adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 490–501. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.109.3.490
- Kelso, J. A. S. (1984). Phase transitions and critical behavior in human bimanual coordination. *American Journal of Physiology: Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, 246, 1000–1004.
- Kessler, E. M., & Staudinger, U. M. (2007). Intergenerational potential: Effects of social interaction between older adults and adolescents. *Psychology and Aging*, 22, 690–704. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.22.4.690
- Kirschner, S., & Tomasello, M. (2009). Joint drumming: Social context facilitates synchronization in preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 102, 299–314. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2008.07.005
- Krampe, R. T., Engbert, R., & Kliegl, R. (2001). Age-specific problems in rhythmic timing. *Psychology and Aging*, 16, 12–30. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.16.1.12
- Krampe, R. T., Engbert, R., & Kliegl, R. (2002). The effects of expertise and age on rhythm production: Adaptations to timing and sequencing constraints. *Brain and Cognition*, 48, 179–194. doi:10.1006/brcg.2001.1312
- Krampe, R. T., Mayr, U., & Kliegl, R. (2005). Timing, sequencing, and executive control in repetitive movement production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 31, 379–397. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.31.3.379
- Kreuz, T., Haas, J. S., Morelli, A., Abarbanel, H. D. I., & Politi, A. (2007).

- Measuring spike train synchrony. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 165, 151–161. doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2007.05.031
- Lehrl, S. (1989). *Mehrfachwahl-Wortschatz-Intelligenztest: MWT-B* (2nd ed.). Erlangen, Germany: Perimed-Fachbuch-Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Li, S.-C., Lindenberger, U., Hommel, B., Aschersleben, G., Prinz, W., & Baltes, P. B. (2004). Transformations in the couplings among intellectual abilities and constituent cognitive processes across the life span. *Psychological Science*, 15, 155–163. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.01503003.x
- Lindenberger, U., Li, S.-C., Gruber, W., & Müller, V. (2009). Brains swinging in concert: Cortical phase synchronization while playing guitar. *BMC Neuroscience*, 10, 22. doi:10.1186/1471-2202-10-22
- Lunn, D. J., Thomas, A., Best, N., & Spiegelhalter, D. (2000). WinBUGS: A Bayesian modelling framework: Concepts, structure, and extensibility. *Statistics and Computing*, 10, 325–337. doi:10.1023/A:1008929526011
- Marsh, K. L., Richardson, M. J., Baron, R. M., & Schmidt, R. C. (2006). Contrasting approaches to perceiving and acting with others. *Ecological Psychology*, 18, 1–38. doi:10.1207/s15326969eco1801_1
- Meltzoff, A. N. (1995). Understanding the intentions of others: Reenactment of intended acts by 18-month-old children. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 838–850. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.31.5.838
- Nadel, J. (2004). Do children with autism understand imitation as intentional interaction? *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, 4, 165–177.
- Nowak, A., Vallacher, R. R., & Zochowski, M. (2005). The emergence of personality: Personal stability through interpersonal synchronization. In D. Cervone & W. Mischel (Eds.), *Advances in personality science* (pp. 292–331). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Pouthas, V., Provasi, J., & Droit, S. (1996). Biobehavioral rhythms: Development and role in early human ontogenesis. In J. T. Fraser & M. P. Soulsby (Eds.), *Dimensions of time: Aspects of life* (Vol. VIII, pp. 19–30). Madison, CT: International Universities Press.
- Pouthas, V., Vanneste, S., Jacquet, A.-Y., & Gerard, C. (1998). What changes in rhythmic performances with aging? In V. de Keyser, G. d'Ydewalle, & A. Vandierendonck (Eds.), *Time and the dynamic control of behavior* (pp. 97–108). Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Radziszewska, B., & Rogoff, B. (1991). Children's guided participation in planning imaginary errands with skilled adult or peer partners. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 381–389. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.27.3.381
- Repp, B. H. (2005). Sensorimotor synchronization: A review of the tapping literature. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 12, 969–992.
- Repp, B. H., & Penel, A. (2004). Rhythmic movement is attracted more strongly to auditory than to visual rhythms. *Psychological Research*, 68, 252–270. doi:10.1007/s00426-003-0143-8
- Rogoff, B., Malkin, C., & Gilbride, K. (1984). Interaction with babies as guidance in development. *New Directions for Child Development*, 1984(23), 31–44. doi:10.1002/cd.23219842305
- Salthouse, T. A. (1984). Effects of age and skill in typing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113, 345–371. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.113.3.345
- Salthouse, T. A. (1996). The processing-speed theory of adult age differences in cognition. *Psychological Review*, 103, 403–428. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.103.3.403
- Schaffer, H. R. (Ed.). (1977). *Studies in mother–infant interaction*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Schindler, I., & Staudinger, U. M. (2005). Lifespan perspectives on self and personality: The dynamics between the mechanics and pragmatics of life. In W. Greve, K. Rothermund, & D. Wentura (Eds.), *The adaptive self: Personal continuity and intentional self-development* (pp. 3–30). Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Schmid Mast, M. (2004). Men are hierarchical, women are egalitarian: An implicit gender stereotype. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 63, 107–111. doi:10.1024/1421-0185.63.2.107
- Schmidt, R. C., Carello, C., & Turvey, M. T. (1990). Phase transitions and critical fluctuations in the visual coordination of rhythmic movements between people. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 16, 227–247. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.16.2.227
- Schmidt, R. C., Christianson, N., Carello, C., & Baron, R. (1994). Effects of social and physical variables on between-person visual coordination. *Ecological Psychology*, 6, 159–183. doi:10.1207/s15326969eco0603_1
- Schmidt, R. C., Richardson, M. J., Arsenault, C., & Galantucci, B. (2007). Visual tracking and entrainment to an environmental rhythm. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 33, 860–870. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.33.4.860
- Schmid Mast, M., & Hall, J. A. (2003). Anybody can be a boss but only certain people make good subordinates: Behavioral impacts of striving for dominance and dominance aversion. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 871–891.
- Schmidt, R. C., & Turvey, M. T. (1994). Phase-entrainment dynamics of visually coupled rhythmic movements. *Biological Cybernetics*, 70, 369–376. doi:10.1007/BF00200334
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, 6, 461–464. doi:10.1214/aos/1176344136
- Searle, J. R. (1990). Collective intentions and actions. In P. R. Cohen, J. Morgan & M. E. Pollack (Eds.), *Intentions in communication* (pp. 401–415). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sebanz, N., Bekkering, H., & Knoblich, G. (2006). Joint action: Bodies and minds moving together. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 71–76. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2005.12.009
- Smelser, W. T. (1961). Dominance as a factor in achievement and perception in cooperative problem solving interactions. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 535–542. doi:10.1037/h0049303
- Smoll, F. L. (1974a). Development of rhythmic ability in response to selected tempos. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 39, 767–772.
- Smoll, F. L. (1974b). Development of spatial and temporal elements of rhythmic ability. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 6, 53–58.
- Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (1999). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spiegelhalter, D., Thomas, A., Best, N., & Lunn, D. (2003). *WinBUGS user manual: Version 1.4*. Retrieved from <http://www.mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk/bugs>
- Spiegelhalter, D. J., Best, N. G., Carlin, B. R., & van der Linde, A. (2002). Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B*, 64, 583–639. doi:10.1111/1467-9868.00353
- Staudinger, U. M., & Pasupathi, M. (2000). Life-span perspectives on self, personality, and social cognition. In F. I. M. Craik & T. A. Salthouse (Eds.), *The handbook of aging and cognition* (pp. 633–688). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thelen, E. (1993). Timing and developmental dynamics in the acquisition of early motor skills. In G. Turkewitz & D. A. Devenny (Eds.), *Developmental time and timing* (pp. 85–104). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thelen, E. (2000). Motor development as foundation and future of developmental psychology. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 24, 385–397. doi:10.1080/016502500750037937
- Tickle-Degen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1987). Group rapport and nonverbal behavior. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 113–136.
- Tognoli, E., Lagarde, J., de Guzman, G. C., & Kelso, J. A. S. (2007). The phi complex as a neuromarker of human social coordination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104, 8190–8195. doi:10.1073/pnas.0611453104
- Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., & Moll, H. (2005). Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28, 675–691. doi:10.1017/S0140525X05000129
- Tomasello, M., & Rakoczy, H. (2003). What makes human cognition unique? From individual to shared to collective intentionality. *Mind & Language*, 18, 121–147. doi:10.1111/1468-0017.00217
- Van Baaren, R. B., Holland, R. W., Kawakami, K., & van Knippenberg, A.

- (2004). Mimicry and prosocial behavior. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 71–74. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.01501012.x
- van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991). *Understanding Vygotsky: A quest for synthesis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Volman, M. J. M., & Geuze, R. H. (2000). Temporal stability of rhythmic tapping “on” and “off the beat”: A developmental study. *Psychological Research*, *63*, 62–69. doi:10.1007/PL00008168
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1933). Igra i ee rol’ v psikhicheskom razvitiu rebenka [Play and its role in the psychical development of the child]. *Voprosy Psikhologii*, *12*, 62–76.
- Warner, R. M. (2002). Rhythms of dialogue in infancy: Comments on Jaffe, Beebe, Feldstein, Crown, and Jasnow (2001). *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *31*, 409–420. doi:10.1023/A:1019573825857
- Wechsler, D. (1981). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale: Revised manual (WAIS-R)*. New York, NY: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wechsler, D. (1991). *Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children: Third edition*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wing, A. M., & Kristofferson, A. B. (1973). Response delays and the timing of discrete motor responses. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *14*, 5–12.
- Wolff, P. H., & Hurwitz, I. (1976). Sex differences in finger tapping: A developmental study. *Neuropsychologia*, *14*, 35–41. doi:10.1016/0028-3932(76)90005-1

Appendix A

Formal Description of Asynchrony Algorithm

The asynchrony measure between two drumming series *A* and *B* applied in this article is based on the minimal cost to transfer *A* into *B* or vice versa. The cost is the sum of all milliseconds that drum beats from series *A* need to be shifted to match beats from series *B*. If the distances are too large, beats may be removed or inserted for a fixed cost penalty defined as half the mean drumbeat interval of the series in question. The actual asynchrony value is the cost for the most efficient transformation.

In the following, a Java source code is given that computes this transformation. For efficiency, dynamical programming is applied to this problem. A table *T* of length *a* of *A* times the length *b* of *B* is initialized; after the algorithm has stopped, the entry (*i*, *j*) in the table will give the minimal cost to transform the suffix of *A* beginning at *i* to the suffix of *B* beginning at *j*. The entry (*a*+1, *b*+1) is initialized at zero. Then, a loop counts down *i* from *l*₁+1 to 0 and *j* from *l*₂+1 to 0. In each loop, the table entry at (*i*, *j*) is computed dependent on the entries in (*i*+1, *j*+1), (*i*, *j*+1) and (*i*+1, *j*), which have been computed before. The new entry at (*i*, *j*) is the minimum of three possibilities: the entry (*i*+1, *j*+1) plus the distance of the *i*th beat in *A* to the *j*th beat in *B*, the entry of (*i*+1, *j*) plus the deletion penalty, or the entry of the (*i*, *j*+1) plus the deletion penalty. After the loop has ended, the entry at (0,0) is the minimal cost to transfer *A* to *B*.

The following Java program computes the entries of *T* and returns the total cost as well as the optimal series of shifts and insertions/deletions:

```
public double[] asynchrony(int[] series1,
int[] series2, int penalty) {
int s1len = series1.length, s2len = series2
.length;
int[][] bestKnownDistance = new int[s1len+1]
[s2len+1];
//Computation of Table T
bestKnownDistance[s1len][s2len] = 0;
for (int i = s2len-1; i>=0; i-)
bestKnownDistance[s1len]
[i] = bestKnownDistance[s1len][i+1] +
penalty;
for (int i = s1len-1; i>=0; i-) bestKnown
Distance[i][s2len] = bestKnownDistance[i+1]
[s2len] +penalty;
for (int i=s1len-1; i>=0; i-)
for (int j=s2len-1; j>=0; j-)
bestKnownDistance[i][j] = Math.min(
Math.min(bestKnownDistance[i+1][j], bestKnown
Distance[i][j+1]) + penalty,
bestKnownDistance[i+1][j+1] + Math.abs
(series1[i]-series2[j]));
int gesValue = bestKnownDistance[0][0];
}
```

(Appendices continue)

Appendix B**Implementation of the Statistical Model (WinBugs-Code)**

```
asynchrony <- function(){
for(i in 1:C) {
  logmean[i] ~ dnorm(mu[i], tau);
  mu[i] <- beta + u2[ vp1[i] ] + u2[ vp2[i] ];}
for (j in 1:N){
  u2[j] ~ dnorm(0, tau2);
}
beta ~ dflat();
tau ~ dgamma(0.001000,0.001000);
sigma <- 1/tau;
tau2 ~ dgamma(0.001000,0.001000);
sigma2 <- 1/tau2;
}
inits <- function(){
list(beta = runif(1, -50, 50),
tau = runif(1, 0, 100000),
tau2 = runif(1, 0, 100000),
u2 = rnorm(N, 0, 10))
}
```

Received October 8, 2009
Revision received August 29, 2010
Accepted September 1, 2010 ■