Requests to children by parents with aphasia

Helene Killmer, Jan Svennevig & Suzanne Beeke

Published online: 12 Jul 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ☑

Article views: 1461

View related articles ☑

View Crossmark data ☑

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Requests to children by parents with aphasia

Helene Killmer [a], Jan Svennevig[a,b] and Suzanne Beeke[c]

aDepartment of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo, Post box 1102 Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway; bDepartment of Nordic and Media Studies, University of Agder, Post box 422, 4604 Kristiansand, Norway; cDepartment of Language and Cognition, University College London, Chandler House, 2 Wakefield Street, London WC1N 1PF, UK

ABSTRACT

Background: With an increasing number of young adult stroke survivors, there is a specific need to investigate how aphasia affects parenting. Raising a child happens through interaction, and centrally involves requests, such as 'go to bed', and 'sit still'. Aphasia may impede participation in interaction and thus potentially also the possibilities to make requests to children and – from a wider perspective – do parenting.

Aims: This study aims to explore practices employed by parents with aphasia to ask their children to do or to stop an action during everyday interactions (e.g. mealtimes, games). The design of requests is systematically examined to shed light on the way deontic authority (the right to direct another person's future action) is displayed by parents with aphasia.

Methods & Procedures: Using conversation analysis (CA), we carried out a collection-based study of 46 request sequences in 10 hours of video recordings involving three parents with aphasia (two with mild and one with severe aphasia).

Outcomes & Results: Stopping a child's action may be easier to achieve than getting a child to do something, as it requires less specification of the action. Furthermore, the severity of aphasia may limit the fine-tuning of deontic authority. The persons with mild aphasia adjust the degree of authority for example by adding mitigating words, such as 'a bit'. The person with severe aphasia uses requests that mostly show unmitigated authority for example by using higher volume. Structured contexts, such as games and mealtimes, may offer resources for all three parents with aphasia because they provide scaffolded interaction.

Conclusions: The analysis offers insights into practices that may allow or hinder these parents with aphasia to perform requests and thus to engage in parenting and participate in family life. Our findings suggest that people with aphasia could benefit from training to implement activities such as requesting in rehabilitation.

Introduction

About 15% of strokes occur in people aged 18 to 50 years and this percentage is increasing worldwide (Boot et al., 2020). The impact of stroke on this younger population has distinct characteristics due to potential childcare, work and financial responsibilities

CONTACT Helene Killmer helene.killmer@iln.uio.no

(for example Coppock et al., 2018; Harris & Bettger, 2018; Kitzmüller et al., 2012; Tiar & Dumas, 2015; Visser-Meily et al., 2005). Disabilities caused by stroke, such as aphasia, affect not only the life of stroke survivors, but may cause third party disabilities in family members, such as anxiety and depression (Grawburg et al., 2019). Thus, in the younger stroke population, rehabilitation requires a focus on demands of the whole family, including children (Shrubsole et al., 2020). While much aphasia research over the last 30 years has focused on the impact for spouses and partners, it is only recently that researchers have begun to consider parenting and the impact on young children (for example Grawburg et al., 2019; Manning et al., 2021; Ryan & Pitt, 2018). According to Manning, Mac Farlane, Hickey, Galvin and Franklin (2021), parents with aphasia describe change in communication with their children, loss of parental authority and need for support to engage with their children. Thus, there is some evidence that parent-child interaction changes as a result of aphasia. However, previous studies have mostly utilized interview methods and there is a need for insights into how parents with aphasia and children engage in real time interaction. Raising a child happens through interaction. Thus, the forms of interaction in everyday activities between parents with aphasia and children may have a crucial impact on their wellbeing and development.

Parenting involves supporting children to become competent social members of their culture and society by familiarizing them with normative social rules and behaviour. Parents commonly accomplish this through requests such as 'go to bed' or 'take your feet off the table'. Such requests may serve different purposes. For example, parents may ask children to do a task, or they may tell a child to stop what the child is doing. Parental requests are common and have been described in typical parent-child interaction (for example Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011; Cekaite, 2010; 2015; Craven & Potter, 2010; M. H. Goodwin, 2006; Kent, 2011).

A parent-child interaction is usually shaped by asymmetrical authority (Heller, 2011). This gap in authority is not pre-ascribed to parents and children. Their roles are constituted in interaction through their behaviour and manifest their social roles within the family (Ochs & Taylor, 1992). Request sequences are a natural arena for this constitution of authority because during them parents attempt to direct and control a child's behaviour. The ability to display parental authority by interacting competently in authority implicative activities is important because 'doing being a parent' comes about by maintaining the asymmetrical social order. According to Bova and Arcidiacono (2013, p. 209) "While [in request sequences] children are engaged in the process of becoming competent members of a social group as children, parents are engaged in the process of becoming competent members of a social group as parents". Thus, the impact of a communication difficulty on interactional authority may on the one hand threaten the intergenerational social order, and on the other hand, a child's socialization process.

This study explores a crucial activity in the upbringing of children: request sequences in which parents with aphasia request children to do or stop an action. The aim of the study is to understand how interactional authority is constituted in interactions of parents with aphasia and their children. By identifying facilitators and barriers for exerting authority in request sequences, the study examines how parental competence is manifested. Thereby, it adds to the growing body of knowledge about the influence of aphasia on participating in everyday family interactions, giving insights into impacts on quality of life of parents and their families.

Requests and deontic authority

Using conversation analysis (CA), various studies have described requesting (for example Drew & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014; Heinemann, 2006; Lindström, 2005; Stevanovic & Svennevig, 2015; Urbanik, 2021). The present study examines one type of requests, namely "requests for actions" or short requests (Tse Crepaldi, 2017, p. 21)[1] For these, a requester asks a requestee to do an action ('Could you clean the table?') or to cease an action ('Stop playing with your food.') (Craven & Potter, 2010; Kent, 2011). In response, immediate embodied compliance is preferred (cleaning the table or stopping to play with the food). While request design varies, from interrogatives ('Could you go to bed now?') and imperatives ('Go to bed now!') to noticings ('It's bedtime.') (Kent, 2011), these utterances have in common that they are "designed to get someone to do something" (M. H. Goodwin, 2006, p. 517). Furthermore, requests may be accompanied by iconic gestures which "act" (Streeck, 2016, p. 72) the requested action (Helmer & Reineke, 2021).

Requests are attempts to direct another person's immediate or future action. As such, they involve some claim of rights to do so, which is called *deontic authority* (Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012). Studies about deontic authority draw on Curl and Drew's (2008) notions of *entitlement* and *contingency*. For example, if a speaker frames their request as an imperative ('Go to bed!'), they claim high entitlement and thus power to require the action of going to bed. In contrast, modal constructions, such as 'can you/could you', orient to the contingency that the interlocutor may refuse or resist the action (Rossi, 2015). Formats such as 'I wonder if . . . ' mitigate a request by allocating to the requestee even more power to decide. Furthermore, deontic authority may be up- or downgraded using prosody, embodiment, or hedges, such as 'a bit' (for example M. H. Goodwin, 2006).

Research on typical parent-child interaction emphasizes the consequences of request design for authority. Kent (2011), M.H. Goodwin and Cekaite (2013) and Antaki and Kent (2015) describe the use of or-alternatives ('Put this down or you go to bed.'), imperatives ('Go to bed!'), and interrogatives ('All right, bedtime?'). Kent (2011) shows how parents use these formats for making requests explicit ('Eat your pasta!') or implicit ('You have some pasta left.'). Craven & Potter (2010) and Kent (2011) discuss how parents may not only ask their children to do an action but also to stop or refrain from an action (also called *desistance*).

Verbal requests may be combined with embodiment to get a child to do something. Cekaite (2010, 2015) and Goodwin and Cekaite (2013) show that parents may adjust their children's bodies during request sequences. When for example requesting children to go to bed, parents may push them gently in the direction of their bedroom (a technique also called *control formation* (C-formation) or *shepherding* (Cekaite, 2010)). Goodwin (2006) illustrates how parents secure direct face-to-face interaction by physical movement, for example moving closer to the child and establishing joint attention when negotiating requests. Thereby, parents establish mutual-spatial orientation (also called *facing formation* (F-formation: Kendon, 1990). With respect to calibrating the degree of deontic authority, studies show that parents upgrade their authority with for example imperatives

---

[1]Recruitments of assistance ("Could you open this bottle?") (Kendrick & Drew, 2016) and requests for material objects ("Could you pass me the bread?") (Kent & Kendrick, 2016) are excluded from the analysis because they attempt to mobilize a requestee's help. In such cases, a requestee executes an action for the requester and becomes "an extended arm" for them..

('Take your feet off the table!') (Kent, 2011) or embodiment by taking the child's feet off the table (Cekaite, 2010; 2015; M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). Other means of upgrading deontic stance may include referring to 'activity contracts' ('Come here because you promised to x!') (Aronsson & Cekaite, 2011) and offering or-alternatives (Antaki & Kent, 2015). Parental authority may be downgraded with modal constructions such as 'can you/ could you' (Craven & Potter, 2010) or by framing the requests as question ('Bedtime?') (M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). By using these practices, parents make the compliance to a request more contingent on the child's response and thus claim less parental entitlement. In general, Kent (2011) notes that requests initiated with low authority do not easily lend themselves to being upgraded when resisted. Aronsson and Cekaite (2011) consider a request that is too authoritative may hinder a child's potential to develop self-regulation.

Only a few studies have analysed the impact of aphasia on request formulation and deontic authority. Bauer and Auer (2009) describe the resources used for requesting by a German-speaking parent with severe aphasia[2] They analyse how this man, HC, together with his spouse requests their daughter go for a walk with her brother. First, HC attracts attention in order to establish himself as speaker by uttering 'hm'. Then he identifies the requestee, his daughter by nodding towards her. By uttering the word 'zwei' (two), gesturing and employing intonation, he displays the requested action of a walk together with her brother. Additionally, the imperative format 'komm' (come) indicates the activity of requesting. After this, the spouse provides a version of what her husband means to say. Studies describe the use of similar resources across different request types, however, they also document trouble with initiating requests and establishing intersubjectivity (mutual understanding of the requested action) by persons with moderate and severe aphasia (Anglade et al., 2018; 2021; Bauer, 2009; Bauer & Auer, 2009; C. Goodwin et al., 2009). Anglade, Le Dorze and Croteau (2018, 2021) investigated requests for material objects by persons with moderate and severe aphasia to shop assistants during service encounters. It was shown that non-verbal resources, such as pointing and iconic gestures, played an important role in constructing. Although the focus is not on requests, Killmer, Svennevig and Beeke (2022) provides an understanding of practices that secure deontic authority of a man with severe Wernicke's aphasia during planning talk about activities for a future date. The authors find that this man displays his deontic rights both by initiating planning sequences, and by modifying planning sequences launched by a conversation partner. Furthermore, he uses verbal resources, such as modal constructions 'you have to' and 'you can', and non-verbal resources, such as gaze, to modify deontic rights between himself, his wife and their daughter. Additionally, he up- and downgrades rights by using formats such as open questions, alternatives, and asking what the conversation partner wants. In summary, there is emerging evidence that when constructing requests persons with aphasia may profit from non-verbal resources, such as pointing and other gestures. When modifying deontic rights to request however, verbal resources such as specific linguistic formats and modal constructions seem to play a crucial role, and aphasia may impact on the ability to deploy them.

---

[2]In this study we analyse data from the same individual as Auer and Bauer (2009). The participant called "Norbert" here is called "HC" in their study..

The present study

Using CA, the present study investigates request sequences in interactions of parents with mild and severe aphasia and their children, for example at bedtime, and during mealtimes and game playing. We focus on parental attempts to get a child to do something or to stop doing something, which require an immediate embodied response. Our aim is threefold:

(1) To analyse the conversational practices used by parents with aphasia to make requests.
(2) To examine how severity of aphasia influences the formulation of requests.
(3) To consider what consequences the formulation of requests have for deontic authority of parents with aphasia.

By examining parental request sequences and the consequences of request design for parental authority, the present study illustrates what doing being a parent with aphasia may look like in everyday interaction.

Materials and method

The present study employs CA (for example Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Ethical approval for the present study was obtained from the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). All participant names and places reported are pseudonyms to safeguard anonymity.

Materials

The data originate from a corpus stored in the data bank AphaDB provided by Prof. Dr Auer (University of Freiburg, Germany) and Dr Angelika Bauer (School of Speech and Language Therapy, Freiburg)[3] The first author was granted access to the data for research purposes but was not involved in data collection. Data were collected in Germany between 2000 and 2005 within the project "Adaptationsstrategien in der familiären Kommunikation zwischen Aphasikern und ihren Partnerinnen" (Adaption strategies within the family communication between aphasics and their spouses). For the original project, 12 persons with aphasia were asked to video record themselves for approximately 2 hours during different typical interactions at home, five times after they returned from a rehabilitation centre after the stroke (immediately, 1, 3, 6 and 12 months after returning from rehabilitation). The participants chose to video record themselves while having conversations with their friends, spouses and/or their children. After data collection, the videos were transcribed according to "Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem" (GAT) conventions (Selting et al., 1998) and saved in the data bank AphaDB together with the transcripts (the first author was not involved in this). The data bank stores 142 recordings and transcripts (in total circa 150 hours) from nine German-speaking persons with aphasia (eight males and one female) and five interview recordings. Five data sets involving young

---

[3]For further information about the data see Bauer (2009).

Table 1. Overview: Demographic and medical information of participants with aphasia who recorded conversations with their children

Parent with aphasia (age, profession)	Gender	Aetiology and lesion side	Type of aphasia[4]	Severity of aphasia[4]	Family members: spouse (age, profession), children (age)
Udo (50, lawyer)	M	Ischemic left middle cerebral artery stroke	Anomic aphasia	Mild	Tina (43, housewife), Florian (12), Annika (14)
Tim (38, truck driver)	M	Extensive cerebral haemorrhage in the left temporal lobe	Anomic aphasia	Mild	Julia (36, part-time carpenter), Anna (9)
Norbert (46, senior businessman)	M	Ischemic left middle cerebral artery stroke	Initially: global aphasia, After 1 year: Broca's aphasia	Severe	Marina (36, part-time office clerk), Florian (1), Hannah (14), Denise (18)

children are available in this data bank. However, one participant did not do requesting to her children and another only made one request for an action to his daughter. Therefore, the present study chose to analyse three parents with aphasia and their children across 10 hours of interaction. All three participants were in the post-acute phase when the recordings were made. At the time of the transcripts shared in this paper, Tim and Udo were 4 months post onset and Norbert was 3 months post onset. This means that the aphasic symptoms were quite stable at that time. Demographic and medical information for the participants is available in Table 1.

Method

CA attempts to identify participants' practices to achieve intersubjectivity, and to construct and organize interactions (Peräkylä, 2007). The CA approach takes recordings of instances of naturally occurring interactions as an initial step for conducting research (Ten Have, 1999) because they provide access to the minutest details of the interaction as well as the opportunity to scrutinize the same data repeatedly (Cameron, 2001). Alongside the recordings, transcripts are used for analysis. They provide verbatim information about participants' utterances together with paralinguistic features such as intonation, volume and multimodality (gaze, gesture, artefact use, facial expression). For the present study, the first author re-transcribed the original transcripts according to the "Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2" (GAT 2) conventions (Selting et al., 1998, 2009) (see Appendix for conventions), translated them into English (provided in bold in the extracts) and added a multimodal transcription (Mondada, 2006) when this was of analytical interest. In the transcripts, participants are designated by the capital letter of their pseudonym. Because the participant Norbert occasionally produces neologisms (sound strings that are non-words), a gloss line is inserted if relevant, in which unintelligible word forms are transcribed according to German orthography and marked with curly brackets (Laakso & Godt, 2016).

---

[4]Diagnosed with the Aachener Aphasie Test (AAT) (Huber et al., 1983).

Table 2. Requests for action

Person	Total time per person	Total requests per person
Tim	04:04:00	13
Norbert	03:53:00	25
Udo	01:20:00	7

The analytic procedure followed three stages: identification of a phenomenon, building of a collection of instances, and qualitative analysis of action formation (Levinson, 2013). Initial localization of a potentially interesting phenomenon in the data (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008) provided different types of requests (for example requests for objects, recruitments, requests for information, requests for action, offerings). To identify requests, we relied on the next turn proof procedure (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). According to CA, next actions display how a previous action (in our case requesting) has been understood. This resulted in almost 200 instances of requests across three participants with children, identified by the first author. Subsequently, analysis focused on sequences of parental attempts to get a child to do or stop an *action*, which required an immediate embodied response by the child. To be able to shed light on parenting with aphasia, we focussed on requests typically applied in parenting, such as requests for "personal and domestic tasks" (Cekaite, 2010, p. 4), for "change in recipient's conduct" (Craven & Potter, 2010, p. 424) as well as "corrective instructions" (Deppermann, 2020, p. 211). The amount of "requests for action" (Tse Crepaldi, 2017, p. 21), as we decided to call them, can be found in Table 2. Because the present article is part of a larger study that will analyse negotiation of requests (Killmer, in prep.), we decided to focus on children able to negotiate verbally. Therefore, we excluded interactions with babies and toddlers due to their preverbal communication. Furthermore, we decided to focus on the influence of mild versus severe aphasia on deontic authority, because we observed differences in the design of requests. To develop the analysis, two sequences were discussed in multidisciplinary data sessions and at a conference. Data sessions are undertaken in CA research to increase a study's validity and reliability by reviewing video recordings and transcripts of the phenomenon collaboratively multiple times (Peräkylä, 2011).

Results

Our data reveal a variety of request designs and ways of modifying deontic authority by parents with aphasia. The analysis is divided into two parts to reflect two prominent request types: first, requests to do an action, followed by requests to stop doing an action. In each of these sections, extracts from a person with mild aphasia are analysed first, followed by extracts from a person with severe aphasia.

Requesting a child to do an action

In the following extract, Udo, a person with mild aphasia, requests his son Florian to clean his (Florian's) chin. The family (Udo, his wife Tina, Florian and daughter Annika) is sitting and chatting at the kitchen table. In the beginning of the extract, Tina and Annika are having

a dispute about Annika being slow when having to catch a bus (lines 1-5) and Florian expresses his annoyance by uttering 'hoa' and covering his face with both hands (lines 4 and 6).

Extract 1. Chin

```
01  Tina:      du bisch en äh du bisch a [schlAfmütz           ]
                you are a eh you are a sleepy head

02  Annika:                               [<<ff>ja entSCHULdigung>]
                                          yes sorry

03  Tina:      hhmm

04  Florian:   tz
               ts

05  Annika:    SO hab ich des ja [jetzt AU net gmeint]
               I did not mean it like that

06  Florian:                    [hoa ®(2 syllables)^]
    f:                            ®covers face with both hands
    u:                                        ^looks at Florian

07  Tina:      hm?

08             ^®(-^®-^)
    u:  -->    ^moves left hand to his chin
    f:          ®uncovers his face and looks at Tina
    u:  -->      ^points at Florian with left hand
    f:            ®looks at Udo
    u:             ^moves left hand to his chin

09  Udo:-->    ^PUTZ dich mal Ab,
               clean yourself once
    u:         ^moves left hand ←→ in front of his chin

10             da Unten
               down there

11             ®(-)^
    f:          ®wipes his chin
    u:            ^nods

12  Tina:      und ®wie geht=es deine APHthen
               and how are your ulcers
    f:             ®looks at Tina
```

The sequence begins with a gesture by Udo who moves his left hand to his chin (line 8). During this movement, he looks at Florian, while Florian looks at his mother, Tina. By pointing at Florian, Udo gains Florian's attention and mutual eye contact between father and son is established (line 8). Now Udo requests Florian to clean himself, simultaneously saying "Putz dich mal ab" (clean yourself once) and using non-verbal resources (moving his left hand from left to right and back in front of his chin, see line 9). After Udo adds specificity 'da unten' (down there, line 10), Florian complies by wiping his chin (line 11). The sequence ends with Udo nodding as an acknowledgment of Florian's action (line 11).

One cannot say whether Udo moves his hand to his chin in line 8 to signal a noticing, or to initiate an implicit request (i.e. 'you have something there'). However, our inspection of data involving Udo shows that he often displays problems with initiating sequences verbally, and this may speak in favour of interpreting the gesture as initiating an implicit request. This is also

in line with previous studies showing that persons with aphasia experience trouble with initiating requests (Anglade et al., 2018; 2021; Bauer, 2009; Bauer & Auer, 2009; C. Goodwin et al., 2009) as well general problems with initiating topics and sequences (Barnes et al., 2013; Beeke et al., 2011; Leaman & Edmonds, 2020; Wilkinson, 1999).

The request is constructed in two parts. First, the pointing gesture at Florian (line 8), establishes mutual orientation between the two, as well as identifying Florian as the addressee of the upcoming utterance. Second, the actual request is expressed through an imperative, telling Florian to clean himself and demonstrating how to do the requested action (line 9). Streeck (2016, p. 72) refers to this as "acting" the request. The establishment of mutual orientation and the synchronization of verbal requests and gesturing that we see here has been observed across different request types by persons with aphasia (Anglade et al., 2018; 2021; Bauer, 2009; Bauer & Auer, 2009; C. Goodwin et al., 2009), in typical parent-child requests (Craven & Potter, 2010; M. H. Goodwin, 2006) and in typical requesting (Helmer & Reineke, 2021). Extract 1 thus demonstrates the complex structure of initiating requests. In order to succeed, two interactional tasks are accomplished: establishing mutual orientation and formulating the request.

Upgraded authority is claimed by Udo in this request. By formatting the request as an imperative (line 9), non-compliance by Florian is not presented as an option (Craven & Potter, 2010). Rather, the request format claims Udo's heightened entitlement to get Florian to clean his chin. However, the request is mitigated with the hedge 'mal' (short for 'einmal' - once or one time), which minimizes the requested action by indicating that it should be executed only once and is not repetitive or long-lasting (Tsuitsui, 2006).

In the next extract, we will analyse a request made by Norbert, a man who has severe aphasia. Here he is playing Monopoly with his family. He requests his daughter Hannah to put her money in a line in front of her. This is the way Monopoly players typically sort their money. The family (Norbert, his wife Marina, Hannah and other daughter Denise) is sitting at the living room table and they are preparing to play. Hannah is in charge of the bank and distributes the money from the Monopoly box on her lap. In the beginning of the extract, Marina, who has just joined the group, asks which game piece belongs to each of them. Hannah is explaining (lines 1-3) when Norbert begins to speak.

The sequential organization is similar to Extract 1 in that it includes two stages. First, mutual orientation is secured, and then a request is uttered. In line 4, Norbert initiates the request by attaining Hannah's attention and identifying her as addressee with the non-word 'mogen' as well as by shifting his gaze from Marina to Hannah. The non-word 'mogen' probably also functions as a means to establish himself as speaker (Bauer & Auer, 2009). When mutual gaze is established and Hannah stops sorting the money, Norbert utters 'so so' (like this, like this, probably expressing 'do it like this') (line 4). Depending on the intonation and the sequential organization, 'so' may indicate different actions in German, such as questioning (rising intonation), requesting (flat intonation) or it may serve as a discourse marker. When 'so' is used for requesting, typically an iconic gesture accompanies it (Helmer & Reineke, 2021). Although there is no accompanying gesture here, the sequential placement and intonation of 'so' indicates that Norbert is doing requesting and not, for example, asking. However, in the following course of action, Hannah withdraws her gaze and continues sorting the money (line 4). Hannah's with-drawal may be a result of a lack of intersubjectivity or it may serve to express her non-

Extract 2. Money

```
01  Marina:      wer isch welcher?
                 who is which one
02  Hannah:      ⁰^ich bin der HUND du bisch der SPRINGER
                 I am the dog you are the knight
    h:           ⁰looks up and stops sorting money
    n:            ^looks at Hannah
03  Hannah:      ^DEnise isch der HUT un norbert is [(3 syllables). ]
                  Denise is the hat and Norbert is
                 ^looks at Marina
04  Norbert:-->                                      [⁰^MOgen ⁰SO SO.⁰]
                                                      {mogen=non-word}
                                                      {mogen} like this
                 like this
    h:                                               ⁰looks down at money
                 and sorts it
    n:                                                ^looks at Hannah
    h:                                                    ⁰looks up and
                 stops sorting money
    h:                                                          ⁰looks
                 down at money and sorts it
05  Norbert:-->  MOgen.^
                 {mogen=non-word}
                 {mogen}
    n:              ^prods Hannah's upper arm with left hand
06  Hannah:      <<whispers> vier (x syllables)>
                             four
07  Marina:      ah [(x Silben)]
08  Norbert:-->     [^SO SO    ]
                     like this like this
    n:              ^stretches out left arm and moves hand in front of
                 Hannah ←→
    n:              ^looks at his left hand
09  Hannah:      ⁰ja.
                 yes
    h:           ⁰looks in Norbert's direction and puts money on table
```

compliance with Norbert's request. Either way, Norbert repeats the twofold request structure. First, he repeats the non-word 'mogen' and prods Hannah's upper arm (line 5). Mutual orientation is not established, instead Hannah demonstrably ignores her father's action and continues to count the money, saying 'vier' (four) (line 6). In line 8, while again uttering 'so so' (like this, like this), Norbert stretches out his left arm and draws an imaginary line by moving his left arm back and forth over the table in front of Hannah (Helmer & Reineke, 2021). This action appears to indicate that Hannah should put the money in a line in front of her. While the performance of the gesture in Hannah's field of vision inevitably secures mutual orientation, the gesture itself demonstrates the requested action, namely to place the money on the table. Hannah treats Norbert's turn as a request by responding with 'yes' and initially complying to put some money on the table (line 9). Further analysis of her response is beyond the scope of the present article.

In Extract 2, Norbert acts out the requested action instead of verbalizing and acting it at the same time, as seen in Extract 1. This may be less demanding for him given his severe aphasia. However the meaning of the request depends on the child's interpretation of the gesture (Auer & Bauer, 2011), because no verbal request disambiguates the requested action (C.

Goodwin et al., 2009). This may lead to the need for more interactional work by Hannah – a consequence of aphasia which has been described previously in the context of gesture use, for example concerning iconic gestures (Auer & Bauer, 2011; Tuomenoksa et al., 2021). Extract 2 reveals the same twofold structure for requesting an action as was described in Extract 1. Furthermore, it exemplifies how mutual attention before requesting may be established in an enforced (prodding the arm) or intrusive way (gesturing in the requestee's field of vision).

In common with Extract 1, here the person with aphasia claims upgraded entitlement. However, no mitigating words are employed when requesting. Norbert displays high deontic authority to initiate the requests by attempting to obtain attention through touching Hannah (line 5). Furthermore, he acts the requested action in Hannah's field of vision (line 8) so that she cannot avoid seeing it. The requests in lines 4 and 8 are framed as instructive requests with the token 'so' (like this) (Helmer & Reineke, 2021), which expresses high entitlement and low contingency. This format is upgraded with high volume and by repeating the token during both requests. High entitlement to initiate and express the request through verbal and physical resources. In contrast to Extract 1, authority is not mitigated. Such high entitlement when initiating requests may hinder possibilities for upgrading authority in the unfolding sequence after children's non-compliance (Kent, 2011).

Requesting a child to stop an action

Extract 3 exemplifies how Tim, diagnosed with mild aphasia requests his 9-year-old daughter Anna to stop trying to attach a piece to a puzzle, which they are completing together sitting on the floor of the living rooming. They are engaged in this activity silently side by side over long stretches of the recording, including the 16 second gap shown in line 1. At the beginning of this sequence, Tim attempts to connect different pieces to the puzzle (line 1). After 5 seconds, Anna takes a piece from the heap of puzzle pieces, leans forward and tries to connect it to the same part of the puzzle Tim is working on (line 1). Two seconds later, Tim takes his hand away from the puzzle and scratches his cheek, before moving his hand back to the puzzle (line 1).

Extract 3. Piece

```
01              (16.0)^^(5.0)®®®(2.0)^(3.0)^
    t:             ^looks at puzzle
    t:              ^tries to connect different pieces to the puzzle with
            his left hand
    a:                    ®takes a piece from the piece heap and moves whole
            body forward
    a:                   ®looks at puzzle
    a:                    ®tries to connect piece to puzzle
    t:                        ^scratches his cheek with the index finger
            of his left hand
    t:                            ^moves left hand to puzzle
02  Tim:-->    <<p>²hm↑²hm:.>®^
                  ²m²m
    a:                    ®takes piece away
    t:                     ^takes hand away from puzzle and moves it to his
            mouth
03             ((voices in the background 10.0))
```

Tim requests Anna to stop her action of trying to connect her piece to the puzzle with ʼ²hm²hm' (²m²m) (line 2). This reduplicated token with a glottal closure is often used for negation in German (Selting et al., 2009) and is presented here with a pitch up-step and prolongation on the second 'hm'. Anna complies with the request, stops trying to connect her piece and moves it away from the puzzle (line 2).

The design and structure of this sequence is simple. There is only one action in progress, namely Anna trying to connect her piece to the puzzle (line 1). This action is in the field of both participants' attention. Therefore, expressing disagreement with this action is sufficient for requesting to stop it. Here, a simple ʼ²hm²hm' (²m²m) shows disagreement and Hannah subsequently suspends her action. Thus, for Tim, the demand this request puts on his interactional resources is low. Furthermore, in contrast to the complex dual structure described in Extract 1 and 2, whereby establishment of mutual orientation precedes the request, one verbalisation is sufficient to stop the child's action here. It is unnecessary for Tim to describe exactly the requested action and Hannah has no difficulty understanding his request. A highly structured context such as puzzling may thus provide opportunities for constructing such request types requiring simple resources and only one interactional task, and facilitate requesting despite aphasia.

High authority is claimed by Tim in this extract. The simple ʼ²hm²hm' (²m²m) is a strong claim of authority as it demonstrates an absolute prohibition, which is comparable to an imperative. At the same time, Tim's entitlement is mitigated as the request is uttered with low volume.

In the data as a whole, we observed a wide range of resources for up- and down-grading deontic authority in the requests of parents with mild aphasia. Therefore, we provide a second extract exemplifying further resources employed also by Tim.

In Extract 4, Tim requests that his daughter stops covering up the puzzle. As in Extract 3, father and daughter are doing a puzzle together. Anna sits beside the puzzle (line 1). Then she moves her body forward, gets on her knees and hands and covers the puzzle with her upper body while she tries to connect pieces to it (line 1). Tim also gets on his knees, takes a piece from beside Anna and moves in the direction of the puzzle in front of Anna (line 1).

Extract 4. Puzzle

```
01              (1.0)ᵉ(4.0)^(5.0)^(4.0)
    a:          >>sits beside puzzle
    a:              ᵉmoves forward on knees and hands – upper body covers
                puzzle – tries to connect pieces>>
    t:                  ^gets on his knees
    t:                      ^takes piece from beside Anna and moves into
                direction of puzzle

02  Tim:-->  lass me doch au  BISsle ᵉ da na↑:.
             let me also still a bit closer there
    a:                          ᵉmoves backward – body uncovers puzzle

03           ^du hocksch scho wieder' ganz' DRINne.^ ᵉ (---)
             you are sitting again completely in there
    t:       ^gazes at Anna                    ^gazes at puzzle
    a:                                          ᵉtakes sitting position
                beside the puzzle – not covering puzzle

04  Anna:    hm'

05           (9.4)
```

Tim expresses the request as an imperative 'lass me doch au bissle da na' (let me also still a bit closer there) (line 2). This request does not specify exactly what action is required from Anna, that is, what she should do in order to let him get closer. However, before Tim has finished his turn, Anna moves backwards and uncovers the puzzle (line 3). Then, while gazing at Anna, Tim gives an account for why she should move aside, formulated as a declarative 'du hocksch scho wieder ganz drinne' (you are sitting again completely in there) (line 3). Anna takes a sitting position beside the puzzle (line 3) and utters the receipt token 'hm' (line 4). Her position is similar to the one she had before she moved forward in line 1.

Obviously, more verbal resources are used to construct this imperative request format than to design the negation '$^?$hm$^?$hm' ($^?$m$^?$m) in Extract 3. However, it is striking that in Extract 4 just as in Extract 3, Anna complies with the request at a point when opposition to the ongoing action (Anna covering the puzzle, line 1) is expressed. Although Tim does not make explicit what action he requests from his daughter, Anna treats his comment as a request to move away from the puzzle. Again, the context of doing a puzzle provides resources that may be exploited in the formulation and understanding of this type of request.

The imperative format claims high entitlement perform the request. Yet, the request is mitigated by the hedge 'bissle' (ein bisschen - a bit). This mitigation is emphasized through intonation by stressing the first syllable of 'bissle'. Furthermore, the intonation of 'na' (dran - closer) with an up- and down-step of pitch and sound prolongation highlights Tim's annoyance and underlines the urgency of the request. The account in line 3 explains the need for action, but may simultaneously be heard as a complaint (Schegloff, 2005). Both of these actions upgrade the speakers' entitlement to make the request. Extract 4 thus demonstrates further resources for fine-tuning deontic authority.

The fifth extract exemplifies how Norbert, with severe aphasia, requests his daughter to stop throwing a dice. Norbert, his spouse Marina and their daughters Denise and Hannah are sitting in the living room playing Monopoly. Before the sequence, Marina has thrown the dice and moved her game piece. Hannah moves her hand to the dice as Marina announces that she would like to buy the 'Seestrasse' (line 1), as part of her ongoing turn. Then Hannah announces that it is her go to take a turn (line 2).

Norbert requests his daughter not to throw the dice by saying 'nein' (no) four times, lifting up his left hand and moving it from left to right (line 3, Image 1). At this point, mutual gaze between Norbert and Hannah is established. Following this, while saying 'nix' (nothing), Norbert holds his left hand up in an open position in Hannah's direction (line 4 and Image 2). Then he looks down at his cards again and begins to sort them. Hannah complies with the request by moving her hand away from the dice (line 5). Yet she also expresses her protest with the token 'hm' by elongating the 'm' and producing a distinct pitch up- and down-step (line 5) as well as asking for an account 'warum nit' (warum nicht - why not) (line 6). Then Norbert initiates a next action, the continuation of the game, with 'so' (well[5]) (line 7) without giving an account.

Norbert attempts to prohibit his child's action of taking and throwing the dice with 'nee' (no) and a prohibiting gesture (line 3, see also Image 1). Although the request is brought about by disagreement (see also Extract 3 for stopping an action with '$^?$hm$^?$hm' ($^?$m$^?$m) expressing disagreement), Norbert extends the request. The extension is realized with the negation term 'nix' (nothing), probably indicating 'du machst nix' (you do

---

Extract 5. Dice

```
01  Marina:      ®ich MÖCHT die seestrasse KAUfe.
                 I would like to buy the Seestrasse
    h:           ®moves hand to dice
02  Hannah:      also ich kann ja schomal würfeln.
                 thus I can already throw the dices
03  Norbert:-->  NEE=NEE=^NEE=^®NEE.
                 Nononono
    n:                     ^looks up from table and at Hannah
    n:                       ^lifts left hand and moves it
                 ←→(Image 1)
    h:                        ®looks at Norbert
04         -->   ^NIX.^
                 nothing
    n:           ^holds left hand still (Image 2)
    n:             ^looks down at cards and sorts them
05  Hannah:      ®hm:↑:®↓:
    h:              ®moves hand away from dice
    h:           ®looks in front of her
06               warum nit?®
                 why not
    h:                      ®leans forward
07  Norbert:     so;^
                 well
    n:              ^looks over table
```


Image 1. Line 3: Norbert makes a hand movement from left to right – indicating 'NO' (image: Pointon, 2018; arrows added by first author)

Image 2. Line 4: Norbert holds his open hand up – indicating 'STOP' (image: Pointon, 2018)

nothing), as well as by stopping the movement of his hand, indicating cessation (line 4, see also Image 2). Extract 5 is another example of how asking someone to stop doing something may require fewer resources than asking them to act, by exploiting the participants' mutual orientation to the action under way.

We already observed that Norbert, with severe aphasia, mainly produces requests with high deontic authority, as illustrated Extract 2. In Extract 5, Norbert repeats the 'no' in quick succession, which upgrades his entitlement (line 3). Furthermore, extending his initial turn (line 3) with a second one (line 4) reinforces the request by being repeated. Additionally, both turns are louder than the previous ones, which upgrades the intensity and thereby the displayed entitlement to make the request. Moreover, the reduplication of the request in several different modes (verbal and gestural) upgrades the insistence and leaves no room for contingencies. Extract 5 shows once more that despite severe aphasia, Norbert is able to express a request with strong deontic authority, and does not appear to have the resources to mitigate the request.

Discussion

These three parents with aphasia do requesting and thus express their entitlement to request actions from their children. We identified structures and contexts, such as games and mealtimes, that may support the demonstration of parental authority despite aphasia because they provide for scaffolded interactions. However, we also uncovered a practice that may lead to loss of authority in aphasia. Stopping a child's action appears easier to achieve than getting a child to do something because it requires less interactional tasks; a simple disagreement in the right sequential position can achieve this. Furthermore, it appears the severity of aphasia may limit the fine-tuning of deontic authority. While the persons with mild aphasia express their authority subtly in requests, the person with severe aphasia uses requests that mostly claim strong authority. The present study provides insights into factors, such as the structure of a request and the severity of aphasia, that might cause the loss of parental authority due to aphasia, which chimes with participant self-report (Manning et al., 2021). We expand on previous findings by revealing how a typical parent-child activity, such as requesting, may influence deontic authority in real time interaction. Thereby, we illustrate how doing being a parent and the socialization process of a child may be influenced by aphasia in everyday life.

The first aim of this study concerned the conversational practices used by parents with aphasia to make requests. Our data show that requesting a child to do something may be more complex than asking a child to stop or refrain from an action. All three parents with aphasia employ a two-stage structure to accomplish requests for action. First, they identify the requestee and gain mutual attention for example by looking at, pointing towards or prodding the children. Second, they produce the request proper. The two persons with mild aphasia achieve this by describing the requested action verbally, using imperatives or declaratives, much as in typical parent-child interaction (Kent, 2011). At the same time, they may demonstrate the action with gestures. The establishment of mutual orientation as well as the synchronization of verbal requests and gesturing has been observed in previous studies across different request types by persons with aphasia (Anglade et al., 2018, 2021; Bauer, 2009; Bauer & Auer, 2009; C. Goodwin et al., 2009), in typical parent-child requests (Craven & Potter, 2010; M. H. Goodwin, 2006) and in typical

requesting not involving children (Helmer & Reineke, 2021). However, the person with severe aphasia expresses the requested action solely with gestures. While the children of the two parents with mild aphasia can rely on verbal and non-verbal information to understand the requested action, the child of the parent with severe aphasia depends solely on non-verbal information, which requires more interpretive work (Auer & Bauer, 2011; Tuomenoksa et al., 2021). In contrast to requests for action, requests to stop a child's action are performed with one simple action, namely expressing opposition or disagreement. All three parents with aphasia achieve this with few resources for example by simply saying 'no'. This is possible due to the participants' mutual orientation to the action underway. Overall, stopping an action may thus be easier for a parent with aphasia than requesting the initiation of one.

The second aim sought to examine how severity influences the formulation of requests. Our data show that the power of deontic authority expressed in a request may be influenced by severity of aphasia. Generally, all three parents with aphasia do requesting, which shows their parental authority. The two persons with mild aphasia calibrate deontic authority by means of various resources for up- and downgrading. For example, imperative formats are downgraded with verbal devices such as hedges, e.g. 'a bit'. In this way they employ similar techniques to those described for a person with severe Wernicke's aphasia that uses modal constructions such as 'can you' (Killmer et al., 2022), in typical parent-child requests (Craven & Potter, 2010; M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013; Kent, 2011), and in typical requesting (Rossi, 2015; Stevanovic & Peräkylä, 2012). However, such fine-tuning is not present in requests made by the parent with severe aphasia. He mostly claims strong deontic authority, for example through increased volume and by repeating the request. He does not appear to have access to verbal resources such as specific linguistic formats and modal constructions, which are available to persons with mild aphasia for adjusting deontic authority. In sum, it seems that severe aphasia limits this person's ability to calibrate the expression of deontic authority.

Last, we aimed to scrutinize what consequences the formulation of requests have for the authority of parents with aphasia. We will highlight three. First, the complex structure of requests for action may become a barrier to requesting for a person who has aphasia, which may impede the socialization of a child and the exertion of parental authority. Second, the constant initiation of requests with high deontic authority may become a hindrance to expressing authority in the long run, as well as restricting the child's autonomy. In request sequences, parents attempt to socialize their children by regulating and controlling their actions, while at the same time preparing their children for adulthood by gradually guiding them toward self-regulation and autonomy, certainly as the children grow older. Kent (2011) notes that requests initiated with high authority do not easily lend themselves to being upgraded when resisted. Furthermore, with regard to children's socialization, Aronsson and Cekaite (2011) discourage regulating a child's behaviour with formats that are overly authoritative. They propose using less authoritative formats that guide the child towards self-regulation. Thus, both notions promote using requests with low deontic authority. Third, highly structured interactional contexts such as mealtimes and games may facilitate the expression of parental authority when one has aphasia. Our data show that although requests by a person with aphasia may not be expressed explicitly, children understand the requested actions because they are

familiar with the routines and rules of the structured activity. Parental authority can be displayed by implicit invocation of an activity's context. Therefore, habits and routines seem to provide a resource for persons with aphasia to scaffold requesting.

Whilst it should be acknowledged that this is an analysis of requests of three individuals with aphasia and their children, many of the practices we observed are characteristic of typical parental request sequences, and, therefore, it may be the case that other parents with aphasia do requesting in similar ways. They might also experience similar barriers, which might be part of an explanation for the few or no requests seen in the data from the other two parents with aphasia in the AphaDB data bank. In order to strengthen our results, a broader study of requesting is desirable. Our next study will analyse the negotiation of requests to children by parents with aphasia (Killmer, in prep.). While it is a striking finding that the person with severe aphasia in this study mostly claimed upgraded authority, one could argue that this might be related to a personal communication style. First, a feature such as high volume may be an individual choice of communication, however, an increased use of gestures is often found in conversations of persons with aphasia (Auer & Bauer, 2011). Thus, resources that are specifically accessible to persons with severe aphasia increase their deontic rights. Second, although there is not much research on this topic, studies have shown that, for example, L2 learners - although familiar with the concept of deontic authority and modal constructions in their L1 – use fewer modal constructions in the early stages of L2 learning (Leclercq & Edmonds, 2017). Thus, a subtle expression of deontic authority is limited when L2 proficiency is low. The use of modal constructions increases with proficiency (Leclercq & Edmonds, 2017), which allows L2 speakers to modify their deontic rights. It seems that we can find a similar effect due to aphasia. In summary, on the one hand, resources particularly used by persons with aphasia, such as gestures, increase deontic rights, and on the other hand, subtle expression of authority is limited with few linguistic resources. However, because findings may partially interfere with previous parenting styles and the influence of availability of linguistic resources on deontic rights has not been sufficiently explored, we suggest that future research should analyse a larger data set that includes persons with varying degrees of aphasia severity. Further research into parental requesting by people with aphasia will broaden our perspectives and concepts for speech and language interventions that aim to facilitate family interactions. Our findings suggest that communication partner training (CPT) could further benefit people with aphasia and their families by encouraging reflection on interactional activities such as requesting, and ways to support this. As part of CPT, parents with aphasia and their family members could talk with speech and language therapists (SLTs) about how requesting works in everyday conversations. Parents with aphasia, their co-parenting partners and their children could then be supported to reflect on how requesting works for them. Goals could then be negotiated as a way of enhancing participation in requesting for parents with aphasia, with a focus on practice in (1) employing complex request structures, (2) modifying authority, and (3) identifying routine family activities or contexts for interaction that may provide a scaffold for requesting.

Acknowledgements

between aphasics and their partners). Furthermore, we would like to thank the Conversation Analysis and Interaction Linguistics research group at the University of Oslo for their input during data sessions.

Declaration of interest statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Helene Killmer   http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8801-8464

References

Anglade, C., Le Dorze, G., & Croteau, C. (2018). Service encounter interactions of people living with moderate-to-severe post-stroke aphasia in their community. *Aphasiology*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2018.1532068

Anglade, C., Le Dorze, G., & Croteau, C. (2021). How clerks understand the requests of people living with aphasia in service encounters. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *35*(1), 84–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2020.1745894

Antaki, C., & Kent, A. (2015). Offering alternatives as a way of issuing directives to children: Putting the worse option last. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *78*, 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.004

Aronsson, K., & Cekaite, A. (2011). Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics. *Discourse & Society*, *22*(2), 137–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926510392124

Auer, P., & Bauer, A. (2011). Multimodality in aphasic conversation: Why gestures sometimes do not help. *Journal of Interactional Research in Communication Disorders*, *2*(2), 215–243. https://doi.org/10.1558/jircd.v2i2.215

Barnes, S., Candlin, C. N., & Ferguson, A. (2013). Aphasia and topic initiation in conversation: A case study. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, *48*(1), 102–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2012.00186.x

Beeke, S., Maxim, J., & Cooper, F. (2011). Redesigning therapy for agrammatism: Initial findings from the ongoing evaluation of a conversation-based intervention study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *24*, 222–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2010.03.002

Boot, E., Ekker, M. S., Putaala, J., Kittner, S., De Leeuw, F.-E., & Tuladhar, A. M. (2020). Ischaemic stroke in young adults: A global perspective. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, *91*(4), 411–417. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2019-322424

Bova, A., & Arcidiacono, F. (2013). Invoking the Authority of Feelings as a Strategic Maneuver in Family Mealtime Conversations. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *23*(3), 206–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2113

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Cekaite, A. (2010). Shepherding the child: Embodied directive sequences in parent–child interactions. *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, *30*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2010.001

Bauer, A., & Auer, P. (2009). *Aphasie im Alltag* (L. Springer & D. Schrey-Dern, Eds.). Thieme.

Cekaite, A. (2015). The Coordination of Talk and Touch in Adults' Directives to Children: Touch and Social Control. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *48*(2), 152–175. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2015.1025501

Bauer, A. (2009). *Miteinander im Gespräch bleiben—Partizipation in aphasischen Alltagsgesprächen*. University of Freiburg.

Coppock, C., Ferguson, S., Green, A., & Winter, D. (2018). 'It's nothing you could ever prepare anyone for': The experiences of young people and their families following parental stroke. *Brain Injury*, *32*(4), 474–486. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2018.1426879

Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies*, *12*(4), 419–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610370126

Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and Action: A Comparison of Two Forms of Requesting. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *41*(2), 129–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810802028613

Deppermann, A. (2020). Imperative im Deutschen: Konstruktionen, Praktiken oder social action formats? In B. Weidner, K. König, W. Imo, & L. Wegner (Eds.), *Verfestigungen in der Interaktion* (pp. 195–230). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110637502-009

Drew, P., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). *Requesting in Social Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, *26*(4–5), 515–543.

Goodwin, C., Goodwin, M. H., & Olsher, D. (2009). Producing Sense with Nonsense Syllables: Turn and Sequence in Conversations with a Man with Severe Aphasia*. In P. Griffiths, A. J. Merrison, & A. Bloomer (Eds.), *Language in Use* (1st ed., pp. 272–285). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003060994-27

Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (2013). Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *46*(1), 122–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.07.008

Grawburg, M., Howe, T., Worrall, L., & Scarinci, N. (2019). Family-Centered Care in Aphasia: Assessment of Third-Party Disability in Family Members With the Family Aphasia Measure of Life Impact. *Topics in Language Disorders*, *39*(1), 29–54. https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0000000000000176

Harris, G. M., & Bettger, J. P. (2018). Parenting after stroke: A systematic review. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, *25*(5), 384–392. https://doi.org/10.1080/10749357.2018.1452366

Heinemann, T. (2006). 'Will you or can't you?': Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*(7), 1081–1104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.013

Heller, V. (2011). Die Herstellung kommunikativer Kontexte in familialen Tischgesprächen. In K. Birkner & D. Meer (Eds.), *Institutionalisierter Alltag: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in unterschiedlichen Praxisfeldern* (pp. 92–116). Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

Helmer, H., & Reineke, S. (2021). Instruktionen und Aufforderungen in Theorie und Praxis – Einparken im Fahrunterricht. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift Zur Verbalen Interaktion*, *22*, 114–150.

Huber, W., Poeck, K., Weniger, D., & Willmes, K. (1983). *Der Aachner Aphasie Test (AAT)*. Hogrefe.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Kendon, A. (1990). Spatial organization in social encounters: The F-formation system. In A. Kendon (Ed.), *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters* (pp. 209–238). Cambridge University Press.

Kendrick, K. H., & Drew, P. (2016). Recruitment: Offers, Requests, and the Organization of Assistance in Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *49*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1126436

Kent, A. (2011). *Directing dinnertime: Practices and resources used by parents and children to deliver and respond to directive actions*. Loughborough University.

Kent, A., & Kendrick, K. H. (2016). Imperative Directives: Orientations to Accountability. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *49*(3), 272–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2016.1201737

Killmer, H., Svennevig, J., & Beeke, S. (2022). Joint planning in conversations with a person with aphasia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *187*, 72–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.021

Killmer, H. (in prep.). *How parents with aphasia deal with children's resistance to requests*.

Kitzmüller, G., Asplund, K., & Häggström, T. (2012). The Long-Term Experience of Family Life After Stroke. *Journal of Neuroscience Nursing*, *44*(1), E1–E13. https://doi.org/10.1097/JNN.0b013e31823ae4a1

Leclercq, P., & Edmonds, A. (2017). How L2 learners of French and English express modality using verbal means: A crosslinguistic and developmental study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *55*(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2017-0108

Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 103–130). Wiley-Blackwell.

Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance with practical tasks in the Swedish home help service. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in interaction* (pp. 209–230). John Benjamins.

Laakso, M., & Godt, S. (2016). Recipient participation in conversations involving participants with fluent or non-fluent aphasia. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *30*(10), 770–789. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2016.1221997

Leaman, M. C., & Edmonds, L. A. (2020). "By the Way" . . . How People With Aphasia and Their Communication Partners Initiate New Topics of Conversation. American Journal of Speech - Language Pathology (Online), 29(1S), 375–392. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1044/2019_AJSLP375392. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1044/2019_AJSLPCAC48180198180198

Manning, M., MacFarlane, A., Hickey, A., Galvin, R., & Franklin, S. (2021). 'I hated being ghosted' – The relevance of social participation for living well with post-stroke aphasia: Qualitative interviews with working aged adults. *Health Expectations*, *24*(4), 1504–1515. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13291

Mondada, L. (2006). Video recording as the reflexive preservation and configuration of phenomenal features for analysis. In H. Knoblauch, J. Raab, H.-G. Soeffner, & B. Schnettler (Eds.), *Video analysis* (pp. 51–68). Lang.

Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1992). Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse & Society*, *3*(3), 301–340.

Peräkylä, A. (2007). Conversation Analysis. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Qualitative research practice* (Concise pbk. ed, pp. 153–167). SAGE.

Peräkylä, A. (2011). Validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research* (pp. 365–382). Sage London.

Pointon, K. D. (2018). *Hand 5*. https://openclipart.org/detail/293196/hand-5

Rossi, G. (2015). *The request system in Italian interaction*. Radboud University Nijmegen.

Ryan, B., & Pitt, R. (2018). "It took the spark from him for a little while": A case study on the psychological impact of parental stroke and aphasia on a young boy. *Aphasiology*, *32*(sup1), 189–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2018.1485858

Schegloff, E. A. (2005). On Complainability. *Social Problems*, *52*(4), 449–476. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2005.52.4.449

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barden, B., Bergmann, J., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Günthner, S., Meier, C., Quasthoff, U., Schlobinski, P., Uhmann, S., & others. (1998). Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT). *Linguistische Berichte*, 91–122.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J. R., Bergmann, P., Birkner, K., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Deppermann, A., Gilles, P., Günthner, S., Hartung, M., Kern, F., Mertzlufft, C., Meyer, C., Morek, M., Oberzaucher, F., Peters, Jörg, Quasthoff, U., Schütte, W., . . . Uhmann, S. (2009). Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung*: *Online-Zeitschrift Zur Verbalen Interaktion*, 353–402.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J., Bergmann, P., Birkner, K., Couper-Kuhlen, E., Deppermann, A., Gilles, P., Günthner, S., Hartung, M., Kern, F., Mertzlufft, C., Meyer, C., Morek, M., Oberzaucher, F., Peters, J., Quasthoff, U., Schütte, W., . . . Uhmann, S. (2011). A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2 translated and adapted for English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten. Gesprächsforschung - Online- Zeitschrift Zur Verbalen Interaktion, 12, 1–51.

Shrubsole, K., Pitt, R., Till, K., Finch, E., & Ryan, B. (2020). Speech language pathologists' practice with children of parents with an acquired communication disability: A preliminary study. *Brain Impairment*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/BrImp.2020.11

Stevanovic, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2012). Deontic Authority in Interaction: The Right to Announce, Propose, and Decide. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *45*(3), 297–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.699260

Stevanovic, M., & Svennevig, J. (2015). Introduction: Epistemics and deontics in conversational directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *78*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.008

Streeck, J. (2016). Gestische Praxis und sprachliche Form. In A. Deppermann, H. Feilke, & A. Linke (Eds.), *Sprachliche und kommunikative Praktiken*. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110451542-004

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Sage.

Tiar, A. M. V., & Dumas, J. E. (2015). Impact of parental acquired brain injury on children: Review of the literature and conceptual model. *Brain Injury*, *29*(9), 1005–1017. https://doi.org/10.3109/02699052.2014.976272

Tse Crepaldi, Y. (2017). *Requests for actions and their responses in caregiver-child interactions: A conversation analytic approach* [Nanyang Technological University]. https://doi.org/10.32657/10356/72525

Tsuitsui, T. (2006). Zur Funktion der Abtönungspartikel „mal" Anhand eines Vergleichs mit der japanischen Gradpartikel „chotto". *Neue Beiträge Zur Germanistik*, *131*, 77–95.

Tuomenoksa, A., Beeke, S., & Klippi, A. (2021). People with non-fluent aphasia initiating actions in everyday conversation with familiar conversation partners: Resources for participation. *Aphasiology*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2020.1852518

Urbanik, P. (2021). Directives in the construction site: Grammatical design and work phases in second language interactions with crane operators. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.016

Visser-Meily, A., Post, M., Meijer, A. M., van de Port, I., Maas, C., & Lindeman, E. (2005). When a Parent Has a Stroke: Clinical Course and Prediction of Mood, Behavior Problems, and Health Status of Their Young Children. *Stroke*, *36*(11), 2436–2440. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.STR.0000185681.33790.0a

Wilkinson, R. (1999). Sequentiality as a problem and resource for intersubjectivity in aphasic conversation: Analysis and implications for therapy. *Aphasiology*, *13*(4), 327–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/026870399402127

Appendix

Summary of the most important GAT 2 transcription conventions
   (Selting et al., 2011) with additions by present author(s):

Sequential structure	
[ ]	Overlap and simultaneous talk
[ ]	
=	fast, immediate continuation with a new turn or segment (latching)
In- and outbreaths	
°h/h°	in-/ outbreaths of appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
°hh/hh°	in-/ outbreaths of appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
°hhh/hhh°	in-/ outbreaths of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
Pauses	
(.)	micro pause, estimated, up to 0.2 sec. duration appr.
(-)	short estimated pause of appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
(–)	intermediary estimated pause of appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
(—)	longer estimated pause of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
(0.5)/(2.0)	measured pause of appr. 0.5/2.0 sec. duration (to tenth of a second)
Other segmental conventions	
:	lengthening, by about 0.2-0.5 sec.
::	lengthening, by about 0.5-0.8 sec.
:::	lengthening, by about 0.8-1.0 sec.
?	cut-off by glottal closure
and_uh	cliticizations within units
uh, uhm, etc.	hesitation markers, so-called "filled pauses"
Laughter and crying	
haha, hehe, hihi	syllabic laughter
((laughs)), ((cries))	description of laughter and crying
< <laughing> >	laughter particles accompanying speech with indication of scope
≪:-)> so>	smile voice
Continuers	
hm, yes, no, yeah	monosyllabic tokens
hm_hm, ye_es, no_o	bi-syllabic tokens
?hm?hm	with glottal closure, often negating
Accentuation	
SYLlable	focus accent
sYllable	secondary accentHT
!SYL!lable	extra strong accent
Final pitch movements of intonation phrases	
?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
-	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low
Pitch jumps	
↑	smaller pitch upstep
↓	smaller pitch downstep
↑ ↑	larger pitch upstep
↓ ↓	larger pitch downstep

(Continued).

Changes in pitch register	
≪l> >	lower pitch register
≪h> >	higher pitch register
Intralinear notation of accent pitch movements	
`SO	falling
´SO	rising
-SO	level
ˆSO	rising-falling
ˇSO	falling-rising
↑ `	small pitch upstep to the peak of the accented syllable
↓ ´	small pitch downstep to the valley of the accented syllable
↑⁻SO bzw. ↓⁻SO	pitch jumps to higher or lower level accented syllables
↑ ↑`SO bzw. ↓ ↓´SO	larger pitch upsteps or downsteps to the peak or valley of the accented syllable
Loudness and tempo changes, with scope	
≪f> >	forte, loud
≪ff> >	fortissimo, very loud
≪p> >	piano, soft
≪pp> >	pianissimo, very soft
≪all> >	allegro, fast
≪len> >	lento, slow
≪cresc> >	crescendo, increasingly louder
≪dim> >	diminuendo, increasingly softer
≪acc> >	accelerando, increasingly faster
≪rall> >	rallentando, increasingly slower
Changes in voice quality and articulation, with scope	
≪creaky> >	glottalized
≪whispery> >	change in voice quality as stated
Other conventions	
≪surprised> >	interpretive comment with indication of scope
((coughs))	non- verbal vocal actions and events
≪coughing> >	… with indication of scope
()	unintelligible passage
(xxx), (xxxxxx)	one or two unintelligible syllables
(may i)	assumed wording
(may i say/let us say)	possible alternatives
((unintelligible, appr. 3 sec))	unintelligible passage with indication of duration
((. . .))	omission in transcript
–>	refers to a line of transcript relevant in the argument

Additions by present author(s)

t:/h: ^/*	representing non-verbal behavior (e.g. gestures, movements and gaze)
?:	unknown speaker