



1

Introduction

Why do parent–child argumentative interactions matter? What is the reason for such an interest? This chapter provides the reasons that motivated the study of parent–child argumentation with the aim to understand the function of this type of interactions. Focusing on the activity of family mealtime, in the first part, the chapter draws attention to the distinctive features of parent–child conversations. A second section of the chapter is devoted to discussing whether and, eventually, when children have the competence to construct arguments and engage in argumentative discussions with the aim to convince their parents to change opinion. In the last part of the chapter, research questions and structure of the volume are presented.

1.1 Introduction

Ten years ago, in a volume concerning the role of argumentative practices in the educational sphere, Muller Mirza, Perret-Clermont, Tartas and Iannaccone (2009, p. 76) stressed that the argumentative attitudes learned in the family are to be considered “the matrix of all other



2 A. Bova

19 forms of argumentation.” The thesis sustained by these authors has not
20 remained isolated, because, since then, parent–child interactions have
21 been considered by many scholars coming from different disciplines as
22 an important object of investigation for the study of argumentative prac-
23 tices. What is the reason for such an interest? Why do parent–child argu-
24 mentative interactions matter? Is it because the family environment, like
25 the school environment, is for children one of the first spaces for learn-
26 ing argumentative skills, or, instead, there is, also, a different reason? To
27 answer this question, in this volume, we will try to understand the func-
28 tion of these types of interactions. Understanding the function of par-
29 ent–child argumentation will help to clarify the reasons why it matters.

30 An important decision at the base of this volume is what kind of
31 interactions between parents and children to analyze. The choice to
32 consider as the object of research of the present study the conversa-
33 tions between parents and children during mealtime is indeed not
34 casual. This choice is based on the fact that the activity of mealtime
35 represents a privileged moment for studying the argumentative inter-
36 actions between parents and children because it is one of the few
37 moments during the day in which all family members come together
38 and engage in verbal interactions. Mealtime is a “densely packed event”
39 in which much has to happen in approximately twenty minutes (Fiese,
40 Foley, & Spagnola, 2006, p. 77). At mealtime, parents and children
41 talk about several issues, from daily events to the school and extra-
42 curricular activities of children, and possible plans for future activities
43 involving one or more family members. During these discussions, dif-
44 ferences of opinion among family members can quickly emerge (Bova
45 & Arcidiacono, 2015). The correct management of the differences of
46 opinions is of fundamental importance, since, at times, they can even
47 degenerate into a full-blown interpersonal conflict (Arcidiacono &
48 Pontecorvo, 2009). The parents could easily avoid engaging in a dis-
49 cussion by advancing arguments in support of their standpoint, and
50 yet resolve the difference of opinion in their favor, forcing children to
51 accept, perhaps unwillingly, their standpoint. The difference in age,
52 role, and skills with their children would allow them to do so. Now,
53 it is evident that this happens frequently. However, equally frequently



54 during mealtime, we can observe argumentative discussions, in which
55 parents and children put forward arguments to convince the other
56 party that their standpoint is more valid, and, accordingly, deserves to
57 be accepted. By reading this volume, the readers will find out why this
58 happens.

59 1.2 Distinctive Features of Parent–Child 60 Mealtime Conversations

61 Mealtime is the term used to describe all meals consumed during the
62 day. In many cultures, meals include breakfast, lunch, and an evening
63 meal referred to colloquially as dinner or tea. Research about mealtime
64 practices, however, is usually concerned with lunchtime and dinner-
65 time. Family mealtime represents more than a particular time of day at
66 which to eat. Rather, it is a social activity type that is organized and
67 produced by the family members in a locally situated way using the
68 resources of talk and interaction (Mondada, 2009). Mealtime in fam-
69 ilies with young children is no less embedded in sociocultural rou-
70 tines and norms than other social events, yet it also has its distinctive
71 features. As shown by Irvine (1979), on a continuum of formality, it
72 occupies an interim position between mundane, day-to-day informal
73 encounters and formal public events, and it has certain organizational
74 principles that are accepted and shared in many different cultures.

75 A shared convention is that family mealtime is a colocated activity,
76 i.e., family members may overhear the talk of other family members
77 (Ochs, Smith, & Taylor, 1989). Colocation also means that once a dis-
78 cussion is initiated, it may lapse and then be reinitiated, and so fam-
79 ily members are in a continuing state of incipient talk (Schegloff &
80 Sacks, 1973, p. 325). However, simultaneous speech in family mealtime
81 conversations is not considered, in most cases, as a turn-taking prob-
82 lem or as a violation in need of repair. For example, it is possible to
83 observe conversations between two family members, between all fam-
84 ily members, or even two conversations occurring at the same time.
85 Therefore, not all mealtime conversations are necessarily multiparty,



4 A. Bova

86 but the potential for multiparty talk is always a possibility at mealtime.
87 The following dialogue is a good illustration of how two different con-
88 versations, the first, from line 1 to line 7, between the father and her
89 7-year-old son, Samuele, and the second, from line 3 to line 6, between
90 the mother and his 5-year-old daughter, Adriana, can both occur at the
91 same time:

92 Excerpt 1.1

93 Italian family III. Dinner 1. Family members: father (DAD, 37 years),
94 mother (MOM, 37 years), Samuele (SAM, 7 years and 11 months), and
95 Adriana (ADR, 5 years and 4 months). All family members are eating,
96 seated at the meal table. DAD sits at the head of the meal table, MOM
97 and SAM sit on the right-hand side of DAD, while ADR sits on their
98 opposite side.

- %sit: Samuele sta bevendo la Coca-Cola
Samuele is drinking Coca-Cola
1. *DAD: non più Coca-Cola, Samuele
no more Coca-Cola, Samuele
- *DAD: adesso: ti do un po' di riso
now I will give you some rice
2. *SAM: non voglio nient'altro!
I do not want anything else
3. *MOM: hai sonno Adriana?
are you sleepy, Adriana?
4. *ADR: solo un pochettino.
just a little bit
5. *SAM: no:: sono pieno:
no:: I am full:
- %act: SAM guarda verso DAD
SAM looks towards DAD
6. *MOM: allora vai a letto ((Adriana))
go to sleep then ((Adriana))
7. *DAD: ti ho detto, basta Coca-Cola ((Samuele))
I told you, stop drinking Coca-Cola ((Samuele))
- %act: DAD guarda verso SAM
DAD looks towards SAM

100 Talking while eating between parents and children is not acceptable
101 everywhere. When it is, it is usually regulated by norms of what is appro-
102 priate to say, at which moment and to whom. In certain cultures, verbal



103 activities are reduced to a necessary minimum. However, in most urban
104 well-educated Western populations, mealtime talk between parents and
105 children is not only permitted but also called for and expected. For exam-
106 ple, the next extract shows how, in a Swiss family, a mother, in line 6, invites
107 her 5-year-old son, Filippo, who was talking with his 3-year-old brother,
108 Carlo, to share with the rest of the family his opinion on “doing sports”:

109 **Excerpt 1.2**

110 Swiss family III. Dinner 3. Family members: father (DAD, 39 years),
111 mother (MOM, 34 years), Manuela (MAN, 7 years and 4 months),
112 Filippo (FIL, 5 years and 1 month), and Carlo (CAR, 3 years and
113 1 month). All family members are eating, seated at the meal table. DAD
114 sits at the head of the meal table. MOM and MAN sit on the left-hand
115 side of DAD, while FIL sits on their opposite side.

- %sit: FIL sta parlando con un tono di voce basso a CAR
FIL is talking in a low tone of voice to CAR
1. *FIL: è importante!
it is important!
2. *CAR: cosa?
what?
3. *FIL: fare attività sportiva
doing sports
- *FIL: ti fa diventare più forte!
it makes you stronger!
- %act: MOM e DAD si guardano e sorridono
MOM and DAD look at each other and smile
4. *MOM: cosa hai detto ((Filippo))?
what did you say ((Filippo))?
5. *FIL: cosa?
what?
6. *MOM: perché è importante fare sport?
why is it important to do sports?
- *MOM: noi tutti vogliamo sentire perché
we all want to hear why
7. *FIL: perché ti fa diventare più forte! [!: FIL fa il gesto di mostrare i
muscoli del
braccio
*because it makes you stronger! [!: FIL makes a gesture to show
his arm muscle]*
- %act: tutti ridono
everyone laughs



6 A. Bova

117 Regarding the topics discussed during mealtime, the choice of
118 the topics discussed by parents and children is strictly affected by the
119 specific context of mealtime (Aukrust, 2002; Billig, 1997; Bova &
120 Arcidiacono, 2018). For example, parents and children do not sit at
121 the meal table to talk about the theory of the relativity; instead, they
122 talk mostly about food and good table manners. In addition to teach-
123 ing children how to eat together with others (Bova, Arcidiacono, &
124 Clément, 2017; Wiggins, 2004, 2013), the family also transmits and
125 transforms all kinds of other eating practices, such as how to comply,
126 or not, with requests to finish (Laurier & Wiggins, 2011). However,
127 during mealtime, parents and children not only talk about daily events
128 and food-related topics. As observed by Blum-Kulka (1997, p. 9), the
129 conversations between parents and children during mealtime are unpre-
130 dictable as they are characterized by substantial, but not total, freedom
131 about the issue that can be tackled. For example, children learn about
132 their parents' jobs and more in general about work, as they listen to and
133 interact with their parents (Paugh, 2005).

134 During mealtime conversations, preferences for certain types of com-
135 ments may be culture-specific. For example, Swedish parents are more
136 concerned in providing behavioral rules for their children than Estonian
137 and Finnish parents (De Geer, 2004; De Geer et al., 2002; Tulviste,
138 Mizera, De Geer, & Tryggvason, 2002). Israelis parents are primar-
139 ily concerned in providing rules for their children on correct language
140 use, i.e., meta-linguistic comments, whereas Jewish Americans parents
141 pay more attention to discourse management, i.e., turn-taking (Blum-
142 Kulka, 1993). Not all topics, though, are open for discussion between
143 parents and children at mealtime. For instance, money, politics, and sex
144 are usually viewed as less suitable themes for mealtime conversations,
145 above all in the presence of young children (Blum-Kulka, 1994; Ochs,
146 2006). These unmentionables comply with a covert formal rule for
147 topic selection that is shared by all members within the family, although
148 the interpretations attached to these avoidance practices may vary
149 according to culture and families.

150 An important aspect that must be considered in the study of par-
151 ent–child conversations at mealtime is the asymmetrical distribution of
152 rights between them. The parents, in fact, exhibit particular rights in



153 this kind of interactions, which usually would not be accorded in adult–
154 adult interactions (Erickson, 1988; Hepburn & Potter, 2011). In other
155 words, parents typically ascribe more rights to themselves than their
156 children, who typically may have restricted conversational rights (Speier,
157 1976, p. 101). For instance, parents can enforce silence when children
158 play together, whereas such as intervention in adult activity by children
159 would be considered impolite. Or, if a child interrupts a discussion
160 between adults, the adult may invoke their right to demand politeness.
161 An example of this dynamics is illustrated in the following dialogue
162 between a father and her 8-year-old son, Marco:

163 Excerpt 1.3

164 Italian family V. Dinner 2. Family members: father (DAD, 42 years),
165 mother (MOM, 40 years), Marco (MAR, 8 years and 6 months), and
166 Leonardo (LEO, 5 years and 7 months). All family members are seated
167 at the meal table. DAD sits at the head of the meal table, MOM and
168 LEO sit on the right-hand side of DAD, while MAR is seated on their
169 opposite side.

1. *DAD: Marco, questa sera non hai proprio fame
this evening you are not hungry at all, Marco
→ *DAD: non hai mangiato quasi niente!
you have hardly eaten anything!
2. *MAR: ma non dire sciocchezze, non è vero!
but do not talk nonsense, it is not true!
3. *DAD: Marco, innanzitutto rispondi in modo educato, e adesso finisci
di mangiare!
Marco, first of all, answer politely and now finish eating!

171 In this sequence, the father, in line 1, saying to his son, Marco,
172 that, according to him, that evening he was not hungry at all because,
173 until that moment, he had hardly eaten anything. The child, in line 2,
174 replies to his father accusing him of saying nonsense, since, for him,
175 it was not true that he had not eaten anything. In line 3, the father
176 says to his child that his reply was impolite (“Marco, first of all, answer
177 politely”), and orders to him to finish eating the food (“and now fin-
178 ish eating!”). Some scholars (e.g., Grusec & Goodnow, 1994; Maccoby



8 A. Bova

179 & Martin, 1983; Pomerantz, Grolnick, & Price, 2005) pointed out
180 that this type of parents' behavior might be interpreted as serving the
181 need of parents to present themselves as the source of authority and
182 power in front of their children. However, during mealtime, parents
183 frequently have a high level of conversational involvement in the many
184 facets of children's lives and, on most occasions, even the youngest
185 children are granted participatory rights as ratified conversational part-
186 ners. In particular, the use of a wide range of supportive strategies by
187 parents encourages children to initiate topics of personal relevance to
188 them (Beals, 1997; Snow & Beals, 2006; Weizman & Snow, 2001).
189 For example, Nevat-Gal (2002) showed that the participation of
190 young children to family discussions is favored by the use of humor-
191 ous phrases by parents. Commenting ironically on the attitudes or
192 habits of children is also a supportive strategy adopted by parents dur-
193 ing mealtime conversations to encourage their children to initiate top-
194 ics of personal relevance to them (Brumark, 2006; Rundquist, 1992).
195 Moreover, a series of studies have shown that conversations with their
196 parents during mealtime represent an opportunity for children to
197 practice both explanatory and narrative talk (Aukrust & Snow, 1998;
198 Beals, 1993; Beals & Snow, 1994; Bova & Arcidiacono, 2013), to
199 extend their vocabulary (Beals & Tabors, 1995; Pan, Rowe, Singer, &
200 Snow, 2005), and to gain practice in the full diversity of roles available
201 (Georgakopoulou, 2002). In this regard, it is particularly illuminating
202 to look at the following dialogue, where the mother, in line 7, asks her
203 5-year-old daughter, Adriana, to help her to finish the narration of a
204 daily event:

205 **Excerpt 1.4**

206 Italian family III. Dinner 2. Family members: father (DAD, 37 years),
207 mother (MOM, 37 years), Samuele (SAM, 7 years and 11 months), and
208 Adriana (ADR, 5 years and 4 months). All family members are eating,
209 seated at the meal table. DAD sits at the head of the meal table, MOM
210 and SAM sit on the right-hand side of DAD, while ADR sits on their
211 opposite side.



1. *MOM: oggi io, la nonna e Adriana, abbiamo fatto una passeggiata in montagna!
today, Grandma, Adriana and I took a walk in the mountains!
2. *ADR: si si
yes
3. *MOM: era una bellissima giornata, c'era un bel sole
it was a beautiful day, and there was a nice sunshine
4. *DAD: quanto avete camminato?
how long did you walk?
5. *MOM: più di due ore!
more than two hours!
- *MOM: a un certo punto: abbiamo perso la nonna
at some point we lost Grandma
- *MOM: e ci siamo fermati ad aspettarla.
and we stopped waiting for her
- *MOM: poi, è arrivata dopo dieci minuti
then, after ten minutes she came
- *MOM: e indovina cosa ci ha detto? ((rivolgendosi a DAD))
and try to guess what she said? ((talking to DAD))
6. *DAD: cosa?
what?
7. *MOM: Adriana, cosa ha detto la nonna? continua tu!
Adriana, what did Grandma say? finish telling the story!
8. *ADR: ha detto:: che si era fermata a raccogliere dei fiori!
she said that she stopped to pick some flowers!
9. *DAD: ah ah [! ridendo]
ah ah [! laughing]
- %act: anche MOM e ADR ridono
MOM and ADR laugh too

212

213 In this sequence, the mother, in line 1 and line 3, is sharing with
214 the other family members what she, her daughter, Adriana, and the
215 Grandmother did together that day: they took a nice walk in the moun-
216 tains and that it was a beautiful day. The father, in line 4, asks a ques-
217 tion to his wife concerning this daily event, and the mother answers to
218 him. What is interesting is that the mother, in line 7, asks her daughter,
219 Adriana, to help her to finish the narration of this daily event: “Adriana,
220 what did Grandma say? finish telling the story!” In this case, the child
221 accepts the mother’s request and, in line 8, she shares with the rest of
222 the family the narration of the daily event: “she said that she stopped to
223 pick some flowers!”

224
225

1.3 Can Children Engage in Argumentative Discussions with Their Parents?

226 Several studies have highlighted how children first learn to argue with oth-
227 ers through interactions with their parents (Dunn & Munn, 1987; Hay &
228 Ross, 1982; Stein & Albro, 2001) and other siblings (Ross, Ross, Stein, &
229 Trabasso, 2006; Shantz, 1987; Slomkowski & Dunn, 1992). Later, when
230 children enter school, they are offered many opportunities to engage in
231 argumentative discussions and learn how to resolve disputes with their
232 peers (Howe & McWilliam, 2001; Mercer & Sams, 2006; Orsolini,
233 1993). However, at what age children start to show signs of the ability to
234 construct arguments and engage in argumentative discussions with the
235 aim to convince their parents to change their opinion? Studies addressing
236 this issue and the answers provided are seemingly contradictory.

237 Many scholars agree with the claim that the capacity to under-
238 stand and produce arguments emerges early in development. Dunn
239 and her colleagues (Dunn & Munn, 1987; Tesla & Dunn, 1992)
240 showed that in mother–child exchanges on differences of opinion over
241 the “right” to perform specific actions, by age 4 children justify their
242 position by arguing about the consequences of their actions. By age
243 5, children learn how to engage in opposition with their parents and
244 become active participants in family conflicts. Pontecorvo and Fasulo
245 (1997) observed that in story-telling with their parents, children aged
246 between 4 and 5 years make use of sophisticated argumentative skills
247 by calling into question the rules imposed by their parents. Hester and
248 Hester (2010) showed that children aged 7 years could use both con-
249 text-bound and cultural resources to produce their arguments. Brumark
250 (2008) has observed that children aged 12–14 years use arguments that
251 require more than one exchange to be resolved, whereas children aged
252 7–10 years use shorter arguments that are about the immediate context.

253 Compared with the studies mentioned above, according to Stein and
254 her colleagues the age at which children acquire argumentative skills
255 comes even earlier. In Stein’s view, children are already familiar with
256 conflict interactions by age 2. They become able to understand fam-
257 ily disagreements by age 4. In domains that are familiar to them, they



258 demonstrate some of the argumentative competences of older children
259 and even of adults by age 5. For example, Stein and Trabasso (1982) pos-
260 ited that children could construct elaborate moral justifications by age 5
261 when the issue is well-known and appealing to them. The purpose of Stein
262 and colleagues' work is to demonstrate that the development of argumen-
263 tation skills has an interpersonal root and that children first learn to master
264 their skills with their parents, siblings, and peers (Stein, Bernas, Calicchia,
265 & Wright, 1995; Stein & Miller, 1990, 1993). Overall, the results of their
266 studies suggest that children have a sophisticated knowledge of argument
267 in social situations that are to them personally significant.

268 The claim that the capacity to understand and produce arguments
269 emerges early in development seems to be contradicted by the work by
270 Kuhn and her colleagues, who documented the poor performance of
271 children in argumentative tasks (Felton & Kuhn, 2001; Kuhn, 1991,
272 1992; Kuhn & Udell, 2003). According to Kuhn and her colleagues,
273 epistemological understanding underlies and shapes argumentation. In
274 other words, to properly comprehend argumentative processes, it is nec-
275 essary to examine children's understanding of their knowledge. Although
276 epistemological understanding progresses developmentally, Kuhn and
277 her colleagues observed that in justifying a claim, young children have
278 difficulty in differentiating explanation and evidence in an argument.
279 These findings lead Kuhn to affirm that young children do not have suf-
280 ficient skills to engage in argumentative discussions with their parents.

281 The differences between the results of the studies of Stein and those
282 of Kuhn, which appear to be mutually contradictory, can be explained
283 for if we look at the different methodology applied in their studies. The
284 reason for these differences is well-formulated by Schwarz and Asterhan
285 (2010, pp. 150–151):

AQ1

286 In the two kinds of studies, the methodological tools were of a very differ-
287 ent nature. For Kuhn, these were structured interviews or questionnaires,
288 administered at different ages [...] In contrast, Stein and her colleagues
289 directly observed children in natural settings while settling disputes or
290 negotiating a decision. The ability to challenge or to counterchallenge
291 was observed in situ [...] It is then clear from a theoretical point of view
292 that the development of argumentation skills and their manifestation in a
293 given situation is highly sensitive to context.



294 Schwarz and Asterhan emphasize the importance of evaluating the
295 argumentative skills of young children in the real contexts in which
296 they engage in argumentative discussions. Despite some differences in
297 methodology and interpretation, the studies on the argumentative skills
298 of young children have the merit to show that preschool children can
299 understand and generate an argument, and to construct justifications
300 in defense of a standpoint. Moreover, these studies bring to light the
301 important function represented by parent–child conversations, which
302 are a sort of laboratory where children learn and improve the argumen-
303 tative skills they can use in many different contexts.

304 1.4 Research Questions and Structure 305 of the Volume

306 The main research question that will guide this volume can be formu-
307 lated as follows: What is the function of parent–child argumentation?
308 To answer this broad question, three research questions have been
309 devised with the aim to examine in detail all the relevant features of
310 the argumentative discussions between parents and children. In a first
311 phase, the focus will be directed to investigate the initial phase of the
312 argumentative discussions between parents and children during meal-
313 time, with the aim to identify the types of issues that lead them to
314 engage in an argumentative discussion: “On what types of issues do par-
315 ents and children engage in argumentative discussions?” (*Question 1*).
316 Subsequently, the focus will be directed to investigate how parents and
317 children contribute to the development of their argumentative discus-
318 sions. The purpose of this phase of the analysis is to identify the types of
319 arguments adopted most often by parents and children to convince the
320 other party to accept their opinions: “What are the types of arguments
321 adopted most often by parents and children to convince the other party
322 to accept their opinions?” (*Question 2*). Finally, in the last phase of anal-
323 ysis, the goal will be to single out the most frequent types of conclusions
324 of the argumentative discussions between parents and children during
325 mealtime: “How do parents and children conclude their argumentative



326 discussions during mealtime after they started and engaged in them?”
327 (*Question 3*). The results of this investigation should provide us with a
328 detailed reconstruction of the function played by argumentative interac-
329 tions between parents and children during mealtimes.

330 To clarify how the research questions will be answered, the struc-
331 ture of this volume is as follows. Chapter 2 provides a detailed exposé
332 of the research methodology on which the investigation of the argu-
333 mentative discussions between parents and children during mealtime
334 is based. In the first part of the chapter, the conceptual tools adopted
335 for the analysis of parent–child argumentation, i.e., the pragma-dialec-
336 tical ideal model of a critical discussion and the Argumentum Model
337 of Topics, are presented. Subsequently, the process of data gathering,
338 the procedures for the transcription of oral data, and the main practi-
339 cal problems and ethical issues and practical problems in collecting par-
340 ent–child mealtime conversations are discussed. Finally, in the last part
341 of the chapter, ethical issues and practical problems in analyzing family
342 mealtime conversations present throughout the study are considered.
343 Chapter 3 is devoted to the investigation of the initial phase of parent–
344 child argumentative discussions during mealtime (*Question 1*). In this
345 chapter, the types of issues leading parents and children to engage in
346 argumentative discussions during mealtimes as well as the specific con-
347 tributions that parents and children provide to the inception of argu-
348 mentation will be analyzed and discussed. To discuss the results, some
349 exemplary argumentative discussions between parents and children will
350 be presented and discussed. Chapter 4 is devoted to the investigation
351 of the most frequent arguments used by parents and children as well
352 as the different types of conclusions of their argumentative discussions
353 (*Questions 2 and 3*). As for the previous chapter, to discuss the results,
354 some exemplary argumentative discussions between parents and chil-
355 dren will be presented and discussed. In Chapter 5, I will first provide
356 an overview of the main findings of the analysis presented in the pre-
357 vious chapters. Subsequently, I will answer the research question which
358 motivated this study: What is the function of parent–child argumen-
359 tation? Finally, I will indicate new open questions that should guide
360 future investigation on parent–child argumentation.



References

361

362 Arcidiacono, F., & Pontecorvo, C. (2009). Verbal conflict as a cultural practice
363 in Italian family interactions between parents and preadolescents. *European*
364 *Journal of Psychology of Education*, 24(1), 97–117.

365 Aukrust, V. G. (2002). “What did you do in school today?” Speech genres and
366 tellability in multiparty family mealtime conversations in two cultures. In S.
367 Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 55–84). Mahwah,
368 NJ: Erlbaum.

369 Aukrust, V. G., & Snow, C. E. (1998). Narratives and explanations during
370 mealtime conversations in Norway and the U.S. *Language in Society*, 27(2),
371 221–246.

372 Beals, D. E. (1993). Explanations in low-income families’ mealtime conversa-
373 tions. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 14(4), 489–513.

374 Beals, D. E. (1997). Sources of support for learning words in conversation:
375 Evidence from mealtimes. *Journal of Child Language*, 24(3), 673–694.

376 Beals, D. E., & Snow, C. E. (1994). “Thunder is when the angels are upstairs
377 bowling”: Narratives and explanations at the dinner table. *Journal of*
378 *Narrative Life History*, 4(4), 331–352.

379 Beals, D. E., & Tabors, P. O. (1995). Arboretum, bureaucratic, and carbohy-
380 drates: Preschoolers’ exposure to rare vocabulary at home. *First Language*,
381 15(1), 57–76.

382 Billig, M. (1997). Rhetorical and discursive analysis: How families talk about
383 the royal family. In N. Hayes (Ed.), *Doing qualitative analysis in psychology*
384 (pp. 39–54). London: Psychology Press.

385 Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). “You gotta know how to tell a story”: Telling, tales,
386 and tellers in American and Israeli narrative events at dinner. *Language*,
387 22(3), 361–402.

388 Blum-Kulka, S. (1994). The dynamics of family dinner talk: Cultural contexts
389 for children’s passages to adult discourse. *Research on Language and Social*
390 *Interaction*, 27(1), 1–50.

391 Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and sociali-*
392 *zation in family discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

393 Bova, A., & Arcidiacono, F. (2013). Investigating children’s Why-questions: A
394 study comparing argumentative and explanatory function. *Discourse Studies*,
395 15(6), 713–734.

396 Bova, A., & Arcidiacono, F. (2015). Beyond conflicts: Origin and types of
397 issues leading to argumentative discussions during family mealtimes. *Journal*
398 *of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 3(2), 263–288.



1 Introduction 15

- 399 Bova, A., & Arcidiacono, F. (2018). Interplay between parental argumentative
400 strategies, children's reactions, and topics of disagreement during mealtime
401 conversations. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 19, 124–133.
- 402 Bova, A., Arcidiacono, F., & Clément, F. (2017). The transmission of what is
403 taken for granted in children's socialization: The role of argumentation in
404 family interactions. In C. Ilie & G. Garzone (Eds.), *Argumentation across*
405 *communities of practice: Multi-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 259–288).
406 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 407 Brumark, Å. (2006). Non-observance of Gricean maxims in family dinner-ta-
408 ble conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(8), 1206–1238.
- 409 Brumark, Å. (2008). “Eat your Hamburger!”—“No, I don't Want to!”
410 Argumentation and argumentative development in the context of dinner
411 conversation in twenty Swedish families. *Argumentation*, 22(2), 251–271.
- 412 De Geer, B. (2004). “Don't say it's disgusting!” Comments on socio-moral
413 behavior in Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(9), 1705–1725.
- 414 De Geer, B., Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., & Tryggvason, M. T. (2002).
415 Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime
416 in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12),
417 1757–1786.
- 418 Dunn, J. (1988). *The beginning of social understanding*. Oxford: Blackwell **AQ2**
419 Publishers.
- 420 Dunn, J., & Munn, P. (1987). Developmental of justification in disputes with
421 mother and sibling. *Developmental Psychology*, 23(6), 791–798.
- 422 Erickson, F. (1988). Discourse coherence, participation structure and personal
423 display in a family dinner table conversation. *Working Papers in Educational*
424 *Linguistics*, 4(1), 1–26.
- 425 Felton, M., & Kuhn, D. (2001). The development of argumentative discourse
426 skills. *Discourse Processes*, 32(2–3), 135–153.
- 427 Fiese, B. H., Foley, K. P., & Spagnola, M. (2006). Routine and ritual elements
428 in family mealtimes: Contexts for child well-being and family identity. *New*
429 *Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 111, 67–89.
- 430 Georgakopoulou, A. (2002). Greek children and familiar narratives in fami-
431 lily contexts: En route to cultural performance. In S. Blum-Kulka & C.
432 E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 33–55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence
433 Erlbaum Associates.
- 434 Grusec, J. E., & Goodnow, J. J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline meth-
435 ods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current
436 points of view. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(1), 4–19.
- 437 Hay, D. F., & Ross, H. S. (1982). The social nature of early conflict. *Child*
438 *Development*, 53(1), 105–113.



16 A. Bova

- 439 Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2011). Threats: Power, family mealtimes, and social
440 influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(1), 99–120.
- 441 Hester, S., & Hester, S. (2010). Conversational actions and category relations:
442 An analysis of a children's argument. *Discourse Studies*, 12(1), 33–48.
- 443 Howe, C. J., & McWilliam, D. (2001). Peer argument in educational set-
444 tings: Variations due to socio-economic status, gender and activity context.
445 *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 20(1–2), 61–80.
- 446 Irvine, J. T. (1979). Formality and informality in communicative events.
447 *American Anthropologist*, 81(4), 773–790.
- 448 Kuhn, D. (1991). *The skills of argument*. New York, NY: Cambridge University
449 Press.
- 450 Kuhn, D. (1992). Thinking as argument. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(22),
451 155–178.
- 452 Kuhn, D., & Udell, W. (2003). The development of argument skills. *Child
453 Development*, 74(5), 1245–1260.
- 454 Laurier, E., & Wiggins, S. (2011). Finishing the family meal. The interactional
455 organisation of satiety. *Appetite*, 56(1), 53–64.
- 456 Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the
457 family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child
458 psychology. Vol. 4: Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp.
459 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- 460 Mercer, N., & Sams, C. (2006). Teaching children how to use language to
461 solve maths problems. *Language and Education*, 20(6), 507–528.
- 462 Mondada, L. (2009). The methodical organization of talking and eating:
463 Assessments in dinner conversations. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(8),
464 558–571.
- 465 Muller Mirza, N., Perret-Clermont, A.-N., Tartas V., & Iannaccone, A.
466 (2009). Psychosocial processes in argumentation. In N. Muller Mirza &
467 A.-N. Perret-Clermont (Eds.), *Argumentation and Education* (pp. 67–90).
468 New York, NY: Springer.
- 469 Nevat-Gal, R. (2002). Cognitive expressions and humorous phrases in family
470 discourse as reflectors and cultivators of cognition. In S. Blum-Kulka & C.
471 E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 181–208). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence
472 Erlbaum Associates.
- 473 Ochs, E. (2006). The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. *New
474 Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 111, 35–49.
- 475 Ochs, E., Smith, R., & Taylor, C. (1989). Detective stories at dinnertime:
476 Problem-solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics*, 2(2), 238–257.



- 477 Orsolini, M. (1993). Dwarfs do not shoot: An analysis of children's justifica-
478 tions. *Cognition and Instruction*, 11(3–4), 281–297.
- 479 Pan, B. A., Rowe, M. L., Singer, J. D., & Snow, C. E. (2005). Maternal cor-
480 relates of growth in toddler vocabulary production in low-income families.
481 *Child Development*, 76(4), 763–782.
- 482 Paugh, A. L. (2005). Learning about work at dinnertime: language socializa-
483 tion in dual-earner American families. *Discourse & Society*, 16(1), 55–78.
- 484 Pomerantz, E. M., Grolnick, W. S., & Price, C. E. (2005). The role of par-
485 ents in how children approach achievement. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck
486 (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 229–278). New York:
487 Guilford Press.
- 488 Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1997). Learning to argue in family shared
489 discourse: The reconstruction of past events. In L. Resnick, R. Saljo, C.
490 Pontecorvo, & B. Burge (Eds.), *Discourse, tools and reasoning: Essays on situ-
491 ated cognition* (pp. 406–442). New York, NY: Springer.
- 492 Ross, H., Ross, M., Stein, N., & Trabasso, T. (2006). How siblings resolve
493 their conflicts: The importance of first offers, planning, and limited opposi-
494 tion. *Child Development*, 77(6), 1730–1745.
- 495 Rundquist, S. (1992). Indirectness: A gender study of flouting Grice's maxims.
496 *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(5), 431–449.
- 497 Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4),
498 289–327.
- 499 Schwarz, B. B., & Asterhan, C. S. C. (2010). Argumentation and reasoning.
500 In K. Littleton, C. Wood, & J. Kleine Staarman (Eds.), *International hand-
501 book of psychology in education* (pp. 137–176). Dordrecht: Elsevier Press.
- 502 Shantz, C. U. (1987). Conflicts between children. *Child Development*, 58(2),
503 283–305.
- 504 Slomkowski, C. L., & Dunn, J. (1992). Arguments and relationships within
505 the family: Differences in young children's disputes with mother and sib-
506 ling. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(5), 919–924.
- 507 Snow, C. E., & Beals, D. E. (2006). Mealtime talk that supports literacy
508 development. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 111,
509 51–67.
- 510 Speier, M. (1976). The child as conversationalist: Some culture contact fea-
511 tures of conversational interactions between adults and children. In M.
512 Hammersley & P. Woods (Eds.), *The process of schooling: A sociological reader*
513 (pp. 98–103). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.



18 A. Bova

- 514 Stein, N. L., & Albro, E. R. (2001). The origins and nature of arguments:
515 Studies in conflict understanding, emotion and negotiation. *Discourse*
516 *Processes*, 32(2–3), 113–133.
- 517 Stein, N. L., Bernas, R. S., Calicchia, D. J., & Wright, A. (1995).
518 Understanding and resolving arguments: The dynamics of negotiation. In
519 B. Britton & A. G. Graesser (Eds.), *Models of understanding* (pp. 257–287).
520 Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 521 Stein, N. L., & Miller, C. A. (1990). I win—You lose: The development of
522 argumentative thinking. In J. F. Voss, D. N. Perkins, & J. Segal (Eds.),
523 *Informal reasoning and education* (pp. 265–290). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence
524 Erlbaum Associates.
- 525 Stein, N. L., & Miller, C. A. (1993). A theory of argumentative understand-
526 ing: Relationships among position preference, judgments of goodness,
527 memory and reasoning. *Argumentation*, 7(2), 183–204.
- 528 Stein, N. L., & Trabasso, T. (1982). Children’s understanding of stories: A
529 basis for moral judgment and dilemma resolution. In C. Brainerd & M.
530 Pressley (Eds.), *Verbal processes in children: Progress in cognitive development*
531 *research* (pp. 161–188). New York, NY: Springer.
- 532 Tesla, C., & Dunn, J. (1992). Getting along or getting your own way: The
533 development of young children’s use of argument in conflicts with mother
534 and sibling. *Social Development*, 1(2), 107–121.
- 535 Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., De Geer, B., & Tryggvason, M. T. (2002). Regulatory
536 comments as tools of family socialization: A comparison of Estonian,
537 Swedish and Finnish mealtime interaction. *Language in Society*, 31(5),
538 655–678.
- 539 Weizman, Z., & Snow, C. E. (2001). Lexical input as related to children’s
540 vocabulary acquisition: Effects of sophisticated exposure and support for
541 meaning. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(2), 265–279.
- 542 Wiggins, S. (2004). Good for “you”: Generic and individual healthy eating
543 advice in family mealtimes. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 9(4), 535–548.
- 544 Wiggins, S. (2013). The social life of ‘eugh’: Disgust as assessment in family
545 mealtimes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(3), 489–509.

Author Query Form

Book ID: **477538_1_En**

Chapter No: **1**

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections.

Dear Author,

During the process of typesetting your chapter, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ1	The citation 'Schwarz and Asterhan (2009)' has been changed to 'Schwarz and Asterhan (2010)' to match the year in the reference list. Please check and correct if necessary.	
AQ2	Reference 'Dunn (1988)' is given in the list but not cited in the text. Please cite in text or delete from the list.	