Topic and Activity Control in Father-child Interaction During Shared Picture Book Reading*

Moeko OZAKI

1. Introduction

1.1 Focus of Previous Studies

Shared picture book reading is a central concern in pedagogy and a substantial amount of research has been conducted in this field, mainly in the context of emergent literacy (Duursma, Augustyn, & Zuckerman, 2008; Aram & Aviram, 2009; Bojczyk, Davis, & Rana, 2016). However, it is only recently that picture book reading, or more generally, child discourse analysis has become of particular interest in linguistics. Until the 1970s, research on child discourse focused mainly on children's linguistic competence from a psycholinguistic perspective. However, in the mid-1980s, conversation analysists broadened the area of study from a narrow focus on children's linguistic competence to a broader perspective covering children's social and communicative skills (Cook-Gumperz & Kyratzis, 2001). The notion that children are not merely the outcome of the parents' upbringing but can be highly communicative led to the understanding that children and their parents are in a mutual apprentices relationship (Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2012). It is in this context that shared picture book reading has earned the interest of linguists. Although picture book reading seems to be a unilateral action of the parent reading to the child, in fact, both the child and the parents' extratextual utterances largely affect the content and flow of the reading session (Thoreson, Dahlin, & Powell, 2001).

One of the pioneering studies conducted on shared picture book reading was by Ninio and Bruner (1978). They observed the achievement of labelling in a longitudinal study of shared picture book reading sessions of one mother-infant dyad from eight to eighteen months of age. They stressed that there is a strict conversational format that the mother and child adhere to when labelling objects during shared picture book reading sessions, in which the mother utilizes only four key utterance types: (1) the attentional vocative *Look*, (2) the query Wh-questions such as *What's that?*, (3) the label *That's an X*, (4) and the feedback such as *yes*. These key utterance types fall into a strict pattern of occurrence and ordering. Following Ninio

* I am sincerely grateful to Professor Ippei Inoue (Keio University) and Professor Ryoko Suzuki (Keio University) for their insightful comments and suggestions.

and Bruner's footsteps, many related studies have been conducted, aiming to rectify the deficiencies of their pioneering study (ethnicity: Haynes & Saunders, 1998; Murase, Dale, Ogura, Yamashita, & Mahieu, 2005; social-class: Kang, Kim, & Pan, 2009; age: Duncan, Adamson, & Deckner, 2005; gender: Gleason, 1975; Thoreson et al., 2001). However, most of these studies exclusively focus on maternal utterances that occur before and after the child's labelling and lack a conversational perspective. Solely coding maternal utterances fails to capture the highly interactional nature of the picture book reading activity. Therefore, this paper focuses on the conversational aspect of shared book reading by considering how parents and children manage topic and activity control during this. More precisely, the goal of this study is to investigate to what degree parents control their children's behavior and utterances (and vice versa) during shared picture book reading.

1.2 Previous Studies on Topic Control during Shared Picture Book Reading

DeLoache and DeMendoza (1987) proposed that mothers control the interaction and "always determined what the topic of conversation would be" (p.119) during picture book reading. They collected video recordings of thirty middle-class mother-child dyads (children aged 12, 15, and 18 months), having each pair read a standard alphabet book with corresponding pictures in a laboratory setting. The mother-child pairs were asked to sit in a chair inside the laboratory room and read the picture book as if they were at home. The interaction was transcribed and divided into verbal units —"utterances that conveyed a single idea or piece of information." If a child's verbalization was intelligible by either the observer or the mother it was considered a verbal unit. The mother's verbal units were further classified into four categories: orientation, information giving, information asking, and feedback. The mother and child's non-verbal units included pointing and the child's unintelligible vocalizations that reflected participation. Although a clear definition of *control* was not provided in their study, the term was used in the sense of regulating the exchange of information.

The results of this study revealed that it was the mother that dominantly initiated new episodes, "that is, introducing a new topic of conversation by focusing on a new picture" (p.115). For all age groups, approximately 80% of the episodes were initiated by the mother, and mothers "influenced the nature of the child's contribution" (p.119) through information giving or information asking. 75% of all episodes were initiated with maternal information giving. The episodes were generally short, and there were three times more maternal turns than that of children's.

These results are intuitive in that the caretaker would more dominantly take the primary responsibility for organizing the interaction and provide scaffolding for the child's active participation. However, these findings are limited as parents may be less controlling over children older than 18 months and may execute a variety of strategies broader than the coding used in this study to initiate new episodes.

A contrastive perspective was offered by Justice and Kaderavek (2003). In their study of 11 lower to middle-class mother-child pairs with children of 45-67 months of age with language impairments, they maintained that mothers and children equally control the topic during picture book reading. The parents were audiotaped at home reading two books to their children: a traditional narrative storybook and a manipulatable storybook with flaps and slots as they would usually do at home. The data was transcribed following specific guidelines: only extra-textual utterances were transcribed and the mother's reading of the text was omitted, any utterances that could not be deciphered within 3 replays of the audio were omitted as unintelligible, and utterances unrelated to the reading interaction such as behavioral management by the mother and child distractions were omitted. The transcribed data was coded with the control of interaction codes as listed in Table 1, which was introduced by Rescola and Fechnay (1996) (as cited in Justice & Kaderavek, 2003) "as a code designed to evaluate conversational initiation and responsiveness" (p.141). The control category represents "a partner taking control of the discourse topic through the introduction of new topics and maintenance of those topics" (p.142). In contrast, the contingency category represents "a partner joining in or maintaining established discourse topics" (p.142).

Table 1: Control of Interaction (COI) Discourse Codes
(Justice & Kaderavek, 2003, p.142)

Category	Code	Description
Control	NTO	New Topic: A partner produces an utterance that introduces a new topic. The topic is considered new if it was not the focus of either partner's most recent utterance.
	OTO	Own Topic: A partner produces an utterance that maintains topic control following her own new topic (NTO) initiation or extension of established joint topic (JT).
Contingency	PTO	Partner Topic: A partner produces an utterance that is related to a preceding new topic (NTO) initiation or own topic (OTO) continuation of the other partner. This represents joining in on the topic of discourse by the new partner.

JT	Joint Topic: A partner produces an utterance on the same topic of her partner's turn (PTO). The utterance may be brief (e.g., yes, no, uh huh) or extended.
EXT	Extension of Topic: A partner produces an utterance that extends the topic of her own joint topic (JT).
REI	Reinforcement (coded for maternal utterances only): Mother produces an utterance that provides verbal reinforcement to the child (e.g., there you go, very good, right, exactly).

Analysis of the proportion of utterances revealed that NTO comprised 42% of all maternal utterances and 45% of the children's utterances. This result can be interpreted as the mother and child equally controls the topic during shared picture book reading. The control and contingency rates were also relatively balanced between mother and child, as described below in Table 2:

Table 2: Justice & Kaderavek - Control and Contingency Rate

	Mother	Child
Control	59%	49%
Contingency	39%	51%

Of the control category, 70% of the mother's utterances and 90% of the child's utterances were NTO instead of OTO. This implies that children introduce new topics instead of extending their own topics to facilitate topic control.

Putting aside that the subjects of this study were children with language impairments, it is rather striking that mothers and their children both equally control the topic considering the nature of the mother's parental responsibilities. However, the transcription guidelines adapted in this study pose critical limitations that influence these findings. Firstly, the mother can use reading the text as a strategy for control, so omitting these readings sways the result. This is a common shortcoming in many studies as they often exclude the text from their analysis. However, the text is a fundamental part of the interaction as without the actual reading of the text, extra-textual utterances would not be produced in the first place (Thoreson et al., 2001). Secondly, omitting utterances unrelated to the reading interaction can also pose alterations to the result, as child distractions can be a form of the child's topic control in that they are purposefully expressing their intention to not participate in the book reading session through

their behavior. Similarly, behavioral management by the parent should also be considered a part of the shared book reading session. Addressing these limitations is an integral part of this study, and will be further discussed in the results.

2. Method

2.1 Participants and Procedure

One middle-class American father with his two children (4 years 10 months and 3 years 4 months, both female) participated in this study. Both the father and the children were Caucasian. The father routinely reads a few chapters of the same book to his two children as a bedtime story. The father was asked to videotape himself reading to his children at home. No other instructions were given. The video was recorded on 8 May, 2019 for a duration of 19 minutes and 16 seconds. The father sat in between his two children on a bed, with the video facing the three of them. In the book reading session, the father begins by reading from chapter two to the beginning of chapter three of *Afternoon on the Amazon* (Osborne, 1995), but after the younger daughter (hereafter referred to as 'Daughter 2') gets distracted they momentarily switch to reading a French book of Daughter 2's choice. However, as the father is not fluent in French, he asks Daughter 2 to choose a different book and they settle on reading the second book of her choice, *Disney Frozen Little Look and Find* (Phoenix International Publications, 2012). After reading a few pages, the father and the older daughter (hereafter referred to as 'Daughter 1') decide to go back to reading the first book and start reading again from the beginning of chapter three to the end of chapter four. The reading session ends after the father notifies the children that they will continue reading from chapter five the next day. Daughter 2 is generally distracted during the book reading sessions of *Afternoon on the Amazon*, while Daughter 1 is keen on listening to her father read.

All utterances of all three participants were transcribed based on the GAT2 minimal transcript developed by Auer, Couper-Kulhen, Meier, and Günthner (2011). The participants' names are substituted by father, Daughter 1, or Daughter 2 when mentioned. Reading of the text is in italics.

2.2 Units for Analysis

Activity

In this paper, activity is defined as the action that the speaker is trying to accomplish. For example, if the father scolds his children while reading a certain picture book, it is considered that the father is engaged in two activities: scolding and reading a picture book. This definition

is in reference to Couper-Kuhlen and Selting's definition that activity is used to refer to '"big packages" such as storytellings, argumentations and descriptions, including what is called "genres"' (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018, p.28). In this paper, every uninterrupted reading of the book by the father was considered a continuation of the activity, as long as it was from the same book. If the book was different, even if the participants continued reading, it was considered a different activity. A participant can control an activity by directly mentioning that they want to change or maintain the activity (e.g. "Let's stop reading"), by abruptly introducing a new activity (e.g. the father abruptly scolds the children while reading), or by continuing the present activity regardless of the other participants' utterances (e.g. the father continuing to read without taking notice of his children's unrelated utterances).

Topic

Activities consist of topics. When an idea or piece of information that was not the center of any participant's most recent utterance was conveyed, it was considered a new topic. Following this definition, in this paper, every uninterrupted reading of the book by the father was considered a new topic. For example, if the father read "the girl chased the bird" from the text, followed by a child's question or elaboration concerning the text, that would be considered one topic. If the father continued reading from the book after responding to his child's utterance, it would be considered a new topic. As such, a new activity can also be a new topic, but a new topic is not necessarily always a new activity. A participant can control a topic by directly mentioning that they want to change or maintain the topic (e.g. "Let's read the next page"), by abruptly introducing a new topic (e.g. irrelevant utterances during book reading), or by continuing the present topic regardless of the other participants' utterances (e.g. not answering irrelevant questions).

Control

DeLoache and DeMendoza (1987) used the term *control* in the sense of regulating the exchange of information. On the other hand, Justice and Kaderavek (2003) adopted a slightly narrower definition as *control* being equivalent to conversational initiation. This paper follows the broader definition adopted by DeLoache and DeMendoza (1987) as topics and activities can be controlled with means other than conversational initiation, as later argued in this paper.

2.3 Coding

To evaluate the validity of Justice and Kaderavek's results, the same codes used in their study —the control of interaction codes—were employed in this study (details described in Table 1). NTO, OTO, and PTO have been simplified to NT, OT, and PT respectively hereafter. In order to differentiate activity control from topic control, the code names have been amended for activity control: NA (new activity), OA (own activity), PA (partner activity), and JA (joint activity). EXT and REI have been omitted for activity control codes as activities cannot be extended nor reinforced. Each utterance is coded for both topic and activity from the speaker's point of view. For example, if the child responds to her father's question, the child's response would be coded as both PT and PA.

3. Results

3.1 Preliminary Analysis

Preliminary analysis was conducted to determine whether the same results as Justice and Kaderavek (2003) could be achieved when following their transcribing guidelines and coding. Two variables were used in their study: the proportion of utterances and the rate of occurrence. The proportion of utterances was "derived by dividing the raw frequencies of each code by the total number of mother or child utterances" (p.142). The rate of occurrence was "calculated by dividing the raw frequencies of each code by the total length of each book-reading interaction, to represent the average number of times a particular Control code occurred per interaction minute" (p.142). The same calculation methods were adopted in this study.

As seen in Table 3, the results revealed that NT comprised 10% of paternal utterances, 3% of Daughter 1's utterances, and 13% of Daughter 2's utterances.[1] This is significantly low compared to Justice and Kaderavek's result, which was 42% of maternal utterances and 45% of the child's utterances. Despite this divergence, the balance between the father and children's proportion of NT is consistent with Justice and Kaderavek's findings and thus this suggests that parents and children may both control the topic during picture book reading.

[1] See Appendix 3.1 for the raw frequencies of father and children COI codes.

Table 3: Descriptive Findings for Father and Children COI Codes

	Proportion of utterances	Rate of occurrence
	Father	
NT	10%	0.52
OT	16%	0.84
PT	11%	0.57
JT	43%	2.19
REI	11%	0.57
EXT	7%	0.37
	Daughter 1	
NT	3%	0.05
OT	11%	0.21
PT	23%	0.42
JT	54%	0.99
EXT	0%	0.00
	Daughter 2	
NT	13%	0.42
OT	10%	0.31
PT	20%	0.63
JT	56%	1.77
EXT	0%	0.00

However, as mentioned earlier, the transcription guidelines adopted in Justice and Kaderavek's study fails to capture the dynamics of topic control during picture book reading sessions. Justice and Kaderavek excluded the reading of the text from their analysis, but reading can frequently be used as a strategy for topic control. An example is the excerpt below:

Excerpt 1:

1	(NT/OA)	FAT:	*Elsa and Anna love to throw royal parties. Can you find these ice*
2			*sculpture decorations Elsa is making?*
3	(PT/PA)	DR2:	that's the tro:ll(.)
4	(JT/JA)	FAT:	um-hm
5	(JT/JA)	DR2:	that's the ((clears throat)) [sss…]
6	(JT/JA)	FAT:	[They're all there]
7	(JT/JA)	DR2:	[ca:stle]
8	(JT/JA)	FAT:	mm-hm
9	(JT/JA)	DR2:	That's the swa:n (4.2)

10 (N/A) FAT: (Whistling)
11 (JT/JA) DR2: There's a swa:n (1.2)
12 (NT/OA) FAT: Okay let's go to the next one (1.6)
13 (NT/OA) FAT: ((sighs)) [*The winter*]
14 (OT/JA) DR2: [I see… I see a swan]
15 (NT/OA) FAT: *the winter ball is full of every* (-) *or is fun for everyone. Search the party*
16 *for Elsa and Anna plus these pairs of dancers.* (1.6)
17 (OT/JA) FAT: Wow(.) lots of people. Can you see Elsa? (1.7)

In lines 1-2, the father reads from *Disney Frozen Little Look and Find* (Phoenix International Publications, 2012), which is an activity book in which children can look for various characters and objects while reading. Daughter 2 enthusiastically looks for the various items and finds a troll, castle, and swan in lines 3-9. When Daughter 2 repeats that she found a swan in line 11, the father decides that they have already searched exhaustively, mentions that they should move onto the next page in line 12 and starts reading the next page. Line 12 is the cue for topic change, but Daughter 2 lingers on the fact that she found a swan in the previous page. To initiate topic control, the father re-reads the next page in lines 15-16, exaggerating *the winter ball* by reading slowly. In line 17 he adds on a question to ensure that the topic has moved on. This excerpt illustrates how reading the text can be a form of NT.

Another shortcoming of Justice and Kaderavek's transcription method is that they omitted utterances unrelated to the reading interaction. This leads to overlooking not only topic control but also significant changes in activity. An example is Excerpt 2:

Excerpt 2:
1 (NT/OA) FAT: *Wild sounds broke the distance. Screeeech! Buzzz! Chirp! Chirp!*
2 *Oh-oh* =
3 (EXT/OA) FAT: = What chapter is this(.) Daughter 2?
4 (PT/PA) DR2: Seven
5 (JT/JA) DR1: No
6 (JT/JA) FAT: No. You better look at it. Now Look at it(.) don't guess(.)
[Read it]
7 (JT/JA) DR2: [Three]
8 (JT/JA) DR1: Three
9 (REI/JA) FAT: Three(.) Right

10 (JT/JA) DR2: [No(.) it's five]
11 (EXT/JA) DR1: [What is it called?]
12 (JT/JA) FAT: It's called Yikes
13 (EXT/JA) DR1: I wanna read it
14 (JT/JA) FAT: Oh okay
15 (NT/NA) DR2: Daddy(.) after can we read another [book?]
16 (PT/PA) FAT: [Uh-hmm]
17 (NT/OA) FAT: *Jack* =
18 (JT/JA) FAT: = Why don't you go pick a book to read

The first topic starts from the father's book reading in lines 1-2 and goes on until line 12, where the three participants discuss the name and number of the chapter they are reading. In line 15, Daughter 2 asks her father if they can read another book, which is off-topic and irrelevant, so it would be omitted from the analysis according to Justice and Kaderavek's guidelines. However, in line 16 the father agrees to read another book, and then briefly goes on reading from the book but decides to stop and tell Daughter 2 to go and choose a book to read next. Soon after this excerpt, the father reads from the French book that Daughter 2 chose. In this excerpt, Daughter 2 initiates a new topic with her 'irrelevant' utterance, which is also the point of activity control. The moment her topic/activity control succeeds, all following utterances regarding the new book become 'relevant'. This transition point in activity and topic is an essential element to this book reading session, and thus including unrelated utterances is crucial to understanding the full particulars of interaction during picture book reading.

3.2 Analysis of Topic Control

The father and children can control the book reading session on two levels: they can control the activity by deciding whether to continue reading a picture book or do something else instead, and also control the topic by reading the same book but asking different questions or reading a different page. The parent may control the activity but allow the children to control the topic or vice versa. Therefore, research on the interactions during picture book reading requires analysis on both the activity and topic level.

On the topic level, the transcript was re-coded with all book readings and unrelated utterances included to revise Justice and Kaderavek's transcription guidelines and overcome their limitations. As described in Table 4, the results show that while 44% of the father's utterances were in the control group, over 70% of the daughters' utterances were in the

contingency group.[2] This implies that in contrast to Justice and Kaderavek's study, the parent controls the topic more than their children during book reading sessions. Of the control group, NT accounted for 70% of the father's control utterances, and 33% and 53% of the children's as seen in Table 5. This result suggests that contrary to Justice and Kaderavek's findings, the father initiates new topics while children hold on to their own topics in order to facilitate topic control.

Table 4: Father and Children Control Versus Contingency in Topic Control

	Proportion of utterances	Rate of occurrence
	Father	
Control (NT, OT)	44%	3.50
Contingency (PT, JT, EXT)	50%	3.91
	Daughter 1	
Control (NT, OT)	23%	0.47
Contingency (PT, JT, EXT)	75%	1.57
	Daughter 2	
Control (NT, OT)	20%	0.78
Contingency (PT, JT, EXT)	72%	2.82

Table 5: Father and Children NT and OT Rate in Topic Control

	Father	Daughter 1	Daughter 2
NT	70%	33%	53%
OT	30%	67%	47%

When the father controls the topic by initiating a new topic, he does so by saying 'yeah' or 'okay' before continuing to read. These freestanding particles function as devices to close a topic when placed before a topic shift (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2018). Examples are Excerpts 3 and 4:

Excerpt 3:

1 (EXT/JA) FAT: What's this Daughter 2? Are those trees?
2 (JT/JA) DR2: Yeah
3 (JT/JA) FAT: Yeah
4 (NT/OA) FAT: *"I wish we could go there." he said and the wind began to blow.*

[2] See Appendix 3.2 for the raw frequencies and descriptive findings of father and children COI codes.

Excerpt 4:

1 (JT/JA) DR2: There's the butterflies [and birds]

2 (JT/JA) FAT: [Yeah] The bird. Yeah.

3 (NT/OA) FAT: *"Yikes." said Annie. She slipped back into the tree house.*

In Excerpt 3, the father asks a question, "Are those trees?" to Daughter 2, to which she replies "yeah." The father also then says "yeah" in line 3, and continues reading the text. The father's "yeah" in this case is not a response to his daughter but instead acts as a cue before continuing to read the text. In Excerpt 4 line 2, the father's first "yeah" is a response to Daughter 2's "There's the butterflies", but the second "yeah" functions in the same way as the father's "yeah" in Excerpt 3, which bounds off the topic and makes space for topic shift. This frequently occurs throughout the book reading session, on an average of once every 3 minutes.

3.3 Analysis of Activity Control

On the activity level, the transcript was again re-coded using 4 codes, NA, OA, PA, and JA. Table 6 demonstrates that while 38 % of the father's utterances were in the control group, over 80% of the daughters' utterances were in the contingency group.[3] This can be interpreted as the father is as controlling of the activity, if not more, than the topic. Of the control group, NA accounted for 12% of the father's control utterances, and 25% of Daughter 1 and 33% of Daughter 2's utterances as indicated in Table 7. This is contrastive with the topic control analysis, as in the case of topic control 70% of the father's control utterances were NT. These results show that although the father frequently introduces new topics, he rarely changes the activity. In contrast, the children are less keen on introducing new topics than their father, but change the activity more often than him. Judging from the data, it is also possible that this trend is stronger for younger children. These results are relatively intuitive in that the father would naturally be keen on continuing and finishing the book reading smoothly while prompting his children to engage in the reading with questions, whereas the children would be more easily distracted, especially in the case of younger children.

[3] See Appendix 3.3 for the raw frequencies and descriptive findings of father and children COI codes.

Table 6: Father and Children Control Versus Contingency in Activity Control

	Proportion of utterances	Rate of occurrence
	Father	
Control (NA, OA)	38%	3.03
Contingency (PA, JA)	60%	4.75
	Daughter 1	
Control (NA, OA)	10%	0.21
Contingency (PA, JA)	88%	1.83
	Daughter 2	
Control (NA, OA)	8%	0.31
Contingency (PA, JA)	84%	3.29

Table 7: Father and Children NA and OA Rate in Activity Control

	Father	Daughter 1	Daughter 2
NA	12%	25%	33%
OA	88%	75%	67%

Fine analysis of the father and children's control utterances reveals that the father only permits the child to control the activity when it does not interfere with the major premise of continuing to read a picture book. For example, in the below excerpt the father does not allow Daughter 2 to control the activity despite her attempt:

Excerpt 5:

1	(NT/OA)	FAT:	= *Jack sighed and "Listen." he said, "We have to go there. To help*
2			*Morgan. That's why the book was left open." "I know that." Said Annie,*
3			*frowning*. (.)
4	(NT/NA)	FAT:	Daughter 2 (.) honey (.) Are you gonna read or not?
5	(PT/PA)	DR2:	Yeah
6	(JT/JA)	FAT:	You need to go to the other room and have a time off?
7	(JT/JA)	DR2:	No
8	(JT/JA)	FAT:	Ok come and sit
9	(JT/JA)	DR2:	No
10	(NT/OA)	FAT	(---) *"Plus, the rainforest are being cut down." said Jack.*

In lines 1-3, the father is reading from the picture-book to Daughter 1 and 2, but Daughter 2 is distracted. After a brief pause at the end of line 3, the father stops reading and directs the

conversation to Daughter 2, implying that she should participate in the book reading session. In lines 4-7 Daughter 2 answers that she does not need a time off and seemingly complies with participating in the reading session, but in line 9 she mentions that she does not want to come and sit with her father and Daughter 1. In line 10, after a long pause, her father lets go of his conversation with Daughter 2 and continues reading. In this excerpt, the father has shifted the topic from reading the book to urging Daughter 2 to participate but does not allow the activity to shift despite her refusal to sit together and continue reading. An opposite example is Excerpt 2, in which the father permits Daughter 2's activity control (reading a different book) as it does not interfere with the major premise.

4. Conclusion

This study sought to investigate to what degree parents are controlling over their children's behavior and utterances during shared picture book reading. Previous research focuses on the topic of conversation, especially extra-textual utterances strictly related to the book reading session. However, a more multilateral approach including the control of the activity itself is necessary to consider the natural form of shared book reading, which is interspersed with readings of the text and unrelated utterances. As such, this paper introduced two levels of analysis—the activity level and topic level. Analysis based on these two levels revealed that the father rarely changes the activity, but when he does, he is dominant in controlling it. Although the children are more proactive in changing the activity, the father only permits their activity control when it does not interfere with the major premise of continuing to read a picture book. To a slightly lesser degree, the father also controls the topic more than their children during book reading sessions. To control the topic, the father places 'yeah' or 'okay' before a topic shift to close the current topic and move on to a new one, while the children hold on to their own topics in order to facilitate topic control.

References

Aram, D., & Aviram, S. (2009). Mother's storybook reading and kindergartners' socioemotional and literacy development. *Reading Psychology, 30*, 175-194. doi:10.1080/02702710802275348

Auer, P., Couper-Kulhen, E., Meier, C., & Günthner, S. (2011). A transcription system for conversation analysis. *Gesprächsforschung*, *12*, 1-51. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279625000

Bojczyk, K.E., Davis, A.E., & Rana, V. (2016). Mother-child interaction quality in shared book reading: Relation to child vocabulary and readiness to read. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *36,* 404-414. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2016.01.006

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Kyratzis, A. (2001). Child discourse. In D.Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H.E.Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp.590-611). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2018). *Interactional linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Danis, A., Bernard, J., & Leproux, C. (2000). Shared picture-book reading: A sequential analysis of adult-child verbal interactions. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 18,* 369-388. doi:10.1348/026151000165751

DeLoache, J.S., & DeMendoza, O.A. (1987). Joint picturebook interactions of mothers and 1-year-old children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 5,* 111-123. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.1987.tb01047.x

Duursma, E., Augustyn, M., & Zuckerman, B. (2008). Reading aloud to children: The evidence. *Arch Dis Child, 93*(7), 554-557. doi: 10.1136/adc.2006.106336

Gleason, J.B. (1975). Fathers and other strangers: Men's speech to young children. In D.P. Dato (Ed.), *Developmental psycholinguistics: Theory and applications* (pp.289-297). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Goodwin, M.H., & Kyratzis, A. (2012). Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B.B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp.365-390). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell.

Haynes, W.O., & Saunders, D.J. (1998). Joint book reading strategies in middle-class African American and White mother-toddler dyads: Research note. *Journal of Children's Communication Development, 20*(2), 9-17. doi:10.1177/152574019902000202

Justice, L.M., & Kaderavek, J.N. (2003). Topic control during shared storybook reading: Mothers and their children with language impairments. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 23*(3), 137–150. doi: 10.1177/02711214030230030401

Kang, J.Y., Kim, Y.S., & Pan B.A. (2009). Five-year-olds' book talk and story retelling: Contributions of mother–child joint bookreading. *First Language, 29*(3), 243-265. doi: 10.1177/0142723708101680

McArthur, D., Adamson, L.B., & Deckner, D.F. (2005). As stories become familiar: Mother-child conversations during shared reading. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 51*(4), 389-411. doi: 10.1353/mpq.2005.0025

Murase, T., Dale, P.S., Ogura, T., Yamashita, Y., & Mahieu, A. (2005). Mother-child conversation during joint picture book reading in Japan and the USA. *First Language, 25*(2), 197-218. doi: 10.1177/0142723705050899

Ninio, A., & Bruner, J. (1978). The achievement and antecedents of labelling. *Journal of Child Language, 5*, 1-15. doi: 10.1017/S0305000900001896

Osborne, M.P. (1995). *Afternoon on the amazon*. New York, NY: Random House Books for Young Readers.

Phoenix International Publications. (2019). *Disney Frozen: Little look and find*. Chicago, IL: Phoenix International Publications.

Thoreson, C.C., Dahlin, M.P., & Powell, T.A. (2001). Parent-child interaction in three conversational contexts: Variations in style and strategy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *92*, 23-37. doi: 10.1002/cd.13

Appendix

3.1 Preliminary Analysis: Raw Frequencies for Father and Children COI Codes

	Father	Daughter 1	Daughter 2
NT	10	1	8
OT	16	4	6
PT	11	8	12
JT	42	19	34
REI	11	3	1
EXT	7	0	0
TOTAL	97	35	61

3.2.1 Raw Frequencies for Father and Children COI Codes in Topic Control

	Father	Daughter 1	Daughter 2
NT	47	3	8
OT	20	6	7
PT	12	8	14
JT	50	19	38
REI	7	0	0
EXT	13	3	2
N/A	2	1	6
TOTAL	151	40	75

3.2.2 Descriptive Findings for Father and Children COI Codes in Topic Control

	Proportion of utterances	Rate of occurrence
	Father	
NT	31%	2.45
OT	13%	1.04
PT	8%	0.63
JT	33%	2.61
REI	5%	0.37
EXT	9%	0.68
N/A	1%	0.10
	Daughter 1	
NT	8%	0.16
OT	15%	0.31
PT	20%	0.42
JT	48%	0.99
EXT	8%	0.16

N/A	3%	0.05
	Daughter 2	
NT	11%	0.42
OT	9%	0.37
PT	19%	0.73
JT	51%	1.98
EXT	3%	0.10
N/A	8%	0.31

3.3.1 Raw Frequencies for Father and Children COI Codes in Activity Control

	Father	Daughter 1	Daughter 2
NA	7	1	2
OA	51	3	4
PA	4	6	14
JA	87	29	49
N/A	2	1	6
TOTAL	151	40	75

3.3.2 Descriptive Findings for Father and Children COI Codes in Activity Control

	Proportion of utterances	Rate of occurrence
	Father	
NA	5%	0.37
OA	34%	2.66
PA	3%	0.21
JA	58%	4.54
N/A	1%	0.10
	Daughter 1	
NA	3%	0.05
OA	8%	0.16
PA	15%	0.31
JA	73%	1.51
N/A	3%	0.05
	Daughter 2	
NA	3%	0.10
OA	5%	0.21
PA	19%	0.73
JA	65%	2.56
N/A	8%	0.31