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Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT; e.g., Giles, 2016a) has emerged as a key interpersonal and intergroup theory, and has been studied across an array of languages, cultures, and applied settings (Soliz & Giles, 2014). This chapter, with its illustrative case accounts, focuses on one domain of CAT research, namely problematic communication in grandparent-grandchild (GP-GC) relationships. GP-GC communication is often a source of satisfaction for both parties (Lin, Harwood, & Bonnesen, 2002; Mansson, 2013), yet such communication is not always pleasant. Several communication patterns exacerbate frustrations or discomfort for one or both parties. For example, grandparents feel particularly frustrated when they perceive grandchildren as disinterested in them or not investing in the GP-GC relationship (e.g., Bangerter & Waldron, 2014). Grandchildren also experience declines in closeness when they perceive their grandparents as deceiving or judging them (Holladay et al., 1998).

Although several communication patterns may erode relational quality, grandparents’ painful self-disclosures (PSDs) to grandchildren are one of the most frequently studied. PSDs consist of disclosures about bereavement, immobility, poor health, loneliness, or other topics the listener perceives as uncomfortable and underaccommodative (Coupland, Coupland, Giles, & Henwood, 1991; Coupland, Coupland, & Giles, 1991). Sociolinguistic data of intergenerational interactions suggest that PSDs from older to younger interactants are much more common than younger-to-older PSDs (Coupland, Coupland, Giles, Henwood, & Wiemann, 1988). Similar to interactions with unrelated older adults, PSDs are also uncomfortable in GP-GC conversations under certain circumstances, such as when...
grandchildren perceive grandparents are disclosing uncomfortable information in order to get grandchildren to do favors or other tasks they otherwise might not be inclined to do (e.g., Barker, 2007).

This chapter explores PSDs in GP-GC relationships as an illustrative case of underaccommodative communication (see Gasiorek, 2016a). We begin by reviewing the importance of CAT and defining key concepts. We then discuss general principles and processes stipulated by CAT, as well as how these principles have manifested in past research on PSDs. Third, we present actual, open-ended accounts from grandchildren about underaccommodation they receive from grandparents in the form of PSDs that constitute our case study. We use these accounts as a foundation for outlining ways future researchers can advance the study of underaccommodation in GP-GC relationships, as well as discussing practical implications for grandparents and grandchildren.

The Importance of CAT

CAT explains how and why people adjust (i.e., accommodate) or fail to adjust their communication to an interaction partner, as well as the consequences of such adjustments. Although CAT is not the only theory to consider accommodation and nonaccommodation, its treatment of these constructs is, arguably, more comprehensive than the treatments of other theories (for a review, see Gasiorek, 2016b). CAT goes further than other perspectives by proposing speaker-oriented and listener-oriented versions of accommodation and nonaccommodation. From speakers’ perspectives, accommodation refers to adjustments designed to regulate social distance or comprehension. Speakers’ adjustments to decrease social distance (often, to establish a common ingroup identity with the listener) and/or facilitate comprehension often manifest as convergence, or becoming more similar to interaction partners. From listeners’ perspectives, accommodation refers to perceptions that speakers’ behavior is appropriately adjusted (Gasiorek, 2015).

Nonaccommodation can also be considered from both parties’ perspectives. Speakers engage in nonaccommodation when they wish to increase social distance or decrease comprehension. For example, they can diverge by making their behaviors more distinct from those of their partners (Thakerar, Giles, & Cheshire, 1982). Listeners can perceive nonaccommodation as overaccommodative (i.e., perceiving that speakers have gone too far in the adjustment necessary for appropriate interaction) or underaccommodative (i.e., perceiving that speakers have not gone far enough in the adjustment necessary for appropriate interaction) (Coupland,
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The common thread behind these versions of nonaccommodation is that distinctiveness, disaffiliation, or disconfirmation is intended, communicated, or interpreted (Gasiorek, 2016a). Put differently, nonaccommodation occurs when speakers want to establish their personal or social identities as different from (and perhaps superior to) those of the listener, thereby removing themselves from any shared connection with the listener. Nonaccommodation also occurs when speakers’ actual behaviors suggest they are different from the listener (e.g., speakers adopting and emphasizing a contrasting accent than the listener’s accent), or when listeners interpret speakers’ behaviors as establishing a lack of shared social connection or understanding. Speaker- and listener-oriented versions of accommodation and nonaccommodation, therefore, allow for diverse foci when studying communication, including speakers’ intentions, objective communication, and listeners’ perceptions (Gallois, Gasiorek, Giles, & Soliz, 2016).

Additional aspects of CAT’s importance include its large body of international scholarship, its interpersonal and intergroup focus, and the array of contexts amenable to study from a CAT perspective. Of all the frameworks addressing how and why interaction partners adjust to each other’s communication styles, CAT has arguably generated the most interdisciplinary and international research (Giles & Ogay, 2006; Soliz & Giles, 2014). Moreover, CAT simultaneously adopts an interpersonal and intergroup focus (Dragojevic & Giles, 2014; Palomares, Giles, Soliz, & Gallois, 2016). The communication discipline has traditionally treated interactions in a dichotomy of either interpersonal or intergroup, which is problematic because idiosyncratic and relationship-specific preferences may work in tandem with larger social identities to shape the unfolding of interactions and relational outcomes (for a review, see Gangi & Soliz, 2016).

Bridging the dichotomy, CAT allows for an examination of how both interpersonal and intergroup forces can shape relational outcomes, a dual focus that has been applied to the GP-GC domain (Bernhold & Giles, 2017). To illustrate the importance of this dual focus when studying GP-GC relationships, Soliz, Thorson, and Rittenour (2009) invoked CAT and found that multiethnic grandchildren’s perceptions of their parents’ and grandparents’ supportive communication, ethnic-specific identity accommodation (e.g., encouragement of grandchildren to learn more about their ethnic heritage), and reciprocal self-disclosure between grandchildren and older generations positively predicted grandchildren’s relational satisfaction. This work illustrates how relational outcomes are simultaneously a function of interpersonal (e.g., grandparents’ accommodative and
reciprocal self-disclosures about thoughts and feelings with grandchildren) and intergroup (e.g., grandparents’ accommodations toward multiethnic grandchildren by encouraging grandchildren to learn more about their cultural customs, despite the grandparents not sharing the same heritage and culture) phenomena. Practically, this suggests that family members must be attuned to and respond appropriately to aspects that make other family members unique individuals as well as aspects that make them part of broader social collectives in order to foster fulfilling relationships with those family members. At times, this might be challenging, as people might not share the same idiosyncratic preferences and broader social identities that other family members share (as is the case, for example, when family members disagree about religious values; Colaner, Soliz, & Nelson, 2014).

Finally, CAT applies to a variety of contexts (Giles, 2016a; McGlone & Giles, 2011). Early research was grounded in intercultural and interethnic settings. These studies found that observers judged speakers with more prestigious accents as conveying higher-quality persuasive arguments, as well as judged bilingual speakers more favorably when they perceived the speakers were trying to accommodate to the observers’ preferred language (e.g., Giles, 1973; Giles, Taylor, & Bourhis, 1973). In the late 1980s and 1990s, CAT scholars began focusing on intergenerational communication and health. The Communication Predicament of Aging model (CPA model: Ryan, Giles, Bartolucci, & Henwood, 1986) showed how the overaccommodation older adults receive from younger adults (i.e., patronizing talk) may constrain older adults’ opportunities for communication, reduce their self-esteem and sense of control, and ultimately contribute to physiological and psychological declines. More recently, scholars have applied CAT to the law enforcement domain, showing how perceptions of police officers’ accommodation can foster civilians’ trust in police officers, with the latter in turn increasing civilians’ intentions to comply with police requests (e.g., Barker et al., 2008). Post-2000 CAT research has also examined a variety of family relationships, including stepparent-stepchild relationships (Speer, Giles, & Denes, 2013) and parent-child relationships in interreligious families (Colaner et al., 2014). Although not exhaustive of all contexts in which CAT has been interpretively invoked and applied, these domains illustrate the theory’s heurism across many settings.

While CAT research on intragenerational and intergenerational communication has yielded rich insights over the decades, there has regrettably been “a notable decline” in such research since 2011 as other contexts have increased in prominence (Soliz & Bergquist, 2016, p. 64). In part, this chapter is intended to serve as a call for a renewed focus on intragenerational and intergenerational communication more generally, and PSDs in GP-GC relationships more specifically.
Principles and Processes Stipulated by CAT

A set of propositions summarizes CAT’s logic and guides research predictions. These propositions are refined on an ongoing basis to reflect the current state of scholarship. The most recent set of propositions is as follows (see Dragojevic, Gasiorek, & Giles, 2016; Gallois, Weatherall, & Giles, 2016):

- Communication accommodation is a foundational aspect of interaction that facilitates comprehension or regulates social distance (i.e., affiliation).
- Interpersonal and intergroup histories, individual preferences, and contextual factors influence interaction partners’ expectations about what constitutes appropriate accommodation.
- Interaction partners’ motivation and ability to adjust influence the degree and quality of their accommodation.
- Speakers increasingly accommodate to listeners the more they wish to affiliate with listeners or increase listeners’ comprehension.
- Listeners’ perceptions of speakers’ accommodation decrease social distance while increasing comprehension, conversation satisfaction, and favorable evaluations of speakers.
- Speakers engage in nonaccommodation the more they wish to increase social distance or hinder comprehension.
- Listeners’ perceptions of speakers’ nonaccommodation increase social distance while decreasing comprehension, conversation satisfaction, and favorable evaluations of speakers, yet listeners’ perceptions of speakers’ motives may moderate these associations.
- Interactional dynamics and the turn-by-turn unfolding of conversations influence the degree and quality of accommodation.

As the seventh proposition suggests, CAT allows for listener-oriented versions of nonaccommodation. Listeners’ evaluations of speakers’ nonaccommodation seem more influential in shaping interaction outcomes than are speakers’ evaluations (Soliz & Bergquist, 2016). Thus, it is important to understand what factors influence listeners’ evaluations of speakers’ behavior. One factor garnering an increased amount of research attention of late involves inferred motives that are the substance and valence that listeners assign to speakers’ intentions (Gasiorek & Giles, 2012). Attributing negative motives to underaccommodative speakers predicts listeners stopping the interaction and expressing negative affect nonverbally, which are two conversational moves likely to exacerbate conflict (Gasiorek, 2013). Moreover, in the face of accumulated underaccommodation, listeners make increasingly unfavorable evaluations of speakers’ motives, with these unfavorable attributions then
reducing communication satisfaction (Gasiorek & Dragojevic, 2017). However, unfavorable attributions of speakers’ motives may be alleviated when listeners engage in perspective-taking (i.e., putting themselves in speakers’ “shoes” and trying to understand why speakers are conversing the way they are). Gasiorek (2015) found that when recalling nonaccommodative conversations, listeners attributed less negative motives to speakers when listeners engaged in perspective-taking. One task for future researchers is to further probe how perspective-taking alleviates unfavorable attributions of speakers’ motives, and perhaps indirectly predicts more favorable evaluations of the speakers and interaction via these more favorable attributions of motive.

Perceptions of older adults’ PSDs, as well as attributions of older adults’ motives for engaging in PSDs, have predicted various outcomes. Young adults have judged nonfamily older adults who engage in PSDs as self-centered and embodying negative substereotypes (e.g., despondent); they have also judged PSDs as less appropriate than other forms of talk (Bonnesen & Hummert, 2002; Coupland, Henwood, Coupland, & Giles, 1990). In the GP-GC domain, grandparents’ PSDs have positively predicted grandchildren’s awareness of grandparents’ age, as well as negatively predicted relational closeness (Harwood, Raman, & Hewstone, 2006). PSDs are especially likely to invoke discomfort when grandchildren attribute control motives to grandparents (i.e., perceiving that grandparents communicate in order to get grandchildren to do something) (Barker, 2007). Such communication patterns are not uniformly negative, however. PSDs invoke less discomfort when grandchildren assign their grandparents identity motives (i.e., perceiving that grandparents communicate in order to let them know more about who they are as people) or positive affect motives (i.e., perceiving that grandparents communicate in order to be role models and show them how to navigate difficult life circumstances) (Barker, 2007). The larger communicative environment may also play a role, as grandchildren who come from conversation-oriented families have reported less discomfort with grandparent PSDs compared to grandchildren whose families do not discuss topics openly (Fowler & Soliz, 2010).

This research suggests that although PSDs are often construed as underaccommodative and linked to negative outcomes, they are not always perceived as such. Thus, one overarching question is the following: under what conditions are PSDs linked to negative personal, relational, and interactional outcomes, and under what conditions are PSDs not detrimental? The cases that follow come from grandchildren’s open-ended accounts detailing what painful topics their grandparents disclose, the reasons why such disclosures are uncomfortable, and their responses to the PSDs. All cases are reported verbatim, allowing for minor
editing of mechanical issues. These cases suggest ways CAT scholars can continue addressing the overarching questions stated above, as well as provide practical recommendations for grandparents and grandchildren.

Illustrative Cases

The following cases come from a larger data set in which grandchildren reported on their grandparents’ self-disclosures and affectionate communication. The data set included open-ended descriptions from grandchildren about what parts of their grandparents’ disclosures were comfortable and uncomfortable, as well as closed-ended questions about the variety of ways grandparents communicate affection to grandchildren. The closed-ended data on affectionate communication are the subject of a different study (Bernhold & Giles, 2019). As we were reading the open-ended descriptions of self-disclosures, we were struck by the diversity in the existence and severity of PSDs. Given this diversity, we decided to showcase a series of cases in this chapter rather than focusing on a single case. Some grandchildren noted that their grandparents’ PSDs were extremely disconcerting. Participant 299 wrote the following about his maternal grandmother:

The only things she talks about that make me uncomfortable are when she talks about her experiences with cancer, and when she talks about her death. Both of these topics make me extremely uncomfortable. This doesn’t make me uncomfortable because I can’t deal with death or cancer. The thought of losing my grandmother is just extremely unbearable … It makes me so sad it almost brings me to tears whenever we talk about it. I don’t like thinking about or visualizing the death of my grandmother, one of my childhood best friends … I usually don’t say much. I try to put it off by changing or avoiding the subject altogether when it gets brought up, but if we must talk about it I am usually quiet, not saying much at all. I often try to comfort her when she talks and tell her it’s going to be okay, she’s going to be fine, etc.

In addition to conveying the grandson’s distress, the response is noteworthy in its description of the grandson’s responses to the grandparent. Lowly person-centered messages deny, invalidate, or criticize the partner’s feelings, whereas moderately person-centered messages acknowledge the partner’s feelings and express sympathy and condolence. Highly person-centered messages acknowledge the partner’s feelings, allow the partner to explore reasons why they are feeling that way, and help the partner contextualize feelings in a broader context (Burleson, 2010; Burleson et al., 2011). The grandson’s attempts at changing the subject fall under low person-centeredness, whereas his attempts to reassure the grandparent (e.g., “it’s going to be okay”) qualify as moderate person centeredness.
Relatedly, Coupland et al. (1988) proposed a taxonomy of receiver responses to PSD that vary in the degree to which they encourage further disclosure. At one end of the spectrum, the hearer could change the subject, thereby preempting further disclosures at the risk of invaliding the older person’s feelings. In the middle of the spectrum, the hearer could respond neutrally (“mm”) or with sympathy (“oh dear”). At the other end of the spectrum, the recipient could ask for more information and help the discloser evaluate the painful event. In the above case, we do not know how the grandmother interprets the grandson’s minimal responses. More broadly, we are not aware of any research (qualitative or quantitative) examining grandparents’ perceptions of their grandchildren’s responses to PSDs, nor how such perceptions are linked to grandparent well-being (both mental and physical). Other research has shown that grandparents’ perceptions of their grandchildren’s accommodation (e.g., complimenting and showing affection for the grandparent, being attentive to the grandparent) are especially important predictors of relational solidarity (Harwood, 2000), but this work did not directly focus on grandchildren’s responses to PSDs. We would argue that the time is long overdue to examine grandparents’ evaluations of their grandchildren’s responses to PSDs in order to better inform grandchildren on the types of responses grandparents perceive as most helpful. In the meantime, grandchildren might heed findings from the social support literature suggesting that distressed people perceive lowly person-centered messages as least helpful (e.g., Burleson et al., 2011; Holmstrom et al., 2015).

The example also illustrates CAT’s attention to the multiple vantage points from which nonaccommodation can be studied (in this case, from the speaker’s perspective versus from the listener’s perspective), and, as such, potential disconnects between speaker intentions and listener interpretations. Although we do not know the grandmother’s intentions, she may have been disclosing her experiences with cancer and death in order to elicit high-quality comfort from her grandson, whereas her grandson assessed her communication as extremely uncomfortable and did not provide such comfort. Using dyadic data, future CAT researchers might explore whether dyads with greater disconnects between speakers’ intentions for engaging in PSDs and listeners’ interpretations predict less relational satisfaction, less relational closeness, and reduced likelihood of grandchildren to care for grandparents during times of need or ill health, for example.

Another observation involved some grandchildren saying they are not uncomfortable with any information their grandparent discloses. Participant 199 recounted the following about his paternal grandmother: “My grandmother does not disclose information to me that would otherwise not be important or I would be uninterested in hearing. She knows the boundaries of what would make me
uncomfortable. Even when she asks me about girlfriends I do not become uncomfortable.” Similarly, Participant 289 noted the following, “My grandpa doesn’t share any information that makes me feel uncomfortable. He is a very respectful and reserved person and does not say anything that makes me feel awkward.” The pithy reply of Participant 333 perhaps best shows how PSDs are not problematic for all GP-GC relationships:

My grandma does not share anything that makes me feel uncomfortable. She is a flat out baller that knows what to say and when. Even in her old age, she is wise beyond her years. I also firmly believe that something can only become awkward if you make it awkward. In most settings, there are multiple ways to go about things and awkward is never one that occurs.

As these responses illustrate, some grandchildren do not even perceive PSDs to exist in their grandparents’ communication, much less finding these disclosures troublesome. We suspect that cognitive complexity underlies these responses. Cognitive complexity refers to the sophistication with which people process incoming information; people with more cognitive schemas to label thoughts, feelings, and behaviors during interaction are more cognitively complex than people with fewer schemas (Burleson, 2007; Youngvorst & Jones, 2017). Participants 199, 289, and 333 referred to their grandparents’ wisdom in discerning appropriate boundaries. Participant 333 also discussed how there are multiple ways to interpret a conversation, and awkward interpretations do not occur during cognitive processing of his grandmother’s communication. Although we did not measure it, grandchildren and grandparents in these dyads may exhibit high cognitive complexity, which may benefit their relational health (see also, the Age Stereotypes in Interactions model, which posits that young adults’ cognitive complexity may buffer them from negatively stereotyping and patronizing older adults) (e.g., Hummert, Garstka, Ryan, & Bonnesen, 2004). Practically speaking, grandchildren might be advised on multiple ways to interpret grandparents’ disclosures, and reframing PSDs might be helpful in reducing some grandchildren’s distress.

Theoretically, these examples illustrate how future researchers may benefit from formally incorporating cognitive complexity as a construct in GP-GC PSD research. This relates to the seventh proposition of CAT about how it is listeners’ perceptions of speakers’ communication that guide listener responses. More cognitively complex grandchildren may be less likely to attribute negative motives (e.g., egotism) to their grandparents’ PSDs, perhaps orienting these grandchildren to respond in more favorable ways. Researchers can look to related CAT work on inferred motives and perspective-taking (e.g., Gasiorek, 2015) as guidance when designing future studies to test these ideas in GP-GC relationships.
Finally, we wish to note that grandchildren often discussed how their grandparents disclosed uncomfortable information about third parties (usually family members not present). Such information made grandchildren feel as if they had to “choose sides” in family disputes. Participant 44, for instance, felt as if her grandmother pitted her against her father:

Sometimes when my grandmother talks about my father (who is divorced from my mother), it makes me uncomfortable because she obviously really doesn't like him anymore because he hurt my mom. I feel uncomfortable because her opinion is biased and he's still my father so I don't like to hear bad things about him, especially from her because her hurt and pain is very real toward him so it sometimes makes me resent him for hurting my mom … It makes me feel uncomfortable because I do not want to hear bad stories or words spoken about my father because he's my father! I love him and have worked hard to forgive him for cheating on my mother, and when my grandmother brings him up, it kind of opens up an old wound that does not need to be opened at that time.

This response illustrates the receiver-oriented nature of underaccommodation. Although the grandmother may have only wanted to support her daughter's side and may not have intended to reopen old wounds, the granddaughter nevertheless perceived the grandmother as insufficiently adjusting her communication to meet the granddaughter’s preferences. We also found the negative revelations about third-party family members noteworthy because past research has found grandparents to be crucial sources of social support for grandchildren during family conflicts such as parental divorce (Soliz, 2008). Although these responses did not contain personal information about grandparents themselves, they involved quite negative information about third parties.

Researchers might explore this theme of negative revelations about third parties more systematically by borrowing from the literature on parents’ inappropriate disclosures during divorce (e.g., Afifi, McManus, Hutchinson, & Baker, 2007). Inappropriate disclosures about third parties might be potent forms of underaccommodation in the aftermath of family conflict. Practically speaking, grandparents might be advised to be more conscientious of the information they reveal about third parties so that their grandchildren do not feel as if they have to choose sides or look down on other family members. Theoretically, the example reiterates some of the ideas discussed previously with respect to CAT’s seventh proposition, namely how it is listeners’ perceptions of speaker behavior that guide listener responses. The example also suggests that dyadic data about grandparents’ motives for revealing negative information about third parties and grandchildren’s interpretations of such negative information might reveal a disconnect between both...
parties’ perspectives, and this disconnect may predict a host of adverse outcomes such as less relational satisfaction and less willingness on the part of grandchildren to help care for grandparents during times of need.

Summary and Conclusions

Taken together, the case studies illustrate several aspects of CAT and suggest opportunities for future research. In line with the theory’s seventh proposition, the wide variety of responses to PSDs—ranging in severity from extreme discomfort to no distress at all—highlights that PSDs do not uniformly invoke a singular judgment of inappropriateness in all grandchildren. Rather, grandchildren’s perceptions of PSDs vary widely and may be the product of factors such as cognitive complexity. One opportunity for further CAT development involves a need for more dyadic research on how relational partners influence one another (Pitts & Harwood, 2015; Soliz & Bergquist, 2016). Applied to PSDs in GP-GC relationships, we believe one opportunity ripe for future research involves examining how grandparents’ motives for engaging in PSDs, grandchildren’s perceptions of grandparent motives, grandchildren’s perceptions of their own responses to grandparents’ PSDs, and grandparents’ perceptions of their grandchildren’s responses to PSDs interrelate with one another and predict noteworthy outcomes such as relational satisfaction and grandchildren’s provision of emotional, instrumental, and other types of care to grandparents experiencing health problems or other difficulties.

By incorporating the perspective of grandparents, future dyadic research on these questions will also shed light on CAT’s fourth proposition. The fourth proposition states that speakers will increasingly accommodate the more they wish to affiliate with the listener or facilitate the listener’s comprehension (Dragojevic et al., 2016). Some grandparents may perceive their PSDs as accommodative and appropriate moves undertaken with an aim of affiliating with grandchildren and establishing a shared sense of solidarity against life’s hardships. Conversely, other grandparents may perceive PSDs as nonaccommodative moves undertaken with the egotistical goal of obtaining emotional comfort from their grandchildren, even if they are aware that such PSDs will be uncomfortable for grandchildren. Future researchers can assess the extent to which these competing perceptions and motives resonate with grandparents’ experiences and bear consequences for GP-GC interactions and relationships.

More broadly, the chapter addressed three objectives. First, it established CAT’s importance by discussing the theory’s breadth, international scholarship, focus on interpersonal and intergroup phenomena, and utility in a variety of applied contexts. It then outlined the principles and processes stipulated by CAT, as well
as discussed how these principles overlap with PSD research. Third, it presented real-life accounts from grandchildren about the PSDs they receive from grandparents. These accounts illustrate how grandchildren perceive their grandparents’ communication as underaccommodative or accommodative. They also suggest ways to advance the study of PSDs, such as by exploring how grandparents perceive grandchildren’s responses to PSD. We hope these insights serve as a springboard for future research on the intricacies of PSDs in GP-GC relationships.

**Discussion Questions**

1. Explain how accommodation and nonaccommodation can be studied from a variety of vantage points. Whose perspective do researchers usually consider when studying PSDs?

2. What are some ways in which CAT is a unique social scientific theory? How might you capitalize on these unique characteristics when designing a study on family communication (either in GP-GC relationships or other types of family relationships)?

3. Are grandparents’ disclosures about poor health and other difficulties always negative? What are some factors that might qualify how grandchildren and other family members interpret such disclosures?

4. Is the study of PSDs in GP-GC relationships too one-sided? How might grandchildren engage in nonaccommodation toward their grandparents? How might grandparents accommodate to their grandchildren?
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