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Firstword

The essays and articles in this collection were written primarily when I was in college as a graduate student between the years of 1994 and 1997. They represent my thoughts and academic development. However, these were written after the completion of coursework for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. The title of this collection refers to the final exams preliminary to candidacy into the doctorate.

As in the last collection, this collection begins with letters to the editor. The letter, A history of the Acadians was published in a local weekly, Nightlife, in September of 1994. It was written in response to a published preview of the music group BeauSoliel which contained some inaccuracies about Acadian history. Where have all the great gators gone? was a tongue-in-cheek story about a fictitious relationship with a well known leucistic alligator from Louisiana. The other two editorials are self-explanatory. I have also included a review of a Pink Floyd album, and a reflection on a classroom event which occurred during my final semester as a teaching assistant for Southern Illinois University.

The next section contains several poems which center around themes of oppression and despair. The period of life following my mother’s passing was the most disturbing for me. The politics of the academy do not mix well with personal grief and loss.

Following the section of essays and poems are the papers written as part of the final exam process for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Speech Communication at Southern Illinois University. This process is called the preliminary examinations. The student and the committee determine the most effective way for the student to demonstrate competency to advance to doctoral candidacy. It includes four questions proposed by the author (as student) to his academic committee. The committee then determines whether to accept the questions as proposed or to modify or re-write the questions. Two of the questions I proposed were accepted with modification. Two questions were written by committee members. The formal preliminary examinary questions as presented to me by my academic committee, and my answers to those questions, are included.

The preliminary examinations are intended to indicate the spectrum of research and study during doctorate level graduate studies. However, they also indicate a clear direction for the doctoral dissertation. These essays offer closure to the work created during this period of my academic life.
A History of the Acadians

Dear Editor,

While I appreciate the effort put forth by Kim Blum in her article "BeauSoleil" (Nightlife, Volume 15, Number 5, Page 3), persons of Acadian heritage might appreciate it if she had been more careful about historical facts. At issue in particular are the three paragraphs beginning with "Through the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht . . . ."

The dispersion of the Acadians from Acadia was more than simply a desire by the governor to provide English colonists with more living space. At the time England and France were at war, and there was a fear that the Acadians would be disloyal to their new rulers similar in a way to the United States government's attitude towards Americans of Japanese descent during the second World War. The English required the Acadians to pledge loyalty to the Crown and renounce their Catholic faith. The Acadians had no real connection to France as a homeland. They had already developed their own culture in Acadia from the time they had settled in the early 1600's. (My ancestor Daniel LeBlanc, originally of Loudon, France, settled in Acadia around 1650). It is unfair and inaccurate to call the action of Governor Lawrence a deportation because the Acadians were there before the English and had developed a good relationship with native peoples.

The Acadians were not readily accepted into any of the thirteen British colonies. In fact, many of the colonies, Massachusetts in particular, were openly hostile toward the Acadians. Some Acadians had made it to Louisiana in the mid to late 1750's. (My family settled near St. James, on the Mississippi, in 1763). For the most part, the Acadians were among the earliest to settle in Louisiana along with the Spanish. The German, Scots-Irish and Anglo populations, as well as the African-Caribbean Creoles brought in as slaves, settled in larger numbers much later. Compared to other southern states, slavery was not as wide-spread in Louisiana until the late 1700's and early 1800's, following the infusion of Creole (non-Acadian) settlers.

Following the infusion of new settlers, the Acadians did not find a welcoming social environment in Louisiana either. In fact, Acadians were looked down upon by every other group of people in Louisiana including the slaves. The Créole culture developed independently of the Acadian culture primarily because the Acadians found it safer, in terms of survival, to keep to themselves. Given the history of the dispersion and their treatment by the English, and then later by the Spanish, this was not an unfounded reaction. The intermingling referred to in the article occurred much later, and at first the intermingling amounted to assimilation of other cultures, particularly the German immigrants moving from Texas into the southwestern Louisiana prairie. The term Créole applies to all colonists in a Latin-based culture; hence everyone living in Louisiana at the time it was a Spanish/French colony was a Créole. In short, every Acadian is a Créole, but not all Créoles are Acadian.
It is heartening to observe an interest about the Acadian culture developing within the mainstream American culture. Perhaps that has happened as a result of the work of people of Louisiana, CODFIL not withstanding (there is a resentment toward the Renaissance movement in Louisiana among persons of Acadian descent because the movement promoted the teaching of Parisian French in the schools as opposed to Acadian French which further erodes the culture). However, the victors write the history books, which leads to the type of inaccuracies in the article.

Serious scholarship is being done on the history of the Acadian people by authors such as James H. Dormon, "The people called Cajuns: An introduction to an ethnohistory," of the Center for Louisiana Studies at Southwestern Louisiana University, and Carl A. Brasseaux, "The Founding of New Acadia: The reconstruction and transformation of Acadian society in Louisiana, 1765-1865." Also Jules O. Daigle, "A dictionary of the Cajun language" is an excellent text which gives Acadian to English and English to Acadian translations, distinctions between Acadian and Parisian French, guides for pronunciation of Acadian phonemes, as well as a brief description of Acadian history.

Published as “A History of the Acadians” (Nightlife, Vol. 15, No. 6, p. 6, September 22-29, 1994).
Dear Editor,

I must protest the suggestions and implications that people who listen to recordings on a vinyl LP as opposed to a CD are musical dinosaurs. The CD medium is as successful as it is not because of superior sound quality, but rather due to its convenience, perceived indestructability (relative to vinyl), and myriad of other uses. The debate between CD and LP sound quality only continues in the mainstream press and among novices who are unaware of the not so subtle differences in methodology.

Although CD's have quantitative superiority in characteristics such as dynamic range (the perceived difference between quiet and loud passages) and signal-to-noise ratio, the reason for this quantitative superiority is due primarily because digital recording techniques "sample" signals. "Unwanted" sounds can therefore be edited out. However, what is lost in the process of sampling is the "infinite" resolution that comes from the analog recording process. Digital recording only takes "bits" of the musical sound, whereas analog recording captures the whole sound. The difference is a warm, sweet sound as opposed to the harsh, bright sound of digital.

The high-end audio and underground press have decried the 44.1 kHz digital standard from the very beginning. The standard was imposed in order to make digital recording techniques and the medium itself marketable.

It is not that CDs sound bad. In order to get the full effect of quality audio sound, the listener has to utilize a well-tuned system. However, in the audio press, expensive digital systems are consistently compared to the "standard analog sound."

Even the audio manufacturers have recognized this as they attempt to "upgrade" the digital sound with new audio standards for the DVD format which is soon to replace the CD format. (This is even addressed in the July issue of Scientific American, a non-audio publication).

We could argue the finer points of psycho-acoustics until the cows come home, but if you really want to know which format sounds better (despite overwhelming theoretical evidence supporting analog), I suggest you listen to any well-engineered recording in both CD and LP formats back-to-back.

Published as "Records Capture a Different Sound" (Daily Egyptian, Vol. 82, No. 9, pg. 4, Thursday August 29, 1996).
Dear Editor,

In the Southern Illinoisan recently, there was a short article with a photograph of an alligator from Louisiana named Louis LeBlanc. I feel I must inform you and your readers that Louis LeBlanc was a family pet. You see, down in south Louisiana children learn to swim at an early age. How this occurs typically is that the parents throw the kids in the bayou and tell them to swim. Well, as you might imagine, it is very important to learn to swim in haste. The alligators are always looking for a free meal.

There were seven of us kids in my family, not uncommon in that area and especially not uncommon among the LeBlanc's. We all learned how to swim in bodies of water that did not contain salt or chlorine. Louis came to us (or toward us) one day as my siblings and I were swimming. My two brothers and I were going to wrestle him until our sisters pleaded with us not to molest him. Louis was quite a peculiar but interesting fellow. And we learned that he had quite a clever and pleasant disposition, once he got to know us. Once Louis reached the age of consent (slightly younger for alligators), he decided he must depart to find his fame and fortune outside the warm waters of the south Louisiana bayous. We hadn't seen him since that day but often thought about him. I must say I was quite amazed and pleased to see his picture in the paper. It would appear Louis is going places.

By means of this letter, the LeBlanc's of Baton Rouge and Donaldsonville, and other places south, send our love and best wishes to Louis LeBlanc and hope he has a wonderful life in the lime light.

Published as "Where Have All the Great Gators Gone?" (Southern Illinoisan, Vol. 104, No. 248, p. D4, Wednesday September 4, 1996).
Graduate Education Important

With the current review of graduate education at SIUC occupying the news and opinion pages over the last several months, it is important that graduate students and faculty effectively communicate the relevance of graduate education. At research institutions, such as SIUC, scholarship contributes to graduate and undergraduate education and impacts the region, state and nation through social and economic development. Furthermore, graduate education provides an opportunity for service to undergraduate education in a cost effective manner.

The training in graduate education involves exposure to current scholarship and creative activities in a chosen field of study. More direct benefits exist by this endeavor than simply perpetuating the curiosity of the scholar or by contributing to the library of knowledge. By conducting research "in-house," students have the opportunity to be exposed to scholarship on the "cutting-edge." It is this "cutting-edge" which has been the hallmark of American higher education and the reason it is among the best in the world. Furthermore, those undergraduates who are fortunate to have the experience of taking a class taught by a graduate student are afforded the opportunity of investing in the process of learning in ways not otherwise available in non-research institutions.

At research institutions, faculty are expected to actively participate in current scholarship as a condition of employment. At non-research institutions, faculty are not required to conduct research as a condition of employment. Often, that difference has been framed as an emphasis on teaching. However, the lack of a requirement for conducting current research does not necessarily translate directly into "better" teaching. Conducting research enhances teaching due to the immediacy, depth and understanding resulting from the process of doing research. Students at a research institution are afforded the opportunity to take part through observation and in some cases active participation in the process of the teacher's learning.

The faculty member's scholarship agenda does not absolve him or her from being an effective teacher. The notion of faculty sharing active learning pursuits with students subverts the paradigm of the classroom as a place of information dissemination. The classroom becomes a space in which to be engaged. "Cutting-edge" research and creative activity, therefore, benefits the student through engagement.

"Cutting-edge" scholarship also benefits the community at large. At a research institution, scholarship directly and indirectly benefits economic development. Scholarship advances human knowledge and leads to application. Scholarship also contributes to regional development through the prestige it affords the institution. This prestige results in external funding. Research institutions attract scholars who in turn attract students and the interest of outside parties who benefit directly from the research endeavor.
In order for a research institution to be viable, it must have graduate education. Graduate students offer support for faculty research efforts through services they provide in the classroom and in the lab. Graduate students assist faculty by collecting data and gathering materials. Graduate students also offer faculty a critique of research through seminar classes. Graduate students as teaching assistants also ease the faculty teaching load so that they can pursue active scholarship.

Scholarship requires institutional infrastructure support such as is available with graduate programs. Furthermore, graduate education provides a necessary resource for teaching introductory courses through graduate teaching assistants. Faculty could not teach the number of courses necessary to cover all of the sections of introductory courses needed to meet undergraduate demand without sacrificing research. To hire enough faculty to cover all of the sections of introductory courses would tax the resources of the state. In short, faculty salaries are more expensive than teaching assistant stipends with tuition waivers. In this sense, utilizing graduate teaching assistants is cost effective and helps to keep the cost of tuition down for undergraduates.

Graduate education provides training for the professorate of the future. It involves the rite of passage through levels of competency for teaching and scholarship. It does not serve the public good to eliminate graduate education. To the contrary, enhancement of graduate education promotes knowledge which is shared in the classroom.

Published as “Graduate Education Important” (Daily Egyptian, Vol. 82, No. 41, p. 5, Tuesday October 15, 1996).
The Dissolutionment (Disillusionment) Bell

The first time I heard the new album, I felt a strong sense of disappointment. I don't know what it was that I expected. It had been seven years since their last release. I supposed in seven years, or is it eleven years, the members of Pink Floyd would have resolved their differences. It became apparent to me upon listening to the new album that resolution was not the case. The album was aptly named.

Several aspects of the album lead me to the conclusion that the subject matter of the album, as a whole, and thus the album title was the very public leave-taking that occurred following the album "The Final Cut" by band member and primary composer Roger Waters. The dissolution of the long-term relationship between Waters and the other band members was an ugly affair. Waters was an artist of impeccable clarity and texture in his descriptions of the human experience. His swan song with Pink Floyd, "The Wall," was very disclosive of a man attempting to deal with the demons of his past, and the follow-up, "The Final Cut," was a realization of that process. The title of that album was ironic in more than one way. It was ironic because it was the final album "cut" Waters was to make with Pink Floyd. But it was also ironic because of the lines from the song of the same name: "I held the blade in trembling hands, prepared to make it, but just then the phone rang, I never had the nerve to make the final cut." It is a wonder if this idea of breaking up the band wasn't something that occurred to Waters or other band members since the period surrounding the cutting of the album "The Wall."

David Gilmour and other members of Pink Floyd described the making of "The Wall" as extremely difficult. According to interviews and reports, Waters was very hard to work with during this time. Waters even "fired" band-mate Richard Wright because his musicianship was "not up to par." Wright was not present on the album "The Final Cut," the only album he was not present on since the first release in 1967. To be sure, Wright had been very quiet during the whole affair. When "A Momentary Lapse of Reason" was released, Wright appeared as an extra musician. On the new album, Wright has principle composing credits on three of the songs, and secondary composing credits on two others, the most he has done as a member of Pink Floyd since "Dark Side of the Moon."

Two of the former songs are instrumentals. These two songs have similar musical themes to the music Waters composed on his most recent album "Amused to Death." Gilmour's guitar in the song "Marooned" even sounds similar to some of the phrasing used by guitarists on Waters' album. Although "The Division Bell" was released after "Amused to Death," it is difficult to determine the direction of influence in guitar phrasing and musical theme. The beauty of the songs crafted by Waters and Gilmour together as members of Pink Floyd occurred because the dark images of the characters created by Waters in the lyrics were perfectly matched by the phrasing of Gilmour's guitar. The song "Dogs" on the album "Animals" is, perhaps, one of the darkest songs ever composed, and its performance is flawless. The song "The Final Cut" contains a measure that requires a major chord as a preferred musical response to the preceding musical theme, however Gilmour.
places a minor chord to match the lyrical theme. The sounds of Pink Floyd, Waters and Gilmour collaborating, were in syncrony.

Waters seemed to want to match that syncrony in his solo efforts following his leave-taking. He even employed highly respected guitarists such as Eric Clapton and Jeff Beck to play guitar on his solo projects. The Gilmour "sound" was most closely reconstructed on Waters' third solo album "Amused to Death." It is this "sound" which is imitated in the two instrumentals written by Wright for "The Division Bell."

However, the images of dissolution do not end with the instrumentals. The song "Wearing the Inside Out" describes a relationship which matches the pattern which occurred between the members of Pink Floyd during the period of the band break-up. Although the lyrics to the song were written by a collaborator, it is difficult to imagine that the lyrics do not apply in some metaphorical way to the events surrounding "The Wall." The first person, the singer of the song, presumably Wright, expresses a feeling of being "overrun" by an other. Musically the song sounds similar to the Wright's solo work (including his singing) on his album "Wet Dream." The significance of this connection can be interpreted as a statement that Wright is musically capable, even though Waters did not think so following "The Wall."

The lyrical images of the remaining songs composed primarily by Gilmour also contain references which can be interpreted as statements about the dissolution of a long standing relationship. During the court battles between Waters and the other members of Pink Floyd, Waters was accused of making the claim that he was Pink Floyd and the other members had no right to continue under that name. Gilmour expressed, in an interview, the he was deeply hurt by that claim because he was a principle composer in much of the work of Pink Floyd. Although he was not the original guitarist, Gilmour did know the band from the beginning. He claims to have taught guitar licks to Syd Barrett, and he played for Syd during the early shows when Syd was too stoned to play. When Syd was asked to leave the band, because the band could not tolerate his acid dropping, Gilmour was the logical choice to take his place. Gilmour's, and the rest of the band's, overcoming the cult of personality surrounding Syd Barrett was difficult in the early years. When "Dark Side of the Moon" was released, the band had finally arrived. The follow-up album "Wish You Were Here," seemed to be a tribute to Syd Barrett, specifically the songs "Shine on You Crazy Diamond" and "Wish You Were Here." The song "Have a Cigar," sung by Roy Harper, lamented the "arrival" of the band.

This songs on the album "The Division Bell" seem to describe the relational dissolution between the band members and Roger Waters in a way that is similar to the tribute offered to Syd Barrett on "Wish You Were Here." The songs seem to describe a regret for the way the relationship turned out. They also seem to describe a desire by the band members to reunite with an old friend, presumably Waters. There are "high hopes" for such a reunion, even though there exists the realization that such a reunion will not occur until the old friend returns the attempts. This image is also shown in the closing sounds, where a phone call is made to "Charlie," but when voice recognition is made, the person on the other side hangs
up. This image of the other hanging up is also present in "The Wall" where the character "Pink" attempts to call his lover. And the image is replayed in the song "The Final Cut." In that song, the phone call delayed the inevitable end, but the end still occurred.

Maybe Gilmour, Mason and Wright are hoping for resolution to relational issues with Waters. It is apparent throughout the album that this desire for resolution, although tempered with a realization of the unlikelihood of resolution, is held by band members. Even the image of the two faces interacting with each other face-to-face on the front shows that desire. However, a closer look at the whole picture shows a broken heart. And as a person who held up hopes for a resolution, it is disappointing, and perhaps even disillusioning to see that it has not occurred.
Listen to Me: An Essay on a Classroom Occurrence

In class, we were discussing our experiences of happiness, loneliness and feeling listened to. Some interesting patterns occurred in the descriptions of life experiences. Descriptions of happiness seemed to involve sharing of events with another or others. In other words, happiness was described as occurring when individuals were in groups of two or more. This was in sharp contrast to descriptions of loneliness which were associated with being alone, although some descriptions of loneliness allowed for the presence of others. Feeling listened to was described as a sense of connection with the other. Thus, feeling listened to was an event which was related to happiness and in contrast to loneliness.

When a person feels that the other is listening, that person may feel confirmed, as though his or her existence is important to the other. That person may also feel as though his or her feelings and experiences are validated. The experience of being listened to may also precipitate feelings of belonging or being included in the life of the other.

Inclusion is both necessary for relationships and a result of relationships. The sense of belonging to the other is a basic human need, and it is the belonging to the other which defines relationships. Therefore, listening is important both for the sense of self-importance and for the maintenance of relationship.

As the teacher, I invited students to describe their experiences of being listened to by others. One student stated that he does not experience being listened to by others. He stated that he believed that what he had to say was not important anyway. His admission was very telling. I listened quite closely to determine whether he was being sincere and had no reason to doubt him. But while he was sharing this, two other students were holding a conversation, at a moderate volume such that other students in the class could not be unaware of its intrusiveness.

I waited until I believed the former student was finished, then I immediately asked one of the other two students how she felt about not being listened to by others. (I asked her first because she initiated the conversation with the other.) She responded to my inquiry by stating that she does not experience not being listened to by others, particularly her two children (10 and 12).

I saw the irony of the classroom situation unfold before my eyes. The experience of non-listening being described by the former student was being graphically demonstrated by the latter student. The latter student demonstrated an attitude of one-way communication, which she described in her relationship with her two children, in her non-listening to the former student.

Upon later reflection about the interaction in class that day and other class periods, I discovered that there was a tendency among some students in the class to not take one student very seriously, the student that expressed the belief that what he had to say was not very important. I tried to discover what might factor into those tendencies. One possible explanation could lie in issues of self-esteem. If the student believes that what he has to say is not important, possibly caused by many life experiences of not being listened to by others, then he might present himself to
others in present situations as not being important. Others might orient to that
presentation of self, thus the belief creates a self-fulfilling prophecy.

In the case of the other student, she may have been reacting to the former
student's presentation of self as if he was not important and thus was not important
to listen to. On the other hand, she may have acted in accord with a belief that he
was not important to listen to for some other reason. This young man is very young
looking. He is a first year student, and I would guess he is about eighteen years old.
On several occasions throughout the semester, the student was the focus of
attention for one reason or another. Once it was because of the clothing that he
wears. In this case, a student asked him why and how he wore his pants a certain
way. (He wears his pants low in the hip-hop fashion.) He responded, "You'll find
out." He did not really answer her question. The student who made this inquiry was
the student who later was holding the conversation during the young man's sharing
of the experience of not being listened to by others.

At an earlier time, another male non-traditional student made a derogatory
remark about the young man's clothing during a role-playing exercise. The following
class period, the student publicly apologized for the remark with a justification that it
was just part of the role-play. Earlier in the semester, the young student had been
placed in a dyad for an exercise. His partner for the exercise was an older
non-traditional student. In responding to the exercise the non-traditional student
stated that the generation gap between himself and the young man kept them from
having anything substantial to talk about.

Thus, another recurring pattern is what might be described as sensitization
to the age of the student. In a less kind but more descriptive fashion, the pattern
might be termed ageism, or a bigotry toward others because of their age. Bigotry
might also be oriented toward the clothing or style of presentation the student
chooses. Whatever the factor may be, it contributes to non-inclusion which can be
experienced as disconfirmation or non-listening.

The irony of the occurrence of one student describing the experience of not
being listened to while not being listened to by others heightened my awareness of
the importance of listening in relationships. I hope that as a teacher and as a human
being, I will not lose nor lose sight of that understanding.
Academia

Criticize the Right
keep an open mind
Marxism's out of vogue

Academic freedom's
got new meaning
Somebody please give me a line to tow

Academia
Place of higher learning
Learning what?

Student apathy
Rubber stamp diploma
Gotta have it to succeed

Economic necessity dictates
**Gentle Man**

I know who I am  
but who's accepting who  
once I was nice  
but I'm on the cusp  
of becoming real mean
I Finally Understand

Because I am a white male,
  I am a bad person
Because I am a white male,
  I can only abuse and oppress
Because I am a white male,
  I am implicated in the oppression of all others
Because I am a white male,
  I have gained from the oppression of others
Because I am a white male,
  I cannot possibly understand victimization
Because I am a white male,
  I cannot hope to be enlightened
Because I am a white male,
  I am empoverished by my lack of experience
Because I am a white male,
  I am a bad person
Because of a random act in the universe
  which determined my chromosomal makeup before birth
  I am doomed to lord power over others
And if by some miracle, beyond my control
  I finally understand my concurrence
  in the oppression of all others
Then I will cease to be a white male
Alone Part II

We are fundamentally alone
We are social creatures by instinct and by genetic make-up
Our cerebral cortex gives us the ability to contemplate our own death
Death is a solitary act
Our lives are spent searching for unity
I Can't Explain

I have certain feelings blah blah blah
That I can't explain blah blah blah
That I can't ignore blah blah blah
That I have to express

You are not the source of these feelings
I don't know what the source of these feelings are
   I know that when I feel them
   I can't function the way I should

   I wish them away but they stay
   I wish for something that may never be
   I know it never has been

There have been times when I have been deluded
   Thinking I had found rest
   I was born with these ghosts

I live in a world where I see unity
   But it is not for me to have
      I see calmness
      I am anything but
      I want rest
And I always thought that is what it meant to be in love
Preliminary Examinations
Methodological Triangulation as an Appropriate Research Approach for Studying Complex Human Systems

Human communication is a complex process involving intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social variables as well as the characteristics of the immediate situation in which it occurs. Researching human communication processes involves observation, description and analysis of phenomena while taking into account any variables which may influence or contribute to these processes. Historically, two primary approaches have been used in studying human communication: inductive and hypothetico-deductive.

The strengths of the inductive model include: (a) orientation to the phenomenon, (b) consideration of the researcher's perspective through participant observation, and (c) greater depth of understanding of the meaning associated with the phenomenon which contributes to its occurrence. The strengths of the deductive model include: (a) generalizability, (b) applicability of probability-based causal modeling, and (c) the separation of researcher bias from the testing procedure.

However, given the nature of human communication, either of these two approaches alone may not be appropriate for studying the complexity of communicative phenomena. For example, in interpersonal contexts, meaning may be differentially applied to the events by participants. These differences may occur as a function of uniqueness of the experienced life world of the participants. When this example is expanded to the family context, the differences may be increased. Inductive research models assume greater within group differences, whereas deductive research models assume greater between group differences. Alone, each of these approaches may not be able to adequately explain the complex nature of communicative phenomena within the context of family.

Therefore, some form of methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970), may be necessary for the purpose of studying communication processes within the family context. How might methodological triangulation be justified for purposes of studying family communication? Provide a theoretical rationale. Provide examples of methodological triangulation by demonstrating how representative quantitative and qualitative studies of family communication could be redone with triangulation techniques.
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Parent-adolescent Child Conflict  
as a Function of a Power-sharing Imbalance

Many families with adolescent children may experience increased stress and conflict during this stage of the family life cycle as compared to earlier stages due to the adolescent child's desire to individuate and become independent from his or her parent(s). This tendency to individuate may be demonstrated through the observation of adolescent's relational development outside of the family system. At this time in the family's life cycle, the adolescent child may attempt to take more responsibility for self, thus shifting the balance of power for making decisions, such as curfew times, permission to leave the house, and choices about friends and activities, toward the child and away from the parent(s).

How power to make decisions is exercised in the family may be a function of parenting style, family cohesiveness, and adaptability, as well as relational satisfaction, role congruence and performance between members of the family.

Synthesize current models of family interaction and functioning and propose a method for studying the communicative characteristics of parent-adolescent child conflict.
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Defining Family from the Individual’s Perspective

Following the recent debate between then Vice-president Dan Quayle and fictional television character Murphy Brown, defining the family has proved difficult not only for political and ideological purposes, but also for research purposes. Current research has attempted to define family in inclusive terms so that many different forms of family, for example single-parent, dual-parent, foster or adoptive parent, multi-generational families can be included. Political and ideological concerns have challenged the notion that forms other than the Standard North American Family Unit, or nuclear family, can be considered true or "normal" families. However, restrictions upon an operationalizable definition of family have proved to be problematic. According to Sayres (1992), given the varied forms of the family, defining family has proved difficult.

New attempts to define family for purposes of social research must be sufficiently abstract in order to be inclusive of all forms of family while at the same time specific so that it can be applied to systems which serve the specific social function of family. This definition should be applied so as not to "normalize" specific family types for ideological purposes. To this end, an existential definition of family from the perspective of the individual family member might serve the purpose of meeting the goal of operationalizing family for purposes of social research. This approach may allow research to emphasize commonalities between various family types instead of emphasizing differences.

Critique and synthesize current definitions of the family and propose a model and definition of family from a communication research perspective. Give examples of specific family communication research issues, such as conflict, development through family life cycles, and interaction between family subsystems, which can be serviced by this model and definition.
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Intimate interpersonal relationships may involve continual negotiation of expectations regarding interactional behavior as well as values and attitudes relevant to the relationship. These expectations may be explicitly stated or implied through rules such as a rule regarding honesty. Violation of these rules may effect the trust or intimacy in the relationship either positively or negatively depending on the meaning supplied by the co-participants to the violation. However, certain types of rules may be common to intimate interpersonal relationships in such a way that violation of these rules may predict a particular type of negative outcome such as the inference of negative effect on the self or relationship. Disconfirming behaviors may fall in to this category.

Specific communicative behaviors within the context of intimate interpersonal relationships may have negative effects on the self or the relationship which are interpreted by one member of the relationship as being disconfirming. Disconfirmation may be defined as the negation of identity through behaviors which neglect, deny or ignore.

Provide a critique of the literature on disconfirmation. Specify a operational definition for disconfirmation, and offer a methodology for studying disconfirmation in intimate interpersonal relationships. Propose a study given a synthesis of current descriptions of disconfirmation, an operational definition, and an appropriate methodology.
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Write a critique of systems theories of family communication, examining their strengths and weaknesses. Contrast systems perspectives with other theoretical paradigms that might be taken in the teaching and study of family communication. In other words, does the notion of "family system" cover just about everything that one might study concerning family communication, or are there other competing theories of families that do not embrace the tenets of systems theories? Cite major contributors to the systems perspective.
A Critique of Systems Theories of Family Communication:
Preliminary Examination Question One

Within the current research on family communication, an emphasis has been placed on the definition of the family as a system. Bochner (1976) defined family as "...an organized, naturally occurring relational interaction system..." (p. 381, cited in Pearson, 1989). Other definitions of family as a system include: (a) "... a system in which communication regulates cohesion and adaptability..." (Galvin & Brommel, 1986, p. 23), (b) "a special set (system) of people with relationships between them..." (Bavelas & Segal, 1982, p. 103), and (c) "a group of two or more individuals who are perceived as interdependent..." (Arliss, 1993, p. 7). A system is "a set of objects together with relationships between the objects and between their attributes" (Hall & Fagen, 1956, cited in Watzlawick, Bavelas, and Jackson, 1987, p. 120). Watzlawick, et al. (1987) applied Hall and Fagen's (1956) definition of a system to human interactants such that a group of relationally interdependent interactants can be described as a system. It is in that sense that the "family as a system" metaphor has been used in current research on family communication.

Systems theories have offered workable definitions and concepts in the study of family communication. However, much scholarly debate on systems theories has been unable to discern adequately what role systems theories play in the explanation of family communication. Systems theories have been described as a paradigm, world view or perspective (Monge, 1977; Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 1993), and as a metatheory or set of theories (Littlejohn, 1989; Bavelas & Segal, 1982; Meadowcroft & Fitzpatrick, 1988; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993). This essay will discern the role or roles of systems theories as explanatory models of family communication, examine the strengths and weaknesses of systems theories in comparison to other models, and describe the usefulness of systems approaches to the explicit research context of family interaction. To accomplish these tasks, a brief description of the background of general system theory will be given, along with an explication of the major concepts associated with general system theory. Next, a brief description of competing paradigms, in particular covering laws and human action paradigms, and competing theories, such as structural-functionalist, interactionist, conflict, social exchange, and developmental models, will be given. Finally, an application of systems theory concepts to the context of human interaction in general and family communication in particular will be offered. I hope to show that a systems paradigm can subsume and entail noncontradictory aspects of competing theories of family communication, and that a view toward the family as a "culture" of variously interdependent individuals can prove beneficial in research into family communication.

General system theory was pioneered by biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1956, cited in Watzlawick, et al., 1987; also Infante, et al., 1993). The purpose of general system theory was to describe the nature of and determine principles common to interactional systems whether biological, physical, or chemical. As such,
general system theory provided a conceptual framework for describing the relationships between human beings as members of a system, such as a family. A systems theoretic perspective was anticipated in the social sciences by Ruesch and Bateson (1951), and later applied to the phenomena of human interaction by social scientists such as Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967).

Characteristics of systems include openness or closedness. A closed system is self-contained and requires no input from the surrounding environment. Closed systems have impermeable boundaries. Open systems are affected by the environment. According to Ruesch and Bateson (1957), the individual communicates at four levels, intrapersonally, interpersonally, within small groups, and with the culture at large. Families, comprised of individual communicators, interact with the environment outside of the boundaries of the family system, and therefore are open. Open systems have permeable boundaries.

Systems can be comprised of subsystems. In the family, subsystems can be determined by roles such as the parental unit, the spousal unit, or the sibling unit. Roles within the family create implicit boundaries in that the roles determine which behavior is to be expected, what type of interactions are considered appropriate, and which members have the right or duty to make rules. Subsystems can also be determined by interaction. Dyadic coalitions may form between particular family members due to personality characteristics, proximity in age, attitude similarity or other factors.

Systems are determined by the interdependence of members. In a family, for example, the behaviors of a member affect and/or influence the behaviors of other members. The degree of interdependence within a system can vary from dependence or enmeshment to independence or disengagement. However, the members interact to adapt to a changing environment. In the sense of interdependence, systems are nonsummative: the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Also, because individual members are interdependent with each other, each cause is also an effect; that is, causality is circular. For example, one member's behavior (effect) is influenced by both the expectations of other members and self-in-relation-to-others (cause). This member's behavior (cause) also influences others (effect) and may contribute to the redefinition of expectations (secondary effect). In this example, the particular member's behavior is both a cause and an effect. In the truest sense, systems theories reject linear causality.

Systems theories incorporate several assumptions which differ significantly from both the covering laws and human action paradigms. The systems paradigm assumes reality is interrelated, hierarchically organized into structural wholes (Tucker, Weaver & Berryman-Fink, 1981). The system paradigm also assumes that systems can change in response to the environment. Both of these assumptions differ from covering laws and human action paradigms.

The covering laws paradigm assumes that reality is independent and objectively knowable to an observer. Observation for the covering laws theorist is theory-free. The covering laws theorist attempts to reduce reality to its simplest components in order to discover causal regularities. In the study of human communication, the covering laws paradigm is associated with behaviorist research.
Systems theorists seek to find regularities of system organization in the form of laws. However, these regularities apply to systems in general, as in the concepts of interdependence, boundaries, and nonsummativity, as opposed to specific regularities differentiated by particular systems.

The human action paradigm assumes that (social) reality is co-constructed by participants, and that knowledge arises through the interaction between the knower(s) and the known (Littlejohn, 1989). Therefore, observation for the human action theorist is theory-laden. The human action theorist attempts to uncover the patterns or rules by which interactants operate, as well as the rules they create. The human action paradigm is associated with rules approaches in the study of human communication. Systems theorists seek examples of self-regulation within systems. For example, a family may interact in ways that are consistent with implicit rules. The rules may help to define boundaries between subsystems, as between the parental subsystem and the sibling subsystem.

The systems paradigm thus encompasses noncontradictory assumptions of both the covering laws and human action paradigms but adds the distinctive features of wholeness, self-regulation, adaptation, and hierarchical embeddedness (Monge, 1977). As a paradigm, the systems approach is appropriate for the study of human communication in several ways. First, the individual communicator is concurrently a member of several different groups. All communicators, in this context, are members of the human race, and as such potentially have the ability to communicate with others for the purpose of meeting needs and goals. Societies are formed with differential levels of hierarchy for the purpose of self-governance. Families exist within societies for purposes of procreation, socialization and identity. Whether these systems have to exist for human survival is not at issue, instead these systems, in fact, do exist and are observable as having certain qualities, such as interdependence. Communication occurs as a means of creating and maintaining these relational systems.

Second, individual communicators define their relationship through the process of communication (Watzlawick, et al., 1987). The corollary of this statement is: communication is a function of relationships (Fisher, 1987, p. 4). The existential doing of relationships, in this sense, is communicative. If relationships can be defined as systems, then the study of relationships would entail examining communicative phenomena.

Third, the systems paradigm proposes the relationship itself as a unit of measure. Prior research, particularly in the covering laws paradigm, treated the individual as a unit of measure. For example, the researcher could examine the persuasive effects on a target individual(s) by the behaviors of a persuader. Cognitive approaches examined the intrapersonal characteristics of an individual to determine which factors contributed to particular outcomes. In these examples, the unit of measure was not the relationship between the interactants but the interactants themselves (Fitzpatrick & Wamboldt, 1990). The systems paradigm does not deny the contribution of intrapersonal characteristics per se, but rather allows for examination of these factors within the context of the various systems (family, society, culture) in which the individual takes part.
Finally, the systems paradigm takes into consideration the stressors which precipitate change in the system, as well as the factors which may lead to a resistance to change in the system. The stressors can be both internal or external to the system. For the family, an external stressor could be a change in job status for the primary breadwinner(s). An internal stressor could include the individuation process of adolescence. Factors which contribute to a resistance to change can also be both internal or external to the system. Internal factors could include family rules, or the rigidity of rules held by the family. External factors could include real or perceived social sanctions toward change such as those imposed following a divorce.

The systems paradigm serves as an appropriate framework for research into family systems, for the reasons outlined above. However, the role the systems paradigm has played in current research has been problematic. The systems "approach" or "perspective" often translates as a theory for human interaction. In fact, much family communication research begins from a systems theoretic perspective, although the research is often pursued with a particular subsystem in mind, for example marital dyads or parent-child dyads (Fitzpatrick & Badinski, 1994). Yet, when the systems perspective is framed as a theory, it has several weaknesses.

Theories must meet certain criteria such as predictability, precision and scope (Smith, 1988). Serious and substantial criticisms have been levied against systems theory on the grounds that systems theory does not meet these criteria. Littlejohn (1989) claims that systems theory is too all encompassing or too broad (see also Tucker, et al., 1981; Infante, et al., 1993). If the scope or domain of a theory is too broad, then it lacks ability to distinguish between different contexts and phenomena. Another criticism about systems theory is that it has little or no explanatory power: it fails to predict. Systems theory fails to explain why families (systems) interact in a particular way, other than to offer broad conceptual definitions, such as interdependence. Finally, systems theory has generated little empirical research and therefore has little heuristic value (see also Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993). Littlejohn (1989) argues that one difficulty with systems theory is that it cannot be both a framework and a theory. Bormann posits that "by confusing a viewpoint with a theory, . . ." investigators often make "unreasonable demands on viewpoints" (1980, p. 156). It is my belief that systems "theory" is more properly a paradigm encompassing philosophical assumptions and broad conceptual definitions which describe the interrelatedness of interactants with each other and their environment and context.

The systems paradigm presents a complex view of communication by incorporating factors beyond the individual communicator. In family studies, examinations of degrees of interrelatedness between members and the mechanisms for developing and maintaining the interrelatedness demonstrates different theoretical approaches subsumed within the systems paradigm. The structural-functional model delineates the structural elements of the family by specifying the roles of particular members or subsystems (Meadowcroft & Fitzpatrick, 1988). These roles may be determined by cultural expectations or by
expectations derived from the parents family-of-origin. The roles of particular members or subsystems, such as the parental subsystems, implicate the boundaries between subsystems.

The interactional model examines how members of a system respond to each other through the negotiation and co-creation of shared meaning. Rather than abide by culturally determined roles, individuals within the system attempt to reach consensus on the roles. Conflict might arise in a system in which individuals have difficulty reaching consensus or where the structure of the system is rigid and resistant to change. An example of rigid boundaries and roles might exist in a family where the parents practice an authoritarian parenting style. If consensus occurred within the family, family members might experience relational satisfaction. However, if role expectations between members are incongruent, dissatisfaction might increase.

Three additional models compete with the systems perspective interactional and structural-functional models for explaining the mechanisms of interaction between individuals within a family. The conflict model assumes that membership in a family is a negotiation of needs and expectations which are necessarily conflicting. According to this model, family members attempt to influence each other with the result of pragmatic interdependence. For example, a child out of practical necessity may attempt to influence parents in giving the child an item desired. In this sense, the conflict model is similar to the exchange model in that a bartering occurs between individuals. However, in the exchange model individuals avoid costly endeavors. The pain of conflictual situations may outweigh the rewards of gaining the desired need or want. In these two models, interdependence occurs as a function of practical necessity.

A final model for describing the mechanisms for family interaction is the developmental model. The developmental model examines the significant occurrences of events within the life of individuals and families. According to this model, events influence the interactions between family members in predictable ways. In particular, individuals go through transitions in the process of maturation which precipitates changes in the family.

Each of these models, though not necessarily intended, contain aspects which can be subsumed within the systems paradigm. The conflict, exchange and developmental models, though focusing on the behavior of the individual, acknowledge the influences that behavior has on others in proximity, for example the family. The interactional approach examines the meaning the individual derives from interactions with others. Yet, this intersubjective meaning depends upon interaction with an other(s). Therefore, the systems paradigm is sufficiently flexible to entail aspects of explanatory models developed under other paradigms provided those aspects of competing theories do not contradict each other or the assumptions of the systems paradigm.

In the following extended example, I will demonstrate the utility of the systems paradigm for studying family communication. In a family of six, four children ranging in age from seventeen to two and one-half years of age share a small three bedroom home with two adults. One adult is mother to all four children. Her spouse,
the other adult in the family, is the father of the youngest child. The seventeen year old child, is a male. The second child, age fourteen, is female. Currently, the fourteen year old child is experiencing conflict with the mother. At issue is the fourteen-year-old's desire to be trusted and given more responsibility for personal choices. In terms of developmental stages, the child is undergoing the individuation process. The mother, weary of the potential for destructive choices, experiences difficulty in allowing the child the degree of freedom she desires. The reasons for this reluctance by the mother include having gone through the process once before as a mother with the older sibling and the consequent difficulties of that process, and the mother's own history as an unwed mother at fifteen years of age. The teenage daughter believes the mother does not trust the daughter's judgment and reacts according to that belief by making choices to go out without the mother's consent. The mother responds to those behaviors by punishing the daughter for not "being trustworthy."

In this example, the cause for the conflict, from a systems perspective, is circular. The response of the mother is precipitated by the daughter's behavior which in turn is a reaction to the perceived attitudes or actions of mother. During this individuation process, the boundaries are questioned by the daughter. In becoming a young adult, the daughter believes she has earned the right to make certain kinds of decisions. The daughter also believes that it is incumbent upon the parents, in this case the mother, to trust her judgment. Meanwhile, the mother believes she is fulfilling her role as parent by specifying boundaries and rules for appropriate behavior for her children. The relationship between the mother and the daughter is highly interdependent. This interdependence is demonstrated by both individuals' attempts to influence the other to get needs met.

Other members of the family are affected by the conflict between the mother and the daughter. The adult male, spouse of the mother, has say in the decisions of the family, however, since he is not the biological father of the daughter attempts to interact only in an advisory role to the mother. This choice of action by the father is a consequence of the history of the family and his relationships with his spouse and her children. The older brother has gone through this process with the mother a few years earlier. His experience offers data for the conflict between the mother and the daughter. The ten-year-old brother has the process to come and the experience of two older siblings, to his benefit or detriment. The children, with the exception of the two-year-old have the ability to form a sibling coalition to benefit the daughter in her conflict with the mother or both parents. The family can adapt to internal stressors of the family life cycle as evidenced by the fact that they survived the first child's individuation process.

This example demonstrates that the systems paradigm can offer a framework for examining the interaction of a family. It can conceptualize the context of family interaction. The systems paradigm is not a theory and therefore cannot examine the particulars of communication phenomena per se. For example, the systems paradigm does not offer an explanatory model for describing particular communicative actions. Yet, the systems perspective offers insight into family as a
relational unit, comprised of interdependent individuals who define, create and maintain relationships through communication.
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Footnote

1 Noller and Fitzpatrick (1993) argue that the systems perspective may have resulted in too much emphasis being placed on the family as a whole while ignoring family subsystems. The tendency to examine the whole family may have changed toward examining family subsystems, such as marital and parent-child dyads. In my research, I have come across many articles on parent-child interaction. Yet, I find it curious that two seemingly contradictory assertions could be published by Fitzpatrick as co-author on a book and as primary author on an article with the publication dates (1993 & 1994) so close together.
Preliminary Examination for H. Paul LeBlanc III, 1994
3-day Question from Philip J. Glenn, PhD

1. Discuss how in the attached article Jenny Mandelbaum provides reasoning and evidence to support the claim that participants "do" relationships in their interactions.

2. Using this approach as a model, analyze the attached transcript and recording ("Pie"). Argue for some particular phenomenon or phenomena which display participant orientation to "doing" being family members.

3. Close with a discussion of the advantages and drawbacks of this kind of approach to studying relational communication.

Note: The transcripts are in various stages of sophistication. Depending on which parts you use, you may need to revise some of them.
An Analysis of Family “Doing” Family: Preliminary Examination Question Two

The ethnomethodological tradition has initiated studies based on the assumption that individuals interact with each other in orderly, patterned ways (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). It is in the examination of that order of interaction that the analyst is able to intuit possible or probable answers to the question, "how do individuals define relationship through interaction?" This question is made relevant by previous research which suggested that the communication between people specifies common knowledge, shared experience, and recognition of the other in a way which identifies each other as being in a relationship (Nofsinger, 1991). Mandelbaum (1985) argues that characteristics of talk demonstrate the "doing" of being members of a couple. A couple, as defined by Mandelbaum, is a group of two people who are intimate with each other. She concludes that the process of being "with" the other determines coupleness. Given her argument, conversation analytic techniques can be applied to larger groups of "withs" such as a family.

In this essay, I will discuss ethnomethodological and conversation analytic attempts to describe how persons "do" relationship. In particular, I will critique Mandelbaum's (1985) essay which provides reasoning and evidence for the interactional production of relationship through the co-telling of co-participated events. Using Mandelbaum's model, I will analyze the "doing" of family from a transcribed family dinner interaction. I will examine how interactants orient to each other as people with whom they have ongoing personal relationships in order to provide evidence for intimacy and "with"ness. To accomplish this, I will analyze instances of the co-telling of co-participated events, requests for information about daily activities, planning of future shared events, and shared attempts at the construction of meaning. Finally, I will discuss strengths and weaknesses of conversation analytic approaches to examining relational communication.

Mandelbaum (1985) examined two instances of conversational storytelling in which the retelling of events co-participated in by a "couple" were simultaneously and complementarily related by both members of the couple. It is in the retelling by both participants of an event that interactional problems must be overcome. The problems described by the author are that the telling of an event is an activity usually undertaken by one individual and that the telling usually occurs when the recipients have not previously heard the story.

The process of storytelling usually involves a suspension of the turn-taking sequence (Sacks, 1971; cited in Mandelbaum, 1985). This suspension requires the cooperation of the other interactants in allowing the extended turn at talk to occur. The suspension may be allowed when the story to be told has the following qualities: (a) it is relevant to the ongoing conversation, (b) it is out of the ordinary or somehow newsworthy, and (c) the events to be described are not known to the recipients. Meeting these conditions amounts to being cooperative. Grice (1975) proposed that conversational interactants must form their utterances in such a way as to fulfill the requirements of the conversational episode so that meaning may be
co-constructed. Grice’s cooperative principle specifies several maxims which must be followed in order for conversation to proceed smoothly. The maxims of strength and parsimony suggest that the speaker should say enough but not too much. The maxim of relevance suggests that an utterance should be directed by or toward "... the overall goal(s) of the participants, to the immediate topic or theme, to the immediate health or safety of the participants, or to some event that happens during the process of the conversation" (Nofsinger, 1991, p. 38).

Mandelbaum points out that repeating a story to a recipient is problematic. A reason for this is that repeating a story violates the maxim of parsimony. However, in a mixed group comprised of both knowing and unknowing recipients, the telling of the story concurrently violates and not violates the maxims. It is in this sense of violating a maxim for one interactant while not violating a maxim for others that the storyteller must orient his or her utterances. One possible way to resolve the problem of violating a maxim is to gain permission to do so beforehand. This may be accomplished through prefacing and qualifying the upcoming utterance or by including the knowing recipient as a co-teller of the story. This condition of inclusion is met in the examples provided by Mandelbaum.

However, the knowledge regarding the events of the story by the co-teller in the examples provided by Mandelbaum is first-hand. Rather than simply relating a story that is based on second-hand knowledge, in the examples provided both the story initiator, or the primary storyteller, and the co-teller participated in the events being recounted. Further, both tellers participated in the events together. They were co-participants. As such, both observed the peculiarities of the reactions and interactions of their partner with the events as they were unfolding. The partners had specific knowledge about each other within the context of the event. The event was a shared experience.

Mandelbaum offers the occurrence of shared experience, and the subsequent co-telling as a basis for the definition of couple. Mandelbaum proposed that the interactive co-telling of shared events offers evidence to the "doing" of relationship, in particular coupling. She suggests that "with"ness creates a peculiar interaction problem of violation/not violation but that resolution of the interactional problems associated with co-telling is a function of "with"ness. She offered several specific conversational phenomena related to co-telling of a shared experience as evidence.

The resolution of the problems associated with the co-telling of co-participated events was described as having several characteristics. First, following a preface or projection up an upcoming story, co-tellers display knowledge of the events about to be recounted either verbally or nonverbally. (For purposes of this discussion, story initiator refers to the individual who first offers the story as a possible topic. The teller refers to the primary storyteller, whereas the co-teller refers to the secondary storyteller. These uses apply to the terms offered by Mandelbaum.) For example, the co-teller may display knowledge of the upcoming story by laughing or by responding with, "Oh! this is really funny." Given this display of knowledge by the co-teller, the teller may ratify the knowledge of the co-teller by
sharing the story preface, by an aside, or by explicitly stating to the unknowing recipients the participation of the knowing co-teller.

While telling the story, co-tellers may demonstrate co-participation in the recounted events by monitoring for errors, requesting verification of the teller’s perceptions of the events, or by offering a complementary telling. A co-teller may offer a conflicting account following an occurrence of a mistake regarding a particular fact about the event in the teller’s story. A co-teller may also request verification of facts about the event from the teller of the story. The request demonstrates that the co-participant has as much knowledge of the event as the other. Also, the co-teller may offer a complementary telling of the event by dramatizing or adding cues to the telling by the other.

At any point in the telling of the story, the teller or co-teller may switch roles. The story initiator does not have to serve as the teller. The story initiator may offer the topic and request the other to tell the story such as, “Tell them what happened to us in class today . . . .” The teller may become the co-teller following an other-initiated other repair. However, to the recipients, the co-telling of a co-participated event demonstrates the shared experience of the tellers.

It is this demonstration of shared events that Mandelbaum offers as evidence of coupleness. As I shall demonstrate, the co-telling of shared experiences may demonstrate "with"ness, though not necessarily coupleness. Coupleness as defined by Mandelbaum is a particular kind of "with"ness which may require more particulars of relational definition in terms of a shared mutual awareness of coupleness expectations than that demonstrated by the co-telling of shared experiences. To be sure, Mandelbaum broadens Goffman’s use of the term to apply possibly to non-sexual couples. However, she suggests that the demonstration of "intimate" knowledge of the others thoughts regarding a shared experience is sufficient for determining coupleness. At minimum, a family may demonstrate "with"ness through shared experiences. However, other conversational phenomena may be necessary to show how families "do" family through interaction. To this end, I will describe other phenomena which demonstrate "with"ness. For example, requests from adult "parents" toward their children regarding information about daily events in the children’s lives may demonstrate a right to ask thus implying a role orientation illustrative of family relationships and therefore "with"ness. Planning of future shared events may imply expectations of continued "with"ness. And, shared attempts at the construction of meaning may imply orientation toward the other demonstrating "with"ness. Examples of these conversational phenomena taken together may offer a fuller picture of "with"ness as experienced by a family.

Method

As in the Mandelbaum study, the method used in this study is conversation analysis, which includes the following steps: (a) observation of a videotaped interaction, (b) careful transcription, and revising and editing of a previously transcribed script, and (c) careful description of the conversational phenomena associated with the transcript and recording. The conversation analyst looks for orderliness in the interaction which demonstrates the methods employed by the participants to maintain coherence in the co-construction of meaning. In this study, I
will be looking specifically for phenomena which resemble the conversational acts specified by Mandelbaum as demonstrating "with"ness.

Data

My study of family interaction uses a portion of an eight minute videotaped recording of a dinner shared by a family of four. The family includes a male (Tom) and a female (Linda) adult who are the natural parents of two young sons (Ben and Josh). Their relationship to each other is known by the analyst as constituting a family, as defined by the family members themselves. The transcription was made by B. Crow, and M. Kelly, and revised and edited by the researcher, using the transcription system developed by G. Jefferson. The transcription of the episode is included in the appendix.

Findings

As demonstrated by Mandelbaum, the telling of co-participated events involves resolving the interactional problem of revealing details to a knowing recipient. The telling of co-participated events also involves the dilemma of concurrently violating and not violating the cooperation principle because the group of potential hearers includes both knowing recipients and unknowing recipients. In a family context, the conversational act of storytelling involving events participated in by family members may serve a function of inclusion, thus enhancing the quality of "with"ness within the family.

To describe how inclusion is increased in the conversation being studied, I describe how members of the family interactively share in the telling of the events thus resolving some of the problems outlined above in the co-telling of co-participated events. I also offer other examples of cooperative interaction which demonstrates inclusion and "with"ness in the family context.

In the first segment, Tom tells Ben and Josh about an event which involved Tom and Linda. The telling of the event is relevant in a couple of ways. First, the event involved the preparing of food, in particular a pie. In the context of the conversation, the family was just finishing eating supper and was about to eat dessert which included a pie. Second, the topic initiator beginning on line 005 can be perceived as a tease about a past event. Including the two boys in on the tease may enhance "with"ness. Also, the event is a "humorous" occurrence and is relevant in the context due to the jovial nature of the preceding conversation as evidenced by the laughter in lines 001 and 004.

The topic initiator (line 005) serves as a possible story projection because the word "our" is emphasized thus demonstrating an out of the ordinary condition. The emphasized "our" specifies a distinction between an "ours" and a "theirs". Also, the upward intonation at the end of the utterance specifies a question, thus the first pair-part of an adjacency pair. This question makes a response from Linda relevant due to the eye gaze an orientation Tom makes toward her at the end of the question. Linda returns eye gaze and a smile, but does not respond at this turn relevance place. Tom continues following a micropause on line 006 by qualifying and clarifying the question with "since I wasn't here?" The qualifying tag question (line 006) also specifies a difference between the making of "our" pie versus the making of "their" pie.
The distinction is not known to the other two participants in the conversation, as is evidenced by the telling of the story beginning on line 010. Thus, the projection of the possible story as a newsworthy item is relevant because it is not known to the two boys, yet it involves an event which includes two family members and is not of an intimate nature.

The sequence between Tom and Linda (lines 005-009) is produced as an aside. This is evidenced by the orientation of Tom and Linda toward each other and by the fact that the event is unknown by the boys. However, Tom’s question may also serve as a request for remembrance of the past event alluded to thus recognizing Linda as a competent teller of the event. Linda demonstrates knowledge of the events and the distinction between the making of "our" pie versus "their" pie with her response in line 009. Linda’s demonstration ratifies her status as a competent story-teller of the event.

Following Linda’s ratification, Tom immediately turns toward the two boys and tells the story without any pause between Linda’s utterance (line 009) and the beginning of his (line 010). Immediately following Linda’s utterance on line 009, Linda turns towards the two boys thus signaling her anticipation of the story being offered to the boys. Linda’s orientation toward the boys may also serve the function of acknowledging or ratifying the appropriateness of the story for the two boys. This function maybe particularly important in a family context where a parent is sharing a spousal event with a child.

Tom tells the story to the two boys in a matter of fact tone until line 013 when he laughs. The function of this inclusion of laughter may be to indicate to the two boys that the fact that Linda got mixed up because she was distracted was laughable. Yet, this projected laughable does not gain the expected or relevant response of the boys. Linda’s complementary addition of Tom’s telling (line 014) serves to explicitly state the funny aspect of the story in order to elicit a response from the boys. Linda’s addition also fails to get a response from the boys. Although the story is apparently funny to Tom and Linda, the boys do not demonstrate overt interest in the story. In fact, in line 025, following several attempts by both Tom and Linda in eliciting laughter, Josh asks to be excused. Linda attempts a second time to explain a funny aspect of the story in Line 018. During Linda’s utterance Ben turns his head away and looks toward some papers on the wall. Tom and Linda continue to express humor in the story through laughter (lines 019, 021-022, and 024), and by adding other humorous elements to the story (lines 018, 020, 023). Apparently, the humor of the event existed only for Tom and Linda, although the telling of the event was designed to elicit laughter from the boys.

This segment of talk demonstrates inclusion and "with"ness in a couple of ways. First, it demonstrates an attempt at inclusion by describing to the boys an event which occurred between Tom and Linda. The event was, perhaps, a moment of intimacy between the parents which the parents felt was appropriate for them to tell to the boys. Second, it demonstrates "with"ness between Tom and Linda at an existential level by the sharing of the event, and at a communicative level by cooperating in their telling of the event. Inclusion of the boys was also demonstrated
by a request for verification of shared knowledge offered by Linda on line 016. This shared knowledge was ratified by Ben on line 017 by his response "Uh huh".

Following several other segments of talk, and the occasion of the pie being served five minutes and forty-two seconds later, the topic of the pie is revisited beginning on line 258. Tom states, "Boy this pie is good". Linda offers a laugh token on the following line suggesting that the topic of the pie "mistake" is admissible as a topic. She then continues with an utterance containing laughter regarding the projected whereabouts of the low sugar pie. Tom and Linda then discuss how much sugar is left out of the pie. This information receives a response from Ben on lines 267, 272-273, and 276, in which Ben states a tease in the form of hyperbole, "That's horrible Mom you (coulda) drowned us". The topic then shifts from the ingredients or lack of ingredients in the pie to the kiss. Josh responds in line 298 to the information about the kiss with an incredulous question. Following Josh's question is an interaction which involves all of the family members (lines 299 through 317). This segment demonstrates the inclusion, illustrated through cooperative interaction, that may have been intended in the initial co-telling of the story at the beginning of the recorded session. However, it is discovered that for Josh the occasion of the kiss is more interesting than the mistake regarding the amount of sugar put in the pie. The sharing of that detail of shared intimacy between Tom and Linda brought about inclusion as illustrated by the cooperative interaction between family members.

Inclusion is also demonstrated by other conversational phenomena throughout this episode. For example, in the segment beginning on line 103 and continuing to line 131, the family talks about plans for future shared events. Mandelbaum suggests that the co-telling of shared events demonstrates "with"ness because cooperation is required in order to manage interaction problems associated with co-telling. However, implicit in the co-telling of shared events is the sharing of events as demonstrative of "with"ness. The planning of future shared events demonstrates an expectation of "with"ness by co-participants and thereby ratifying current perceptions regarding "with"ness. This ratification of the current perceptions of "with"ness within this family is evident by the use of the pronoun "we" in lines 116, 117, 119, 120, 128, and 130.

Another conversational phenomenon in this episode which demonstrates inclusion is the request for information about daily events. These types of requests indicate a desire for shared knowledge by relational partners. In this case, Tom and Linda request information from the boys about activities they have engaged in throughout the day. For example, in lines 112, 114, and 116 Linda and Tom ask Josh about a conversation he had with his teacher. In lines 162 through 183, Tom asks Ben about his exercise program. In this example, Tom requests more information about an activity that he apparently heard about from another source other than Ben, possibly another family member. In the case of these requests by parents, the boys give relevant responses that appear to fulfill the obligations of an implied right to know by the parents. Within this episode, only one request for information from a parent (Tom) to a child (Josh) fails to get a response (line 034). However, this particular utterance overlaps an utterance by Linda (a parent) in giving information to Ben (a child). In this case, it is possible that the request was
not heard. Also, no request for information about daily activities is made in this episode from child to parent. This may demonstrate parent-child role expectations, or it may be due to the age or interests of the children. The parent-to-child request for information demonstrates the parent's desire for shared knowledge thus implying inclusion.

Finally, inclusion is demonstrated as well by the interactional cooperation required to construct shared meanings. This characteristic of talk illustrates the axiom that relationships are defined by communication. However, in this episode, the construction of meaning, reference to a particular object in the back yard, is expanded over several turns, for a full minute and twenty two seconds, due to an inability by Ben to describe more specifically the object referred. Beginning on line 189, Ben makes a request for verification from Tom (Dad) regarding Tom's knowledge of a metal object "out there". On line 195, Tom displays a lack of understanding regarding "what metal thing" to which Ben is referring. From that point, line 195, until line 240, Ben attempts to describe the metal thing so that Tom will know to what he is referring. On line 240, Ben states emphatically, "Yeah, that!" displaying that understanding has been reached.

The purpose of Ben's providing Tom with the referent of the metal thing is so that he can continue his description of his exercise routine. The occasion which brought about the trouble in understanding between Tom and Ben may have been the combination of the 1.6 second pause on line 184, and the off-topic interjection by Josh on line 185. Previously, Tom and Ben were talking about Ben's exercise program. The pause and subsequent topic shift may have affected Tom's ability to see the relevance between the previous segment of talk about the exercise program and the current one about the metal thing. Although Ben supplied an "and" to tie his utterance to the previous topic, the "and" overlapped a previous utterance by Josh which may have taken Tom's attention away from Ben momentarily thus prohibiting Tom from attending to the "and" as topic connector.

Throughout this segment, both Linda and Josh offer candidate answers to the question, "what metal thing?" This cooperation in the construction of the meaning "that thing in the back yard on which I (Ben) do my exercises" demonstrates how the entire family attempts to make relevant communication between its members. It is this type of cooperation which demonstrates an investment in the "with"ness of relationships.

Discussion
In a family context, the perception of "with"ness between spouses both within the spousal subsystem and from the children's perspective may be enhanced by cooperative co-telling of co-participated events. The co-tellers resolve the interactional problems of concurrently violating and not violating relevance, strength and parsimony maxims by checking appropriateness of the projected story with the other, and displaying and recognizing the knowledge of the other. Co-tellers also request verification of facts about the events and add information where necessary to enhance the story.

Other conversational phenomena also enhance the perception of "with"ness and inclusion within a family context. These phenomena include planning of future
shared events, requesting information about the daily events of members, and shared attempts at the construction of meaning. Observation of these types of conversational acts can contribute to our understanding of how families "do" family through inclusion.

**Conclusion**

It is my belief that conversation analytic techniques by themselves are not sufficient for making determinations about the nature of any given relationship between two or more interactants. Conversation analytic techniques allow the researcher to examine how interactants make relevant utterances by an other. As such, these techniques can claim that they examine the doing of relationship for it is in the doing that relationships are defined. However, these techniques do not and do not purport to show the internal meaning and expectations an individual has toward an other in which that individual is in relationship. These techniques merely show the particular and actual methods thus employed by an individual as opposed to the possible methods.

There are other factors, other than behavior alone, which effectively create relationships, such as expectations based on past experiences to which neither the co-participants themselves, nor the analyst has direct access. These expectations, as well as shared experiences by members of the relationship, serve as a subtext which is not always apparent to the observer. This subtext may only be partially accessed through direct interrogation of the people to which the subtext applies.

Furthermore, the analyst cannot be completely unmotivated. In the present study, the relationship of the interactants was already known. I knew that the four persons in the interaction were related by blood and constituted a family from their own perspective. Although Mandelbaum claimed that little demographic information was known about the participants she examined, she was not completely unmotivated in that she was looking for instances of the co-telling of co-participated events for the purpose of discovering the characteristics of interactional "with"ness. This inability to be completely unmotivated as an analyst does not necessarily discount the findings. However, care must be taken not to assume that the findings of a study constitute a rule for interpreting phenomena. The assessment of a particular conversational phenomenon as being constitutive of relationships is to be left to the community of scholars to determine intersubjectively, but even then the assessment is a matter of interpretation and thus serves only as a probable explanation.

Yet, although the use of these types of analyses are not sufficient for determining relationships in (nearly) absolute and thus predictable terms, an orientation to the phenomenon itself, as is performed through conversation analytic techniques, is necessary for the furtherance of knowledge about communication. Hawes (1977) argues that careful description of the phenomena about which the discipline of communication is engaged is a necessary first step before theory building can occur (see also Litton-Hawes, 1977). To be sure, an extensive database of "... all manner of human communicative activity," (Hawes, 1977, p. 64) should be developed to motivate subsequent research.
In the study of family communication, particular attention should be given to the "doing" of family through interaction with family members. Yet, the family still exists for the person, as does other relationships, even when those significant others are not present for the person to interact with. Although communication does define relationships by setting boundary conditions, implying rules and roles, and specifying the desires and expectations of the other through both content and meta-messages, the individual does bring to the relationship the self and those factors which do impact the choices which bring about the interaction.
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Appendix

Pie (10/1/94)


L: = Linda (Mom), T: = Tom (Dad), B: = Ben (oldest son), J: = Josh (son)

001 L: (Well::), it wasn't very filling was it eheheheheh, ↑eh eh
002 T: No it was uh (.)
003 good but it went by pretty quickly
004 B: hehehehehehehehehehe
005 T: Did uh (0.2) Did you put all the sugar in our pie?
006 (. ) since I wasn't here?
007 L: You know I- (.)
008 Yeah, I did
009 I almost didn't
010 T: Your mom was makin a pie today boys 'n I came up behind 'er 'n
gave 'er a kiss 'n said "Did you put all the ingredients in
already so I don't gitchu distracted" ·hh and she said "Yes," and
she got mixed up 'n heheh ·hh left part of the ingredients out
L: And the- the (.) funny thing is I made the pie for (.) a couple
(.) that's s:sick?
Y'know Mr. 'n Mrs. Bryant?
L: Now they have a pie with part of the sugar out of it.
hhh hhh hhh
T: Part of the sugar was rit there
L: [(laughing)]
T: Part of the sugar from that pie
ehehehehkheh
J: Can (we) go now?
T: No we're gonna have dessert
J: (Hi) I
B: Josh, we don't have dessert de sert very often you should be happy
L: ((Laugh))
J: May I (.) I already had ice cream and I, and I don't like apple
pie
T: You boys seem, you boys
L: Wher'd you have ice cream today?
L: Oh, I forgot to ask Sara's mother about (0.6)
coming over to house early
B: Oh (.) You can call her, can't ya?
L: Help me remember to call her
T: Yeah
B: You better call her right now
(1.8)
They're gonna pack, they're peak, they're packing right now and
L: Well, not, I don wanna interrupt their dinner
T: They have a twenty hour drive to, a Colorado
B: They'll get there Sunday night
L: They're not (.) They're not leaving until tomorrow, are they
B: (I dunno) ahh
T: Well, I don't know when they're leaving
J: Yea, they're not leaving til tomorrow
J: They're leaving tomorrow
B: Dad ya know what in that box that, er (3.0)
   Ah what Sara had, there was another hamster too.
T: Really
B: Um mm
T: In the box he had one hamster in his
B: Yeah
J: We're keeping the hamsters
J: No::::
T: I would've liked to keep that hamster
B: A:h
L: Josh your not care for any pie
B: He liked us, do you know that (0.4) dad he liked us
T: The hamster liked us
J: I don't want any pie, please
L: You don't either?
T: Ben are you sick or what?
B: What?
T: You don't want any pie?
(1.2)
J: I don't either
T: It's apple pie
B: I hate apple pie
B: (Yeah um)
(1.4)
J: Uhh, I don't want ice cream either
B: I want ice cream
L: It's really good
B: Ump, what kind?
J: what kind?
(0.8)
L: ↑apple
(0.6)
T: What kind of ice cream
B: Apple ice cream
B: Apple ice cream
L: Neopolitan, Oh
B: (Yuh yuh) Give me some choc choc choc cha cha chocolate
(sucking noise))
J: Give me everything but pink, um
B: baaa baa baa baa baa
L: Well someone has to eat the pink
T: Put this in there, the refrigeration
J: I used to love all that pink (. I used to always want pink,
but now I don't
B: I bet you clear off all the pink
and then, (. ha eat the chocolate
(0.2)
J: and then the white would be left
T: Are you boys excited about being out for Spring Break?
J: Um mm
B: Yeah
(0.2)
T: Are you looking forward to going to Arkansas?
J: Kinda
B: Uuh eh
J: You know what sh, our teacher said um, she might pack quick
enough and she would go down there too cuz she used to live in
the-, in Little Rock
T: Oh now that's right, she did, didn't she
L: She would like to go with you, is that what she meant?
J: Yea
L: To see her friends?
J: Yea
T: Did you tell her that, you told her we were going to Arkansas
J: I told her we were going to Little Rock
T: Uh huh
J: I asked a prayer so we could drive safe to Little Rock
T: Well that's nice (. Well, we ah, (. we're supposed to have
B: woosh, woosh, woosh
T: a big barbeque Saturday night
B: do do do do do do ((singing))
J: Yeah
T: Barbequed ribs
J: Fish fry, fish fry
B: Where
T: Uh huh, I dunno know if we'll, I don't think we'll have a fish fry while you're down there, we'll probably have one while I'm down there, he heh
J: A::w
T: Uncle John used to be a cook in the army, (0.2)
he's a good cook, yeah
L: You boys can go ahead and clean your plates (0.8)
T: Keep your fork
J: I don't want it (. ) well
T: your only having ice cream
J: I, I don't want that much ice cream, just a little
L: What kind of ice cream, Josh
T: Be::n, put me some more ice in here
J: Oh: chocolate and vanilla
B: sure
B: ((singing)) (0.4)
J: Be::n (0.2)
B: Whoop, whoo, whoo ((sound effects for the dropping of ice))
B: Is that enough
T: uh little more
B: little more (0.4)
B: »Whoo, whoo« ((sound effects as in line 147))
T: Thank you
B: You're welcome
T: Yes whoops
B: Yeah, Josh, you got this all scratched up
T: Josh, hand me the tea picture
J: Naw uh
B: Yea, it's got scratches all over it
T: .hh (kay) Ben? what's this I hear about your conditioning program that'chu been doin' a little workin' out
L: (You do want some ice cream don't ya)
B: What are you talking about "a little"
T: I told your Mom I said "Ben looks like he's getting in good shape!" (. ) And she said "Well, I think he's been doing some conditioning or something"
B: Mm hm!
T: Really?
B: Exercises?
T: Exercises?
B: Yeah
J: ((Whistling))
T: Like what.
B: Sit ups, (2.0) 'n::: You know that bicycle (thingy) out there?
T: Yep
B: (I) ride that for five minutes
T: Uh huh?
B: Sometimes ten minutes but (it figures) heheh, y'know hhh
T: Yeah!
B: Uh- I can tell it's (. ) th- I can tell that you're in better shape jus' by lookin'
(1.6)
J: I got the hiccups
B: And do you know that-
L: ((whispering to Tom: presumably about Josh and a spoon?))
(2.3)
B: Dad. (. ) Dad. Do you know that metal thing out there?
L: ((laughing))
B: You know [that metal thing out there?
L: We're in Trouble! heheh
B: Dad. You know that metal thing out there?
L: Josh, go ahead and get an extra spoon for Ben
T: What metal thing
Ya know that metal type of thing that was in our sandbox? That metal. BIG metal. Oh yeah! That big metal where you do the chinups, No::: The gutter? That big metal uh, piece of metal? Oh yeah and it's really big? Piece of what??= It's lo::ng? It's a metal- It's a piece of metal. hhh I don't know what it is = (It--) = It's a big thing, and it's - it's a (whistling)) = metal tube, alright?= =Y'know that thing behind the house? it looks like that. And half of it is um half of it is filled up with concrete? (0.2) And and it's rusted there You know half of it was filled up with concrete? Oh, uh that hole::? a post that's - it's set in concrete? No, (Yuh)- (Y-) No, that wasn't there, (there) that's not it there, (there) that's not it Well you're gonna have to tell me somethin' more a- about it. More specifics Er:::, you can go see it outside Alright, but what about it. It looks like the thing back behind the house Luh- ((laughing))
You know how some (people)-
No it doesn't
Well I (heh) don't know what that is either
It doesn't. All right-
What kind of thing.
"The clothesline is what he's talkin' about" but it's not that
Mm! hm!
I saw a piece of pipe out there,
Yeah, that!
Arright,
Tha- and it's f- halfway filled with
concrete
=Mm hm?
And, you know how some people do this?
Mm hm?
I do ten of those every day.
Oh, uh huh?
So,
W' that's a good idea
I mean 'cause Zack has all those weights, you can't lift em.
Yeah.
And (.) if you try to change 'em he'll get really mad, so (.)
Mmm hm?
Mm! mm
(0.4)
Boy this pie is good
hehhh [ Thank yo[u
Oh! Forgot about our ice cream
Heheh!
Decided Bryants gonna (heh) H(heh)ave(heh) it(heh) .hhh
Well you know, you usually leave (.) s- (.) uh how much sugar
 goes in it
(3.0)
I probly left a good (.) half cup out of it
uhhh
Well how much sugar goes in it
Three fourths a cup
T: ((boisterous laughing)) hehehehHUHUHUH,
[.eh .eh, HUHUHU .hhhhh
B: Oh man!
That's horrible
L: I was mixing a portion of the flour (..) with the sugar/ 'n
then I was going to add the rest of the sugar/ eheheh
B: That's horrible mom you (coulda) drowned us
T: I asked you before I started-
L: Maybe more than that
B: Wao:::
(1.5)
L: Maybe a third
T: Well (those) (..) apples are naturally sweet=
L: Mm hm,
T: ='n these are not tart apples anyway
L: I think it'll be awright, it just
T: I'm gonna tell 'er what really happened when I see 'er
(1.0)
T: (I'll say) "Ms. Bryant?
J: 'n it- [looks-
T: "Linda was standin' there bakin' that pie?, (..) 'n I came
up behind 'n gave 'er a kiss 'n I said, uheheh, didju have all
the ingredients." iheheheh a ·hhh
And she's g- iheheheh eheh!
L: You're gonna have to tell her all of it
T: eheh
(0.4)
J: You gave her a kiss?
B: Mm hm!
T: Sure!
(1.6)
B: Man! Josh
You got some problem.
L: Didn't cost me anything.
(0.4)
B: Kissing
307  J: Whoop 'im, mama
308      (1.5)
309  L: Why should I whip 'im I liked it=
310  B: =Mm hm!
311  I would have
312  L: hehehehehe
313  J: Nnn, 
314      (1.0)
315  B: If I was you mom I would have
316      (4.0)
317  T: She didn't mind too much
1. Describe and explain the differences between inductive, deductive and abductive approaches to research in human communication.

2. Survey what has been recently written regarding methodological triangulation and link it, as appropriate, to the forms of reasoning discussed above. Critique the strengths and weaknesses of triangulation.

3. Demonstrate how theory influences our research methods choices and the subsequent implications of such choices, e.g. how does theory delimit what we study and how we go about studying it. How do such choices constrain other methodological choices?

4. Special note: Use specific examples to illustrate your claims. They may be from published research or hypothetical in nature.
The Bases and Foundations for Methodological Triangulation: Preliminary Examination Question Three

The methods or tools used by scholars to study phenomena are dependent upon philosophical assumptions regarding how scholars come to know (episteme) about reality (ontos). Thus, the system of philosophical assumptions has been termed methodology, and the various systems are referred to as methodological paradigms. Within any domain of study, such as the domain of human interaction which is the object of study for the field of speech communication, certain types of phenomena are attended. That domain may determine the necessary or predominant methodological paradigm. However, in the human sciences, in which speech communication falls, the characteristics of the phenomena observed are of different types or natures, depending on perspective, thus demanding multi-methodological approaches. Such, in fact, has been the history of our discipline. The methods used to study human communicative phenomena have varied because the relationships between the factors which determine the observable characteristics are extremely complex.

In order to understand and make sense of the distinctions between methodological paradigms, the scholar must understand the nature of the characteristics of the phenomena being examined and the process of knowing. To that end, the scholar must understand the nature of phenomena and the relationship between phenomena (the object of observation) and the observer (the subject knowing). Also, the scholar must understand the differences in modes of logic, such as inductive, deductive, and abductive modes. These modes of logic are contingent upon epistemological and ontological assumptions and determine modes of inquiry and explanation (see Poole and McPhee, 1994, for a discussion of these modes). Methodological triangulation involves a broad conceptualization of ontos and a tripartite dialectic of episteme.

In order to describe the bases and foundations for methodological triangulation two approaches must be used. First, the philosophical argument must be laid out, as briefly done in the above paragraphs. This step involves defining terms such as phenomena, and the modes of logic, inquiry and explanation. The second step involves setting forth a pragmatic argument based on the uses of methodology within the social sciences in general and speech communication in particular. The pragmatic argument specifies the relationship between theory and methodology, the limitations of theory and methodological choices and how these limitations may be overcome by methodological triangulation. It is my belief that the current and long-lasting debate regarding methodology within the field of speech communication, and indeed in the social sciences, stems from either failed attempts at resolving issues from the philosophical argument (the first step), or from a lack of attendance to the philosophical argument. Resolving these issues may be outside of the scope of a short essay (for a three-day question), however a brief outline may assist the scholar in understanding deeper issues in the pragmatic argument.
In this essay, I will offer a brief outline of the philosophical argument by defining the term phenomena and discussing the relationship of the observer to phenomena. Then I will briefly describe the modes of logic, inquiry and explanation in reference to the above definitions. Finally, I will describe briefly how methodological triangulation involves a broad conceptualization of ontos and a tripartite dialectic of episteme.

The second part of the essay will offer the pragmatic argument which describes the relationship between theory and method and how examples of current research in the field of speech communication demonstrate this relationship. Next, I will describe the limitations of particular methodological choices within the field of speech communication and how these limitations may be overcome through methodological triangulation. To do this, I will survey literature regarding methodological triangulation and show how methodological triangulation accomplishes the task of integrating the modes of logic, inquiry and explanation. Finally, I will offer a critique of the weaknesses of methodological triangulation.

Before I begin the project outlined above, it is important to distinguish between method and methodology and between method triangulation and methodological triangulation. A research method is the systematic steps taken to study a particular phenomenon or set of phenomena. A method involves the use of tools. For example, a quantitative method involving comparison of independent and dependent variables, such as in an Analysis of Variance, may use a tool such as a survey instrument in order to collect the data for the analysis. A research methodology is the system of assumptions which determines appropriate methods. A methodology, such as logical positivism makes assumptions about reality and our knowing of that reality. Logical positivism, for example, assumes that reality is that which exists independent of the subject's knowing, thus knowing can be performed by independent researchers through direct observation of the object. This assumption determines the methods of the logical-positivist school in that, for example, the objects can be distinguished by characteristics, and the ability to distinguish between objects, or the characteristics of objects, allows for the ability to count them.

Method triangulation involves using variously complementary, symmetrical or parallel systems of steps to observe and study a phenomenon or set of phenomena. The purpose of doing such may be to obtain different views of a phenomenon in order to better understand it. Method triangulation does not necessarily entail methodological triangulation. An example of this might be that in physics, the characteristics of light include that of particles and waves, simultaneously. However, the particle and wave characteristics of light cannot be directly observed at the same time (the indeterminacy principle). Therefore, alternate methods are employed to observe the various characteristics of light. But, the alternate methods for observing light both fall within the same methodological paradigm.

Methodological triangulation involves employing variously complementary, symmetrical or parallel assumptive systems, or perspectives, in order to get alternate views of the phenomena in question. This approach makes more sense in the social sciences as opposed to the physical sciences because the phenomena of
human interaction are necessarily more complex (see the following philosophical argument). Methodological triangulation necessarily involves the use of various methods because, as described above, methods are determined by methodology. With these distinctions between method and methodology in mind, I shall proceed with the arguments regarding methodological triangulation in the social sciences, depending of course on the phenomena to be observed.

The Philosophical Argument

The process of inquiry necessarily involves an object of knowing. Inquiry asks a question, such as what, how and why, and therefore requires something to be known. The process of inquiry also necessarily involves a knower because inquiry is an act which requires intention toward something observed, and intention requires will. Thus inquiry necessitates a relationship between a knower and an intended object of the inquiry. The condition of the relationship specifies that characteristics of the knower include the ability to know and that characteristics of the object of inquiry include the ability to be known.

Scientific inquiry in the social sciences places the burden of knowing on the scholar/researcher. The researcher attempts to describe, explain and predict relationships between objects. This is accomplished through observation of phenomena and comparison of those observations to what is known or through creation of explanatory models. The term phenomena refers to the appearances, or characteristics, of objects observed, not the objects-in-themselves (see Alexander, 1988; Moser & vander Nat, 1987). How the researcher comes to make assertions about phenomena and relationships between objects of observation is a function of reasoning. Two types or modes of reasoning have been most prevalent in scientific inquiry: inductive and deductive.

Inductive reasoning argues from specific instances of phenomena to a general conclusion about the probable characteristics of that phenomenon, or from the particular to the universal. In abstract terms, the formula of induction is of the sort: \textit{case + result = rule}. Induction occurs in methods where an orientation to the phenomenon occurs as the first step. The phenomenon in natural use, such as a conversational act, is the case. How that act is manifested (the inherent structure, orderliness, or relations between acts) in a natural setting is the result. The rule is applied in the description of the use of the act. For example, a turn at talk is the phenomenon being observed, the case. In natural settings of conversation, turns-at-talk occur in sequential relationship to each other. The rule thus formulated states that two interactants in a conversation take turns-at-talk as a way of organizing the interaction in orderly recognizable ways. As in this example, the ethnomethodological and conversation analytic approaches typically employ inductive logic.

Deductive logic begins with a general premise believed to be true, typically stated as a tautology, and derives certain conclusions about specific instances which fall within the domain of the general premise, or from the general to the particular. In abstract terms, the formula of deduction is of the sort: \textit{rule + case = result}. Deduction occurs in methods where precedence is given to what is already known about the domain of inquiry. So, the first step in a methodology employing
deductive logic is to examine what is already known (theory) about a type or class of phenomena in order to specify a working premise (hypothesis), and to apply that knowledge to a set of cases within that type or class in order to predict a result. If the expected result does not occur, then critique of the existing knowledge or the method employed to test cases is produced. The theory is either verified or denied. As in this example, logical-positivist approaches typically employ deductive logic.

Scientific inquiry has moved from these two modes of logic. In the process of scientific inquiry, the assessment of what constitutes the appropriate starting point determines which of these two modes of logic will be privileged. Typically, in qualitative studies, hypotheses are developed from the observable characteristics of the data, then these hypotheses are verified through explication to arrive at a proposition about the data. It is in this sense of orientation to the phenomena that induction is privileged in qualitative studies. Most often in quantitative studies, hypotheses are developed from what is known (theorized) about the domain in which particular phenomena appear to be entailed. The phenomenon is then compared using a truth condition method to what is known. Explanation and conclusion follow from the comparison. It is in this sense of orientation to the theory that deduction is privileged in quantitative studies.

However, the distinctions between quantitative and qualitative methodologies in terms of the mode of logic privileged are ambiguous. The difficulties inherent in qualitative studies by privileging induction involve being truly unmotivated in observations of the data. Scholars read and learn how to do analysis before they do analysis. As Rose (1990) posits, it is difficult if not impossible for the ethnographer to observe culture without first having learned about the procedures of observation, though he proposes one attempt that task. In a sense, the issue is whether an observer can observe in a systematic way unknowingly and unmotivated by the results that observer hopes to find.

The difficulties inherent in quantitative studies by privileging deduction involve the paradox of beginning with an assumed true premise which is tested for the possibility of being untrue. If the premise is indeed untrue, then the methods employed to test it as true may be inappropriate. But more importantly, some observation of phenomena had to occur before a question could be raised to be tested. In other words, all scientific inquiry necessitates an object of inquiry as a preliminary condition. Therefore, observation of phenomena precedes selection of explanatory theory to which to test a particular sample of the phenomena against.

Determining the proper starting point, thus choosing methodology by mode of logic when induction and deduction are the only choices (in an either/or sense), is problematic. Considering the epistemological issues of how we come to know muddles the choice between modes unless we consider another alternative mode. Abductive reasoning as a mode of logic was first posited by C. S. Peirce (Lanigan, 1992).

Abductive reasoning begins with a general premise regarding the possibility of a case. Abduction then explicates the structure or relationships inherent in the general premise and applies that structure to the case. In abstract terms, the formula of abduction is of the sort: rule + result = case. Abduction occurs as
knowing wherein the possibility of perception of phenomena is a necessary condition for observation of a case to occur. The relationships or structure, as posibilized by the rule, allow for the case to be observed. Pierce (1931-35, cited in Jones, 1975) argued that perceptual judgment of a phenomenon does not require distinct acts of inference, as in induction and deduction, but rather is a continuous act which is both determined by the results of prior processes of judgment and creates the possibility of further perceptual judgments. However, the process itself is not available to the determination of a starting or ending point. Thus, knowledge, for Pierce, depends upon "... memories of the past and expectations of the future that make it possible for the understanding to construct the ordinary objects of ordinary experience 'from slight data'" (Jones, 1975, p. 270-271).

The abductive reasoning mode thus resolves the issue of a methodological starting point by specifying episteme as a continuous process. However, a starting point might be a practical necessity when conducting research. For example, at what point does the scholar stop reading and start observing phenomena, or vice-versa, to make meaning out of what was read or observed? Some thought or idea must have motivated the researcher to observe a given phenomenon or to test a specific theory. In other words, what motivated the researcher to attend to particular phenomena and not others? I propose that the answer to the dilemma of a methodological starting point requires two parts. First, the researcher must be mindful that he or she cannot enter into an observation cold and thus must remain both aware and critical of the antecedents (past experiences, knowledge) which precipitated the decision to attend to particular phenomena. Second, the researcher must orient to the phenomena to ground the expectation of adherence (truth condition) to the antecedents. In a sense, triangulation of inductive and deductive modes of logic best approximates, systematically, abductive reasoning while allowing for a starting point which is a practical necessity for doing research.

Within social scientific inquiry, similar distinctions have been made between modes of inquiry and explanation. Poole and McPhee (1994) suggest that there are three modes of inquiry and three modes of explanation. They delineate the modes of inquiry as such: (a) hypothetico-deductive, (b) modeling, and (c) grounded theory. Hypothetico-deductive mode starts with theory. A hypothesis is generated from the theory and tested. Modeling involves the "... depiction of how theory generates the observed data in a specific context" (Poole & McPhee, p. 49). Grounded theory involves an orientation to the phenomena from which theoretical propositions are made. These modes of inquiry are related to the modes of logic in that the hypothetico-deductive mode of inquiry privileges deductive logic, grounded theory privileges inductive logic, and modeling uses a combination of the two modes of logic.

Poole and McPhee (1994) delineate the three modes of explanation as: (a) causal explanations, (b) conventional explanations, and (c) dialectical explanations. The three modes of explanation can be distinguished by the assumptions regarding the relationship between the knower and the known, how the explanation is produced and evaluated, and what point of reference is privileged. Causal explanations privilege the researcher as an independent, objective observer.
Conventional explanations privilege the subject, but assume that the researcher and the subject of research are independent. Dialectical explanations privilege the subject but do not assume independence of the researcher and the subject of research.

As suggested above, each of these modes of logic, inquiry and explanation taken alone place severe limitations on how the researcher can know what which he or she observes. I propose methodological triangulation as a means for overcoming those limitations. To accomplish this task of triangulation requires a broad conceptualization of ontology and a tripartite dialectic of epistemology.

According to Smith, the current ontological view of human communication is that it is "marvelously complex" (1988, p. 316). Part of this complexity stems from the fact that individuals have free will and thus can choose which acts to engage in. Schrag (1986) argues that discourse is both for someone and by someone. This argument implies that communication is intentional. If individuals are unique in their experience, as is implied by the term individual, then the process of communication, by which meaning intended by communicators and co-constructed between individuals in relationship, is necessarily complex. Thus the characteristics of phenomena of communication are multi-faceted, involving memories, past experiences and expectations toward the future as well as the situational constraints of the present process of communication.

Accessing these multi-faceted characteristics requires multi-methodological approaches. As described above, social scientific inquiry has attempted to describe, explain and predict relationships between phenomena through a variety of modes. Perhaps a more appropriate approach would be to take the multi-faceted nature of social phenomena into consideration and apply a combination of modes. This approach would require syncretism of theoretical assumptions about: (a) the relationship between the knower and the known, (b) the relationship between what is knowable and what is knowing, and (c) what is the proper and practical starting point of inquiry.

How researchers in the field of speech communication work out these issues of epistemology and ontology in research at the practical level is described below.

The Pragmatic Argument

The debate regarding the appropriate modes of inquiry in the field of speech communication has been waged for over two decades (Berger, 1991). The debate continued recently in a panel discussion at the 1993 SCA convention in Miami Beach, Florida. Although the panelists were cordial and respectful toward each other, it was obvious to me that there was a great chasm between the panelists that resembled the distinctions in mode as described in the preceding argument. From my observation, little attention was paid to the possibility of methodological triangulation or to a deeper epistemological dialectic which might allow for triangulation in research in speech communication. In fact, little attention has been paid to methodological triangulation in journals or textbooks which discuss available methods and methodology. I suspect the reason for this lack has to do with the inherent complexities and subsequent weaknesses of triangulation (which I will discuss below). Another reason for this lack may be due to the relationship between
theory and method, and that the theory in the discipline of speech communication
has not sufficiently attended to the epistemological and ontological issues outlined
above.

Recent scholarship regarding theory and methodology has suggested that
the differing views towards communication dictate that a multiplicity of methods be
available (see Bochner, Cissna, & Garko, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1983). Indeed, the
particular type of communicative phenomena being attended to and the theories
used to explain them, may specify the methods used to research those phenomena.
Duck and Montgomery (1991) argue that the object of inquiry, theory about the
domain of objects in which the object of inquiry is entailed, and the method used to
perform the inquiry are interdependent.

Theory is a "... set of interrelated concepts that present a systematic view of
phenomena by specifying relations for the purpose of explaining and predicting the
phenomena" (Tucker, Weaver, & Berryman-Fink, 1981). This definition of theory
implies the inter-relatedness of theory, method and the object of inquiry. Method is
the process of viewing systematically the object of inquiry, thus building theory. For
example, if the phenomenon to be studied is family conflict, then the particular
characteristics of the phenomena must be determined. In this example,
characteristics of family conflict could include, but are not limited to: (a) the "doing"
of conflict through interaction, (b) the conditions which contribute to conflict, such as
the structure of the family, personality variables of the family members, and the
performance or nonperformance of expected roles within the family, and (c) the
meanings of family and family conflict that family members hold. Each of these sets
(a, b, c) of characteristics of family conflict may demand different methodological
approaches. The first set (a) may require conversation analytic or interaction
oriented (grounded) modes of inquiry. The second set (b) may require
hypothetico-deductive or modeling modes of inquiry because characteristics such
as family structure and roles are theorized to exist within families and affect
interaction. The third set (c) may require phenomenological approaches involving
interview protocols in order to access individual meaning within the context of family
conflict.

If theory, method and the object of inquiry are interdependent, then
methodological triangulation may be the most effective means for obtaining a fuller
understanding of complex, multi-faceted phenomena. Herein lies the weakness of
triangulation. The researcher has to be very specific about the characteristics of the
object of observation in order to determine which mode best serves the purpose of
the inquiry. This limitation exists for any methodology, but in the case of
triangulation, the problem is compounded by attempting to syncretize possibly
contradictory results. This problem of syncretization is not an issue for
single-methodology approaches. Therefore, the researcher has to be aware of how
the different approaches interact with each other in reference to the particular
phenomena to be examined.

Conclusion

According to Denzin, "No single method is always superior. Each has its own
special strengths, and weaknesses. . . ." Researchers should "... approach their
problems with all relevant and appropriate methods, to the strategy of methodological triangulation" (1970, p. 471). Given that human interaction is complex by its very nature, I believe this suggestion is well grounded. Given the relationships between how we come to know and characteristics of the knowable to which we, as researchers attend, approaching inquiry from all possible directions can help in gaining that fuller understanding. This attitude is particularly useful when applied to the field of speech communication where the process of communication is concurrently the object of study and the means by which study is both conducted and presented.
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¹ The panel: Epistemological, ontological and axiological foundations of theory building: A socio-cultural approach, (Program item 1204, p. 55), included researchers who have taken different methodological approaches to their research. The purpose of the panel was two-fold: (a) to continue the methodological debate, and (b) to promote a new text (to be published by Lawrence Erlbaum) in which this panel included the authors of the articles.
Review, synthesize, and critique current research on parent-adolescent interaction, with particular attention to conflict interaction as a communicative phenomenon rather than a psychological-developmental phenomenon alone. Look at theories of how power is constructed and maintained in family systems. Choose a particular variable from among the following to shape into a proposed study of the communicative characteristics of parent-adolescent conflict: parenting style, family cohesiveness & adaptability, relational satisfaction, role congruence and performance, or any other variable you might focus on, but not a combination of all of the above. Develop a detailed proposal for a study of the phenomenon of interest, talking about procedures that would help you get away from studying the perception of conflict and into studying conflicts in progress. Will you make use of interviews? self-report instruments? conversation analysis? ethnographic observation? How will you recruit participants, and who might they be? Let the outline of the study occupy about the final third or fourth of the paper.
"A hallmark of youth is the refusal of socialization" (Rogers, 1978, p. 7).

People communicate with one another in order to meet immediate or long-term needs or to initiate, develop, maintain, or terminate relationships. Communication is the process through which relationships are done, and communication is a learned activity. Theories of socialization propose that learning how to engage in the activity of communication occurs from an early age. Indeed, according to Brennan and Wamboldt (1990) the psychodynamic socialization theory posits that later relationships are influenced by the individual's childhood experiences. The child learns how to do relationship by internalizing the characteristics of his or her experience of significant relationships at an early stage and developing schemata about those characteristics. These schemata are modified and enhanced throughout the individual's life.

The individual thus learns how to do relationship through a process of socialization. The context in which this process occurs may be termed the socialization environment, and this environment often takes the form of family. Arliss (1993), in defining the family, states that the family is the institutional unit in which adult members of the society exercise the responsibility of primary socialization over children. Embedded in this definition are several assumptions. First, the definition assumes that children are socialized by adults. Second, the statement assumes that adults can have and exercise influence over children. Third, it assumes that children develop into maturity by the guidance of others, then may take on the role of primary socializers of a new generation of children. Finally, it assumes that this process of socialization, and therefore development of the child, occurs within the context of an interdependent relational system, a family, consisting of adults who have taken on the role of parents (defined as primary socializers), and the children dependent upon them.

Within this process of socialization which occurs through family interaction, the child develops and becomes more independent of the need to be socialized by adults. Theories regarding the development of individuals into maturity such as the psychosocial model (Erickson, 1963), the cognitive development model (Piaget, 1955), and moral development models (Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981) as well as developmental models of the family life cycle (Barnhill & Longo, 1978; Carter & McGoldrick, 1980, 1988; Duvall, 1962; Hill & Rodgers, 1964), suggest that individuals develop through stages as they become socialized (cited in Becvar & Becvar, 1993). Theories of communication development (Haslett, 1984; Wartella & Reeves, 1987; cited in Pearson, 1989) also propose stages that follow a fairly linear path. In general, these theories posit that the individual develops from a high degree of dependence on others, as an infant, to a high degree of independence as a mature adult. Developmental models assume that individuals move through
separation/individuation in order to achieve independence. Separation/individuation is the developmental process by which the individual differentiates self from other. This process begins at an early age (at six months according to Becvar & Becvar, 1993) and continues throughout childhood to adulthood, at which point the individual resolves issues of self-identity. For example, according to psychosocial development theory (Erickson, 1963; cited in Becvar & Becvar, 1993), the developmental tasks of adolescence and young adulthood include the dialectic tensions of identity versus role confusion and intimacy versus autonomy. The development from dependence to independence within the context of the family can result in conflict between parents and children due to separation and redefinition of family roles and boundaries which are negotiated through interaction.

According to Hocker and Wilmot, "conflict is an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals" (1991, p. 12). Families are groups of interdependent individuals. A family member may experience periods in which personal goals are incompatible with the goals of other family members. When considering the development of the individual within the family, conflict seems inevitable due to the inherent stresses of the developmental tasks of separation/individuation particularly during the period when the child is first attempting to make decisions on his or her own. These developmental stresses are inherent because they require negotiation or re-negotiation of family boundaries which may impinge upon the goals of individual family members.

In this essay, I will examine the characteristics of family systems, such as boundaries, which predispose family members to experience conflict. I will examine the characteristics of conflict as a communicative event to determine how persons in relation to each other define and negotiate their relationship. Finally, I will propose a study to describe how parents and their adolescent children manage conflict during and as a result of separation/individuation.

To accomplish this, I will review current research on power and conflict in the family. I will offer a model for examining conflict strategies utilized by family members in order to create and maintain family system and subsystem boundaries. And, I will examine the relationship between strategy use and parenting style. I will use examples from actual and hypothetical conversations to demonstrate strategy use and how boundaries are maintained, negotiated or renegotiated. In the final sections of this paper, I will propose a study for examining strategy use by parents and children from actual conversations, specify methods for the study, and close with a discussion of the expected results as well as the limitations of the proposed study. It is hoped that a model for studying parent-child conflict can be offered for later study.

Family Structure and Power

Characteristics of families, from a systems perspective, include degrees of openness to the environment, interdependence of members, roles which specify subsystems and subsystem boundaries, and circular causality. Communication within the family may demonstrate how these characteristics are constituted. For example, subsystem boundaries between parents and children can be specified by
participants in a number of ways: (a) through explicit or implicit statements of rules for interaction, movement, and access to resources, (b) through expectations derived from the culture, and (c) through structural elements of the family system determined by relational definitions, such as role expectations and the characteristics of the parent-child relationship.

Current research on family communication examines these and other characteristics. A major characteristic of family systems are boundaries which are the set of symbolic rules or expectations "... which specify the rights, obligations, possessions, and space of individuals" within a group (Vuchinich, 1984, p. 219). In fact, family structure is determined by "arrangements or unwritten 'rules' which govern transactions between family members" (Barker, 1992, p. 67). Subsystems occur when there is a transactional alignment between members of a system. For example, roles or expectations regarding who talks to whom about what in the family, how or where that interaction is to take place, and the authority to specify these roles or expectations determines family structure. These characteristics of families may vary quite considerably between first marriage, two-parent families and other types of families. Boundaries may be more ambiguous in families that have undergone changes in subsystem membership. In first marriage families, families are defined by emotional ties. Following divorce, family members have to contend with redefining in-group membership. In subsequent marriages, subsystems may be more independent. In stepfamilies, boundaries are more ambiguous due to lack of time to adjust to various members developmental stages (Bray, 1994). Similar ambiguities may exist in single parent homes following a divorce due to the renegotiation of system boundaries, particularly due to parental maintenance of separate households. Thus, the developmental task of socialization through boundary formation, as it applies to the family life cycle model, may only be appropriate to discussing first marriage families. However, the developmental task for children overall, may be the same regardless of the form of the parental subsystem.

Single-parent, dual-parent and step-parent subsystems all perform the role of primary socializers in the family. According to Khleif (1979), the process of socialization includes boundary formation through describing what is in-group, and what is out-group or non-group. In a sense, the new group member (for example, the child in the family) is socialized toward appropriate in-group behaviors and against inappropriate out-group behaviors. Boundaries define belonging, group identity, and self-identity within the group. The status of group socializer, or parent in a family, is therefore potentially powerful. Thus, power in the family is a function of the authority to make or enforce the arrangements or unwritten rules of the family.

Power, according to Blood and Wolfe (1960; cited in Berger, 1980, p. 198), is "the potential ability of one partner to influence the other's behavior" (see also, Fasold, 1990, p. 4). If the family serves as an institutional unit for the purpose of socializing children, then power is an important component or characteristic of family relationships, particularly between parents and children. The parents' ability to influence the children in terms of decision-making, access to resources, movement within the system and between systems, and interaction demonstrate the
use of power in the family. In that sense, power is manifested through the parental specification of family boundaries.

Power may be exercised in a number of ways. For example, in a family with children, children may be provided food, shelter, safety, and emotional support by parents. These resources are important for the health and survival of children. However, children may have limited ability to obtain these resources on their own. Resource theory (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Cromwell & Olson, 1975; cited in Berger, 1980; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993) proposes that individuals seek access to resources to meet needs and that individuals who control access to resources therefore have power. However, power is not maintained by an individual without the existence of others: power is a system property. If an individual did not have a need for a resource which an other could provide, then that other could not exercise power over the individual in terms of access to the resource. Also in a family, an individual (A) needing a resource, of which another (B) has access, exercises power over the other (B) by requiring that the other (B) provide the resource. For example, the resource of shelter needed by children is provided by parents. However, because the children need the resource, the parents have to work in order to provide the resource. There are both external and internal sanctions against the parent not providing the resource. External sanctions might include imprisonment for negligence. Internal sanctions might include loss of love or respect from the children, which the parent may need. In this example, power is systemic; that is, family members are interdependent with each other in meeting certain needs. Thus each family member exercises some power over others in the family. However, if parents are the primary socializers over children, due to the children's need to learn how to live in the world as independent adults, then parents have a greater amount of power by virtue of their role.

Power is demonstrated in the family through structural elements or roles. Families may consist of subsystems such as parental subsystems and offspring subsystems. In terms of power, the parental subsystem maintains control of certain resources over children. For socialization to occur, the parent has access to information, such as social conventions and rules, which the child needs to develop into an independent adult. At early stages of development, the parents may be the primary source if not the only source for this information. As the child grows older, sources external to the family may become more prevalent. These sources could include peers or non-family adults, and mediated public sources such as television. Parents may have limited ability to control access to these outside sources, but through time that control wanes. For example, at infancy the child does not have the same level of access to outside sources of information regarding social conventions as is present at school age. Also, ability of the child to process information and make meaning of stimuli increases with age and cognitive development. At an early age, the parent may assist the child in processing stimuli at a more simplified level by limiting access to complex messages. As the child becomes more exposed to outside sources, the potential for complexities such as incongruence between parental messages and peer or teacher messages increases. As exposure to
sources of information outside the family increases, parental power in terms of primary socialization decreases.

Family systems are open because complete isolation from the environment is impractical or impossible (Galvin & Brommel, 1986). However, degree of openness can vary. How and in what ways a child is exposed to the environment may be controlled by the parents. Parents may specify rules for television viewing or with which peers the child is able to play. Parents also may specify rules regarding movement in and out of the family home, such as curfew times. How parents take on the role of parenting in terms of specifying rules and controlling behavior has been termed parenting style (Baumrind, 1971, 1991).

According to Baumrind (1991), parents may manifest authoritarian, authoritative, or permissive parenting styles. Authoritarian parents use punitive control to maintain behavior in accordance with standards or norms believed to be appropriate for children. Authoritarian parents attempt to control behavior by limiting access to resources or to the environment; thus boundaries in a family with authoritarian parents may be relatively impermeable. Authoritative parents, on the other hand, may allow the child to make choices within a limited set of options. This parenting style emphasizes guidance while allowing the child to experience some level of autonomy, implying more permeable boundaries than families with authoritarian parents. Permissive parents allow the child to regulate his or her activities, which also implies permeable boundaries. Parenting style differs in the level at which the child is able to make decisions on his or her own, and by the permeability of boundaries which constitutes the degree of openness of the family system.

In terms of the developmental stages of the child, if the child is moving from more dependent on the parents for meeting needs to less dependent, then it may be necessary for the parents to anticipate need levels of the children at these various stages. However, there may be a relationship between parenting style and increases in conflict. According to Bartle, Anderson, and Sabatelli (1989), authoritative parenting is more separation/individuation promoting. Authoritarian parenting is more separation/individuation inhibiting. As stated before, separation/individuation is the developmental process through which the individual progresses toward separateness and maturation. If the child is attempting to separate, but the parents are attempting to control or limit separation, then conflict may arise out of the incompatibility of the child's goals with that of his or her parents. Johnson, Shulman, and Collins (1991), found that adolescents were more likely than younger children to perceive incongruent parenting behaviors. The most likely incongruency involved one parent as authoritative and the other as authoritarian. This incongruency is particularly problematic in that one parent may be allowing for the individuation process while the other is inhibiting it, thus creating a double-bind for the child in his or her relationship with the parental subsystem.

Authoritative parenting may be associated with higher levels of support than authoritarian or permissive parents but lower levels of control than authoritarian
parents. Prior research has documented that support and control are significant characteristics of parent-child relationships (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Support messages may take the form of acknowledgment, encouragement or cooperation. Authoritative parenting is more supportive because it allows the child to make decisions. Furthermore, children are able to distinguish between support and control messages. Amato (1990) found that primary school-age children perceived parents as more supportive than controlling as compared to adolescents, whereas adolescents perceived parents to be more controlling. This perception by adolescents may be a function of the attempts to pull away from the parents during individuation. Noller, Seth-Smith, Bouma, and Schweitzer found that “families with adolescents tend to be more effective when they are high in support and moderate to low in control” (1992, p. 113).

Lack of support by parents has also been shown to have a negative influence on the development of adolescents. Support might take the form of concurrent tolerance for independence and intimacy (Gavazzi, Anderson, & Sabatelli, 1993). Support may be demonstrated through “distance regulation patterns” (Gavazzi, et al., 1993) which are maintained by definition of boundaries. According to Gavazzi, et al. (1993), low levels of maturation in terms of independence occur in adolescents whose parental and peer support is low. However, the authors found interaction between peer and parental support. High peer and parental support together result in low maturation, which may be due to a lack of challenge or resistance to change. Low peer and high family support resulted in moderate levels of maturation. And, high peer and low family support resulted in high levels of maturation. The authors also found that high parental intrusiveness (control) and low peer support resulted in adolescents having higher levels of problem severity. These findings suggest that decreasing dependence on the family and increasing dependence on social support outside of the family is related to healthy development of adolescents into adults.

Power within the family may be manifest through openness or closedness of boundaries. Allowing access to the environment would suggest that the boundaries are more open and thus permeable. Controlling access to the environment would suggest impermeable boundaries. Developmental theories suggests that boundaries might become more permeable and the binds that maintain family connectedness might become weaker or less rigid as the child individuates during adolescence. Therefore, the characteristics of system boundaries during the development process of the family life cycle may change from less permeable to more permeable as the child grows into adulthood (see Figure 1). In Figure 1, the family (X) in the early stages, stages 3 and 4, of the family life cycle (time 1) may experience little difficulty in maintaining family identity and role expectations between family subsystems due to the developmental needs of children. During the middle stages, stages 5 and 6 entailing adolescence (time 2), children may have more exposure to out-group (outside of the family) resources and influences, such as their peers or society-at-large. This exposure of adolescents to out-group influences serves to blur and make more permeable the boundaries which specify in-group and out-group. According to Khleif (1979), the blurring, thus
making more permeable, of system boundaries or the assimilation of in-group members to an out-group threatens group existence. In fact, the process of separation/individuation of children from the family of origin serves to redefine family for its members. This redefinition of family for the child may begin its cycle during these middle stages to the later stages, and on into adulthood. The final stage of the nuclear family life cycle, stage 7 (time 3), the launching stage, further weakens the boundaries around the family of origin and allows for the formation of new families of procreation. It is at this stage that the children of the original family (X) reach adulthood and begin to form families of their own.

Subsystem boundaries may also change in nature from strong and impermeable to weak and permeable. As children grow into adolescence and adulthood, parents may be more willing to allow their children to know about their relationship. An example of this may be first discussions about sex between parents and children. Rules of privacy regarding information about the parents’ spousal relationship may be loosened due to parent’s perceptions that their children are "old enough" to know a little more about their relationship. Also, at this stage in the development of children, it may be important to discuss values regarding romantic relationships with children as they begin dating. Parents may use their own
relationship as an exemplar in teaching values. As children grow older, into adulthood, sharing of the resource of information may increase between parents and children, thus empowering children to begin and complete the task of separation/individuation.

It is the onset of adolescence which makes the developmental tasks of separation/individuation relevant. Several definitions of adolescence point to the importance of these tasks in the family. According to Atwater (1988), adolescence begins with the onset of puberty but has an uncertain ending time between late teens and late twenties and includes psychosocial as well as physical development. Kimmel and Weiner argued that the end of adolescence "... is most easily defined by the person’s social age" (1985, p. 3) which implies that adulthood is reached when the individual achieves independence. Complete independence from parents may never be achieved by some children, which demonstrates the difficulty in defining an upper limit to adolescence. However, the authors continue, "Social institutions have defined criteria for the transition from adolescence to adulthood. These include, in the family, leaving one’s parents' home, marriage, and parenthood" (p. 5). This period of adolescence is marked by negotiation and re-negotiation of family boundaries thus bringing about changes in family structure. However, changes in system structure require interaction by members of the system. Grotevant and Cooper (1986) posit that development into adolescence heightens the need for renegotiation of openness and connectedness. Baxter (1988) maintains that this renegotiation is managed through communication.

Power is constructed and maintained in families through interaction as well as through access to resources or structural elements. Interaction allows for the individual family member’s knowledge of others’ needs. Yet, material needs such as goods and services and the meeting of those needs within a family or other relationship are not sufficient for maintaining relationship. Other needs such as love, inclusion, and intimacy, as well as openness and connectedness, have to be negotiated and renegotiated. As suggested earlier, relationships are defined through communication (Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 1967). Needs such as love and inclusion are components of relationships. Therefore, interaction is the process through which power is constructed and maintained.

According to Galvin and Brommel (1986), patterns of talk such as the organization of turns demonstrate how power is constructed and maintained. Power may be manifested through length of turns, who is addressed or speaker selection of other, by interruptions and silences (Drummond, 1989; Rogers & Farace, 1975; Tannen, 1990; West & Zimmerman, 1977; Zimmerman & West, 1975), as well as by divergence from in-group language style and convergence with out-group language style (Khleif, 1979). Power may also be assessed by who receives the most addresses (Berger, 1980).

In several studies, the characteristics of power in conversation have been termed control (Millar, Rogers, & Bavelas, 1984; Noller & Fitzpatrick, 1993; Pearson, 1989) and dominance (Millar & Rogers, 1985; Tannen, 1990; Vuchinich, 1990). Specific ways in which conversational control can be created include verbal statements which illustrate active opposition or exclusivity from the in-group (see
below), relational messages which attempt to maintain the dependence of the other, or nonverbal cues which regulate conversational turn-taking. An individual can submit to control messages of the other by acknowledging the right of the other to make demands or control the conversation. In families, these type of control messages may be used to create, maintain or terminate boundaries.

**Family Conflict**

The particulars of managing power and family structure during the separation/individuation stage of the family life cycle contribute to interactional characteristics of parent-adolescent conflict. In order to negotiate support and control, family members may utilize conflict management strategies in situations where perceptions of incompatible goals exist. For the adolescent, personal control over decision-making, access to resources, and movement within, between and beyond boundaries may require non-cooperative strategies. For the parent, attempts to maintain family boundaries may require integrative or competitive strategies.

Sillars, Coletti, Parry, and Rogers (1982) defined three conflict management strategies: distributive, avoidant, and integrative. Distributive and avoidant strategies are non-cooperative, whereas the integrative strategy is cooperative. The authors defined the distributive tactics as verbally competitive or individualistic behaviors. Examples of distributive tactics include insults, criticism, and concession-seeking. Avoidant tactics are behaviors which minimize explicit discussion of conflicts including topic shifts, denial, and indirect statements. The distributive and avoidant strategies are intended to gain control. Integrative tactics are verbally cooperative behaviors which seek mutually favorable results.

Integrative tactics are not intended to gain control, but rather meant to demonstrate support while resolving conflict. Hocker and Wilmot (1991) redefined the three types of conflict strategies as competitive, avoidant, and cooperative.

The interaction of strategy selection or use in the context of a family dispute may be complex. In a study of parent-adolescent conflict strategy selection, Comstock and Buller (1991) found that adolescents tend to reciprocate the cooperative conflict strategies of their parents in most conflict conditions. However, the authors also found that adolescents tend to reciprocate competitive strategies in conflict situations that are perceived as highly salient. Yet, reciprocity is not predictable in many communicative exchanges between family members. In another study, Spencer (1993) found no support for self-disclosure reciprocity in family conversations. In fact, Spencer found that a need for explanation most often precipitates self-disclosure and self-disclosure results most often in commentary by other family members. It is possible that self-disclosure may be used as a competitive defense of self tactic. Waln (1982) found that verbal defense of self increases as perception of the intensity of conflict increases.

Boundaries are negotiated through conflict (Vuchinich, 1984). Defense of self may be used as a boundary defining tactic, such as claiming the right to have certain feelings or make certain decisions. The domain of issues that determine boundary conditions in adolescents’ relations with their parents are also complex. Although the developmental models predict general increases in conflict as the
separation/individuation stage begins, the adolescent gains in the ability to effectively argue and certain issues which may have seemed more salient to the pre-adolescent are less salient to the adolescent. In a longitudinal study, Galambos and Almeida (1992) found decreases in conflict in certain domains of issues and increases in others.

Defense of self during the separation/individuation process may be a function of face wants. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), people interact with one another with rationality in order to save "face." There are two types of face wants: (a) negative face wants which allow the individual not to have his or her wants impeded by the other, and (b) positive face wants which allow the individual to maintain a positive self-image. Face threatening acts are behaviors by the other which encroach upon the individual's face wants. Power may be demonstrated through face threatening acts. Lakoff (1988) argued that two underlying principles or rules specify face threatening behaviors: (a) imposition and lack of options affect negative face wants, (b) appreciation and approval affect positive face wants. Imposition of will and limiting options are forms of control, whereas, appreciation and approval are forms of support. Conflict may arise when the individual's goals of saving or maintaining "face" are circumvented by control moves or lack of support by others.

Degree and nature of conflict may also be affected by parenting style. Control may be a more important issue for adolescent children of authoritarian parents compared to children of authoritative parents. The conflict strategies learned and reciprocated by adolescents also might be a function of parenting style. Bayer and Cegala (1982) found that adolescents with authoritarian parents tended to have low argumentative skills but used more verbal aggression than adolescents with authoritative parents. Adolescents with authoritative parents also tended to be more skilled in argumentativeness. In a related study, Barber (1992) found that psychological overcontrol (associated with authoritarian parenting style) and behavioral undercontrol (associated with permissive parenting style) were strongly related to adolescent problem behaviors.

Adolescents' perceptions of the family climate may demonstrate a relationship between parental support and control and the strategies used in family conflict. Noller and Callan (1990) observed that adolescents perceive parents as dominating conversations and offering little support for their views or opinions. There may be discrepancies in the way parents and their adolescent children perceive conflict in the family. Smetana, Braegas, and Yau (1991) found that parents tend to view conflict with their adolescent children as being about norms and rules, whereas adolescents view conflict with their parents as being about the adolescent's right to make decisions, and boundaries. Wierson, Nousiainen, Forehand, and Thomas (1992) observed that adolescents were more likely than their parents to believe that they should make decisions on their own. Adolescents also tend to expect to establish independence earlier than their parents expect (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1989).

These expectations of parents and their adolescent children may influence the types of strategies used in conflict situations. Cooperation communicates
support, but non-cooperation may communicate control. If the adolescent is attempting to establish independence, then he or she may opt for non-cooperative strategies during family conflict. Family structure and parenting style may influence conflict management strategies. Conversational use of these strategies through inclusion and exclusion may illustrate or display how the issues of control and support are negotiated and renegotiated in the family.

In an earlier essay, LeBlanc (1994) proposed that family relationships can be displayed through interaction. Following a model proposed by Mandelbaum (1985), the author analyzed instances of inclusion in a family dinner conversation. Inclusion was demonstrated through shared experience and the co-telling of shared experience. The author extended Mandelbaum's model by proposing that within the context of family, "planning of future shared events, requesting information about the daily events of members, and sharing attempts at the construction of meaning" each demonstrate inclusion (p. 14). Inclusion may be one way in which support is demonstrated by parents.

The family analyzed in that essay included two pre-adolescent children. For these children support may have been a more important issue than control. Developmental models predict that there is a gradual shift toward an emphasis on control as children reach the separation/individuation stage during adolescence. This shift in emphasis may precipitate exclusionary conversational acts as a way of separating from the parents. In contrast to inclusion, exclusion differentiates between the experiences of individuals and the meanings of those experiences for individuals within the same group. For example, an individual family member might believe that his or her experiences are not welcomed or understood by other member of the group. Instead of heightening awareness of unity and sameness, exclusion heightens awareness of individuality and uniqueness. Exclusion from the family, whether self or other-imposed, may be necessary to accomplish the developmental task of separation/individuation. It is this exclusion which allows for the achievement of autonomy from the parents. Although exclusion implies a complete break from the family, exclusion may take the form of "distance regulation patterns" (Gavazzi, et al., 1993) or attempts to maintain appropriate levels of independence and intimacy.

In terms of conflict strategies, exclusion might take the form of non-cooperation, either as a competitive move or as an avoidant move. Adolescents might use a series of one-up statements in competition for the right to set boundaries. That is, if the adolescent is attempting to separate from the parents, the adolescent might attempt to set boundaries for the self outside the influence of the parents. This setting of boundaries may occur explicitly or implicitly. Avoidance of influence strategies by the parents may imply a desire to separate. However, in conflict situations, the setting of boundaries, excluding the parents from the decision-making of the adolescent, may include statements such as, "You don't understand," "You can't make me," or "I'm going anyway." These types of statements amount to power grabbing, or autonomy moves by the adolescent.

Given the dialectic tension between autonomy and intimacy needs for the adolescent, the adolescent may attempt to maintain solidarity (Brown & Gilman,
1972; cited in Fasold, 1990) or intimacy with his or her parents. However, solidarity moves, such as the use of reciprocal address terms, tend to blur sub-group distinctions, thus threatening the face wants of other group members.

Thus interaction within a family can accomplish maintenance, negotiation or re-negotiation of boundaries. Interactional moves which serve to re-negotiate boundaries may be termed boundary markers. Boundary markers are actions or behaviors which demonstrate the existence of a boundary to interactional participants. Boundary marking behaviors, therefore, specify limits to transactions between persons and serve the purpose of exclusion to bring about separation/individuation or autonomy.

The dialectic tension between intimacy (solidarity) and autonomy (independence) is demonstrated through moves to maintain or negotiate boundaries. It is the tension to maintain or negotiate boundaries which can result in family conflict. In the family, children attempting to establish autonomy may attempt to grab power. These attempts may take the form of competitive strategies such as: (a) altering language style (Khleif, 1979), (b) claims to rights of privacy and territory (which may also be used as boundary maintenance strategies by parents), (c) claims to freedom of action and freedom from imposition (derived from Brown & Levinson, 1978; see also Lakoff, 1978), and (d) demands for positive self-image (Brown & Levinson, 1978).

The developmental tasks associated with moves from dependence to independence, and the imbalance of power between parents and children associated with the parental role of primary socializer at the early stages of the family life cycle, may require that children attempt to grab power in order to gain independence. Children may also negotiate solidarity in order to gain independence. Moves that could negotiate solidarity, from the child’s perspective, could include the use of reciprocal address terms (Brown & Gilman, 1972). Children, in attempting to establish themselves as independent adults, may also make claims to equal status in order to achieve solidarity. Moves to establish equal status may achieve solidarity by redefining the relationship between parents and children as peers, thus relieving the tension to be autonomous while remaining intimate.

Children may either attempt or resist changes to family structure through boundary negotiation. The dialectic tension experienced between parents and children within the family suggests that there exists a tendency to maintain intimacy. Children may attempt to resists changes through: (a) cooperation with their parents power maintenance moves, (b) resisting parental power sharing or giving moves, or (c) resisting or disallowing parental solidarity moves. Resistance strategies may take the form of competition or avoidance.

Parents can promote or allow changes, which are part of children's separation/individuation process, and thus allow for development of independence or autonomy in their offspring, or parents may attempt to disallow or resist these changes. Parenting style may affect whether and how parents allow these changes to occur. For example, authoritarian parents might be more likely to disallow or resist children's attempts at gaining independence, whereas authoritative parents
might allow limited attempts by their children to gain independence. Permissive parents, on the other hand, may take a laissez-faire approach toward their children's attempts at gaining independence. Where authoritarian parents may use more controlling, and thus more competitive or avoidant conflict strategies, authoritative and permissive parents may use less controlling and more supportive or cooperative conflict strategies. The nature of the relationship between parents and children in a family, and the parenting style of the parents, therefore may affect the types of boundary marking behaviors used by family members. (See Appendix A for a typology of boundary marking behaviors).

**Boundary Maintenance, Negotiation, and Re-negotiation**

As the preceding discussion suggests, family conflict can involve the maintenance, negotiation, and re-negotiation of system boundaries. These boundary conflicts occur as a result of the autonomy versus independence tension of individual family members in relation to each other but may occur more frequently during the separation/individuation task of adolescence. The following examples are taken from parent/child conflicts and demonstrate the use of boundary marking behaviors of both parents and children.

The first two examples are taken from transcribed interactions in an article by Vuchinich (1992). In the first example, the son (S:) is six years old but asserts the right to choose whether he will or will not do what his father (F:) wants. The son eventually submits but only after competing with the father. This asserting of independence demonstrates pre-adolescent attempts, although somewhat unsuccessful, at separation/individuation. (The line numbering of the excerpt is slightly modified).

015  F:  Chow down on them beans. They're good.
⇒ 016  S:  Uh uh.
017  F:  Yes.
⇒ 018  S:  I don't like 'em. That's why.
019  F:  Well they're there. You eat 'em.
020  M:  Has he eat alot of 'em?
021  F:  No. He hasn't eat but maybe one of 'em.
⇒ 022  S:  Uh uhm.
023  F:  EAT.
024  (6.1)
025  F:  Or you'll go back to your room when you get done.
026  (10.5)
027  S:  ((Son begins eating food and cutting meat))
028  F:  Cut it right.

In line 015, the father tells son to eat his beans. The son replies in line 016 with an attempt to grab power by asserting a claim to freedom from imposition. The father responds to this move (in line 017) by disallowing the power grabbing move of the son. The father reasserts his demand, and the son offers an account for non-compliance (line 018). The father rejects the account and reasserts the demand
on line 019 with the statement, "You eat 'em." The mother and father then discuss whether the son has eaten any of the beans; the father claims that the son has eaten "maybe one of 'em," and the son rejects that claim. The father then reasserts the demand more forcefully (assuming emphasis by Vuchinich's transcription of EAT on line 023 in all capital letters), and following a gap of 6.1 seconds, offers a treat for non-compliance with the demand. After a gap of 10.5 seconds the son submits by eating his food. The fathers then demonstrates his right to impose or influence the son's actions by making an additional demand on line 28.

In the second example, the son (S:, age 14) is arguing with the daughter (D:, age 17) about the sharing of chores. The daughter asks the father (F:) for mediation, at which point the son offers an excuse for noncompliance. However, the excuse is ultimately rejected, and the father demands compliance, to which presumably the son submits.

039  D: (You're gonna) work on the trash with me.
⇒ 040  S: No.
041  D: Yes he is idn't he daddy?
042  S: Tom can. I got to work.
043  D: Tom won't be able to.
044  F: EMPTY THE TRASH WITH HER.
045    (1.2)
⇒ 046  S: I get to drive then.

In line 039, the daughter makes a statement which is treated as a request for assistance by her brother. Her brother (S:) rejects the request with a non-negotiable, "no." In so doing, the son makes a claim to freedom from imposition of his sister's request. This claim may serve to achieve autonomy from the sister (offspring subsystem). However the daughter treats the initial request as a claim regarding the son's responsibility (to the family) to help her with a chore. The claim is specified further by the daughter's alignment with the father (in line 041), who presumably has the authority to settle disputes and make and enforce rules regarding chores. The son responds to the daughter's alignment attempt with a candidate replacement and an excuse for non-compliance (in line 042). The daughter rejects the son's suggestion for his replacement with an account. The father then asserts a demand for compliance by the son (line 044), and following a 1.2 second pause the son suggests a reward for his compliance with the father's demand.

The third example is taken from a family counseling session (see Wickman, Hedinger, & White, 1994) between a mother and teenaged daughter. At issue in the argument between the mother and the daughter is a definition of respect. In the counseling session the counselor asked both mother and daughter to describe what respect meant to them. The following is a transcript of their reply. (The quotes are direct and in sequence, but the transcript has been created to follow the same style as the other examples).
In line 002, the daughter explicitly claims a right to privacy and territory thus specifying a need for a boundary between herself and her mother, or her family. The mother responds to the daughter's claim to a lack of respect, and therefore privacy, by implying that the daughter does not receive respect because of the daughter's actions. The mother may disallow the daughter's attempts at gaining independence by requiring the daughter to "follow the rules." This excerpt clearly demonstrates the tension between the daughter's need to become independent, and the mother's resistance to change.

Examples of boundary marking behaviors are delineated in the following excerpt from the University of Texas Conversation Library (F1Devil.7). (The full transcript is offered in Appendix B). In this excerpt the daughter attempts to exclude her mother from the right to influence her political position. At first, the mother requests information about future plans of the daughter, which may imply a desire to do something together (inclusion). However, the purpose for the request becomes more clear following the negotiation of the request. Although the daughter is twenty-three years old and has moved out of the house, this example demonstrates the types of boundary marking behaviors typified in the separation/individuation process of adolescence. By asserting her right to choose who she votes for, the daughter demonstrates independence from her mother. However, throughout this conversational episode, the mother continually attempts to influence the daughter.
⇒ 062 D: I'm not voting- I am (.) pt -hh twenty-three
⇒ 063 years old and I c'n vote- for who I want to
⇒ 064 now.
065 (0.5)
⇒ 066 D: You can't make me °»you can't make me
⇒ 067 you can't make I/me.«°
068 M: ih There's a little orange
069 marmalade in there- okay
070 M: I just thought maybe you might like to.

Starting on line 053, the mother states a need for help. The daughter orients
to her mother's statement as a request that she help her mother. The pre-request
offered on lines 047-048 about the daughter's plans for a future date, which the
daughter ratifies with her responses (lines 050-051 and 052-053), implies that the
following statement (lines 053-054) will be a request for the daughter's participation
in a future event with which the mother is somehow involved. The statement (lines
053-054), therefore, serves as a request.

On line 057, the daughter does not agree to the mother's request. Following
a micropause on line 055, the daughter states: (a) that she is not voting for Gramm,
(b) she is not working for Gramm, and (c) that she does not like Gramm. The
micropause may indicate that the upcoming answer (lines 056-058) is a dispreferred
response. According to Sacks (1987), there is a pragmatic preference for
agreement in the second pair-part of an adjacency pair. Disagreements require
more work such as an account or excuse to give reason for the disagreement (see
Buttny, 1987). The first response does not answer the mother's request directly, as
in, "I cannot or will not phone for Gramm." Rather, line 056 offers an account for the
implied rejection of the mother's request. In other words, the daughter is implying
that she should not work for Gramm if she is not planning to vote for him. The next
line serves the purpose of justifying the implication on the previous line. And, line
058 gives an account as to why the daughter feels justified in rejecting the mother's
request. It is in rejecting the mother's request that the daughter claims rights to
independence. As a boundary marking behavior, the rejection of the mother's
request on line 057 attempts to grab power by claiming freedom from the imposition
of the mother's request. Line 058 further serves the purpose of marking a boundary
(of independence) by claiming the freedom to decide (act) who she likes and does
not like.

On line 059, the mother requests clarification of the account given by the
daughter. The request for clarification may serve to delay ratification of the
daughter's claim of freedom for imposition of the mother's political ideology (which
occurs much later), and the daughter does not treat the request as ratification for
her claim. The daughter treats the mother's request as pertaining to the reason why
the daughter does not like Gramm. However, the daughter demonstrates an
unwillingness to comply with the mother's request for clarification by avoiding a
direct answer. She reiterates that avoidance by requesting that the mother ask someone else to do her a favor. 

Beginning on line 062, the daughter then specifies a boundary condition on her relationship with her mother. This is accomplished in several ways. First, the daughter reiterates her promise not to vote for Gramm, apparently the person for whom the mother intends to vote. This demonstrates a difference in intention and goals between the daughter and the mother for future events. Next, the daughter demonstrates her right to be separate from the mother by adding a time component of age at the present time. In this way, the daughter purports exclusion by asserting adulthood by implication. Also, the daughter specifies her right to make her own decisions about what she wants to do. Finally, as demonstrated on lines 066-067, the daughter establishes independence from the mother's influence by stating emphatically, reiterating the point three times, that the mother cannot make the daughter comply with her wishes. The repetition can perform several functions. First, it makes a claim for freedom of action. The mother cannot impose her will upon the daughter in terms of her voting tendencies. Second, the daughter may also be claiming equal status with her mother. Finally the daughter may be countering the mother's competitive move of disallowing the power grabbing move of the daughter. However, in repeating the statement three times, the daughter is behaving in a way which may be reminiscent of childhood temper tantrums, thus allowing the mother to save "face" by demonstrating non-reciprocity of status; that is, a child, as opposed to an adult, has temper tantrums.

The mother continues to press the issue, further attempting inclusion, beginning on line 070. The mother offers a justification for the daughter's compliance (in lines 071-072, see Appendix B), to which the daughter responds with an account of the mother's opinion in the form of an attribution (lines 073-075). The conflict continues for a few more minutes, in which the daughter does not comply with the mother's wishes for either help in working for Gramm or voting for Gramm. The daughter, in several instances, reiterates her opposition to her mother's political influence by stating (on lines 100-101), "I may vote a straight democratic ticket." The mother responds to her daughter's opposition with the remark (on line 105), "Whatever turns you on." This response may serve as a ratification of the daughter's claim to freedom from imposition, however the daughter does not treat it as such as evidenced by her continuation of the topic. Finally, the mother offers a change in the topic and an account for the conflict with (on lines 146-149), "Well, maybe we better not talk about politics (1.3) while we're being recorded." Following a (1.7) gap (line 151), the mother ends the segment with a restatement of the initial request (line 152), "Well anyway I need somebody." By re-emphasizing the "need", the mother may be acknowledging the inadequacy of the initial request (Davidson, 1984). The daughter does not submit to the mother's request and responds with a preclosing response, "Well, I need to go." The topic changes, and the conversation continues for a few more minutes. The mother does not press the issue beyond the daughter's preclosing response thus acknowledging minimally that she and her daughter are at a stand-off.
This series of boundary marking behaviors demonstrates how dyads compete in conflict. In the preceding example, competition between the mother and the daughter occurs because of differing goals of inclusion and exclusion. The mother wants the daughter to agree or take part in her political activities, thus sharing experience or meaning. The daughter, however, wants to assert her independence from the mother. It is in this assertion of independence that the daughter is attempting to specify boundaries in her relationship with the mother in such a way as to redefine the relationship as more equal than would be expected between a parent and a young child.

During the individuation process, in which the adolescent is attempting to establish independence, the adolescent may use conversational moves in order to exclude his or her parents. This tendency to use certain tactics by the adolescent may be exacerbated by parental tendencies to control. It is the relationship between these conversational moves and family structural elements that this essay proposes to study.

Proposed Study
In order to determine how parents and adolescents in the family manage conflict, I propose to examine the relationships between family structural issues, such as boundary maintenance, negotiation and re-negotiation in relation to parenting style, and characteristics of conflict talk in terms of boundary marking behaviors. In particular, the following research questions will be addressed:

RQ1 What types of boundary marking behaviors, if any, do parents and/or adolescent use in their interaction which each other?

RQ2 Is there a relationship between the types of boundary marking behaviors in parent-adolescent interaction and parenting style?

To accomplish answering these questions, several different types of measures have to be employed.

The first step involves recruitment and selection of candidate families for study. For purposes of this study, families to be recruited must contain at least one parent and at least one adolescent child living in the same household. Shared residence is relevant since the characteristic of adolescent development to be observed involves the attempt to separate. This process of separation may not be relevant for adolescents who do not reside with their parents since separation/individuation may involve physical as well as emotional independence.

Recruitment of families will be accomplished through advertisement in local newspapers and newsletters. Families who respond to the advertisement will be sent an initial questionnaire and a brief description of their involvement in the study. Random sampling of families will not be necessary since the goal of the study is descriptive and the relevant methods employed have previously been determined to be valid and reliable (see below).

Selection of families from those that respond to the advertisement, fill out the initial questionnaire, and agree to the terms in the initial correspondence will be
based on the following criteria. First, a minimum of nine families are needed for the case study. Three families each for the three parenting styles will be selected from the responses of the initial questionnaire. The initial questionnaire will be the ICPS Family Functioning Scale developed by Noller, et al., (1992). This scale measures family functioning in terms of three factors: intimacy (high vs. low), conflict (high vs. low), and parenting style. The ICPS Family Functioning Scale is useful for this study for three reasons: (a) the factors measured (intimacy, conflict, and parenting style) are directly relevant to the characteristics of the family during the separation/individuation stage, (b) a valid and reliable measure of parenting style is necessary to answer the second research question, and (c) the use of a reliable scale for purposes of coding may be necessary to apply theoretic constructs to inductively derived data. The scale has proven to be a valid and reliable measure of family functioning and correlation has been shown to be strong between these factors and family systemic characteristics of cohesion and adaptability.

Upon determining the parenting styles of the respondents, all respondents will be contacted and told of their involvement time requirements and details of the procedures of the study. If the respondents agree to the terms, a total of nine families will be selected randomly from the secondary list.

The terms of the study will include for each family selected approximately three hours of time from the family for interviewing and three to six hours of audio or video taped, naturally occurring family interactions between the adolescent(s) and at least one parent. Recordings of interactions will be performed by the participants and collected by the researcher. The researcher will perform an initial observation of the taped interactions and select an episode for each family which contains conflict, assuming there is one.

These conflict episodes will be examined for examples of boundary marking behaviors and conflict strategies. The episodes will be analyzed using conversation analytic techniques for purposes of determining the pragmatic moves of participants. Boundary marking behaviors will be coded and analyzed according to their structural details and pragmatic function. Examples of boundary marking behaviors which demonstrate non-cooperative (competitive or avoidant) strategies manifested in these episodes, from a conversation analytic perspective, may include dispreferred responses which demonstrate trouble, accounts, and moves to gain or maintain the floor such as interruptions or series of turns at talk. Examples of boundary marking behaviors which demonstrate cooperative strategies manifested in these may include preferred responses and the demonstration of inclusion through shared experience. Examination of conflict strategies in the text from a discourse analytic perspective will also include instances of one-up versus one-down versus one-across power moves. Also, the use of threats, insults, criticism, compliance-gaining and resisting, and verbal defense of self, as well as face threatening and face saving moves will be examined. Overall, the goal of this analysis is to find examples of cooperative versus competitive or avoidant strategies in conflict episodes which might serve as boundary marking behaviors.

Following categorization of boundary marking behaviors and conflict strategies by the researcher, the researcher will show the selected segment of
taped interaction to the family and ask the family to describe the interaction in terms of conflict strategies. Specifically, family members will be asked to give their overall assessment of the segment. Then, individual members will be asked to determine: (a) what are the relevant issues in the conflict, (b) who has control, (c) is support offered, and if so how, and (d) what specific strategies (avoidance, competition, or cooperation; Hocker and Wilmot, 1993) are being used and by whom.

Participant coding will be compared with observer coding to determine ecological validity. This step is necessary because the participants are not trained to find the specific elements of conflict required in the study. Walm (1984) found that overall, participant coding of data is unreliable, perhaps due to lack of training. However, their perceptions of the interaction are necessary to assess the nature of the relationship between strategy use and the developmental goals of the family members. Also, participant perception is necessary to determine the meaning particular acts have for members of the family.

The final procedural step for the family will involve an interview of adolescents and parents separately to determine their overall perceptions of family structure, climate, and the expectations of separation/individuation and family nest-leaving. This interview will occur approximately two weeks after the completion of the earlier procedures in order to give the members time to consider and make meaning of the events that have taken place. These reports will be compared to earlier reports of family structure and functioning based on the ICPS scales.

The final analysis will include comparison of the various forms of data. For each family individually, parenting style will be compared to the parents' strategy use and use of boundary marking behaviors in conflict episodes to determine if there is a relationship. Parenting style and parents' strategy use and use of boundary marking behaviors will be compared to the adolescent's use of conflict strategies and boundary marking behaviors. Strategy use and use of boundary marking behaviors by both parents and adolescents will be compared to members' perceptions of family climate, structure and the developmental goals of separation/individuation and family nest-leaving. A profile of each family will be developed, and comparison among families of similar structure and between families distinguished by family structure will be performed to determine if an overall profile by family structure can be used to explain strategy use and use of boundary marking behaviors in conflict situations.

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to describe the communicative ways adolescents perform and accomplish separation/individuation from their parents. The process of separation/individuation involves the re-negotiation of system boundaries which define the parent-child relationship. The dialectic of support and control prompts parents to maintain rigid boundaries around the family system and the parental subsystem. The degree of rigidity and permeability of these boundaries may be a function of parenting style.

Children developing into adolescents may begin to challenge these boundaries. They may seek to balance power in order to gain control over resources, movement between boundaries, and the ability to make decisions on
their own. Adolescents may not dispute the boundary around the parents, especially as a spousal unit, but may try to gain equality as an adult in relationship to the parents. Adolescents may also attempt to loosen the family boundary in preparation for family nest-leaving.

The communicative acts which may demonstrate this process can be seen in family conflict episodes. These acts may include competitive or avoidant strategies which seek to exclude the parents and thus gain independence from them. If the parents wish to maintain boundaries, then the moves of the adolescent may be countered. However, it may be more likely that the moves and counter moves may be in response to latent conditions related to internal and external stressors for the adolescent and parents during the course of the development process.

Studying the relationship between the psychosocial development of the family system, its members, and the interaction of the family is necessarily a complex undertaking. First, the researcher has to demonstrate the behaviors which illustrate developmental changes. Then the researcher has to draw a connection between those behaviors and the goals of the family and individual family members in terms of development and structure. However, such a complex undertaking could go a long way in drawing a more encompassing picture of the family and family communication.
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Appendix A

Typology of Boundary Marking Behaviors

I. Power grabbing moves: Autonomy
   A. Language style divergence from the in-group (Avoidance/competition)
   B. Language style convergence with the out-group (Competition)
   C. Claims to rights of privacy and territory (Competition)
   D. Claims to freedom of action (Competition)
   E. Claims to freedom from imposition (Competition)
   F. Demands for positive self-image: Appreciation/Approval (Competition)

II. Solidarity moves:
   A. Use of reciprocal address terms: Convergence within group which
      blurs sub-group distinctions (Competition)
   B. Claims to equal status between subordinates and superiors
      (Competition)

Subordinates can attempt changes or resist changes in the in-group structure in
terms of their relationship with superiors: Separation/individuation versus stresses
for maintaining in-group intimacy.

I. From the subordinate role: (Attempting changes)
   A. Attempting power grabbing moves (Competition/avoidance)
   B. Attempting solidarity moves (Competition)

II. From the subordinate role: (Resisting changes)
   A. Allowing superior power maintenance moves (Cooperation)
   B. Resisting superior power sharing moves (Avoidance/competition)
   C. Disallowing superior power giving moves (Avoidance/competition)
   D. Resisting or disallowing superior solidarity moves
      (Avoidance/competition)

Superiors can promote or allow changes, or retard or disallow changes in the
in-group structure in terms of their relationship with subordinates.

I. From the superior role: Power maintenance moves (Authoritarian)
   A. Disallowing subordinate power grabbing moves
      (Competition/avoidance)
   B. Disallowing subordinate solidarity moves (Competition/avoidance)

II. From the superior role: Power sharing moves (Authoritative)
   A. Allowing **limited** subordinate power grabbing moves (Cooperation)
   B. Allowing **limited** subordinate solidarity moves (Cooperation)

III. From the superior role: Power giving moves (Permissive)
   A. Allowing subordinate power grabbing moves (Cooperation)
   B. Allowing subordinate solidarity moves (Cooperation)
Appendix B

F1DEVIL.7:2  (You'd vote for the devil)
Family dyad, UT Conversation Library
D: Daughter,      M: Mother

001 M: [Hello]
002 (0.2)
003 D: M other:
004 M: Yes?
005 D: ·hhhhhhhhhh You're such a ne:rd
006 D: ·hhhh u:mi- (0.4) I'm sor:ry I had to (0.2)
007 dip- (0.3) take my lea:ve so fa*st
008 M: That's all ri:ght.
009 (1.0)
010 D: I hi:ope I (0.4) get to Jazzercise and I'm
011 alri:ght h
012 M: Are you goin to Jazzercise n:ow?
013 D: Yeah
014 (0.9)
015 M: [Wh:e:n.]
016 D: [I p:aid] for it (. ) I mi'ze well g:o:
017 (0.7)
018 M: ·hhh Well- uhhh
019 (0.7)
020 D: Well uhhh what.
021 M: If you gonna go run all this way then maybe
022 you should've done either one or the other.
023 M: (en)
024 D: [Mother I didn't run all whu- run all what
025 way. I didn't run (0.2) but a mile and half.
026 M: ·hhhhhhhhhh [hhhhhh
027 D: [I'm gonna be fi:ne mother
028 ((break in recording))
029 D: too ignoran:
030 M: ·hh- Okay now I've got it- (0.2) I've got it
031 the right place now
032 (0.4)
M: We can talk.
D: We sound alike
M: (↑it) doesn't sound ignorant
D: We do:
M: ↑(We-)
D: We have nothing to talk about that's relevant
M: What are you goin be doing March twenty fi:rst.
D: ↑I don't know what I'm gonna be doing
M: ·hhhhh ↑I need: two more people to do: phoning for Phil Gramm.
D: I: am not voting for Phil Gramm.
D: I'm not working for the ma:n
D: I don't- (0.2) like him.
M: Why not
D: Because ↑I j ust d on't
D: No:w you find somebody else,
D: I'm not voting- I am (. ) pt ·hh twenty-three years old and I c'n vote- for who I want to now.
D: You can't make me "you can't make me
you can't make ↑me."°
M: ↑ih There's a little orange marmalade in there- okay
M: I just thought maybe you might like to.
M: He's very intelligent and he's been in Congress for a long time.
D: Other:- (0.2) you like him because he's a Democrat and he turned Republican you'd vote for
M: .hh
(0.7)
M: .hhh Well listen (. ) if- (0.2) if he wins the: n- u::h (0.3) nomination for the:
D: i-
M: .hhhhhhhh to run for Senator on the Republican ticket then will you vote for him?
D: .hhhh I don't know?
(0.5)
M: .hh Well see it's between he and Mossbacher.
(And if he-)
D: I like Mossbacher.
M: Well I know but if Mossbacher doesn't get the nomination if-
D: saying I don't know if I'll vote for him or not.
(0.2)
D: I don't particularly like the man.
M: .hhhhhh Well what do you know about him.
D: We:ll? (0.3) I've just seen him and I don't know if I like him or not.
(1.4)
M: pt .hhhhhh We:ll=
D: =I may vote- (0.2) s- a straight Democratic ticket hh
(1.0)
M: "Well"
D: hhh=
M: =Whatever turns you o:n.
D: Huh huh .hhhhhh You are such a d-
You'd vote for—
I
What.
You'd vote for the devil if he was Republican.
'h No I wouldn't—I did get a real nice letter from Mossbacher he was the speaker at the Republican Ladies Club last week.

Why don't you like Mossbach?

He is not a baby [mother:?
just running this time to get his name out He—
he doesn't have—have any idea that
'the's gonna win this]

Well I agree: but
you gotta start somewhere.

Well that's fine.

but—

That's what they were saying about Mark White a—few years ago now look where he is.

Hey did you see his plane?

Who

Mark White.

Oh Mark White makes me sick.

Did you see his three and a half million dollar jet?

that's outfitted like a cadillac?
M: Yeah
D: ·hhhh u:h hh he makes me ill.
M: We:ll- maybe we better not talk about politics
M: While we're being recorded
D: W- well I-
M: We:ll. hh anyway I need somebody
D: ·hh W- We:ll I need to go:. cause I'm- (0.4)
I feel lot better no:w I- I don't feel sick anymore
M: We:ll what're you all gonna do tada:y.
D: pt ·hh We:ll- (0.3) is it supposed to be pretty today
(0.4)
M: uh Whu it sêems like it's gonna be?
D: Well I got a:- (0.5) since we're going camping I've got to- (0.4) I'm gonna make some chili and-
M: Whu did you- (0.2) figure out where you're gonna go:,
D: Yeah we're gonna go to Lake Buckanan,
(0.3)
D: or Bucanan whatever °it is°
D: We're gonna take Mitzi
D: We figured it wouldn't be crowded this time a (0.3) we're gun take a rope you know where-
(0.2) she can be tied up some but wê figured ·hhhh you know it shouldn't be that crowded
D: I'd li:ke to go to the coast but I kno:w everybody and their dog is gonna be down there and I- (1.5) we: kind a want to be by ourselves.
M: Just you and your little dog. huh

D: And I guess John hhh

M: ·hhhh huh You and John and a little dog

D: (0.4) we're gonna do some fishin and-

(0.4) we're just gonna relax.

(1.4)

D: You know

(1.0)

M: Well I hope

D: Oh-I want you to call Chester

M: Ok. Okay=

D: =And change my appointment make it u:h (.)

I'll write it down- I'll write it down but-

·hmmm and change my appointment from ten to

eleven on Thursday

M: Ten to eleven.=

D: =Or ten to twelve or one.

(0.4)

D: Have it one- ·hh h's gonna- h:mm: (0.4)

is gonna hate me ever- eery thing that I:

(1.0) every- I change it- (0.2) or else I

cancel on every appointment

D: ·hmmm Just change it- (0.2)

D: Tell- t- tell him- eary afternoon one would

be great for me: But=

M: =On Thursday

D: ·hhh Ye:ah-
Because I have a dentist appointment— in the afternoon too I mi'ze well— you know [get it all done °same day°]

When is John goin]to call that guy in (0.2) Llano.

(0.2)

·hh I don't know. I guess— when he gets=

Just a minute

Harry do you still have that card? (for-)

No:

He gave it to John

Oh— Oh okay,

(0.7)

When did you say he was gonna call [him

(0.7) ·hhh we're gonna be so close to Ll\^{a}no we mi'ze well— you know call him (0.2) Monday or something while we're up (0.7) camping

Well how's he gonna get dressed up in a suit [darlin-

Well he's not

But he can just make up an appoint[ment set it up on Friday]

·hh Oh make an appoint[men-

Oh I see okay and then come home then go ba:ck.

Yea:h.

And maybe on Friday or [something]

Well?

I don't know whether he ought to wear his
three piece suit over(h) to Llano or n(hh)

D: Well what I thInUk what we might-we're gonna go by and- we're gonna ask Tom about this I don't know

--- recording ends ---
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