Master's Works

Table of Contents

Firstword ........................................................ iii
Catholicism ........................................................ 1
Sparkman (Poem dedicated to Andrew King) ...................... 3

Book and Article Reviews:
  Graduate work in public speaking ............................... 4
  Interpretation and evidence .................................... 5
  Alan Wilson Watts' philosophy of communication ............. 6
  Elements of encounter ............................................ 9
  The development and maintenance of friendship .............. 13
  Speech communication antecedents of perceived confirmation 15
  Self-presentations of small group leaders .................... 17
  Marital power, role expectations and marital satisfaction .... 19

Interpersonal problem solving:
  Problem conceptualization and communication use ............ 21
  Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication .... 24
  Measurement and reliability of nonverbal behavior .......... 27
  Accuracy of the judgment of facial expression of emotions 28
  as a function of sex and level of education
  The exchange of nonverbal intimacy:
    A critical review of dyadic models .......................... 29
    Similarities and differences between the dyadic models 30
      as presented by Andersen and Andersen

Qualitative Analyses:
  A description of conversational phenomena in F1COOK.2 ..... 34
  A description of adjacency pairs in F1COOK.2 ................ 39
  A description of restarts in F1COOK.2 ........................ 40
  A description of the retelling of an experience
    or event in F1HARD.1:12 .................................... 41
  A description of repairs in F1CUP.1 ............................ 43

Research Proposals and Articles:
  Communication patterns in the religious community: A prospectus . 45
  Minimal responses ............................................. 50
  Rejection and disconfirmation:
    Compliance-gaining strategies in abusive relationships .... 60
    Chronemics: Persons perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors
      as they relate to the use of time ............................ 71
  Rule violations by family type: A proposal for research .... 81
  Perceptions of compliance with and importance of rules
    for classroom interaction: Students versus teachers ........ 91

Master of Arts Comprehensive Exams .............................. 114
Firstword

The poems, essays and articles in this collection were written primarily when I was in college as a graduate student between the years of 1989 and 1992. They represent the thoughts and academic development of a young man.

The collection begins with a letter to the editor which was written during my first years as a graduate student as a response to an editorial about Catholicism. It is included to show the reasoning employed in a public forum following the four years I spent in the seminary. They are included in order to compare developmental trends illustrated in other editorials and papers found in the earlier volume of works: Poems, Thoughts and Essays. This letter is followed by a poem written to describe the character of a certain professor. The move from undergraduate studies to graduate studies as evidenced in the two volumes demonstrates a change from more artistic pursuits to more academic pursuits. The difference in the proportion of creative writing to academic writing between the two volumes is noticeable.

The rest of the collection includes book and article reviews, descriptive analyses of conversation phenomena and research reports. The works were written as assignments for classes, but are not inclusive of all classwork and assignments required for the Master of Arts degree. Rather, these works are the projects and assignments which were written as papers, therefore excluding assignments in the form of presentations, outlines, and annotated bibliographies. As such, they provide evidence for academic development.

The article reviews follow the structure of the articles themselves. The process of writing reviews in this format helped in learning the structure of articles and research proposals. Most of the articles included follow the hypothetico-deductive model. However, a few of the articles as well as the two books and the thesis make a strong argument for interpretive and critical analyses. This combination of exposure to quantitative and qualitative methodological perspectives helped form a more critical approach to research. The last two reviews included are written on the same article. These two reviews were written for two different classes during the same semester. The purposes and goals for the classes were quite distinct which may be evidenced by the different approaches taken for each of the reviews.

The next section contains short qualitative analyses of conversational phenomena from an ethnomethodological perspective. This approach requires observation of micro-level structures in everyday conversation. Conversation analysis serves as a counterpoint or antithesis to current hypothetico-deductively driven research into human interaction.

The next section includes formal research proposals and articles. The first proposal implies a qualitative approach to research, perhaps using interview type data combined with survey self-reports based on personal lived-experience. The first article uses a conversation analysis approach to discover characteristics of talk which may lead to feelings of being disconfirmed. The next three proposals use a hypothetico-deductive approach and demonstrate first attempts at constructing
models and research tools for measuring communicative phenomena. In the case of the paper on the use of time, data was collected and analyzed. The final article involved a pilot study which served as the groundwork for the master's thesis: Student perception of rules for classroom interactions.

The final work included in this collection is the essays written for the comprehensive examinations for the Master of Arts degree in Speech Communication. They are intended to indicate the spectrum of research and study during master's level graduate studies. They are included as closure to the work created during this period. Hopefully, this collection, as the last, will help you understand who this person was and who he has become.
Dear Editor,

I am certainly appalled, to put it mildly, with recent reactions by certain groups toward the Catholic church. But I was offended on an even deeper level, several levels, by the reaction of Mr. Zmirak in the Daily Reveille. My initial reaction was one of anger and disgust, but after thinking about it for quite awhile it turned to a deep sadness, and a deep frustration.

From the first couple of lines I knew that it was going to be a difficult reading, not from the intellectual weight of it, but rather from the pointedness and sheer force of violence in the lines. It uttered anger towards those who would dare violate the sacredness of the sanctuary. Mind you, I strongly dislike the actions of those who would desecrate the Sacrament.

What offended me was the violence inherent in the reaction. The argument spoke of the violence of the ACT-Up and WHAM groups, and the lack of violence on the part of the worshippers in St. Patrick's Cathedral. (I am certainly happy a violent reaction on the part of the worshippers did not take place. That would have given a bad image of the Church to a great many more people.) On the one hand, Mr. Zmirak seems to be condemning violence. On the other, he seems to condone it. He seems to imply in his opening paragraph that violence would have occurred had he been there. Secondly, he seems to state, at least implicitly, that the silencing of those who disagree with his point of view is a legitimate action. What I mean by that is: If the tenor of the letter is righteous indignation, then there is implied righteousness.

I suppose we all deal with some level of personal violence in our lives. We may have come from broken homes, dysfunctional families, or been ridiculed deeply when in high school. There are many sources of resentment and anger in our troubled world. We try the best we can to deal with it. But, there comes a point when violence becomes explicit and external. Then it is no longer our own, but the world's with which to deal. The letter was uncharitable to those who may seem very misguided to many of us. Mr. Zmirak used the term "hate-fest" to describe the actions of this group. Those who commit violence on the pro-life side of the argument are also guilty of being involved in "hate-fest," as well as Mr. Zmirak himself in writing this column. This is not meant to condone either sides actions.

The part that upsets me the most about this whole business is what it must do to those who are on the outside. The article deeply alienates a lot of people, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. I met someone the other day who was upset because someone turned to him in class and asked what kind of bizarre things the Church is teaching now. Catholics do not know how to respond, and non-Catholics as well as many Catholics do not know what to think. The Church has many sides. There are the conservatives who rigidly follow the Magisterium. There are the liberals which include most modern Catholic Theologians. Then there is the vast majority of regular Catholics who are so confused by the arguments that they do not
know what to think. The problem is that the people on the right, of which Mr. Zmirak is a member, as well as those on the left seem to forget that the people are the Church. So while the left and the right are bickering, the people are lost. An elitist, arrogant type of attitude will not bring people closer to God. A violent, screaming attack of the "misguided" will not bring them closer to God. Only a quiet whisper and example of the mercy and compassion of God will call them home.

Published as “Catholicism” (Daily Reveille, Vol. 94, No. 75, p. 7; February 9, 1990).
Sparkman  
(to be sung to the tune of "The Yellow Rose of Texas")

There's a beautiful sparkman (sic) shooting through the sky  
He like to come and meet us, but he thinks he'll blow our mind.  
But please, turn on your heartlight and come see us today  
So don't phone home our sparkman,  
'Cause we need you to stay.

It only takes a spark to get a fire going  
And soon all those around you can warm up in your glowing  
So bite down on your wintergreen lifesaver tonight  
And let me call you sweetheart, 'cause I love you all right.

Don't leave us a-lone our Champion Spark Plug  
You light up our life like Moosehead in a mug  
The low spark of your high heel brings light into the dark  
But Ready Kilowatt, my friend,  
We know it's full of stars . . . .

Come on baby, light my fire and charge my battery  
You bring good things to light, do you work for G.E.  
But please, turn on your heartlight and come see us today  
So don't phone home our sparkman,  
'Cause we need you to stay.

October 29, 1990

(Dedicated to Andrew King)
Graduate Work in Public Speaking


A. M. Drummond, of Cornell University, begins the article with a general overview of the direction of the field of Speech Communication, then known as the department of Public Speaking. He states all the possible questions involved in the organization of study for a beginning discipline, which Public Speaking was at the time this article was written.

He then states his argument that the direction the discipline should take be generalist in nature. Drummond offers as an example the Department of Public Speaking at Cornell, and its expectations of those students that wish to pursue further study in the field. First, a student should have a liberal arts background, of the order of the general requirements of the "old-fashioned" college. The department itself should not insist that the undergraduate student, planning to further his (or her) education in speech, do any considerable work in undergraduate level speech, and that these students should avoid any over-specialization. And lastly, that a student coming into the program be able to read and write well.

Drummond states as his conclusion that the order of the discipline is to "teach the communication of the living thought, through the living word, to the living hearer." It seems that the general direction of the field has diverged at some point to create two branches: the first being that which Drummond espoused, and the second being a more technically-minded, analytical and specialized approach akin to the natural sciences. The existence of the more generalist approach attests, perhaps, to the magnitude of Drummond's contribution to the discipline. I believe that we may indeed see a renaissance of this approach.

Delia and Grossberg begin with an argument on the nature of fact in order to show the incongruity of traditional scientific inquiry with lived experience. The argument is older than this article points out, and perhaps older than most researchers realize. It began, perhaps, with the skepticism of David Hume which awoke Immanuel Kant out of his "rationalistic slumber."

Kant recognized that the structures were not "out there", but rather within our minds. We see reality through filters. Delia and Grossberg go on to argue that one acquires meaning through socialization with the already meaningful world around him or her. Bernard Lonergan posited that the meaning we have received influences the meaning we will receive. It is for these reasons that Delia and Grossberg believe Communication research should be interpretive.

They go on to enumerate ways to approach Communication research interpretively. First, researchers should "arrive at a shared, interpretive understanding of the processes of human interaction" through communication. Second, researchers should collect data relevant to those processes, not through metacommunication, but through the actual event. Last, researchers should construct interpretive theory based upon the original interpretive understanding which reveals consistencies and regularities in those processes of human communication.

Overall, the article was well thought out and effective. My own philosophical bias lies along those same lines. Behaviorism denies human free will. The human being creates and evolves.
Alan Wilson Watts' Philosophy of Communication


Alan W. Watts was not a communication theorist, but rather he was a philosopher who wrote and taught on metaphysics and the relationship of language to reality. Owens, in her thesis, attempts to collect into a coherent system the thoughts of Watts on the subjects of perception, language, and myth. It is hoped that through this study, one can come to both a better appreciation of Watts' contribution to the field of communication and to use this philosophical base as a means to achieve more effective methods of communication. However, the latter purpose was not explicitly stated in the thesis itself but rather inferred from the thought of Watts as stated in the thesis.

The method of this thesis was first to cover the history of the man and the evolution of his thought to obtain a mental grounding of his philosophical perspective. The first two chapters cover his life, learning, and teaching of Eastern modes or patterns of thought. It was Watts' contention that a proper understanding of the Eastern perspective of reality would give westerners a more rounded comprehension of methods of effective communication. Owens, therefore, attempts to show the correlation between Watts' philosophical basis and the studies on perspective, language, and myth.

The next three chapters cover these three areas separately. The method, from this point, is to extrapolate from the text the principle notions of Watts in the three areas noted above. The classification is topical. Justification for this form of study is noted in the section: Contributory Studies in the introductory chapter. Parallel studies of similar form were conducted by other contemporary scholars on the writings of political reformers and relativist philosophers. These parallel studies were noted and even referred to throughout the thesis.

The third chapter begins the discussion of perception. Watts believes that the corruption of Western thought began centuries ago by an arbitrary division in the conceptual categorization of reality. We divided reality conceptually into polar opposites such as matter and form. The ancient Hindu belief holds that this division of reality is actually an illusion. Eastern thought accommodates the notion of the inter relatedness of nature, whereas Western thought does not. In the West, we understand reality as being comprised of events, facts and things. We interpret those perceptions according to constructs of the mind. Those constructs separate out the matter from the form, and the events and facts from nature.

Yet, we perceive reality in bits and pieces. It is a physiological fact that our eyes and ears sense data digitally. It is possible that this knowledge was not known by Watts' at the time of his writing. However, it does point to a discrepancy between his thought and what is now known about human perception. Our understanding of perception is not at fault, per se. Rather, the actual existent discrepancy between the analogical reality and the digital perception is at fault. That may seem like a fine
distinction, but it is important to note when placing the blame on patterns of thought which contribute to communication failure.

Watts does not place the blame squarely on perception. He believes that it, along with language, is contributory to the illusion. The structure of the English language requires the separation of events from things. Owens contends that Watts saw the whole of nature as being interrelated, and that our language should represent that interrelatedness. That which sets humans apart from the lower animals is our ability to create symbols to represent reality. (This idea has been disputed in recent years due to the research in the field of primate language with chimpanzees.) Due to this symbol making, we have a need to represent ourselves through symbol. Because of the structure of our language, this symbol of the self, the ego, has been separated from the real being.

The confusion of symbols with reality is the subject of the next chapter. Owens begins by describing Watts' conception of the development of language. Watts believes that all language is an expression of basic needs. Thus, as communicators we began naming things to understand the reality and to communicate that understanding to others in order to build a common cognizance. Our different languages were born out of different thought patterns, which are based on different modes of perception. These patterns in themselves are necessary for understanding. It is the differences between the thought patterns, and therefore languages, which contribute to breakdowns in communication. The differences in our system of symbols, the language, point to the confusion of symbols with reality. Symbols have taken on an undeserved responsibility.

Due to the nature of symbols, there is a need to distinguish between types of language. The subject of the last chapter, excluding the conclusion, is the purpose of myth. So far, the discussion has been aimed at factual language. The nature of this being that symbols are derived from the conceptual form of the sensory data of nature. This perception of nature is conscious. Factual language essentially divides and classifies data into conceptual symbols. Poetic or mythic languages does not divide, but rather it expresses the inherent relatedness in reality. Owens, in paraphrasing Watts states "life cannot be defined or explained completely with words." We experience life as being analogical. Therefore, the digital nature of language cannot express it. For this reason, mythical language, a product of the unconscious mind, is used to express that realm of experience which is common to all, life. "Through myth, man sees himself as part of the ultimate reality, or divine order of the world. This is why man is unable to live without myth."

Owens has taken these ideas about myth, language, and perception in order to develop a coherent theory of communication, as attributed to Watts. Perception of reality is the first idea to be considered thoroughly, for it is our perception of reality which decides our perspective. Our Western language is intimately connected to our perception. Through language we express our needs. Yet, language itself is not an objective symbolization of reality. We tend to confuse symbol with reality because of a need to be in unity with that reality. Because factual language divides and classifies reality, there remains a need to express our need for unity with reality. This need is met through mythical language.
I found the writing style of the thesis to be very fluent, clear, and understandable. Reading was easy without having to consult outside sources. References to the writing of Watts and other authors was well documented and well placed. There certainly was no placing of references in illogical, vague or irrelevant locations. There were still a few typos, but that is of less importance in this evaluation.

If there is a complaint to be levied against Owens' thesis, it would be that it was somewhat one-sided. It is as if Owens had bought into Watts' contention that Western thought patterns are a failure and a hindrance to effective communication. It may indeed be the case that the separation of symbol from reality is necessary to achieve unity with one another. However, this in-and-of itself implies a duality, which is the complaint levied against the Western patterns of thought. The Eastern perspective, requiring less verbal communication, seems to negate Watts' idea that all language is an expression of basic needs. The human need for unity must be expressed. Yet, this ultimate unity, achieved through perfectly effective communication is by its nature an ideal. As an ideal, it can never be fully attained.

It is ironic that as Watts' wrote profusely on the topic of language, entailing his belief that verbal communication has led to the confusion of symbol with reality, he shows his contempt for verbal communication. He admonished his readers to "talk less". And yet, the pages of this thesis remain so clean as to entertain the idea that these words have not been read.
Elements of Encounter

New York: Irvington.

William Schutz’ study of small group dynamics has been collected into several books, the first of which was FIRO: A 3-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Communication which was initially published in 1966. In this book, Schutz proposes a theory of communication which is used in the book Elements of Encounter. Interestingly, Schutz somewhat assumes that the reader is conversant with his theory before reading Elements of Encounter.

The organization of the book is very straightforward. It begins with a definition of encounter as “a method of human relating based on openness and honesty, self-awareness, self-responsibility, awareness of the body, attention to feelings, and an emphasis on the here-and-now” (p. 3). He also describes the encounter group as having no formal agenda, as being interested in the expression of present feelings, and as being open, as opposed to closed, though this latter qualification is not clearly defined. Lastly, Schutz placed specific perimeters on the encounter group about when, where, and how it meets. This leads the reader to assume that the author is interested only in a particular type of encounter group.

Schutz was involved in the community at Esalen, California. This community was a group of psychologists studying different approaches, or therapies, for achieving health. In this framework, the author drew connections between his work and many interesting and esoteric therapies. He saw as influential group psychotherapy (1907), Moreno's psychodrama (1934), Kurt Lewin's Training (T) groups (1947), Gestalt therapy (1951), the social psychology study of group dynamics (1953), body movements such as T'ai Chi, and Theatre and dance. Within the Esalen community, many of these various therapies were practiced.

Schutz has attributed trends to the encounter movement which include the incorporation of encounter methods into modern culture and the use of those methods as a basis for a whole life style for many people. The author believes that the expectations of encounter groups such as honesty, confrontation, the emphasis on self-determination, and demands for humanistic treatment has spread to social movements. In 1971, Carl Rogers wrote, "The encounter group is perhaps the most significant social invention of this century" (p. 12).

In the second chapter, the author describes the principles of encounter. Among these principles are the idea that the person is a unified organism encompassing a physical, psychological, and spiritual self. The ultimate goal of the encounter group is to help the person achieve his or her potential. In order to achieve this goal, it is suggested that openness and honesty, self-awareness, self-responsibility, and the trusting of natural processes is imperative. It is stressed that encounter is indeed a life style that requires critical examination of the cultural factors which inhibit the individual. Finally, encounter groups incorporate many different systems for personal growth. The belief behind this embrace is that no one
system can suffice for such complex and unique individuals and that different 
systems may work better at different phases in a person's life.

Schutz goes on to describe the different type of obstacles in a person's life 
which may prevent growth toward the potential. He states that the growth toward the 
potential is both psychological and physiological, and three possible causes for the 
prevention of that growth were enumerated. Physical trauma, such as a debilitating 
disease or a crippling accident, do not allow the person to reach their full potential. 
Emotional trauma, such as a harsh childhood could also result in the inability to 
reach full maturity. However, perhaps the most common obstacle of all is the limited 
use of our physical and emotional resources. We are taught not to explore the 
depth of emotions, or not to involve ourselves in different types of physical 
exercises. Our movement becomes habitual and limited, and these habits serve as 
obstacles to our growth.

Schutz suggests there are connections between the physical and emotional 
dimensions to the human being. He contends that the body structure, how an 
individual sits in a chair, gives an account of that individual's personal history. For 
example, if a person's shoulders are slumped, that is an indication that the 
individual is suffering from an emotional burden. Or, if an individual's arms are 
folded during a conversation that is an indication of the individual's feeling closed. 
The author believes Izard's conclusions were accurate, that "the body is central to 
understanding emotions" (p.28). Izard also stated that "natural feelings expressed 
through motor action are suppressed by cultural factors" (p. 28).

In the next chapter, the author shows the psychological basis for encounter. 
This is accomplished by positing, what Schutz believes, are the basic human needs. 
These three needs were first stated in the author's prior book FIRO. These three 
basic needs are inclusion, control, and affection. Inclusion involves the person's 
feelings of significance, importance, and belonging. To fulfill that need the individual 
seeks prominence and centers his or her attention on encounter. If the person's 
socialization was inadequate, then that person could become undersocial. The 
undersocial person is introverted and withdrawn. The oversocial person, on the 
other hand, is extroverted. Though the behavior is opposite in these two types of 
people, the underlying, unconscious feeling is the same: both fear being left behind. 
For the individual who has not suffered maladjustment, inclusion needs were 
resolved in childhood and presents no present problems.

Control involves the person's decision making processes. The person seeks 
either dominance or submission and centers on confrontation. The two maladjusted 
types either seek to control (autocrat) or be controlled (abdicrat). The democrat is 
comfortable either submitting or controlling according to what is warranted by the 
situation.

Affection involves the person's need for intimacy. The person seeks to 
embrace the other and centers on acceptance. Maladjusted individuals either avoid 
close ties or try to develop extremely close ties with many people. The well adjusted 
individual is comfortable with intimacy and detachment.

Schutz believes that people relate to nature and institutions with the same 
basic needs of inclusion, control, and affection. In his theory of group development,
the author suggests that the development of a group progresses through phases corresponding to the three basic needs, in the order discussed above. However, he also believes that "group members tend to concentrate first on their relations to the leader, and then on relations to each other" (p. 51). In the inclusion phase, the new member joining a group wants to find out where he or she fits, how much commitment will be invested, and what boundaries exist around the group. In relational development with the leader and other members, the new member searches for signs of commitment.

In the control phase, issues of distribution of power, competition, and struggles for leadership responsibility take place. To satisfy the need to appear competent and intelligent, members vie for power roles or influential positions. The submissive person may wish to relinquish all responsibility, and thus become dependent on the rest of the group.

In the affection phase, members search for balance and comfort by forming dyadic pairs. Members search for feeling of warmth with other members while deciding upon mutual like or dislike toward the leader.

Separation of a group normally follows an opposite pattern. "As groups terminate they tend to resolve their relations in opposite sequence: affection, control, and inclusion" (p. 56).

At this point in the book, Schutz leaves the theoretical discussion to talk about the practical perimeters of the encounter group and the rules that should be followed. He suggests that the encounter group have intensive one week workshops to get the most out of the immediacy of the experience. He then enumerates twenty-three rules that should be followed to create an open encounter experience. Most of these rules deal with how to express feelings, being open, taking responsibilities for one's actions, and to relieve inhibitions. However, two specific rules warrant particular mention.

The first of these rules states "fight when it feels right." It has been suggested that emotions can and should be expressed physically. For this particular rule, the emotion being expressed is anger. No restrictions were put on how these emotions could be physically expressed. The assumption was that those persons involved would take responsibility for their actions. Harm and injury were a distinct possibility. Yet, the rule was promoted due to the belief that unhindered physical expression of emotion was healthy and inherently of more good than the possible down side. This belief is dubious.

The second rule suggested that individuals take off all of their clothes if they felt it was important. Certainly the human body is beautiful. The useful purpose of this practice is not apparent. The belief that inhibition is unhealthy seems to be of dubious good for this rule as well.

The role of the leader was to implement these rules, but more importantly to give direction to the group in their search for each one's potential. The qualities of the leader insisted that the leader be not only self-aware, but also aware of the energies of others. The leader was to create an atmosphere for the easy expression of emotions by group members. This required that the leader be aware of how each of the members was feeling. This could be attained by following the messages
communicated through the body language of the members. The leader also needed to legitimize the feelings of members by giving them the opportunity to express those feelings.

Schutz believed that the results of encounter groups were ultimately good and outweighed any possible risks that might be involved. He interviewed many people who had experienced the encounter group and found an overwhelming positive response. However, there had been recorded instances of psychotic behavior by some persons who had experienced the encounter group. It was Schutz' belief that these persons had chosen psychotic tendencies to deal with their problems. This belief is based on the idea that people are ultimately responsible.

Schutz also believed that the influence of encounter culture on the larger culture was great. He saw these influences as being usable in various aspects of mainstream life such as in psychotherapy techniques, industry, education, theatre, childbearing and parent-child relationships, religion, daily life, and society at large. He saw encounter as a method for reducing the mental, physical, and emotional obstacles to effective functioning and optimal growth.

There are several questionable premises on which the merits of the encounter group are based. Certainly, the human animal is a complex organism with interdependent systems of a physical, mental, and spiritual nature. However, how those systems are interdependent and connected is not so apparent. Schutz' explication makes assumptions about those connections which are not documented fully in this book. It is questionable about whether they are factually established. This is not to suggest that these connections do not, in fact exist. The connections seem plausible. Yet, the fact that they are not established make the risks involved in this form of encounter group experience appear greater than Schutz would have the reader believe.

The theoretical section on the basic human needs is perhaps the most useful section of the book. It is a concise explanation of Schutz' theory of interpersonal behavior that was established in FIRO. The rules and application of encounter are also helpful. Although, the encounter group movement is possibly the first systematization of the rules incorporated, I do not believe it is the first time some of these rules have been suggested for use in a small group setting.

At this time, there are many encounter type groups which serve the purpose of promoting personal growth. This is not a new phenomena, in the sense that it developed as a result of the Esalen experiments. For example, Alcoholics Anonymous has been in existence since the nineteen-thirties and has promoted personal growth through honest disclosure and support for individual's emotions in a small group setting. In Judeo-Christian history, small groups embodying these ideals have existed before the time of Christ, for instance the Essene community. Schutz seemed to be rather caught up in the discovery of these ideals and their implementation in the Esalen community, that he believed they were new and unique.
The Development and Maintenance of Friendship

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 75-98.

Introduction

Robert Hays proposed through this research that friendships are developed according to Altman and Taylor’s Social Penetration Theory. The study assesses friendship development according to the participants through a self-report survey known as the Friend Observation Checklist (FOC). The study followed the development of friendships in order to interpret patterns inherent in the development along depth and breadth axis as defined in the theory of Altman and Taylor.

Hays justifies the research on the grounds that friendship behavior assessment is necessary to judge the applicability and relevance of attraction research. Secondly, Hays points out that although much research has been conducted on the depth axis of Social Penetration, research on the correlation between friendship and breadth of topics has not been extensive. Also, research has focused specifically on verbal self-disclosure and not on other friendship behaviors.

Several hypotheses were tested. These included: (a) the relationship between ratings of friendship intensity and performance of intimate behaviors, (b) the rate of increase of intimate behaviors versus non-intimate behaviors in friendship development, (c) the relationship between judgments of friendship intensity and behaviors of various content areas, and (d) possible shifts in content areas as relationships develop.

Methodology

The FOC was distributed to college undergraduates in a freshman level Psychology course, during the beginning of the fall semester. The students were asked to fill out the checklist in accordance with behavior they observed in three different same-sex friendships they were developing since the beginning of that semester. These checklists were completed every three weeks for four consecutive periods during the semester. At the end of the spring semester, checklists were filled out.

Four friendship behavior content areas were identified: (a) companionship, (b) consideration (or utility), (c) communication (or self-disclosure), and (d) affection. Four levels of intimacy were identified: (a) an acquaintance, (b) a casual friend, (c) a close friend, and (d) a ‘best’ friend.

Findings

The results of the tests were divided into three categories: (a) behavioral correlates of friendship, (b) friendship development, and (c) long-term maintenance of friendship. For the first category, "both the breadth . . . and the intimacy level . . . of the dyads’ interaction showed positive correlations with friendship intensity ratings at all time periods." This was interpreted as being consistent with Social
Penetration theory. Also, intimacy scores were more highly correlated with friendship intensity than the breath of interaction.

In the second category, of the friendships that developed into close relationships, the behavior exchange from superficiality to intimate levels of interaction followed a steady linear progression. This progression corresponded to the Guttman scale and also was interpreted as supporting the Social Penetration theory. However, the breadth of interaction for both the successful relationship and those that did not progress decreased with time.

In the third category, it was found that the behavioral exchanges at the fourth time interval were good predictors of friendship intensity at the last interval. Consideration behavior was found to be more important than breadth of interaction at time interval four. Although breadth of interaction decreased over time, it was still found to be important in friendship intensity ratings.

**Analysis**

One of the more interesting findings was that the emergence of intimate behaviors in the relationships was not as gradual as had been hypothesized, but rather the number of intimate behaviors peaked around six weeks into the relationship. Other behaviors followed the same pattern. Despite the decreases of behavioral exchange, friendship intensity ratings increased. Hays suggests that the relationships become less dependent on quantity of behavioral exchange through time and more dependent on the quality of behavioral exchange.

**Criticism**

One may have intuited that the results would have supported the hypotheses. We believe that friendships that survive have done so because they developed and grew into more intimate levels. For that reason, the research seemed to be general. Interestingly, Hays raises this criticism himself. He states that more research is needed at the micro level of relational development. He also states that age and social status of the group influences the values and expectations of the friendship development of the participants. Furthermore, the effect of the environment of the college campus does not necessarily reflect society at large. This is my criticism also. More importantly however, is the possible difficulties with the self-selection ratings of the participants. Their expectations, desires, and feelings toward the relationship itself may cause perceptual problems.

All in all, the research was coherent and valid. It seems the most acceptable means of obtaining information on and about relationships at this point, until we can tackle the difficulties and paradoxes inherent in self-analyzation.
Speech Communication Antecedents of Perceived Confirmation

The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 43, 48-60.

Introduction
The purpose of the two studies conducted and presented here is to specify those antecedents which lead communicants to feel they are being confirmed. Cissna and Keating state that although much theoretical groundwork has been done regarding confirmation and disconfirmation, begun by Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson, little is known about the specific communicative phenomena which induce feelings of confirmation and/or disconfirmation. The hypotheses which the first study seeks to confirm state that a positive correlation exists between the communication of empathy, respect, genuineness, and self-disclosure and "the extent to which the other person feels confirmed by the first." The second study, as a follow-up of the first study's findings, attempts to show the relationship between agreement and disagreement with the other's feelings of being confirmed. However, in the second study the hypotheses revolve around a gender distinction.

Methodology
In the first study, the population of the study consisted of couples living in married student housing at the University of Denver. Demographically, the majority were white, well-educated, adult Americans, in the early stages of marriage. The four communicative features were measured using Robert Carkhuff's procedures. Perceived confirmation was measured using a summated Likert-type scale known as Sieberg's Perceived Confirmation Scale (PCS). Data was collected for each couple in two sessions. Twenty minute discussions were recorded.

The second study involved members of Marriage Encounter who resided in St. Louis, Missouri. On average, the couples were ten years the senior of the couples in the first study both in age and in length of marriage. As in the first study, Carkhuff's "Gross Ratings of Facilitative Interpersonal Functioning" scale as well as the PCS and a simple tally of agreement and disagreement. Two sessions were used, and audio-tape recording was also employed.

Findings
A moderate association between communicated empathy, respect, and genuineness and the perception of confirmation by the other was found in the first study. However, the association between self-disclosure and perceived confirmation was statistically insignificant. Interestingly, a significant gender difference was found in the study. Females were found to communicate respect, genuineness, and self-disclosure more than males. Whereas, males scored higher on perceived confirmation and combined facilitative communication. No connection was found between female communication and male confirmation, yet a notable connection was found between male communication and female confirmation.

In the second study, as in the first, facilitative communication, self-disclosure, agreement, disagreement, ratio of agreement to disagreement, and ratio of
disagreement to agreement were measured. "None of the differences between the pairs of correlations were statistically significant," although some of the correlations were statistically significant.

Analysis

According to the findings, three conclusions are suggested. First, important differences may exist between females and males in communication behaviors and feelings of confirmation. Secondly, feelings of being confirmed or disconfirmed by the other are probably not related to agreement or disagreement. And lastly, evaluative attitudinal expressions are not accurately reflected by the narrow construct of agreement versus disagreement.

Criticism and Direction for Future Study

Cissna and Keating suggest that more studies are needed to show the connection between confirmation, disconfirmation, and self-esteem. They also suggest that more studies need to be conducted on the particular behaviors that contribute to feelings of confirmation and disconfirmation. Lastly, they suggest that more research should be conducted on other types of interpersonal relationships. I think the restriction of this study to married couples is too narrowly focused. These hypotheses should be tested on other types of relationships, romantic and non-romantic.

Another criticism deals with the stated assumption, "an individual's communicative linkages with others take two basic forms, acceptance and rejection." This seems both reductionistic and simplistic. An individual may derive some satisfaction from the simple exchange of information when the other's intent is simply to disseminate information. The assumption that self-esteem is derived totally from others is too simplistic, although it plays a very large part. For instance, an individual may gain self-esteem through his or her own accomplishments.

Also, this study suggests gender differences without proposing possible reasons for those differences. It may come down to the nature versus nurture argument, though I would suggest that those type of differences are more a product of social conditioning than physiological differences. It is important to make that distinction when talking about behavioral differences. Such neglect often leads to bigotry. Inter-departmental studies could go a long way toward healing that division.
Self-presentation of Small Group Leaders


Introduction
Impression management theory, first posited by Irving Goffman, suggests that individuals will behave in such a way that will create an impression in a social setting. People will make judgments about others based on the behaviors they have observed. In order for the individual to maintain some control over those judgments, that person will act in certain ways to gain respect, acceptance, or friendship.

Leary, Robertson, Barnes, and Miller propose that small group leaders will use self-presentations to preserve their leadership roles. Two types of group leadership styles were suggested: task-oriented and relationship-oriented. These styles are useful for the two primary functions of the group: goal accomplishment and relationship maintenance. However, the styles used by the leader depend on not only situational factors and role expectations, but the values the individual holds.

Two experiments were conducted. The first study was devised to assess how the self-presentations of small group leaders are affected by role requirements and preferred leadership style. It was hypothesized that the leader would self-present in a manner that maximized the effect necessary for the given function (see above). This maximizing tendency could require compromising or balancing preferred leadership style with role expectations. (Gender differences in self-presentation were also noted.)

The second study, the experimenters sought to measure confidence levels for task versus relational orientation. It was hypothesized that high Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) leaders would be more confident in task approaches, whereas low LPC leaders would be more confident in relational approaches. In the experiment, the leader's self-perceived competencies were incongruent with the preferred leadership orientation.

Methodology
In the first study, forty male and forty female undergraduates participated in five member, mixed-gender groups. Each student was asked to fill out an LPC scale, then were told they would be involved in decision making tasks. Each was told individually that they were chosen randomly to assume the leadership role. Half of the subjects were told that task oriented styles were most effective. The other subjects were told relational oriented styles were most effective. The subjects were required to fill out information exchange questionnaires before the group meeting, and filled out a form on the kind of leader they believed would be most effective.

The second study was almost identical to the first with a few exceptions. The first questionnaire included a measurement of the individual's confidence in performing task versus relational leadership functions. Also, the second form requested information on style relevant attributes on a Likert scale. In both
experiments, after the forms were filled out the subjects were told that no group processes would take place, and they were dismissed.

Findings

In the first study, the desired perceptions were successfully induced by the manipulation of optimal leader role. A median split was performed on the LPC scores which produced low-LPC and high-LPC groups with forty members in each. Responses on the forms yielded evidence that the groups were homogeneous. The predictions about optimal leader role were found to be false, or at best qualified. "Role manipulation affected the task-relevant self-presentations of low-LPC women and high-LPC men," but not vice-versa.

In the second study, the manipulation check and median split produced significantly similar results as in the first study. The effect of role manipulation was found to be similar to the results of the first study. However, confidence did not play a role. Also, gender difference was not found to be connected with optimal leader role as in the first study.

Analysis

Both studies supported the initial hypothesis that leaders of small group would manage impressions consistent with role expectations. They showed that leaders "conveyed the impression that they were the right kind of person in the role of leader given the nature of the group situation." The findings did not suggest the knowledge of the optimal type of leader affected the self-presentation of interpersonal qualities. And, it was suggested "not all individuals responded to situational pressures to engage in tactical self-presentation."

Criticism and Direction for Future Study

One criticism about this study stems from the interpretation of the inconsistency regarding the relationship between gender differences and self-confidence, specifically in high-LPC women and low-LPC men. The suggestion was made that sex-role socialization may foster confidence in certain leadership attributes. For instance, women are socialized to be more confident in relationship oriented styles, whereas men are socialized to be more confident in task oriented styles. This suggestion was not supported by the findings. Yet, the opposite was not examined; that is the possibility that women are socialized to be less confident in task oriented styles, whereas men are socialized to be less confident in relationship oriented tasks. Perhaps, people avoid the negative, even though it may not be shown they gravitate toward the positive.

There are, to be sure, many possibilities for the findings which suggest gender differences. Although my own guess is that most cognitive differences derive from socialization, studies sometimes fail to bare this out because of a lack of ability on the part of the researchers to see the larger picture. There is a quick jump to find a cause for the effect, even though there may be more than one cause. And, when that phenomena is not found to be the cause, the search is abandoned. The way to reduce animosity between groups is to see all the possibilities for explanation about differences. Anything less will surely be reduced to bigotry.
Introduction
In this study, the role expectations placed on each other in a marital couple is observed. These role expectations encompass power and authority to decide for the couple, in conflict situations. Previous studies have divided power structures in marital relationships in four categories: wife-dominant, husband-dominant, jointly-shared equal authority, and equal but separate authority.

Mashal suggests that expectations regarding the type of power structure in marital relationships can have a significant affect on marital satisfaction and happiness of the members of the relationship. Earlier studies have shown that marital satisfaction and happiness does not depend on the type of power structure in the relationship, but rather, whether the actual power structure conforms to the ideals and expectations that the members have about the relationship.

This study will examine the connection between marital satisfaction and role expectations as well as the actual power structure inherent in the marital relationship. It was hypothesized that discrepancy from the ideal power and authority structure is inversely related to marital happiness. It was also hypothesized that the similarity between each in the couple expectations regarding the ideal power and authority structure is related to marital happiness.

Methodology
Twenty couples in traditional-type marriages participated in this experiment. All twenty wives were full-time homemakers. Each couple had been married at least five years and were from middle to upper-middle class socioeconomic backgrounds. The couples involved fell on a continuum from highly satisfied marital partners to highly dissatisfied couples.

Questionnaires were given to each couple in one session. These questionnaires measured actual versus ideal authority, in the context of decision making, the actual outcome power of conflict resolutions versus the ideal outcome power, and marital satisfaction.

Findings
The self-description of the couples was compared to the findings. Relative authority and outcome power exercised by one spouse was found to have no significant correlation to marital happiness. Also, the findings suggested that concordance of opinion on the ideal authority structure was unrelated to marital happiness. However, discrepancy about the ideal authority structure was negatively related to marital happiness. And, discrepancy regarding the ideal outcome of power was inversely related significantly to marital satisfaction.

Analysis
Joint power sharing was found to be strongly related to marital satisfaction whereas neither the wife dominated or husband dominated authority structure was
associated with greater marital happiness. Mashal suggested that the couples in the study, despite their traditional characteristics, either attained or wished to achieve the recent cultural norm of authority sharing in the relationship.

Mashal gave three reasons why the findings differed from previous studies. First, the demographic selection of couples was greatly restricted. Second, as a result of the demographic restriction, only one wife-dominant couple was tested. And third, the shared authority index was used to emphasize the importance of authority sharing for marital happiness.

Mashal proposed that power sharing promotes marital satisfaction by necessitating compromise in decision making processes. By the same reasoning, it was suggested satisfaction was unrelated to the number of decisions won in a member's favor, but rather whether that member felt their maximum ideal of control had been achieved.

Criticism and Direction for Future Study

Mashal implied several directions for further study in the article. These include studies of marital relationships in other socioeconomic groups, control for more couples with a wife-dominated power and authority structure, and specifically shared authority couples to find if marital satisfaction is found significantly across the board.

Mashal's inclusion of cultural norms in the interpretation of the results was commendable. That possibility is lacking in most studies. Yet, it is questionable if that is the proper interpretation because of the conflict with the earlier studies. It could have been due to some abnormality unforeseen in Mashal's study. As for criticisms, I thought the limitation to one experiment for this article was shortsighted, especially since Mashal's findings conflicted with earlier studies. The second study should have included new subjects, although it probably would have been advisable to stay with the same socioeconomic group and limited the hypothesis to that group. The second group should have included more wife-dominated couples.

Without a second study to confirm the first, and possibly correct any potential variable errors, the first study's findings are tenuous at best. Given the simplicity of the experiment, it should be easy to duplicate provided couples willing to participate and fitting the categories first established could be found.
Interpersonal Problem Solving: 
Problem Conceptualization and Communication Use

Communication Monographs, 55, 336-359.

Introduction

Our culture has developed a set of rules and norms to be adhered to within relationships, with special rules developed by members of the relationship. When those rules are violated, when expectations are not met, confrontation can occur. On the other hand, problems exist when the individual perceives that the present state is incommensurate with the goal state. This study attempts to show a relationship between problem conceptualization and the types of communicative strategies used in problem solving.

The focus of this study is on conceptualization and initial interaction between people in a relationship after a problem situation is perceived. Two tendencies are involved. Parties in problematic situations tend to reciprocate communication. And, due to the first tendency, perceptions are reinforced and therefore remain relatively stable. The study accordingly tests the following hypotheses: initial communication varies across the dimensions of initiation of discussion, amount of information search, and level of negative affect for the other. Four types of communicative strategies were examined: (a) integrative communication, (b) distributive communication, (c) indirect communication, and (d) avoidance.

Methodology

Two studies were conducted. In the first study, an equal number of college students were asked to report on an interpersonal problem situation they were presently or recently involved. Participants completed a Likert-type scale questionnaire containing representations of conceptualizations about the problem, likelihood of use of one of the four types of communication strategies, and demographic information.

The second study involved the same parameters as the first with a few additions. The participants were directed to answer questions representing the "difficulty of indicating the likelihood of the variety of conceptualization perceptions." This study required that participants read an example of an interpersonal problem situation and indicate how they would respond initially. Three examples of each of the four types of communication patterns were presented. However, participants were asked to respond to only one of the twelve.

Findings

The first observation in study one was that participants placed a higher value on the relationships on which they were reporting prior to the problem situation than after the problem arose. Secondly, four types of communicative strategies were yielded by the responses given by the participants.

The four types of communicative strategies were defined by Witteman as having varying degrees of the three dimensions. For instance, integrative
communication involves high initiation, high search, and low negative affect. Whereas distributive communication involves high initiation, low search, and high negative affect. Indirect communication involves low initiation, high search, and low negative affect. And avoidance strategies involve low initiation, low search, and either high or low negative affect. The study supported the hypothesis showing the relationship between the communicative strategies and their dimensions for the first three types. The findings only partially supported the hypothesis regarding the fourth type of strategy.

The second study tested and confirmed that a significant effect occurred for all communication strategies as a result of these variables: (a) the other's intent, (b) the relationship, (c) the environment, and (d) feelings for the other. Uncertainty about the relationship and the other did not play a significant role.

Analysis

The hypotheses posited by Witteman were generally supported. The researcher suggests that four general conclusions come from these findings. "First, people are able to report on initial communication use. Second, the dimensional approach to conceptualization perceptions is theoretically useful. Third, the results support the existence of problem structures and indicate what relationships between perceptions and communication characterize them." And fourth, because people who experience uncertainty as a result of problems in relationships use avoidance tactics, one can conclude that people do not act rationally always by initiating discussion and searching for information.

Witteman proposes that this study has laid groundwork for four areas of study dealing with interpersonal problem solving: (a) personal influence, (b) conflict, (c) relational intervention, and (d) human problem solving in general. He suggests that earlier studies, while admitting the importance of conceptualization in problem solving, have failed to show the relationship between conceptualization and communication strategies in the interpersonal context.

Criticism and Direction for Future Study

Witteman notes several criticisms of his own study. First is the problem of self-reports. Witteman declares, however, that the problem of self-reporting is of little consequence here because the theoretical framework assumes or presupposes a certain level of consciousness about the problem. If, for example, cognitive problem structures do exist as a product of experience, the person would have access to these structures in the present situation. Given the participant's self-report, the researcher can derive the cognitive problem structure in use by the individual.

His second self-criticism is that the difficulty of response affected the results. Witteman dismisses this criticism due to his perception that the participants found it relatively easy to answer the questionnaire. Although the first study had participants report on their own problems, the researcher implied that the accuracy of the participants conceptualizations was important for the validity of the study.

To take issue with this above implication, one might note that this assumes a high degree of honesty of the part of the participant. When viewing a problem in a relationship, the member may deny or fail to see responsibility for the problem.
There may be a high tendency to scapegoat prior to initial communication regarding the relational difficulty. Initial communication was studied in this report. If one denied responsibility prior to the initial interaction, and then found that he or she was in fact responsible, could there be a tendency to deny being wrong about the initial conceptualization?

For the second study, one might argue that given the situation the participant could see both sides of the problem, whereas prior to initial interaction in the first study the participant has not. Any future study into conceptualizations regarding interpersonal problem solving prior to initial communication should address these criticisms.

**Connection to Persuasion**

Use of communicative strategies in interpersonal problem solving has implications for research in interpersonal influence and compliance-gaining. At a most basic level, the goal of problem solving in this situation could be continuance of the relationship. (In some situations influence might be used to dissolve relationships.) The assumption posited in the above paragraph creates a possibility that one member's intention may be to convince the other of the rightness of his or her position.

On an intuitive level, one might suppose that distributive communication would generate the most persuasive message in the mind of the receiver. Blaming of the other could result in a high level of dissonance particularly if that member views the relationship as valuable. The cost of that member's not taking the blame may not outweigh those of losing the relationship.

On the other hand, one can see how other communication tactics, as outline in the above study, could influence a member of the relationship. For instance, integrative tactics may create in the receiver an image, illusory or real, of the sender as concerned about the receiver or the relationship. This could increase the sender's credibility, and make him or her seem attractive to the other.

Indirect tactics may be employed, such as complimenting the other in order to achieve a welcomed mood or attitude. Once the other is in a good mood the topic or problem can be brought up for discussion. Indirect tactics can also give the illusion of care, concern, or love thus making the other malleable to influence. This often occurs between teenagers who want to go out and unyielding parents. The teenager may attempt to be extra-nice, clean up the bedroom, or do other household chores in order to manipulate the parent.

Avoidance tactics are most likely the most difficult to link to influence. Avoidance can be seen as a disconfirming response in an interpersonal situation. Yet avoidance may arrive at a goal of influencing the other by increasing the cost of the other. For example, a person who is trying to persuade a lover to abandon the relationship may actively avoid emotional, physical, or communicative contact.

If these tactics do, in fact, achieve these goals for members of interpersonal relationships, then the study of communicative tactics in problem solving situations has great implications for studies in persuasion. One should not assume that intentions are always good and honest in such situations. But, research in this area will help in our understanding of those persuasive structures.
Body Politics: Power, Sex, and Nonverbal Communication


Introduction

Henley writes in the first chapter that there are two dimensions to nonverbal communication. The first of these, which has been studied most, is the horizontal dimension. This dimension is concerned with friendships as measured by closeness, attraction, intimacy, sexuality, expressions of emotions, and sharing of negative or positive attitudes.

However, she contends that there is another dimension, a vertical dimension. This dimension is measured in terms of status, power, dominance, and superiority. There has been little study of this dimension by nonverbal researchers by 1977, according to Henley.

Examples of gestures or other nonverbal behaviors enumerated which lead to subordination include: interruptions, ignoring behaviors, touching, personal space, eye contact, and smiling. Nonverbal behavior is the basis from which verbal messages are interpreted.

The power differential can lead to a vicious cycle of self-fulfilling prophecy. Those in power react to subordinates in a dominant way, which leads to the subordinate maintaining the role. This, in turn, leads the powerful to devalue the subordinate.

Henley takes a systems approach in her study of nonverbal behaviors as related to issues of power and gender. She does not deny the possibility of idiosyncratic differences. However, she does not believe that idiosyncratic differences can be as coincidental as has been measured without some major underlying contributing factor such as cultural socialization.

The book is divided into areas of nonverbal communication. She looks at the power and gender dimensions as related to these various areas.

The first area of study is personal space. It is stated that territoriality is seen as existing in a complimentary relationship with dominance. Territoriality is a form of communication which has been observed in lower animals. Five ways which animals communicate dominance with space include: (a) dominant animals control greater territory; (b) they are freer to move in other animals', or common, territory; (c) they are accorded greater personal space; (d) subordinates yield space to dominants when approached, or in passing; and (e) dominants occupy positions associated with, and/or controlling, desired resources. Humans behave with similar patterns.

Space differential is noted between races. Blacks are afforded more space than whites, but it is believed to be a result of stigma. Males are afforded more space than females. This is a result of the space allowed according to status which is most often afforded males.
Time is very similar to space in the way it is communicated. Metaphors refer to time as space. However, we deal with time differently, that is more time is afforded intimate situations, whereas less space is afforded intimate situations, and vice-versa. Time, like space, is also controlled by those in power.

Environment, the placing of props, also communicates a power differential between the sexes. For example, where chairs are placed around a table in an office communicates power. Most often the boss sits at the "head" of the table. Also, the stereotypical role for women to be behind the man, supporting and nurturing, or in the home caring for the children while the man wields powers to bring home the necessary resources for survival of the family communicates power differences. These images are portrayed in the media, further perpetuating the stereotype.

Henley contends that differences exist in our language in terms of how males and females address one another, in verbal aggressiveness, in interruptions, and conversational patterns within the context of small groups. In each of these aspects, males display dominance. Women also self-disclose more personal information to others than males self-disclose. Men, in general self-disclose as a function of reciprocity.

The author also suggests that more leeway is given to males when communicating through body functions and adapters. Henley notes Goffman's research in which he posited that those in higher positions are allowed more latitude in behavior, while underlings must be more circumspect. For instance, males are allowed to be less tidy of their persons and environments. Women, in our society, are expected to look their best in most situations. (I, personally, have noticed a great tendency even in comic strips to show couples as consisting of an attractive female with a homely but otherwise lovable, for reasons that are not always apparent, male.)

Touch is one of the more obvious areas where a difference between the sexes can be observed. Touch is normally viewed as a communicator of affection, love, or attraction. Social mores consider it an affront to authority for a subordinate to touch a superior, though a superior has the freedom to touch a subordinate. For males, touch by a member of the opposite sex is generally viewed as being primarily sexual in nature. For women, however, being touched by a man is perceived as a ploy for power.

The next area of study concerns body movement, posture, and gesture. Gestures such as a clinched fist, a pointed finger, and a raised head communicate dominance. Body movement such as a forward lean, and posture such as a relaxed seated position also communicate dominance. Closed body positions can demonstrate power by showing an unwillingness to compromise. However, females sit with legs closed as a function of social restrictions. Females engage in higher levels of preening, direct body orientation, and gaze holding.

The expression of anger by women has been suppressed to the point that women cannot directly express this emotions the way men can. Women's anger is often expressed through tears. Whereas men are allowed to vent their anger through aggressive behavior.
Eye contact also varies according to gender. Eye contact is an invitation to or indication of intimacy. Yet, eye contact can also communicate aggression in the instance of the hard stare. Avoidance of eye contact can communicate subordination. Henley discusses Exline’s research which found that the higher one’s status, the less eye gaze one has to give others, and vice versa. Exline also found that women engaged more in both mutual and non-mutual gaze, and held the gaze longer, than men did.

The final area of nonverbal behavior discussed by Henley is facial expression. A contention regarding gender differences in facial expression holds that women smile more than men, and that this behavior is expected of them.

In the final chapter, Henley list eighteen points that were covered in the book. An example of two of these points includes: (a) Power (status, dominance) is a major topic of nonverbal communication; and nonverbal behavior is a major avenue for social control on a large scale, and interpersonal dominance on a smaller scale, and (b) the behaviors expressing dominance and subordination between nonequals parallel those used by males and females in the unequal relation of the sexes.

As stated in the introduction, Henley takes a systems approach for explaining the differences between males and females in nonverbal communication. It is her bias, that the differences are due mainly to societal norms that are taught and perpetuated by those in authority to do so, mainly men. I do not disagree with this bias. It is more easily shown that these differences are due to nurturance as opposed to nature. One criticism, however, is that Henley seems to be highly ego involved in the writing of this topic. In some ways it is understandable, that is, gaining knowledge of one’s own oppressed status can be angering. However, one may overstate the appropriate response to that anger in a professional publication.
**Measurement and Reliability of Nonverbal Behavior**


**Introduction**  
This article reviews research on nonverbal behavior in order to determine the reliability of the various measurements used for assessing nonverbal behavior. Baesler and Burgoon synthesize data across nonverbal types including kinesics, proxemics, haptics, vocalics, turn-taking behaviors, and global assessments. It is hoped that by assessing reliability across measures researchers could increase dependability, and therefore maximize predictive ability.

**Methodology**  
The review contains only studies which report interrater reliabilities. This procedure eliminates many of the earlier studies. Data for the study are organized according to type of behavior and coding scheme: (a) kinesic trunk and limb behaviors; (b) kinesic head, face, and eye behavior; (c) proxemic and haptic behaviors; (d) vocalics and turn-taking behaviors, and (e) global assessments involving multiple cues. Sources for the data were derived from four communication journals and sixteen social-psychological journals. The authors believe this is a sufficiently representative and comprehensive sample.

Baesler and Burgoon note four measurement issues which affect the coding of nonverbal behavior. The first deals with whether the behaviors should be measured by subjective reports of interpretation by receivers, or by objective physical characteristics. The second issue deals with the unit of analysis, whether macroscopic or microscopic. The third issue is the size of the time interval for measurement. And, finally the fourth issue concerns whether a coder should take samples of an interaction or the whole interaction.

**Analysis**  
The authors chose .80 as the criteria for determining if a given measure was sufficiently reliable. They reported both the range of reliability and the median reliability estimate. Reliabilities for kinesic trunk and limb behavior are .81 or better using the median as the best estimate. Reliabilities for kinesic head, face, and eye behavior fell above .80. Reliabilities for proxemics and haptics fell above .89. Reliabilities for several of the behaviors characterized under vocalics fell below .80. Overall, the study of nonverbal behavior has yielded reliabilities above .80. Interestingly, an analysis of the data regarding reliabilities in Burgoon et al. studies reveals a range between .05 and .96. Averaging each reliability score for all studies performed by Burgoon alone or with colleagues reveals a score of .70.

**Discussion**  
Baesler and Burgoon suggest these findings can be used as a compendium of nonverbal studies for researchers interested in nonverbal behavior. Indeed, this information can be used for deciding on operational definitions and other methodological issues.
accuracy of the judgment of facial expression of emotions
as a function of sex and level of education

kirouac, g., & dore, f. y. (1985).
journal of nonverbal behavior, 9, 3-7.

introduction

this article examines the recognition of facial expressions of six emotions as
a function of sex and level of education. the six emotions tested for were
happiness, surprise, disgust, anger, fear, and sadness. the six emotions were
chosen because a review of the pertinent literature suggests that the expression of
these emotions is fundamental cross-culturally. if this is true, then it seems
reasonable to assume that the recognition of these fundamental emotions should
also be accurate within subgroups of a given culture. to this end, the researchers
hypothesize that the sex or level of education should not have a major effect on the
accuracy of judgment of facial expressions of emotion.

methodology

for subjects, kirouac and dore chose a sample of 300 french speaking
students of high school, college, and university. these students were randomly
divided into six groups according to sex and level of education. facial stimuli were
derived from ekman's pictures of facial affect (1976). subjects filled out a form
consisting of demographic questions, and an answer sheet for the experiment. the
form contained instructions for the subjects. each slide was presented for ten
seconds and subjects had to select the proper emotional term for the slide.

analysis

results showed very accurate judgments for all emotional stimuli across sex
and level of education. the greatest accuracy was found regarding happiness. the
lowest accuracy was found regarding fear. however, overall performance was
generally over eighty percent.

as predicted by earlier studies, females were found to be more accurate
decoders of nonverbal expressions of emotion through facial cues. however, the
differences between males and females in this study only accounted for 2.83
percent of the variation. also, level of education only accounted for nine percent of
the variation in this study.

the rank ordering of the six emotions by accuracy according to this study
was, from highest accuracy to lowest: (a) happiness, (b) surprise and disgust
equally, (c) anger, (d) sadness, and (e) fear.

criticism and direction for future study

this study used still photographs (slides) for the basis of judgment. this
procedure does not take into account effects of context on judgment. kirouac and
dore speculate that the addition of context should improve accuracy. this remains
to be seen. it could be that interaction between persons could confound judgments
of emotion from facial cues due to incongruencies between content and nonverbal
cues or personality effects.
Introduction

This article examines, summarizes and criticizes six models for explaining the exchange of nonverbal intimacy.

Models

Affiliative Conflict Theory (Equilibrium Theory) Argyle & Dean (1965) posits that for each relationship, the two interactants in a conversation will establish a certain total amount of intimacy. They will work to maintain this overall amount of intimacy, and will compensate individually for increases or decreases of intimacy by the other. According to the model the state of equilibrium is maintained by the process of approach or avoidance. This model does not account for reciprocity effects.

Two Expectancy-Norm models are critiqued. The first of these is the Model of Personal Space Violations by Burgoon, et al. (1976). This theory predicts that persons viewed as high rewarding will be perceived positively when deviating from the norm, provided personal space is not threatened (range limit). Persons viewed as low rewarding will be viewed most positively if they do not violate expectancies regarding distance norms. The second model is Bakken's (1978) Expectancy-Norm Model. Bakken argues that research supports an Expectancy-Norm Model incorporating the idea that intimacy is a function of social norms when compared to equilibrium or arousal forces.

The third model is the Arousal-Labeling Model proposed by Patterson (1976). This model is an extension of Affiliative Conflict Theory which incorporates reciprocity forces as well as compensatory forces. According to this model, immediacy overtures create changes in the level of arousal which is labeled by the individual as positive or negative. This label determines whether compensatory or reciprocal behaviors are initiated in response. A negative arousal will produce a compensatory response. A positive arousal will produce a reciprocal response. This model places the initial reaction in the cognitive realm.

The fourth model is P. Andersen's (1983) Arousal-Valence Model. This model suggests that when increased immediacy by person A is perceived by person B, arousal in person B occurs. Similar to Expectancy Violations Model, extreme positive or negative violations result in unpleasant or aversive perceptions of the behavior.

Andersen suggests that six sets of variables positively or negatively valence the arousal. These six sets are: (a) social or cultural norms, (b) interpersonal relationship history, (c) perceptions of the other, (d) environmental context, (e) temporal, physical or psychological state of the person, and (f) psychological or
communication traits of the person. These valencers act as schemata, thus requiring little cognition. This allows for mindless arousal. A negative arousal will produce a compensatory response. A positive arousal will produce a reciprocal response.

The fifth model is the Discrepancy-Arousal Model by Capella & Greene (1982). This model is based on an earlier theory which suggests that arousal results from novel stimuli which are not part of the individual's cognitive schema. These stimuli create cognitive activation or arousal. These schema characterize social norms, situational differences, idiosyncratic preferences, and past relational history. According to the model, moderate arousal leads to neutral or positive affect. Extreme arousal leads to negative affect. Positivity or negativity determine whether an approach or avoidance response is used.

The final model summarized is Patterson's Sequential Functional Model (1983). This model suggests that behaviors are evaluated as a result of antecedent factors and preinteraction mediators. The antecedent factors include personal, experiential, and relational-situational factors. Preinteraction mediators include behavioral predispositions, potential arousal change, and cognitive-affective assessment. Large discrepancies between expected and actual behavior of the other results in a condition of cognitive instability which may affect level of involvement (approach or avoidance) or the reassessment of the behavior (positive or negative).

Analysis

The various models presented by Andersen contain some similarities. For instance, the Nonverbal Expectancy Violation model, the Arousal-Valence model, the Discrepancy-Arousal model, and the Sequential-Functional model all assume a priori cognitive schemata. Both the Arousal-Valence and Arousal-Labeling models account for reciprocal behavior as a result of negative violation. And, the Affiliative-Conflict theory, Arousal-Labeling model, and Arousal-Labeling model account for compensatory behavior as a result of positive violation.

Suggestions for extreme violation of expectancies result in negative evaluation of the behavior. This hypothesis is posited in the Nonverbal Expectancies, Arousal-Valence, and Discrepancy-Arousal models. Suggestions that moderate violation of expectancies result in positive evaluation of the behavior. This hypothesis is posited in the Nonverbal Expectancies model, and the Discrepancy-Arousal model.

Finally, the use of arousal as a construct exists in the following models: (a) Nonverbal Expectancy Violation, (b) Arousal-Labeling Model, (c) Arousal-Valence Model, (d) Discrepancy-Arousal Model, and (e) Sequential-Functional Model.

Criticism and Direction for Future Study

This paper is a good synopsis of the various models, though it demonstrates the differences in perspectives communication researchers use. Prediction of communicative behavior may be more accurate if a grand unifying theory regarding the exchange of nonverbal intimacy was constructed. The complex nature of human behavior may prevent this from occurring, especially when the egos of researchers are considered.
Similarities and Differences Between the Dyadic Models
As Presented by Andersen and Andersen

In Peter and Janis Andersen's paper, presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association in November 1984, the authors discuss six dyadic models for explaining the exchange of nonverbal intimacy. These models include: (a) affiliative conflict theory, (b) two expectancy norm models, (c) an arousal-labeling model, (d) an arousal valence model, (e) a discrepancy-arousal model, and (f) a sequential functional model. In their paper, the authors describe each model and show the strengths and weaknesses of each. The purpose of this paper is to show the similarities and differences between the models, based on Andersen and Andersen's presentation of those models.

First, a brief listing of some of the similarities to be discussed include: (a) the assumption that an a priori cognitive schema exists in the individual regarding expected behavior, (b) the assertion that reciprocal behavior results from a positive violation, (c) the assertion that compensatory behavior results from a negative violation, (d) the assertion that extreme violation of expectancies results in negative evaluation of the behavior, (e) the assertion that moderate violation of expectancies results in positive evaluation of the behavior, and (f) the use of arousal as a construct.

The Basic Assumption

In order for a violation of an expectancy to occur, first an expectancy has to exist. It is a pre-condition. Such an expectancy or group of expectancies exist in the mind in the form of cognitive schemas. This schema regarding expectancies is formed through socialization.

David Hume argued, in the eighteenth century, that one cannot have innate knowledge. One learns about reality through the senses. The process of socialization gives individuals a working knowledge of the basic skills necessary to interact with other individuals. Yet, this socialization is affected by many variables including ethnicity, socio-economic status, and situational and contextual factors. For example, young children of a given gender are taught roles by the toys that are given to them. They can also be taught these roles by observation of same sex and opposite sex parents.

Behavioral expectancies, therefore, are derived from the knowledge regarding performance of roles. The first model to assume an a priori cognitive schema regarding expectancies is the expectancy-norm model. In this model, expectancy violations are derived from cognitions regarding social norms and known idiosyncracies of the other. The second model to incorporate this assumption is the arousal-valence model. Six sets of variables positively or negatively valence the arousal. Included in these variables are social or cultural norms and interpersonal relationship history. These two variables are contingent upon prior knowledge. These valencers act as schemata, thus requiring little cognition. This allows for mindless arousal.
A third model which incorporates this assumption is the discrepancy-arousal model. However, in this model, arousal comes from novel stimuli which are not within the individual's cognitive schema. This assumes further, that an individual must have a schema with which to compare the stimuli.

The final model to incorporate this assumption, is the Sequential-functional model. Antecedent factors which lead to intimacy exchange include prior experiences of the individual. This is similar to the second model discussed above. Also, this is similar to imagined interaction as it occurs prior to a confrontation with another individual. This would suggest the possibility of mindful, strategic behavior.

**Assertion One**

Two models present the assertion that reciprocal behavior results from a positive violation: the arousal-valence model, and the arousal-labeling model. In the arousal-labeling model, arousal is the result of a violation of expected behavior. The arousal state induces an individual to label cognitively the violation as either positive or negative. Patterson (1976), posited that a negatively labeled arousal will produce a compensatory response, whereas a positively labeled arousal will produce a reciprocal response.

The arousal-valence model makes the same assertion. The difference between the two is the level of cognitive activity, after the fact. In this model, the schema exists prior to the violating behavior. Labeling of the behavior as positive or negative is not required, since a violation is automatically measured against pre-conditional valencers. However, the same reaction results.

**Assertion Two**

The assertion that compensatory behavior results from a negative violation, is held as complementary function to the above assertion. As a consequence, the two models mentioned in the above argument share this assertion. The affiliative-conflict model (Equilibrium theory), also holds this contention. According to this model, for each relationship, the two interactants in a conversation will establish a certain total amount of intimacy. They will work to maintain this overall amount of intimacy, and will compensate individually for increases or decreases of intimacy by the other.

**Assertion Three**

The third assertion maintains that extreme violation of expectancies results in negative evaluation of the behavior. This contention is held in: (a) nonverbal expectancies model, (b) arousal-valence model, and (c) discrepancy-arousal model. Violations of expectancies may or may not fall within a range of acceptable behavior. According to Burgoon’s model, the behavior is assigned positive or negative evaluations or valences. Deviation from these expectancies causes arousal or discomfort in the individual which precipitates the evaluation. Moderate levels of deviation tend to produce positive affect, whereas extreme deviations tend to produce negative affect.

The arousal-valence model holds that very small changes in an individual's arousal level require very little behavior change. However, it states, very large changes including both increases and decreases in an individual's arousal are experienced as unpleasant and aversive.
The final model supporting this assertion is the discrepancy-arousal model. According to this model, moderate arousal leads to neutral or positive affect. Extreme arousal leads to negative affect. Positivity or negativity, as evaluated by the aroused individual, determine whether an approach or avoidance response is used.

Assertion Four
The assertion that moderate violation of expectancies results in positive evaluation of the behavior, is also described by the three above models.

Arousal as a Construct
Five of the six models presented use arousal as a critical construct, as Andersen and Andersen state in their paper. (Affiliative-conflict theory is the only one that does not use the term arousal.) Arousal is seen as a reaction to deviations from expected behavior, and is defined as having degrees of magnitude.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory
The construct of arousal assumes cognitive dissonance. The reliance on Cognitive Dissonance theory is supported by its continued use throughout each of the above models. Persons react to arousal effects due to discomfort. Burgoon, in her later studies equates arousal with discomfort.

Cognitive Dissonance theory holds that persons will change in order to reduce mental discomfort. This discomfort can arise from a perceived inconsistency between attitudes and behaviors. To maintain consistency, and therefore reduce dissonance, an individual may change the attitude or the behavior.

By extension, the construct of arousal, which is central to the above models, maintains the possibility for extreme discomfort which can result in behavior change, such as avoidance.
A Description of Conversational Phenomena in F1COOK.2

In the conversation between the mother and the daughter, and interesting dynamic occurs. Starting on line 74 of F1COOK.2 (see Appendix), the mother asks the daughter what her plans are for the following day. For the next several lines, in the context of answering the initial question, several observations can be made about the interpersonal relationship between the mother and the daughter.

Prior to the question posed by the mother on line 74, the mother states that she will try to get the cookbook to the daughter the next day. After that statement, before the daughter has a chance to respond, the mother asks the question. The sequence of the statement and question seem out of order. That is, the mother should have asked if the daughter would be available to receive the cookbook before stating that she, the mother, would try to get it to the daughter the following day. Having the statement and then question, in that order, put the daughter on the spot.

The evidence for the proposition that the daughter was put on the spot exists in the next couple of lines. In line 75 there is a four tenths of a second pause. It seems reasonable that the daughter would have known what the mother was going to ask before she was actually finished asking. In that pause, the daughter was probably trying to come up with an answer that sounded reasonable. The daughter's searching is further evidenced in line 76 by the audible and lengthy turn holding. At the beginning of the line the daughter lip smacks and has an audible in-breath. The next word, well, is lengthened and then cut off at the end. The word well serves, in this instance, as a time lengthener. (It serves the same purpose as the beginning of the statement on line 71 by the mother.)

The daughter gives her answer about the time she is planning to spend in the morning. She then continues in a similar fashion to suggest a scenario for the afternoon. There is a short pause following the first statement, about her plans for the morning, on line 77. The daughter then utters: "an then uh," which is followed by a significantly long pause of one point four seconds. This phrase and pause serves as a time lengthener or turn-holding device while the daughter tries to think of an excuse or rationalization for not being available in the afternoon. (The reason for the assumption that the daughter's response is an excuse will be explained below.)

An interesting side note is that the qualifier about Lisa at the end of the first statement protects the daughter from criticism from the mother. The daughter has a commitment with a friend to go to jazzercise. In order for the daughter to make time for the mother, the daughter would have to break her commitment. The mother will probably not ask the daughter to break her commitment with Lisa, so the daughter is protected from having to explain why she cannot be available in the morning. The second part of the statement, about the afternoon, does not have that quality.

After the daughter's response, there is another significant pause. This pause serves as a transition relevance place. However, there is no immediate response from either the mother or the daughter. The mother did not self-select immediately, nor did the daughter continue. It is reasonable that the daughter was finished with
her statement and was awaiting response from the mother. The mother’s pause seems to suggest that the mother was either wondering what the daughter meant by the last statement or was trying to find the proper response. The daughter’s response, with all the pauses and false starts, may have suggested to the mother that she was looking for an excuse not to be available so that the exchange of the cookbook could take place.

The mother then asks the daughter about her last test. The mother assumes that the daughter is studying for a test. There is a pause on line 81, and then the daughter responds by stating that she does not have one. The daughter then has to come back later to state that she has a report to write. This is the reason for the assumption above that the daughter is looking for an excuse. The daughter could have just said that she had to write a report at the beginning. This is the reason for the frequency and size of the pauses in this exchange. Both the mother and the daughter are trying to deal with the awkwardness of the situation first precipitated by the mis-ordered sequence of statement/question committed by the mother in lines 72 through 74.

Appendix

F1COOK.2
Family dyad, UT Conversation Library
D: Daughter, M: Mother

((conversation resumes after a blank spot in the tape))
((topic change))

001 D: (see um)
002 M: I have a present for you
003 (0.3)
004 D: What's that
005 M: A little bunny rabbit brought it today
006 D: What was it=
007 M: =It's a real pretty cookbook
008 D: alright (.) that's good
009 (0.3)
010 M: No I ordered it for you from (.) Southern Living
011 (0.6)
012 M: And I was going to get it to you for Easter
013 but I decided I'd go ahead and give it to you
D: How come?

M: Well because it's a (.) a low calorie cookbook it's a (.) but it's very well balanced and it has a (.) what e'ry all ev'rything has in calories and what you should be eat:in an all that kind of stuff (.)

An I jus thought that you might like it

D: Well thank you

M: mm kay. what are you doing ((topic change))

D: Oh nothin, what are you doin

M: Pt.hh Well we just finished eating and I'm gettin ready to go upstairs and start cleaning Dee ((Dean)) talked to his friend Dave and he's gonna be here.

D: yeah

D: You make good spaghetti an you make good beans

D: >>I tell you something<< (that impresses people) (is when you) have cook- (.) alot of be:ans (and ham and) cornbread
M: who (did I impress.)
D: (Oh Jeff and) allot of people have that you've done
(said) that- and it makes good (bread pudding)
also. ((?))
M: A:^w okay
(0.2)
D: I mean you to put sa- a little bit of sugar in the
cornbread cause it tastes pretty blah (if you
don't)
((0.2))
you know
M: I don't ha- make good cornbread
D: .hh We'll you have before but the blah stu- you
make real blah stuff and it doesn't have any sugar
in it You need (t) to- make where it's just a
little sweet
M: Yeah, 
D: I wish I had a piece of it right now
D: Aunt (Beth) made the best corn bread of anybody (I
ever knew) (to)
M: Yeah she sure did
have you had anything to eat for supper?
(0.2)
D: pt.hh Yeah
(0.3)
M: pt'huhhh We'll hhh okay I just want(ed) tell ya
about the cookbook, so I'll try to get it to you
sometime tomorrow=
(>>)What are you((<<)) gonna do? tomorra
D: pt'hhh We'll in the morning I'm goin to go to jazzercise with Lisa(.) and then uh in the afternoon I'll probably just study

M: hhh When do you have your last test.

D: I don't have one this week

M: You don't have one this week

D: [No: ]

uh I just um I've got to write a report

M: 'hhh >>Well now<< this is your last week of school before spring break. it'nt ((isn't)) it?

D: [Yeah ((instantaneous))] yeah

M: Okay

M: pt .hhh We'll uh Dean wants to talk to Jeff about playing golf

M: If Jeff would rather call him back (why)

D: uh No hold on just a second I'll get him

M: Okay

((sound of phone being placed down))

- - - - - - - - - - - end of conversation - - - - - - - - -
A Description of Adjacency Pairs in F1COOK.2

The first adjacency pair in this analysis begins at line 67 when the mother asks the daughter if she has had anything to eat for supper (see transcript of F1COOK.2 in “A Description of Conversational Phenomena in F1COOK.2”). The daughter responds affirmatively.

The second adjacency pair begins at line 74 when the mother asks the daughter what she plans to do the following day. The daughter responds with her morning plans, and then pauses as if searching for the words or possibly trying to quickly think of something to do in the afternoon.

The third adjacency pair begins on line 80 when the mother asks the daughter when her last test is. The daughter responds that she does not have a test that week. The mother responds to this bit of news with a restatement of the daughter's response in the form of an inquiry, as if to question the honesty of the daughter's response. As a result, the daughter seems to fumble verbally as if she is trying to legitimize her need to study.

TRP's are present on lines: 68, 70, 75, 79, 81, 83, and 87. On line 68 the transition is assumed by the question in the immediately prior turn (line 67). This is also true on lines 74, 80 and 84. In each of these lines, with the exception of line 84, the mother asks the daughter a direct question, which on the surface requires a response. In line 84, the mother asks a question, however it is stated in the form of a declarative sentence. In this instance, the mother is looking for an explanation of the daughter's last response (line 82). The daughter creates transition-relevances places with her short responses in lines 69 and 82.
A Description of Restarts in F1COOK.2

Lines 17 through 19, spoken by the mother in the conversation F1COOK.2, contain several restarts (see transcript of F1COOK.2 above). The sentence, as a whole, by its evidence of numerous restarts shows that the mother is having difficulty constructing the sentence. Many reasons for this awkwardness could exist. It may be relationally determined: the mother’s buying of a cookbook for the daughter, especially a low calorie cookbook, could be speaking about the mother’s concern for the daughter’s health. The difficulty or awkwardness may stem from the mother’s overprotectiveness or inability to tell the daughter how she feels. These are possible scenarios, but let us look at the specific evidence supporting the notion of restarts.

The first restart occurs in line 17. The repetition of the indefinite article (a) occurs following a micropause (.). Although the repeated (a) may simply be a vocalized pause (uh or um), the vocalized pause would serve the same purpose of restarting. However, careful listening led me to believe that the sound was an (a) rather than an (uh).

The second restart occurs shortly afterward in line 18. This restart also involves a repetition following a micropause. The repetition of the pronoun (it’s) shows that both before and after the micropause the mother’s intent was to refer to the cookbook. However, before the micropause, it appears that the mother was going to give a definition of the cookbook, evidenced by the use of the indefinite article, whereas after the micropause the mother gave a description.

The third restart appears in line 19 and also incorporates the use of micropause. No repetition occurs. It is evidenced, rather, by the use of a word (what) which should not follow an indefinite article. It could be argued that the indefinite article was rather a vocalized pause (uh). Yet if it was a vocalized pause, it could still be regarded as a restart.

The fourth and final restart in this statement by the mother also occurs in the 19 line. This restart takes a different form in that it is not accompanied by a micropause. It does incorporate repetition. The word every, or possibly everything, is repeated. It is stated as every (e’ry) and followed by the word all, which does not follow logically. The word everything (ev’rything) is then stated, or restated.

Four restarts in one statement leads the analyst to believe that the event was awkward for the mother. The awkwardness could have been a function of the statement itself, the relational dynamics in regards to the cookbook and the mother’s concern, or some other reason. However, it seems obvious that some awkwardness did occur.
Description of the Retelling of an Experience or Event in F1HARD.1:12

The following contains an example of a prior experience being related to another:

F1HARD.1:12
Family dyad, UT Conversation Library
D: Daughter, M: Mother

377 D: =A lot oh the ˈhhhh that- gree:ns and the
378 (0.3) taːns and stuff belted and- y'know all
379 that kind of stuːff
380 M: Yeah
381 (1.0)
382 M: ˈhhhh Wêːl Oka:y. I'm gonna hang up
383 and play this back and see
384 if this thing[ is workin ]
385 D: [ Yea:h erase ] it if there's a-
386 if we sound too igno rant ˈhh
387 ˈhuh
388 M: Listen I soːnd. so bad[ I'm ˈem bar ˈrassed
389 D: [ ˈhh ˈOːh. I−I ]
390 hate my voice on the tape recorder so− (0.4)
391 pt ˈhh [ˈhh ]
392 M: [You] know what Dee told me his− (0.2)
393 blue couduroy pânts were clean and I said
394 Dee you know you only hâve two pair of pants.
395 D: Oʃːːh] don't tell me, did he wear em out=
396 M: [Only]
397 D: =on his date dirty
398 M: In− well no I had to wash em anː− and dry em
399 at the last minute−
In this example the topic is changed, a new topic is introduced, by the mother. In this extended conversation, many topics are addressed. Perhaps the purpose of the call F1HARD.1 was to discuss the sick friend, and the daughter’s difficulty in dealing with death. However, by line 382, the mother engages preclosing moves. This is evidenced by: (a) the end of a topic in line 379, (b) the long pause in 381, (c) the use of the words well and okay, and (d) the statement by the mother that she is going to hang up in line 382. The topic of the tape recording is brought up by the mother and is continued for a few more lines, to the point where the example above comes in at line 389.

At line 392, the mother changes the topic. This continuation of the conversation is in conflict with the statement made earlier by the mother that she was going to hang up. The transcript shows that the actual conversation goes on quite longer. The topic change is preceded by a pause (and a lip smack and out breath, which was interpreted by the mother as a location for her to select.)

The first phrase in the mother’s statement on line 392, is structured as a question. However, it is treated as a statement by both the mother and the daughter. It is used, with the words "Dee told me", as an indication that an event is going to be told. In the retelling or telling of the event, the storyteller uses self-referent (first-person) personal pronouns, second and third-person personal pronouns. The use of these pronouns demonstrates that an event occurred between the storyteller and another individual.

In the telling of the event, the daughter also knows the person who is referred to by the mother. This is evidenced by her response in line 395, and especially on line 397 where the daughter reveals new information not given by the mother. This response by the daughter licenses the telling of the event by continuing the topic brought up by the mother. (In fact, this topic continues for several more lines.) It also seems to nullify the preclosing of the mother in line 382.
A rather interesting communicative event occurs in this exchange between the mother and daughter (see Appendix). Line 1 suggests that this conversation is a continuation of a conversation although nothing relevant comes before it on the recording. This is evidenced by the fact that there is no opening sequence.

Yet, the most interesting exchange of this event occurs in the first couple of lines. The daughter is requesting additional information from the mother, presumably about how to cook a dish. What is accomplished in this short event is the exchange of a part of a recipe. Other ingredients are given by the mother in subsequent lines. This leads the analysis to believe that the daughter is requesting additional information about the recipe in line 1.

Before the daughter is able to finish the request, she is interrupted by the mother. The point at which she is interrupted is important. The mother comes in at the moment when the daughter is giving information about where she is in the recipe. The phrase the mother utters is unintelligible (for me) throughout the duration of the daughter's utterance. The part that is semi-intelligible, after the daughter cuts herself off, does not seem to make sense in the context of the conversation.

The daughter does not finish her statement in line 1, but cuts off in deference to the mother. This is suggested by the fact that in line 4 the daughter gives a fuller description of where she is in the recipe. This fuller description is valid and necessary in the context of the goal of the event, to get a recipe: that is having a cup of water is qualitatively different than having a cup of water in the microwave in this context.

The next interesting aspect of this exchange is that there is a very brief pause (line 3) between the mother's interruptive utterance in line 2 and the daughter's continuation in line 4. This pause could suggest that the daughter waited to see if the mother was finished with her interruption. If this is the case, it makes an interesting statement about the relationship between the mother and the daughter. When the daughter defers to the mother, she is taking a one down position in the power structure of the relationship. However, in this episode, the daughter (after the short pause) restates the phrase from the point of interruption and continues through the qualifier: in the microwave. This can be viewed as an option for control of the conversation, in other words, a repair for the interruption.

The pause on line 5, following the repair and request statement of the daughter, is significantly long. It suggests several possibilities. Because line 4 also takes the capacity of a request, and therefore it is the first part of an adjacency pair, it demands a response from the mother. However, she does not select for a significant amount of time. Maybe, she is trying to comprehend the nature or reason for the repair. Maybe, she is making a statement about the power component in the daughter's repair. Or maybe it is just a little confusion on the part of the mother. Whatever the case, the pause is significant.
Looking over the rest of the event recorded here, one notices that the mother does most of the talking. In most of the transcripts between the mother and the daughter it appears the mother does most of the talking. That in itself makes a statement about the relationship, and thus gives credence to the above argument.

Appendix

F1CUP.1
Family dyad, UT Conversation Library
D: Daughter, M: Mother

001 D: Okay. I got- cup of water
002 M: (          ) in yer (do:g)
003 (0.1)
004 D: cup of water in the microwave
005 (1.0)
006 M: Okay (.) with a teaspoon o:f uh- (.) b- beef
007 bullion (0.2) and about a teaspoon o::f (.)
008 Kitchen Bouquet (0.2) .hh (0.4)
009 M: an you jus- jus heat that u:p (0.6) an pour it
010 over your meat (.) an-
011 D: ^Kitchen Bouquet=
012 M: =Yeah you know that stuff that makes things brown=
013 D: =mm hm
014 M: .hh Jus heat that up an pour it over your meat and
015 turn your meat on as low as it will go
Communication Patterns in the Religious Community: 
A Prospectus

Introduction: General Overview of the Area of Concern

Communication between members of a dyad form interesting patterns, especially when viewed according to the context in which the dyad was formed. These dyadic pairs have become an intriguing subject of study in themselves. Yet many pairs develop out of the larger context of a small group such as a family, or larger groups such as a township, or still larger groups such as a society.

Though small groups are a cause and a consequence of thousands of years of human evolution, and their existence has been noted for almost as long, their formal study is only a relatively recent occurrence. Even more recent still has the study of the dyad within the context of the small group been formalized. Nevertheless, many small groups develop patterns which are constrictive to dyadic formations.

People join groups to have their needs met, such as a basic need for inclusion (Littlejohn, 1989). People also join groups to achieve common goals. Those goals begin as personal goals which seem unfulfillable unless help can be obtained by others. Groups certainly fulfill those needs. However, belonging to groups alone cannot fulfill the human need for intimacy. Even within groups individuals have a tendency to form dyadic coalitions (Wilmot, 1987).

As a result of these tendencies, two difficulties occur: the group forms patterns that can be destructive to dyads, and dyads form within the group which can be destructive to the group.

The design of this study is to investigate the patterns of specific types of small groups which contribute to the breakdown of dyadic communication or the formation of dyads within the group which are antagonistic to the patterns or the creators of the patterns of a small group.

Statement of the Problem

The specific type of small group this investigation is interested in is the formation community of Roman Catholic Religious orders. Any typical formation community is comprised of two smaller groups: the formators, and the students. Many goals are embodied into the formation community, however the main goal of any formation community is to socialize and incorporate new members into the larger Religious order thereby continuing the order and its mission.

Yet, the two smaller groups within the formation community may have distinct goals, as well as individuals who have personal goals. These goals may be complementary or cooperative. Often, however, these goals may be in conflict. For example, the main goal of the formators may be to train the students to continue the mission or work of the order. Although, the main goal of the student community may be to form a strong sense of "family," with the mission of the order taking secondary importance. This conflict of goals may cause a serious strain among the two groups and between individual members of the two groups. Because of the hierarchical structure of many religious orders, the tendency for the formators goals eventually
to win the struggle is great. Still, the struggle that exists causes many problems between members including resentment and withdrawal, which further destroys a sense of family sought by many community members.

**Purpose and Justification of the Thesis Research**

This investigation seeks to isolate the mechanisms or patterns that contribute to these communication breakdowns within communities which are a result of conflicting goals. The general purpose of any Roman Catholic Religious order is to spread the Gospel. This work is often jeopardized by the conflict of goals within the formation community, and these conflicts can have long lasting effects on the relationships between members of the community which result in a further duplicity of the purpose of the Religious order.

It seems apparent that this study's ultimate aim is to contribute to the lessening of intra-community conflict in order to better serve that general purpose of spreading the Gospel. This is indeed a high ideal. It is not, however, the true goal. This thesis work's purpose is simply to point out or acknowledge that the difficulties do in fact exist and cause damage to the mission. It is hoped that through such acknowledgment solutions can be sought.

**Contributory Studies**

Many studies have been conducted on the subject of interpersonal interaction within small groups. One such study was conducted by Bonacich (1987). In this study, Bonacich suggested that conflicts between group and individual goals arise in groups that have mixed motives of communication and accumulation of information. Findings show there exists a curvilinear relationship between a group's centralization and its vulnerability to motive conflict. Findings also suggest that vulnerability is least in highly centralized and decentralized groups. In another study, Thompson, Mannix and Bazerman (1988) found that negotiation and consensus were most effective in small groups involving mixed motives. Majority rule tended to promote dissatisfaction and inequality. There have also been studies on the sense of community perceived by members of small groups. Two such studies were: Dunne's (1986) study of l'Arche communities, and McMillan and Chavis' study of various forms of community including neighborhoods, professional and spiritual groups. Interpersonal verbal behavior within the context of a small group has also been studied by Wright and Ingraham (1985), and also by Rook (1987).

Although these studies will be used as guides for creating survey questions, methodological approaches, and data interpretation, it should be noted that at this time extensive research on the specific problems and dynamics of goal conflicts in Catholic Formation communities has not been done. Therefore, the research proposed is most likely original research and will require a distinctive approach.

**Research Questions**

RQ1 What effect does the differences in goals, if they exist, between the formators and the students of a formation community have on the actual communication patterns?
RQ2 What effect does those differences in goals have on the perceived communication patterns?

RQ3 Do the perceived communication patterns differ depending on the position of the community member?

RQ4 What is the frustration level among students as a result of the structure of the community and its effects on communication patterns?

RQ5 What is the tendency of the two groups to become antagonistic?

RQ6 What is the tendency of the two groups to form sub-communities to legitimize the group's goals?

RQ7 What effect may this tendency to form sub-communities have on communication patterns in the larger group?

RQ8 What effects do these goal conflicts have on the individual's communication satisfaction?

Methodology

Given the nature of the study, being essentially original research, the procedure will incorporate field data gathering, codifying, and interpretation. The first step will be to build a foundation upon which pertinent questions can be asked. This will involve the study of the literature to find the range and define the proper scope of questions.

Next, a survey will be developed assimilating the questions into a format which can be both easily answered and easily codified. This survey questionnaire will be structured in the form of multiple choice questions with the choices depending on the perception of the surveyed individual.

This survey will be sent out to various religious formation houses in the following five cities: Philadelphia, Saint Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Washington DC These cities were chosen because they are centers of theological studies for many Religious orders.

The surveys, once returned, will be codified according to two basic perimeters: the position of the individual in the formation community as either formator or student; and the frequency of answers to various questions depending on the position of the individual in the community. The results will be used to decipher and interpret communication patterns within the two groups and the whole community in general.

Conclusion

It is believed that the structure of the formation community affects how community members communicate with one another. This study will examine the characteristics idiosyncratic to the religious formation community which impact the interpersonal relationships in this setting.
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Minimal Responses

Introduction

Minimal responses are replies to statements, questions, inquiries, requests, and other forms of first pair-parts in adjacency pairs which do not serve the purpose of answering or confirming the first pair-part. In a conversational interaction between two people, it is sometimes observed that one person gives minimal responses to the other's comments, statements or questions. An example of this is found in the following excerpt:

FO1BUBBA.9:4:

114 M: Well that'd be too mu:ch wouldn't
115 D: ʰhhhh
116 D: W- ʰI don't knôw.
117 D: Do you think so
--></p>118 (1.0)
119 D: ʰhh I really feel safer with Chigger
120 (1.4)
121 M: pt ʰhhhhhh We'll (0.4) if you wanna leave

In this example, note that in line 118, M (mother) does not give a coherent response to D's (daughter) question. In fact M gives no response at all to a fairly direct question. (Note that the symbol --></p> will denote a specific instance of minimal response to be examined.)

This study will attempt to demonstrate the different characteristics of minimal responses. A working definition will be devised below. This definition will be used to distinguish probable minimal response episodes from the transcripts. An appendix appears at the end which contains excerpts comprising potential episodes.

Full descriptions of two minimal response episodes will be followed by an analysis of the collection of transcripts to determine if the description fits the prospective excerpts. Finally, a discussion will come after to discuss the relevance of this study to other fields of communication research.

Definition of Terms

To define minimal responses, other terms must be considered first. Responses require turn-taking in conversation. Erving Goffman (1955) first described turn-taking as "one type of organization operative in conversation." It was later described (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) as a system for ordering sequences in conversation. In normal talk, a person speaking is taking a turn. That turn is ratified by the listeners or co-participants. Speakers change, and the length of a turn may vary. However, turn-taking rules are employed, and locally managed, for the purpose of sequentially organizing conversation.

Harvey Sacks, et al. (1974) continue this description of turn-taking by further delineating characteristics. Turns typically comprise unit-types, such as words, phrases, clauses, or sentences, which complete a thought as determined by the
situation. Rules governing turn-taking protocol include the decision regarding the next speaker. These rules provide, for each completion of a unit-type, that: "(a) a current speaker may select a next speaker at talk, and if not choosing to do so, (b) a next speaker may self-select, and if not, (c) the current speaker may continue." In terms of turn-taking, minimal responses may occur when it is relevant for a next speaker to continue but does not. (Minimal responses involve more than this, as we shall see.)

The point at which a unit-type ends, and it is relevant for a next speaker to continue, is known as the transition relevance place (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Levinson, 1983). At transition relevance places (TRP's), the transfer of talk to the same speaker or another is coordinated. As suggested above, minimal responses may occur when the situation or content of the conversation dictates a change in speakership.

Specific types of units which require two parts, a statement and a response, are known as adjacency pairs (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Adjacency pairs require a response or answer, a second pair-part, on the part of a recipient of a statement or question, a first pair-part. Conditional relevance is the "criterion for adjacency pairs that, given the first part of a pair, a second part is immediately relevant and expectable (Schegloff, 1972)."

These responses can be preferred, such as an agreement or acknowledgment, or dispreferred, such as a disagreement or an ignoring response. Levinson (1983) delineates three qualities to dispreferred responses, namely: (a) they usually occur after some significant pause, (b) they normally begin with some marker signifying dispreferred status, and (c) they typically include an account or excuse why the preferred response cannot be performed. Minimal responses, in our definition here, typically entail dispreferred responses, though that is not necessary.

The working definition for minimal responses in this study therefore, consists of the above criteria. Specifically, minimal responses occur, or fail to occur, as second pair-parts of an adjacency pair. They typically involve dispreferred responses. And as will be demonstrated, are short in duration, involve pauses, and are normally followed by a continuation of talk by the first speaker.

(Example) West and Zimmerman define "retarded minimal responses" as those silences which occur prior to issuing a brief acknowledgment, such as "unhuh," as a response to a first pair-part given by another speaker.

**Description of first event**

The first example of a minimal response(s) is taken from a conversation between a male and a female.

(1)

```
D6POST.1:4
171 M: How bout you How are your finals (shaping up
172 with that-) d'you have fi five of em like me
---> 173 (2.2)
174 M: You don't wanna
```
In the line 171, M asks three distinct questions. The first simply asks for acknowledgment. The second question requests information. And the third question simply desires a yes or no response. According to our definition, each of these could serve as individual units. Yet, neither of the three are answered.

There are no pauses between each of the three requests. It is conceivable that a one unit type response could suffice to answer all three questions. For example, if the answer to the last question was yes, then a valid response could have been, "Yes, I have five and I'd better start studying." According to Sacks (1987), if the proper response was to agree, than the preference for contiguity requires that the most direct, and most recent question be answered first. This suggests a "yes" response should have been forthcoming. If, on the other hand, the proper response was to disagree, then according to the definition of a dispreferred response, there would have been a delay, a marker of dispreferred status, and an account.

This first instance contains none of these qualities. There is a long pause, but no response where one would have been relevant. In this particular event, a "no" answer may not have been viewed as a dispreferred response. The content of the third question does not suggest that a "no" answer would have been dispreferred.

The person M appears to trying to elicit a response in line 174 and again in line 176, where the first part of the phrase is repeated. Given the context of the above minimal response, these attempts are trying to elicit an agreement or simply an acknowledgment. In line 175, there is a significant pause following a transition relevance place, which could take the place as an invitation for the other to self-select. That does not take place here. One can argue that the airplane noises usurped that opportunity. Nevertheless, the first speaker makes the same request again: it is repeated.

The second individual, gives a response in line 177. It may be argued that some form of nonverbal response was given by the second person, yet the verbal response appears to be inappropriate. The laughter in line 177 by F does not seem
to follow an invitation to laugh by M. If the question asked by M was indeed straightforward and direct, then F's response in line 177 would appear to be a dispreferred response, and also minimal.

Airplane noises follow the above sequence, for a significant lapse, after which a topic shift is initiated by M. This topic shift may confirm suspicions that the above question (line 174, 176) was not answered, and so a new topic was chosen as a type of repair to the conversation. Succeeding the topic shifting statement is another significant gap, where it can be reasonably assumed some type of acknowledgment was expected.

Perhaps the most obvious example of a minimal response occurs at line 184 where F laughs as a response to another question by M. The evidence which suggests this response is minimal is that the question is repeated. The shape of the repetition is also interesting in that: (a) it occurs as an overlap and interruption of the laugher of the other, and (b) it is articulated more accurately than the original question. M seems to desire an answer that is not forthcoming from F. The last statement, line 187 in the excerpt, epitomizes the entire exchange. F responds to M's question by changing the topic. This excerpt is a small image of the relational messages being stated in the entire D6POST.1 exchange. The exchange contains extended turns by M which contain many TRP's and gaps, as well as repeated questions. The next excerpt below gives another example of this tendency.

**Description of Second Event**

The second example of a minimal response(s) is taken from a conversation between a male and a female.

(2)

**D6POST.1:16**

```
510  M:  And the limbs they look like u:h (1.6) if I
511       have to classify this it'd be a witch
512       (0.6)
513  M:  You see those lo:ng strangling limbs
514       (0.2)
515  M:  Th- they look like a wi:ch about ready to
516       come over here and grab you
517       (1.3)
518  M:  Right
519       -->
520  M:  Don't- don't you think you'd see this
521       in a ho:rror movie
522       (0.4)
523  M:  With Vincent Price
524  F:  This- no :: this looks like a dirty
```
This event is very similar to the above example in that one person is attempting to elicit a response from the other through several non-threatening requests. Immediately following each request is a significant pause. The first question asked by M in this excerpt begins on line 513. The question is fairly direct and incorporates the directive "you." It continues through line 516, after which is a gap. The question is further directed with the tag question "right," which is followed by another gap.

This gap shows a lack of response by F. A response does not occur until after the next question is raised by M, and the response is in the form of a disagreement. The interesting thing about this event is that several questions are asked by M which have no responses from F. The gaps, in the sequences, suggest that a response from F was at least desired if not expected by M. These tendencies are prevalent throughout the whole transcript of D6POST.1.

Possible characteristics of minimal responses

Below are listed twelve possible characteristics of minimal responses (see Appendix A). These were derived from an analysis of the transcripts. They are not exclusive, and perhaps not exhaustive either. Some of the criteria must exist for the phenomena to be considered a minimal response, yet that is a consequence of the definitions. It is important to note that expectancy plays a large role in the perception of minimal response within the context of the situation.

As stated earlier, minimal response occurrences incorporate adjacency pairs where the first pair-part is not responded to in the way expected by the person uttering the first pair-part. This adjacency pair must include a conditional relevance of expectancy for a second pair-part. The type of response expected is cognitively determined by the initiator of the adjacency pair sequence.

When that expectancy of a response is not reached, several outcomes may follow: (a) the initiator may repeat the first pair-part, (b) the initiator may continue after a gap, which can ultimately result in an extended turn including many TRP's and gaps, or (c) the initiator may attempt a repair or metacommunication, such as, "are you listening to me?"

The perception of the other in a conversation as not listening, could be acerbated by topic shifts in the second pair-part. Topic shifts form a type of dispreferred response in which the second person fails to acknowledge the speech of the other. This is especially true in conditionally relevant adjacency pairs.

Another way this may be manifested is when the second person does not self-select at the TRP following a gap in the conversation. Significant pauses, or gaps, which occur at the end of unit-types are often signs that an acknowledgment is expected by the initiator. The minimal response can take the form of no response at all. This gives the initiator a subjective sense of non-listening on the part of the other, which can be dealt with in the three ways enumerated above.

With the exception of a question directed at a specific person in a group, minimal responses are typically only observed in a conversation between two people. The reasons for this are based on the practical limitations of observation. In a group, it is difficult for members to conclude who is responsible for responding to any given question. It would also be difficult to determine, by the observer, which
individual the initiator expected to answer. For these reasons, observing instances of minimal responses in groups, given the above criteria, would be problematic.

**Analysis of the Collection of Possible Minimal Responses**

Given the above characteristics, the following examples from Appendix B appear to follow the definition of minimal responses. First, in A10FROST.8 line 14, Skeet (SKE) responds to Jessica's (JES) statement with a statement which is irrelevant, with the appearance of being illogical. The impression of non-listening occurs.

Secondly, in F1HARD.1 line 34, Mother (M) applies a tag question after a statement. The tag question is directive, and the context suggests that a brief acknowledgment by the daughter (D) would have been sufficient. The tag question is followed by a gap.

Thirdly, in F1DEVIL.7 line 185, Daughter (D) applies a tag question after a statement. In much the same way as the above example, the "You know" is directive. It precedes a gap and also requires a brief acknowledgment as a sufficient response.

These examples propose that minimal responses may be a fairly common occurrence in conversation. Their study may give some insight into relational dynamics, which might be lost otherwise without concrete examples.

**Relevance of the Study of Minimal Responses**

Some hypotheses for the causes of minimal responses may include: (a) an imbalance of conversational time sharing may result in minimal responses, (b) a desire for one member of the conversation to end the conversation while the other continues may result in minimal responses, (c) a distraction of one member from the conversation may result in minimal responses, and (d) relational difficulties overshadowing the immediate situation of the conversation may result in minimal responses.

Minimal responses will most likely cause problems in the maneuvering between participants of a conversation. In the situation where a full response is not forthcoming, the initiator may have difficulty deciding to self-select or continue. This may be the reason for the pauses in the above examples. Managing transitions becomes problematic.

Because of the possible relational dynamics involved in the process of minimal responses, extended relationships should be examined. Isolated instances of minimal responses may not point to answers to the above hypotheses. It is hoped that by studying minimal responses in the context of extended relationships, some judgments about the effects of such responses can be made. The ultimate aim is to show that minimal responses have a disconfirming effect in the relationship.
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Appendix A

Qualities or Characteristics of Minimal responses

1. Adjacency pairs which incorporate conditional relevance
2. Repetition of the first pair-part of an adjacency pair
3. Repetition of statement by the originator
4. Topic shift in the second pair-part of an adjacency pair
5. Dispreferred responses or lack of preferred responses
6. Minimal responses are often no responses at all
7. Significant pauses known as gaps at TRP's
8. Lack of turn-taking selection by the other following gaps
9. Following a minimal response, the originator normally continues after a gap
10. Extended turns by the initiator which include many TRP’s and gaps
11. Conversation is normally between two people
12. A subjective sense of non-listening on the part of the other

Appendix B

The following are excerpts from transcripts found in the text for SPCM 7945: Conversation Analysis. These excerpts are used throughout the text of this paper, and relevant portions are referred to by their name and line number.

1) A10FROST.8:11

4  JES: When you write a check and they're all-
5   u:h credit card please
6  JES: And they're all u:::h you know pull out
7   this Gulf card or something they're all-
---> 8  SKE: Hm
9  JES: uh No: gas cards please
10   (0.7)
---> 11  JES: Huh huh 'hhh
12  SKE: I know
13   (0.6)
---> 14  SKE: pt I don't have one either
15   (4.4) / ((whispering))
16  JES: Well- listen I gotta- I'm gonna go
17    downstairs for a minute an then-
18  SKE: O k ay
2) FIDEVIL.7:6

181 D: And:
182 u:m- (0.4) we're gonna do some fishin and-
183 (0.4) we're just gonna rela:x.

--> 184 (1.4)
185 D: You know

--> 186 (1.0)
187 M: Well I hope
188 D: O:h- I want you to ca::ll- Chester
189 Farrell for me
190 M: Oh. Okay=

3) F1HARD.1:11

29 M: And if you feel yourself- choking ûp why
30 just- you know kind of excuse yourself an-
31 (0.7) an just- (0.2) squeeze her ha:nd and
32 tell her how much y- you enjoyed workin u-
33 with her up there that summer and
34 M: ‘hhhhh hhhh you know

--> 35 (1.4)
36 M: pt ‘hhhhh just like that is all I know to
37 tell you to do:,

--> 38 ?: (0.6) k ‘hhh (0.6)
39 M: It’s har:d but they say the worst thing
40 (0.2) u:h- (0.6) is when people withdra-aw
41 from terminally ill (0.2)

--> 42 D: Yeah,
43 M: people like that you know and- and dôn't
44 talk to em and don't- (0.8) you know just
45 ignore em that's really ha*rd.
46 D: Yeah,

--> 47 (2.2)
48 M: S:o do you wanna go to u::h (0.8) Llano
49 with us tomorrow afternoo:n
50 D: No: Mother

4) F01BUBBA.9:4

114 M: Well that'd be too mu:ch wouldn't
115 D: ‘hhhhh
116 D: W- ^I don't knôw.
117 D: Do you think so
118 D: .hhh I really feel **safer** with Chigger

120 M: pt .hhhhhhh We'll (0.4) if you wanna leave

5) D6POST.1:4

171 M: How bout you How are your finals (shaping up with that-) d'you'av **five** of em like me

173 M: You don't wanna

175 (1.8) ((loud airplane noise --> ))

176 M: You don't **wanna** talk about it

177 F: hûh hûh hûh

178 (9.2) / ((noises))

179 M: Actually I cannot wait- to go and see you and Lee

181 (3.5)

182 M: How's it gun be interesting.

183 (4.0) / ((crumpling))

184 F: pt Hûh hûh hûh huh (.) hûh 'hh

186 M: How is it going to be interesting

187 F: Put- the tape recorder down

6) D6POST.1:16

510 M: And the limbs they look like u:h (1.6) if I have to classify this it'd be a witch

512 (0.6)

513 M: You see those lo:ng strangling limbs

514 (0.2)

515 M: Th- they look like a **witch** about ready to come over here and **grab** you

516 (1.3)

518 M: Right

519 (1.5)

520 M: Don't- don't you think you'd see this in a horror movie

522 (0.4)

523 M: With Vincent Price

524 F: This- no :: this looks like a dirty
Introduction

Strategies for influencing one’s partner in an interpersonal relationship are often used. Motives for these strategies range from the benevolent, to help the other or the relationship, to more self-serving changes. Different types of strategies of influence are used depending on the desired outcome, the situation in which the strategies are employed, or the expectations of either member. Some individuals may have limited resources from which to choose persuasive strategies within the relationship, either due to their own inabilities or an outside source of limitations or control.

In abusive relationships, the victim of abuse is often viewed as having limited resources. The reasons for this are many. For example, the abused may have very low self-esteem and thus believe they do not have the ability to effect change in the situation. Or, the abused may see control in the relationship as being externally located.

This low self-esteem of the victim in an abusive relationship is potentially the product of the abuse. The tactics used by the abuser amount to rejection and disconfirmation of the other. For purposes of this paper, rejection is equated with the actual abuse which takes place in dysfunctional relationships. However, it also relates to the perception of the victim in terms of his or her relationship to the abuser.

Disconfirmation, in the schema of abuse, is normally equated with neglect (as in child neglect). Yet, disconfirmation can also apply to the feelings of the victim. Put another way, the abused often believes that his or her feelings are discounted or ignored by the other.

This does not suggest that the victim has no recourse to change the situation. She or he may try to let the other know how they feel either implicitly or explicitly. These attempts may be shown to incorporate compliance-gaining or affinity-seeking strategies for influence over the other. A collection of studies has brought forth a large accumulation of strategy types for influence in relationships. This study seeks to show that victims do have specific compliance-gaining and affinity-seeking strategies at their disposal, and that they are used to influence the attitudes, and possibly, behavior of their abusers.

Dysfunctional, abusive relationships are an unfortunate reality in our society. Dysfunction may be on the rise, or we as a society may just be becoming more aware of its existence. Child abuse, spousal abuse, familial-sibling abuse, abuse in romantic or platonic relationships all exhibit similar dysfunctions. Through this study, through offering possible explanations, we may be able to find solutions to this distressing problem of abuse.
Statement of the problem

For purposes of this paper, abuse is defined as an encompassing term which includes physical, sexual, emotional, and psychological mistreatment or maltreatment. Also, neglect is considered a form of emotional abuse. Although abuse in its most general sense refers to rejection of the other (or the other’s habits, as is often the justification given by the abuser), such mistreatment can be considered disconfirming in the sense that it denies the feelings of the other.

In the example of child abuse, physical and sexual abuse entail emotional and psychological abuse. The opposite is not necessarily the case. That is, emotional and psychological abuse do not entail physical or sexual abuse. Mixed messages are often given by the abuser. Sometimes the justification for such acts amounts to a distorted understanding of benevolent intent, that is: "I am doing this for your own good," or "I am trying to teach you a lesson." Often, however, the recipient is made to feel worthless either implicitly or explicitly.

Reports of victims of spousal abuse frequently admit that the aggressor stated that the abused was "worthless," "no good," or "good for nothing." Whether such statements are explicitly stated or not seems to be of little consequence. In most cases, that is the message that is interpreted.

With this in mind, it appears obvious that the abuser has considerable influence over the self-concept, self-image, self-confidence, and self-esteem of the other in the relationship. Main and Goldwyn (1984) described three characteristics of abusive parents: (a) inability to control aggression, (b) tendencies toward self-isolation which make initial contacts difficult, and (c) distress in others elicits an angry response. Specific compliance-gaining strategies of the abuser could include: threat, coercion, pressure for action, negative alternative giving, warning, personal rejection, negative esteem, negative receiver image, and guilt.

The victim of abuse can succumb to these strategies employed by the abuser. Several of the above examples can directly affect self-esteem. If the individual is made to feel worthless, it is a short step to the notion that one’s purpose in life is to please the other. Again, reports of abused persons suggest that these individuals feel they have no purpose other than to please the other.

This attitude reveals a serious double-bind. The individual may desire the abuse to stop, so they try to do everything the abuser desires. (Sometimes this is not the case: the abused may tragically derive all self-worth from the abusive behavior of the other. That is, in the victim’s mind rejection, in the form of abuse, is better than disconfirmation, in the form of neglect.) By attempting to do everything the abuser desires, the individual perpetuates the attitude of low self-esteem. If the relationship is particularly dysfunctional, and performing all requests does not stop the mistreatment, this can have an extremely devastating effect on the individual.

Given this scenario, it is not difficult to imagine the victim trying to influence the attitudes and/or behaviors of the abuser. If the desire is to stop the mistreatment, then by doing what the abuser requests may have an appeasing effect. In fact, the victim may attempt to show love (in the way it is understood given the situation) toward the abuser. Many cases of child abuse have indicated a disturbing inclination. The child will gravitate toward the abusive parent in an
attempt "to prove" love for that parent. Indeed, it is often the case that the child will ignore the non-abusive parent because he or she is using all his or her energy to please the other.

In light of this, strategies are used by the victim to influence the abusive individual in the relationship. Specific compliance-gaining strategies that may be employed are: liking, altruism, manipulation, emotional appeal, flattery, cooperation, empathic understanding, and siamese twin strategy. Specific affinity-seeking strategies used to produce liking in the other could include: conceding control, eliciting other’s disclosures, including the other, nonverbal immediacy, supportiveness, and trustworthiness.

These types of strategies can be employed in a variety of abusive situations. Spousal abuse, familial-sibling abuse, as well as romantic and platonic friendship abuse all bear similarities with child abuse. Through a study of compliance-gaining, affinity-seeking and other influencing tactics in regards to abusive interpersonal relationships, we may be able to see which tactics are employed and which are effective.

Studies in Compliance-gaining

When considering persuasive strategies in interpersonal relationships, it is important to weigh the characteristics of power. Early studies on social power were conducted by French and Raven (1960,1965). They identified six types of social power: (a) rewarding, (b) coercive, (c) referent, (d) legitimate, (e) expertise, and (f) information power.

Rewarding power is based on the target's perception. If the recipient believes that the agent has the ability to mediate rewards for him or her, then the agent is afforded power. Coercive power, on the other hand, is based on the target's perception that the agent has the ability to mediate punishment. Both of these types can play a significant role in an abusive or dysfunctional relationship. For example, an abused person might act a certain way out of fear of being hit again.

Legitimate power is based on the recipient's belief that the source of the power has a legitimate right to prescribe and/or proscribe behavior for him or her. Whereas if the agent has expert power, then the recipient believes the agent has special knowledge or expertise. If the target identifies him or herself with another, then that other is said to have referent power. Finally, if the information communicated by one individual changes the cognitional elements or schemata of another, the communicator is said to have informational power.

Smith (1983) suggested that French and Raven, in their studies, conceive of that power attributed to the agent by an influenced person as merely a perception. Yet, this perception gives the powerful person more power, especially if those perceptions are overtly reinforced. This contention is supported by the research of Jaremko and Rose (1979). They found "overt reinforcement and covert assertion tended to increase internality" in the message recipient. They also noted "response irrelevant covert reinforcement and control instructions did not" increase internality. In other words, if an abusive individual overtly reinforces an implied meaning, the recipient of that message (if it is inferred) will incorporate that meaning into his or her own meaning.
In this situation, the abusive individual is the power broker. This individual influences and controls meaning in the relationship. Manz and Giola (1983) suggested that four qualities define and perpetuate power in the relationship. First, the person who controls the resources has the power in the relationship. Second, "interpersonal power is the driving force for controlling individuals." Third, the type of power used will influence the relationship. And, personal control fosters resource control.

In another study on power in relationships, Schlenker, Bonoma, and Tedeschi (1970) argued that if the source of a threat is perceived as accommodative, the other will be more compliant and will state more frequently the intention of compliance. However, a source which is perceived to be exploitative will likely induce the other to be less compliant and more deceptive. Despite that tendency to be less compliant to a perceived exploiter, highly dogmatic persons are significantly more active in employing both pro-social and anti-social compliance-gaining strategies than low or non-dogmatic persons (Roloff & Barnicott, 1979).

Compliance-gaining strategies are used by the powerful in interpersonal relationships. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) were perhaps the earliest researchers of specific compliance-gaining tactics. They identified five types: (a) rewards, (b) punishments, (c) expertise, (d) activation of impersonal commitments, and (e) activation of personal commitments. Three of these five types mirror French and Raven's social power types.

The fourth and fifth of Marwell and Schmitt's types are interesting. In reminding someone of his or her previous commitments, one can influence that person to follow through on those commitments. This could have implications for abusive relationships. For example, a commitment made when an abusive parent is sober, can be brought forward in times of crisis. This is the idea behind intervention and confrontation used by groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous.

In the years following Marwell and Schmitt's initial work, many researchers have added to the list of compliance-gaining strategies. (For an extensive list, see Appendix A.) Two of the more recent additions were made by Burger and Petty (1981). These include: Foot-in-the-door, and Low-ball techniques. Foot-in-the-door involves asking the other to commit to a small request. When the other complies with this request, a larger request is made. The low-ball technique is similar in that it involves asking for an initially small request. Before a commitment is made, a more costly request is made.

The door-in-the-face technique is a way of gaining compliance by making a large initial request. When that request is refused, a smaller request is made. This particular technique has generated much research, and much debate. Cialdini, et al. (1975) found this technique to be effective because it is mediated by a rule for reciprocity of concessions. Pendleton and Batson (1979) argued that the technique increased compliance because it induces concern about self-presentation.

However, Even-Chen, Yinon and Bizman (1978) suggested that the door-in-the-face technique only works when the initial request is extremely large. They also suggested that Cialdini's initial findings only work under specific
conditions. Finally, Goldman and Creason (1981) found that two initially large requests work better than one, and that a self-determination request increased compliance significantly over the fixed request.

Other compliance-gaining tactics include: (a) Siamese twin strategy, (b) altercasting, (c) cooperation, (d) liking, (e) empathic understanding, and (f) manipulation. Altercasting gains compliance by disputing values held by another. Empathic understanding is a tactic used which employs emotional level perception. Wheeless, Barraclough, and Stewart (1983) have offered a comprehensive taxonomy for compliance-gaining strategies which seeks to explain their use within the framework of interpersonal power.

**Studies in Affinity-seeking**

Similar to, but distinct from, compliance-gaining strategies are affinity-seeking strategies. Both attempt to influence the other. Yet, affinity-seeking has a specific goal in mind, namely to persuade the other to like the affinity-seeker. Bell and Daly (1984) developed a list of affinity-seeking strategies (which is offered in Appendix B). Among that list are the strategies: (a) conceding control, (b) nonverbal immediacy, and (c) supportiveness. (These three seem particularly relevant to our discussion on abusive relationships.)

In studying compliance-gaining, Pendleton and Batson (1979) observed that subjects indicated they were afraid of being observed as unhelpful. It could be argued the reason for this fear involves the desire to be liked by others (affinity-seeking) where helpfulness is a likable trait. This has implications for the locus of control argument. Persons with an external locus of control may believe that likableness is judged by others based on how helpful they are.

Phares (1965) studied locus of control and found that internally controlled subjects were able to exert more influence and attitude change than externally controlled subjects. Similarly, Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) found that externally controlled subjects used significantly more coercive power than did internally controlled subjects. Their results were explained in terms of expectancy of success.

These findings seem incongruent with the notion that abused persons place the locus of control externally, yet appear to engage in non-threatening affinity-seeking strategies of influence over their abusers. Paul and Thelen (1983) found "when an irrelevant message was delivered, passive responses resulted in the lowest level of retaliation," and that when a relevant message was delivered, "the match-same strategy emerged as an effective deterrent to aggressive behavior." This too seems incongruent with the tendencies of the abused toward the abuser.

There must be another mechanism at work here. The victim of abuse has an external locus of control but does not seem to have the ability to use coercive power against the other, except for in some extreme cases. As we shall see, another theory accounts for the discrepancy.

**Learned Helplessness Theory**

Learned helplessness theory suggests that persons in abusive relationships typically cannot engage in direct, coercive type strategies of influence on their abusers. It is reasoned that individuals who suffer constant attacks on their
self-esteem, reach a low point from which they cannot find a way out. They are helpless in their situation with their abusers and thus take on the role of the helpless victim. This reduces the responsibility to act, but also places them in a double-bind from which escape is extremely difficult.

In terms of locus of control, Biondo and MacDonald (1973) found that persons with a perceived external locus of control have "a negative expectancy for success to come from attempts at personal control." In contrast, persons with an internal locus of control have a more positive expectancy. Externals conform to both covert and overt influence attempts, whereas internals reacted against such attempts.

In parallel research, Cronen, Pearce, and Snavely (1979) found that perceived enmeshment in an unwanted repetitive pattern was a product of the individual's understanding of the situation as being externally caused. Also, the individual perceives him or herself as having a very narrow band of options which are negatively related to the desirability of the consequences.

Presumably, with few exceptions, abuse is an unwanted repetitive pattern for the abused. Being in the situation of an abusive interpersonal relationship brings forward a dilemma for the victim. The feeling of helplessness does not allow them to act, especially in a direct manner. Not acting perpetuates the abuse. Any small amount of self-esteem left in the individual is further deteriorated by the vicious cycle. Yet, there is still the tendency for some victims of abuse to gravitate toward the abuser.

Discussion

Given what is known about compliance-gaining and affinity-seeking strategies, as well as learned helplessness theory, some subtle, indirect forms in influence and persuasion must be instigated by victims of abuse. These forms of strategies, in this context, may need more research. The serious nature of the topic warrants careful consideration: it cannot be left alone. This seems especially relevant for scholars in interpersonal communication and persuasion studies.

Below are five proposed hypotheses. First, among abusive relationships, abusees tend to use relationship and identification forms of compliance-gaining strategies as opposed to expectancies/consequences or values/obligations forms of compliance-gaining strategies. (See Wheeless, Barraclough, and Stewart, 1983, for a discussion on the categorization of compliance-gaining strategies.) More specific tactics, which seem most relevant to individuals in this situation, may include liking, positive communicator image, and cooperation. Other possible tactics employed appear earlier in this article.

Second, within interpersonal relationships, victims of abuse tend to use relationship/identification forms of compliance-gaining strategies, in higher proportion to other forms, more often than persons who are not victims of interpersonal abuse.

Third, abusees tend to use affinity-seeking strategies, more often than non-abused persons, to bring about change or influence the behaviors of the abuser. Strategies which tend to be used more often by the victim of abuse are directly conciliatory in nature so as not to arouse anger in the abuser. Specific
tactics might include altruism, conceding control, and supportiveness (see above argument for more possibilities).

Fourth, learned helplessness and conceding control have a positive correlation to continued abuse in abusive interpersonal relationships. And finally, the strategies employed by the abused have a positive correlation to an external locus of control.

**Conclusion**

The importance of such a study cannot be underscored. Understanding these tendencies can have an effect on how abuse is dealt with in the future. Certainly, by understanding the processes victims of abuse go through to better their situation, we may be able to find ways that work in certain circumstances. This may allow our society to help individuals find a safe and joyful place to live.

**References**


Appendix A

Categorization of Compliance-Gaining Techniques
According to General Power Bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectancies/Consequences</th>
<th>Relationships/Identification</th>
<th>Values/Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROMISE</td>
<td>LIKING</td>
<td>PREGIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREAT</td>
<td>ALTRUISM</td>
<td>MORAL APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE, +</td>
<td>ESTEEM, +</td>
<td>SELF-FEELING, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE, -</td>
<td>ESTEEM, -</td>
<td>SELF-FEELING,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERSIVE STIMULI</td>
<td>SIAMESE TWIN STRATEGY</td>
<td>ALTERCASTING,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANGLING CARROT</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP,+</td>
<td>ALTERCASTING,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANGING SWORD</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP,-</td>
<td>DEBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESSURE FOR ACTION</td>
<td>COMMUNICATOR IMAGE</td>
<td>CATALYST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIFICATION FOR ACTION</td>
<td>MANIPULATION</td>
<td>FAIRYLAND STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COERCION</td>
<td>NONNEGOTIATION</td>
<td>RECEIVER IMAGE, +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGGESTION OF (-) ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td>EMOTIONAL APPEAL</td>
<td>RECEIVER IMAGE, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>PERSONAL REJECTION</td>
<td>GUILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLUREMENT</td>
<td>EMPATHIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNING</td>
<td>UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOR-IN-THE-FACE TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>FLATTERY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>STATEMENT AS QUESTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW-BALL TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>FOOT-IN-THE-DOOR TECHNIQUE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGRATIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subdimensions:
1. Valence (positive, negative)
2. Directness (explicit, implicit)
3. Rationality (rational, irrational)

NOTE: this index is taken from Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart (1983).
## Appendix B

Affinity-seeking strategies used to produce liking in another

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altruism</th>
<th>Nonverbal immediacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assuming control</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming equality</td>
<td>Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable-self</td>
<td>Personal autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceding control</td>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational rule keeping</td>
<td>Presenting interesting self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>Rewarding association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting other's disclosures</td>
<td>Self-concept confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating enjoyment</td>
<td>Self inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing perceptions of closeness</td>
<td>Similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (see Bell & Daly, 1984).
Many functions of everyday life are overlooked or taken for granted. These aspects have enormous effects on how persons deal with each other. However, they are taken for granted because they are habituated, routine behaviors. An example of this is the use of time.

There are various fundamental differences in attitudes, values, or beliefs about time and its use from person to person, from family to family, and even from culture to culture. These differences in values, attitudes, or beliefs affect persons’ interactions with one another. In fact, Galloway (1979) noted that uses of time and the values we hold have a positive correlation.

When observing the use of time as a form of nonverbal communication, the observer must decide if the behaviors manifested are linked to an attitude, value or belief. Much research has been done on the perception and judgment of time duration, time estimation and time allocation. The studies have been performed on lower animals as well as humans. In human studies, observations have been made with differences in culture, age and sex taken into account.

This study will attempt to demonstrate whether differences do exist between cultures, age groups, and gender. Particular attention will be given to gender differences, if they exist. Specifically, three questions should be asked about the study. First, are there significant differences between the genders in perceptions about time? Secondly, are there significant differences between the genders in attitudes about time? Lastly, are there significant differences in behaviors between the genders as these behaviors relate to the actual use of time?

This report will attempt to demonstrate whether or not these differences exist in two ways. A review of the literature, including behavioral studies, will be used to synthesize a framework for an argument. Then a study will be suggested to test two hypotheses regarding differences between the sexes. Some preliminary results from a pilot study will be posited as a starting place for further research.

Previous Studies

In any study about time one must first discover what are the fundamental philosophical assumptions about the concept. The concept of time is by no means new. As civilizations progressed, divergent views about time became more divergent. For example, the Oriental understanding about time is very different from the Occidental understanding.

According to Stewart (1985), North Americans subscribe to the idea of a linear progression of time. This affects one's view on events. With a linear progression of time, relationships are viewed in terms of cause and effect which gives one the appearance of control over the environment, oneself or others.

In the Orient, time is viewed as cyclical in nature. This affects their views about relationships between persons or things, which results in a much different approach toward life. This would seem, in our limited perspective, to have a limiting
effect on the efficiency of institutional systems. However, one might also argue that such a view about time could have a freeing effect on behaviors. That is, one would not be constricted by time constraints.

This fundamentally different view of time has practical consequences. One’s allocation of time, judgment of time duration, and attitudes about the use of time are based on the values grounded in one’s view of the abstract time.

In a study conducted in 1984, Ahmadi found that persons tend to judge time as longer in duration when waiting in unexpected conditions as compared to waiting in expected conditions. Thus, if an individual knows how long they will have to wait from one event to another, then the time between the two events seems shorter in duration than it would had the individual not been told.

Osuna’s findings concur with Ahmadi (1985). There is greater psychological cost involved in a situation of uncertain time duration for persons waiting. Osuna recommends that a waiting individual be told the approximate length of wait to reduce stress in that individual. He also suggests that individuals can be in a certain psychological state that can make them more or less conducive to waiting.

Warner and Block (1984) found that type a persons showed greater variability and absolute error, and thus greater randomness, in perceptions about time duration when compared to type b persons. In this case, psychological trait seems to affect time perceptions.

Psychological state can have a very large impact on the perception of time duration. Galinat and Borg (1987) found: (a) that people believed that their perceptions of duration would not be affected by difficulty of the task but by pleasantness or unpleasantness, however, (b) difficulty dampens the effect of the pleasantness facet whereas ease accentuates the effect. This seems to imply that if an individual is in a certain emotional state, such as anger, waiting for an unspecified amount of time might make that individual more angry. A good example of this may be the person stuck in traffic who is behind schedule or late for an important appointment. The opposite may also be true. If a person is happy, waiting may heighten that feeling, though this is not necessarily the case with either emotional extreme.

Conduciveness to waiting can be increased through interaction with others. In the same study, Ahmadi (1985) found that persons tend to judge time as shorter in duration when acting alone as compared with interacting with others.

Interaction is not the only variable that can effect perceptions of time duration. Environmental variables, physical tiredness, boredom, or time of day can all affect the perception. Time duration perception is also affected by the task at hand. As stated before, if the task at hand is viewed as pleasant, the time seems to pass more quickly. If, on the other hand, the task is tedious or difficult, time seems to pass more slowly. This is evidenced by the legions of workers huddled around the clock at the end of the workday.

Dunham, Cornwall, and Hurshman found that when choice of responses were restricted, time was allocated to the option which most resembled the restricted option as a function of motivation. This may be explained by the notion we hold in
this culture, as a result of Judeo-Christianity, that if an option is restricted it must be fun.

The study of time allocation is one of the most studied areas in the field of anthropology and cross-cultural studies. Gross (1984) suggests the study of time allocation is a valuable tool for measuring differences between cultures, due to the ability to code microscopic behaviors. He posits that time is a resource for work and leisure and that civilizations arise out of the desire to have more leisure time. This can be reflected in the values held by a given cultural group.

Hall (1959), in his book The Silent Language, describes the perceptions about time in various parts of the world. For example, in the Middle East it is considered presumptuous to even suggest a future scenario. To the Arab, only God knows the future. Another example is the comparison between the North American attitude of "doing nothing" and the Indian idea that just sitting still is doing something. Time for North Americans is thus a matter of a resource which must be used to better ourselves or others. Time allocation in our society is based on a hierarchical priority list of most important tasks to least important tasks. As a result, we may expend much energy making decisions about the next task in order to maintain efficiency.

According to Myers and Myers (1976), "in American urban white culture, punctuality is valued, and tardiness is considered insulting." When late, persons tend to offer an explanation for their tardiness. The kind and extent of the apology will depend upon the degree of tardiness. Thus, it is a violation of an implicit societal rule to be tardy. This rule can be suspended for certain sub-cultural groups. In New Orleans, it is considered fashionable to be late for a party.

Other cultural beliefs contribute to our behaviors in regards to the use of time. In Anglo/American culture the locus of control is believed to be internal. This contributes to individualization, which in turn affects the decision-making process. With an internal locus of control, as well as a belief in the ability to control the environment, persons from this culture can and do make decisions in absolute terms. Whereas the Japanese consider it brash to make definite decision about oneself or others.

Kume (1985) compared North American decision-making processes to Japanese processes and found that North Americans are much more impatient, impulsive, and quick in their decision-making style when compared to Japanese. Research supports the contention held earlier about differences between the fundamental viewpoints of Occidentals and Orientals.

Given that demonstrable differences exist in behaviors as they relate to time cross-culturally, it seems an easy assumption to make that given sex-role typing as a function of socialization could create similar types of differences between the genders. Indeed, Doob (1971) suggested, when comparing various research findings, that if differences between the sexes in the judgment of time intervals do exist, then it is most likely to be a function of roles as determined by the culture.

Other theorists have posited different reasons for the seeming differences between the genders in terms of time allocation and perception. Fraser (1978) suggested that as a function of biology, female roles tend to have long-term
objectives as compared to males short-term objectives. He also suggests as a consequence that females seek the whole, whereas males seek the part. However, he concedes that the latter stereotype is based on traditional sex-role typing.

Despite those explanations much research has been done in the general area of nonverbal communication which reveals gender based differences. In Hall’s (1985) studies on nonverbal behavior, results show females tend to have more immediacy than males. Examples which suggest this include touch, body orientation, interpersonal distance, gaze, smiling, and attention. Studies cited in her article suggest that females take notice of nonverbal behavior more than men, and take differential notice of certain kinds of nonverbal cues such as facial cues (DePaulo, Rosenthal, Eisenstat, Rogers, & Finkelstein, 1978; Zuckerman, Blanck, DePaulo, & Rosenthal, 1980).

Studies done on smiling found that the frequency of smiling was higher for females than males. In close interpersonal distances, females tend to gaze more than males, but gaze less at further distances. The trends in interpersonal space imply that women are more affiliative than men and therefore prefer the positive-affect connotations of closer distance, and that women have lower social status than men and therefore cannot command as large interpersonal spaces (Hall, 1985).

In terms of body direction, females tend to be more direct, and other-oriented. Also, women on the whole tend to touch more than men. In one study (Berkowitz, 1971), twenty-four samples were used, for a total of over twenty-thousand persons picked from regions around the world in four different age groups, and all but one sample showed that females initiate touch more than males.

These studies compiled by Hall (1985) indicate that females use more immediacy type behaviors than males. Andersen (1985) suggested that spending time with someone communicates closer psychological distance, increased availability, and interpersonal approach, and therefore immediacy. Perhaps, immediacy is a consequence of those behaviors associated with females.

Not all research has pointed out differences between the genders regarding the use of time, however. Fraisse (1963) suggests that the research in the area of duration of time judgments has found divergent results in regard to the question of gender differences. Some research sighted has found that females significantly overestimate the duration of time of a task or event when compared to males. However, other studies have failed to find a significant difference. Fraisse therefore, suggests that the research in this area is not complete. The research must control for extraneous variables such as motivation.

An example of such divergent results occurred in an experiment conducted by Warner and Block (1984). They found there is no effect of sex and no interaction of sex and personality type on any of the measures of duration judgment. These findings were a result of the tests they ran on their subjects. Yet, in making observations about arrival times of subjects for the experiments they found that females tend to arrive earlier than males and that females are less likely to wear watches than males.
Even so, Orme (1969) found no evidence to support the claim that, in general, an association exists between gender differences and time estimation. However, there are a few studies which suggest that women tend to give larger estimates of time duration than men, especially when stress is involved (Weber, 1965; Geer et al., 1964).

Perhaps differences do exist to some degree. The real answer may lie in the causes of those differences. If the differences are a matter of socialization, the potential exists for drastic changes in the roles for men and women. Yet, most often roles perpetuate themselves in a society for unseen or uncontrollable reasons (at least from a practical level). For instance, the social roles which we observe may co-exist as part of a symbiotic system. Dismantling a role or set of roles could have disastrous effects. On the other hand, the perpetuation of social roles may be simply a function of historicity. We may not challenge the roles as a society because as a society we seek stability. Therefore, we maintain the roles in order to maintain the stability.

There has been criticism of the entire approach of studying gender differences in communication. Rakow (1986) has complained that historically social science research about gender has been carried out for the most part on the basis of nineteenth-century assumptions about sex and gender. However, one might argue that the assumptions perpetuate themselves because research bias could assume that the social roles have some basis in the nature of the gender difference.

Studies Rakow (1986) conducted on the use of the telephone in a small, rural, midwestern town show the perpetuation of sex-typed roles. Females of the community were charged with the duty of maintaining unity within that community through kin-keeping type behavior. This behavior included the use of the telephone. This study still implies the perpetuation of social roles for the purpose of societal stability.

Differences, gender or cultural, in the use of time seem to be a function of social roles. Further research on these differences can flesh them out. However, in doing such research, the researcher must begin with the perspective that any measurable differences can be attributable to socialization.

**Proposed Study**

Given a philosophical framework, testing for differences between the genders can be achieved. Two hypotheses for further study may include: (a) given a common cultural background, significant differences between the genders do not exist in perceptions and attitudes about time, and (b) significant differences between the genders do exist in behaviors as they relate to the use of time as a function of role expectations.

It is important to see the distinction between the two hypotheses. The first posits congruity of attitudes about time between members of a given social group. Whereas, the second posits discongruity of actions as a result of the restrictive nature of social roles. With careful methodology, these hypotheses should be shown to be true. A questionnaire has been developed to survey individuals about their perceptions of time (see Appendix). It is hoped the questionnaire will reveal differences among respondents by cultural background.


Appendix

Chronemics Questionnaire:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover attitudes about time.

Demographics: which best applies to you?

1. Which ethnic or cultural group do you consider yourself a part?
   A - Anglo/American   B - African/American
   C - Hispanic         D - Asian/American
   E - Oriental (non-American) F - Arabic (Middle-eastern)
   G - European         H - Other

2. What is your Age? _______

3. What is your sex?
   A - Female   B - Male

I. Waiting: (How long is too long to wait?) Please answer the limit of your tolerance.

   A. In restaurants: How long is too long to wait?
      1. Between the time you order food and the time you receive your order? (fast food restaurants)
         a - 1min       b - 2min       c - 5min       d - 7min
         e - 10min      f - 15min      g - longer

      2. Between the time you order food and the time you receive your order? (sit down restaurants)
         a - 10min      b - 15min      c - 20min      d - 30min
         e - 45min      f - 60min      g - longer

      3. In a sit down restaurant, between the time you arrive and the time you are seated by the hostess (no reservations)?
         a - 10min      b - 15min      c - 20min      d - 30min
         e - 45 min     f - 60min      g - longer

   B. In Doctor’s offices or clinics: How long is too long to wait to be seen?
      1. While sitting in the waiting room for, minor illnesses with appointment?
         a - 10min      b - 15min      c - 20min      d - 30min
         e - 45min      f - 60min      g - longer
2. Between setting up the appointment and the appointment date (minor illness or checkup)?
   a - 1day  b - 2days  c - 4days  d - 1wk
   e - 10days  f - 2wks  g - longer

C. Waiting in line: How long is too long to wait?
   1. In the checkout line at a grocery store?
      a - 2min  b - 5min  c - 10min  d - 15min
      e - 20min  f - 30min  g - longer

   2. For tickets to an event?
      a - 10min  b - 20min  c - 30min  d - 1hr
      e - 3hrs  f - 6hrs  g - longer

   3. In line to see an event (sporting event, concert, movie)?
      a - 10min  b - 20min  c - 30min  d - 1hr
      e - 3hrs  f - 6hrs  g - longer

D. For personal objects: How long is too long to wait?
   1. To be repaired (TV, radio, etc.)
      a - 4days  b - 1wk  c - 2wks  d - 4wks
      e - 6wks  f - 10wks  g - longer

   2. To be repaired (Car)
      a - 1hr  b - 4hrs  c - 1day  d - 2days
      e - 4days  f - 1wk  g - longer

E. For receiving orders via mail: How long is too long to wait?
   1. For merchandise to be sent:
      a - 4days  b - 1wk  c - 2wks  d - 4wks
      e - 6wks  f - 10wks  g - longer

   2. For information to be sent:
      a - 4days  b - 1wk  c - 2wks  d - 4wks
      e - 6wks  f - 10wks  g - longer

II. Visiting: How long is too long to visit? Please answer the limit of your toleration.

A. In sit down restaurants, how long do you stay to visit after finishing the meal?
   1. Assuming the company is pleasant?
      a - 10min  b - 15min  c - 20min  d - 30min
      e - 45min  f - 60min  g - longer
2. Assuming the company is unpleasant?
   a - 10min  
   b - 15min  
   c - 20min  
   d - 30min  
   e - 45min  
   f - 60min  
   g - longer

B. How long do you talk to one person on the telephone at one sitting?
   1. Assuming the company is pleasant?
      a - 10min  
      b - 15min  
      c - 20min  
      d - 30min  
      e - 45min  
      f - 60min  
      g - longer
   2. Assuming the company is unpleasant?
      a - 10min  
      b - 15min  
      c - 20min  
      d - 30min  
      e - 45min  
      f - 60min  
      g - longer

C. How long would you allow a visiting friend or relative to stay in your home?
   1. A friendly visit:
      a - 1day  
      b - 2days  
      c - 4days  
      d - 1wk  
      e - 2wks  
      f - 4wks  
      g - longer
   2. A visit based on need:
      a - 1day  
      b - 2days  
      c - 4days  
      d - 1wk  
      e - 2wks  
      f - 4wks  
      g - longer

III. Arriving and leaving for functions or events:

A. When is the proper time to arrive: When is too late:
   1. For a party?
      a - On time  
      b - 10min late  
      c - 20min late  
      d - 30min late  
      e - 45min late  
      f - 60min late  
      g - later
   2. For a dinner?
      a - On time  
      b - 10min late  
      c - 20min late  
      d - 30min late  
      e - 45min late  
      f - 60min late  
      g - later

B. When is the proper time to leave: after arrival.
   1. For a party?
      a - 30min  
      b - 45min  
      c - 60min  
      d - 90min  
      e - 2hrs  
      f - 3hrs  
      g - longer
   2. For a dinner?
      a - 30min  
      b - 45min  
      c - 60min  
      d - 90min  
      e - 2hrs  
      f - 3hrs  
      g - longer
IV. Degree of importance of time:

A. How important is your personal time?
   1 - very important,        2 - important,
   3 - somewhat important,   4 - neutral,
   5 - somewhat unimportant, 6 - unimportant,
   7 - very unimportant

B. Do you wear a watch?
   1 - always,                2 - usually,    3 - sometimes,
   4 - usually not,          5 - never

C. Do you take naps during the day, on weekdays?
   1 - always,               2 - usually,    3 - sometimes,
   4 - usually not,          5 - never

D. Do you avoid traffic: Do you leave early just to beat the rush?
   1 - always,               2 - usually,    3 - sometimes,
   4 - usually not,          5 - never
Rule Violations by Family Type
A proposal for research

Introduction
As part of the human condition, people must interact with one another. Persons interact with each other in ways that are predicted by earlier behavior. That is, persons interact in learned patterns. These patterns are a function of socialization. And, socialization is the process by which persons learn what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior in a given cultural or social context.

In the family, children are socialized by their parents, older siblings, or other relatives with which they come in contact. Outside of the family, persons are socialized by peers, significant others, or the media. "No one is born social, but must acquire social characteristics from others and incorporate them into his [sic] own personality." (Bell, 1963). Persons learn what is acceptable behavior through observation of others.

These observations are organized into cognitive schemata, which serve as knowledge bases for achieving goals (Berger & Kellerman, in press). Goals such as being accepted into a group, or not being alienated from a group, serve as motivators for acting acceptably. The group is defined by those actions or behaviors which are expected of its members. The expected behaviors are specified by rules.

Theoretical Framework
Susan Shimanoff (1980) defines a rule as a prescription which can be followed and suggests behaviors which are obligated, preferred, or prohibited in particular contexts. Rules are determined by the society, the family, or a member of the family given authority to make such rules, i.e. the head of household, and can be implicit or explicit. She states:

In order for communication to exist, or continue, two or more interacting individuals must share rules for using symbols. Not only must they have rules for individual symbols, but they must also agree on such matters as to how to take turns at speaking, how to be polite or how to insult, to greet, and so forth. If every symbol user manipulated symbols at random, the result would be chaos rather than communication (p. 31-32).

Rule development begins with and is parallel to earlier childhood development. A child learns rules about language by interacting with adults. One type of interaction that infants take part in with adults is games. In an study conducted by Bruner and Sherwood (1976), observations were made regarding an infant's rule development for the game of peekaboo. The study indicated that in the game of peekaboo, the infant appears to learn not only the rules of the game, but also the range of variation possible within the set of rules. It is the emphasis upon patterned variation within the constraints of the rule set that seems crucial to the mastery of competence and generativeness.

The formation of the rule may also be a result of a behavior which is contrary to the expectations of the group. This deviant behavior may not have been
intentionally deviant. When this behavior occurs, it creates a crisis situation in which the group may decide to state the rule, therefore making the rule explicit. Implicit rules exist when members of the group know what is expected of them as a consequence of observed behavior of other members of the group (Ford, 1983).

Minuchin (1974) argued that rules are dependent upon the family system. "Transactional patterns regulate family member's behavior. They are maintained by two systems of constraint. The first is generic, involving universal rules governing family organization." (Minuchin assumes a traditional model of family structure.) "The second system of constraint is idiosyncratic, involving the mutual expectations of particular family members," which are derived from observations of interactions within the family.

Members of a family can deviate from the family rules, that is from the definition of rules. Family rules are base on the goals and values of the family. Since values determine goals and result in the allocation of time, money, and energy, parent-adolescent differences in values might be expected to lead to conflict in the family (Nye, 1958). Conflict of goals between members of a family may motivate some members to violate the rules.

Rule violation occurs when a member of a group defined by the rule acts contrary to the suggested behavior. This may require specific knowledge of the rule. If the individual group member is unaware of the rule, then the rule violation is an unintentional deviation from expected behavior. If a group member is aware of the rule, then a true violation occurs.

Shimanoff (1980) delineates rule following and rule deviating into four types of behaviors each. Rule fulfilling and rule ignorant behaviors involve acting without knowing the rule. Rule conforming and rule error behaviors involve unconscious following or nonfollowing of a known rule. Rule following behavior is conscious compliance with the rule. Rule violating behavior is conscious violation of the rule. Positive reflective behavior is conscious following of a rule that has been positively evaluated by the individual. Negative reflective behavior is conscious violating of a rule that has been negatively evaluated by the individual.

A violation of a rule may entail negative sanctions by the authority setting the rule, or by the group which is defined by the rule. These negative sanctions can include punishment, ostracism, or alienation from the group. Consistent violation of the rule may result in reformulation of the rule, or a withdrawal of the rule.

In the family context, a child who deviates may be punished by a parent. The sanctions employed by a parent in this situation will depend on the ideology of that parent or the marital couple towards child-rearing. Kephart (1966) delineates between two schools of thought in regards to child-rearing: the permissive school, and the restrictive school. The permissive school holds that the needs of children to feel loved, attended to, and to be afforded the right to self-expression is of more importance to the development of the child. Whereas, the restrictive school believes that teaching discipline and respect for authority is paramount in the child's development of character. The writer holds that the extreme application of either school is not healthy for the development of the child.
Although violations can incur negative sanctions, this is not always the outcome. According to Burgoon (1983), violations appear to be an effective strategy (for influence) so long as they are accompanied or followed by other positively valued actions that can compensate for any negative connotations they carry.

Rules serve the function of structuring language. However, rules also define relationships. Rules set boundaries so that members of systems can tell who is in the system and who does not belong to the system. Kantor and Lehr (1976), define the term equifinality as the notion that families are capable of achieving similar goals or ends through a variety of different ways and with different starting points. This implies that different families can have idiosyncratic rules.

Littlejohn (1989) states that rules approaches incorporate two assumptions. First, although some human activity is mechanical and determined by uncontrollable factors, the most important behaviors are considered to be actively initiated by the individual. Second, social behavior is structured and organized.

Pearson (1989) holds that rules are important for three reasons. First, the development of rules reinforces relational development. Second, rule development encourages relational satisfaction. Third, rules allow individuals to define any given relationship.

Rules, therefore, are learned and used in everyday interactions. For example, Burgoon and Saine (1978) have found that our society has evolved rules about how and when one gazes at another. Also, proximity rules dictate that closeness communicates friendliness, but too much closeness creates discomfort in others. Ford (1983) found: "rules can be inferred from any repetitive family behavior."

Rules also affect how persons interact with one another. For instance, the style of expression and the skill of communication are influenced by the emotional expressiveness of the family environment (Halberstadt, 1986). "In a society where being liked is important, the child is often taught . . . to fit smoothly with all his age peers." (Bell, 1963).

As a consequence of the development and use of rules, persons have expectancies regarding the compliance of persons to rules in any given context. Individuals in a system are expected to follow rules, and noncompliance is viewed as a violation. In this study, we are interested in the rules regarding nonverbal behavior in the family. Nonverbal behavior has a communicative function. As a form of language, it has rules regarding its use in certain social contexts.

Ekman and Friesen (1969) specified the origins of nonverbal behavior as including: (a) innate reflexes of the nervous system, (b) the anatomy of the human species (such as the existence of hands), and (c) experience of the use of nonverbal behavior from other members of one's culture, class, or family. The last origin supposes a function for nonverbal behavior such as communication in social interaction.

Burgoon and Hale (1988) researched violations of expected nonverbal behavior and have created a model which incorporates the following concepts: arousal, communicator reward valence, violation valence, and the interpretation and evaluation of behaviors. Arousal occurs when a noticeable deviation from the norm
is performed. This arousal may have been sought by the deviant, as a means to get attention. That is, deviation may have been intentional or unintentional.

Communicator reward valence influences the perception of positive or negative affect of the deviant. This may affect further violations for the purpose of getting attention. This may also affect further evaluations of the deviant due to continued violation, i.e. negative evaluation contributes to further violation with contributes to further negative evaluation.

In terms of behavior interpretation and evaluation, regard for the communicator may affect selection of meaning for the implicit relational message. Negative regard for the violator may result in negative interpretation of the deviant behavior.

And finally, in terms of violation valence, behaviors are evaluated as positive or negative as a result of the source of the message, the societal norms regarding the meaning of the message, and the degree to which the violation exceeds the range of acceptability.

As stated above, persons have expectancies regarding the compliance of persons to rules in any given context. This is true in impersonal settings as well as in interpersonal settings such as in a family system. However, the types of rules and the strictness of maintaining those rules may depend on the family type.

Kantor and Lehr (1976) have described three different types of families: closed, open, and random. A closed family has a fixed use of space, a regular use of time, and a steady use of energy. A useful metaphor for this type of family may be a well-oiled machine. In the machine, every part has a specific function, and each part moves in its own space in a given interval.

An open family has a movable use of space, a variable use of time, and a flexible use of energy. A useful metaphor for this type of family may be a body of water. An object can be placed in the water, and the water will just move around the object. The water may be still, or it may be very restless. Finally, the output of water from the pipe depends upon the diameter of the pipe and the relative pressure forcing the water out of the pipe.

A random family has a dispersed use of space, an irregular use of time, and a fluctuating use of energy. A metaphor for this type of family may be a fire. The fire may be raging or smoldering. A little bit of wind may start a smoldering fire raging again. But, one may have difficulty controlling where a raging fire burns.

These different family types have different target ideals. Kantor and Lehr (1976) state that a closed family holds a hierarchical power structure of authority as an ideal. This structure helps to maintain durability of affect and certainty of meaning. They seek stability through tradition.

Open families seek adaptation through consensus. This consensus is achieved by sharing power through cooperation. Open families hold as an ideal the authenticity of affect and the contextual relevance of meaning.

Random families do not desire any form of structure. They make room for whatever feelings any member can possibly have and want to share, if that family member wants to share his or her feelings. Random families hold as an ideal free choice. And, to accomplish this, they may choose a laissez faire approach to
decision making. This family type holds as an ideal tolerance for ambiguous meaning.

Given these three family types, it seems reasonable to assume that each family type will have different attitudes regarding compliance to rules. It may be that very specific roles are held in a closed family, and the rules for interaction are dependent upon those roles. For example, a closed family, desiring the stability of authority, may place the father in the role of authority figure. (This is a traditional family role). Having father as the head of household may entail certain rules for interaction between the father and other members of the family.

Although these assumptions may make intuitive sense, there is reason to doubt they hold true. In a study conducted by Jackson (1965), traditional sex roles appear in interactions with strangers, but such roles tend to disappear in the context of the family. Another study found that family members share common rules about how they should handle their affect (Middelberg & Gross, 1979).

Some theorists believe that the larger social context has drastically affected family functioning, structure, and stability. For instance, Becker (1981) believes: "The family in the Western world has been radically altered, some claim almost destroyed, by events of the last three decades. The rapid growth in divorce rates has greatly increased the number of households headed by women and the number of children growing up in households with only one parent. The large increase in labor force participation of married women, including mothers with young children, has reduced the contact between children and their mothers and contributed to the conflict between the sexes in employment as well as in marriage. The rapid decline in birth rates has reduced family size and caused, as well as resulted from, the increased rates of divorce and labor force participation of married women. Conflict between the generations has become more open, and parents are now less confident that they can guide the behavior of their children."

Whether or not this is the case may or may not affect the development of rules in any given family. Yet, a basic issue still exists in the rearing of children. "The middle class family, in rearing its children, is faced with the basic problem of teaching the children to be competitive enough to stand out to some degree, but not be so different that they will be viewed as threatening to generally accepted social values" (Bell, 1963).

Given this argument, the study of rules and rule violations by family type is highly relevant. A highly structured, authoritarian family system may contribute to reticence in children. If this is the case, it can be measured. In a study, Burgoon and Koper (1984) found that as the level of reticence increases, subjects nodded less, showed less facial pleasantness and animation, displayed more anxiety and tension, leaned away more, and communicated greater disinterest. Reticents' relational messages were rated as expressing less intimacy or similarity, more detachment, more submissiveness, more emotional negativity, and therefore less credible.
The lack of credibility may become a Catch-22 for children in this type of family system. If a child is caught in this type of bind, he or she may believe his or her only recourse is to violate a rule. This may even contribute to violence in the home. deTurck (1987) found that males were more likely than females to use violence against a noncompliant male persuasive target in noninterpersonal contexts and in noninterpersonal relational contexts with short term consequences.

Other types of rules can be measured by family type. For instance, kinkeepers use a variety of activities to keep families in touch including visiting, telephoning, letter writing, and mutual aid (Adams, 1986). In terms of roles, Brody and Steelman (1985) found that as the number of sons in the family increases (holding constant the number of daughters), the sex-typing of traditionally female tasks decreases. In sibling groups with no sons, increases in the numbers of daughters reduce the sex-typing of male tasks.

In a study conducted by Callan and Noller (1986), the researchers found that there were few differences in ratings of family members between the parents. However, adolescents rated family members as more anxious, less involved, and less dominant. Both parents and children viewed interactants as equally friendly. The perceptions of the five dimensions marginally depended upon the sex of the adolescent and the perceived level of marital quality.

These findings suggest that rule violations can be found in families and differentiated by family type. The argument is therefore relevant for the proposed study.

**Proposed Study**

The type of nonverbal rules of interest in this study include proxemics, oculesics, regulation of conversation, and rules regarding the use of environment and territory. These behaviors can be observed in interactions between people in any interpersonal context. Emotions can be inferred from nonverbal behavior. For the six universally expressed emotions of happiness, sadness, surprise, anger, fear, and disgust, Ekman and Friesen (1975) found that abilities to detect these emotions from facial cues was moderately to extremely accurate cross-culturally.

In our society, persons maintain proxemic norms which when violated tends to create defensive reactions in the person whose space has been violated (Hickson & Stacks, 1989). Conversational interaction rules include following the proper cues for switching speakers. This is known as turn taking. In a study, researchers have identified behaviors such as a raised index finger, and an inhalation of breath coupled with a straightening of the back as cues by the listener to select the next turn at talk (Wiemann & Knapp, 1975). Harrigan (1985) also found that body movement (eye gaze and hand movement) prefaced turn-taking. Duncan (1972) found that strong regularities exist in behaviors regarding the rules of turn-taking.

Eye gaze behavior carries with it a set of rules. In order to show that a person is attentive, that person, occasionally at least, should direct eye gaze toward the speaker. According to Burgoon, et al. (1984) low eye contact, distal position, backward body lean, and the absence of smiling and touch communicated greater
detachment. High eye contact and close proximity alone communicated greater dominance and control.

Eye contact communicates intimacy. When strangers make eye contact, that contact typically lasts for a few moments and then is followed with a downward glance. When a stranger maintains eye contact for longer periods of time, it can become uncomfortable for the individual. Our society has rules against staring.

Immediacy to the task or interaction is required and expected. Hale and Burgoon (1984) found that a dominant pattern of reciprocity occurred when immediacy was increased, especially on evaluative measures. Burgoon, Newton, Walther, and Baesler (1989) found that greatly increased involvement communicated being very immediate, receptive and equal, whereas decreased involvement communicated nonimmediacy, dissimilarity, neutral receptivity, moderate equality, moderate submissiveness if the communicator had high reward value, and high submissiveness if the communicator had low reward value. Maintaining eye contact with the teacher is an indicator of immediacy and attentiveness.

It was suggested that development of nonverbal communication may be related to overall language development (Andersen, et al., 1985). The violator may be acting for the purpose of gaining attention. Ickes, et al. (1982) suggest that when low reward persons violate rules, others in the interaction tend to evaluate the violator negatively. The violation also has the effect of generating positive evaluations for the nonviolator.

Aronson and Linder (1965) found that subjects liked the evaluator best when the evaluations moved from negative to positive when compared to evaluations that moved from positive to positive, from negative to negative, or from positive to negative (in rank order).

Violations may occur when conflict in the family arises. These violations can communicate difficulties in family systems. A family with much conflict may have problems adjusting to each other, which may have ramifications for family development in subsequent generations. Nye (1957) found that children from homes broken by divorce do not have overall poorer adjustment than those children from homes broken in other ways. Children from broken homes have superior adjustment than children from unhappy unbroken homes.

Family conflict can lead to changes in family rules of interaction. Witteman (1988) conducted a study which looked at family interaction. The focus of this study is on conceptualization and initial interaction between people in a relationship after a problem situation is perceived. Two tendencies are involved. Parties in problematic situations tend to reciprocate communication. And, due to the first tendency, perceptions are reinforced and therefore remain relatively stable.

The four types of communicative strategies were defined by Witteman as having varying degrees of the three dimensions. For instance, integrative communication involves high initiation, high search, and low negative affect. Whereas distributive communication involves high initiation, low search, and high negative affect. Indirect communication involves low initiation, high search, and low negative affect.
Further study suggests three relevant research questions: (a) What is the frequency of nonverbal rule violation in the family? (b) Are there significant differences in the frequency of nonverbal rule violations among open, closed, and random families? and (c) If significant differences occur among the family types, what is the nature of these differences?

These research questions can be studied by observing nonverbal behavior in family interactions. Baesler and Burgoon (1985) posit that overall, the study of nonverbal behavior has yielded reliabilities above .80. This type of study, involving family interactions with children, has been conducted before with success. In a study by Callan and Noller (1986), they videotaped interactions between parents and their adolescent children. Then the family members viewed the videotapes and rated each other on levels of anxiety, involvement, dominance, and friendliness of themselves and other members of the family. The method used in their study has direct relevance to the method proposed in this study here.

The question regarding the reliability of children's responses has been addressed in other studies. For instance, Amato and Ochiltree (1987) studied children's responses to interviews about their families and compared the children's responses to the responses of their parents and the perceptions of the interviewer and found that the quality of data for adolescents is higher than that of primary school age children. However, the quality of data provided by the primary school age children were high in absolute terms. They posited that the findings have positive implications for researchers wanting to use the responses of children.

Therefore, I propose the following methodology for obtaining relevant data. First, interview family members to derive a set of rules for each of the family types. The interview should suggest the following dimensions for generating rules: (a) the use of space, (c) the use of time, and (c) the use of energy. The results of the interview will be used to create a coding scheme. A template will be derived from the coding scheme. This template will allow coders to check off which rules were violated when in each interaction situation and what frequency of violations will occur.

A new sample of families will be chosen to take part in natural family interaction situations which will be videotaped. The videotapes will then be coded using the above coding scheme by two separate groups. The first group will be the control group. This group will be selected at random and trained to look for specific nonverbal cues, as described above. The second group will entail the family members themselves who took part in the segments. Each family member will be asked to view the videotape and code any rule violations they observe.

The results will then be analyzed according to the following criteria: (a) family type reported, (b) frequency of rule violations, and (c) type of rule violations. The scores of the control group will be compared with the results of the family members to check for consistency of coding.

This method and analysis should reveal differences, if they exist between frequency and type of nonverbal rule violations by family type.
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Perceptions of Compliance With and Importance Of
Rules for Classroom Interaction:
Students versus Teachers

Introduction

As part of the human condition, people must interact with one another. Persons interact with each other in ways that are predicted by earlier behavior. That is, persons interact in learned patterns. These patterns are a function of socialization. And, socialization is the process by which persons learn what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior in a given cultural or social context.

In the family, children are socialized by their parents, older siblings, or other relatives with which they come in contact. Outside of the family, persons are socialized by peers, significant others, or the media. "No one is born social, but must acquire social characteristics from others and incorporate them into his [sic] own personality." (Bell, 1963). Persons learn what is acceptable behavior through observation of others.

These observations are organized into cognitive schemata, which serve as knowledge bases for achieving goals (Berger & Kellerman, in press). Goals such as being accepted into a group, or not being alienated from a group, serve as motivators for acting acceptably. The group is defined by those actions or behaviors which are expected of its members. The expected behaviors are specified by rules.

Theoretical Framework

Susan Shimanoff (1980) defines a rule as a prescription which can be followed and suggests behaviors which are obligated, preferred, or prohibited in particular contexts. Rules are determined by the society, the family, or a member of the family given authority to make such rules, i.e. the head of household, and can be implicit or explicit. She states:

"In order for communication to exist, or continue, two or more interacting individuals must share rules for using symbols. Not only must they have rules for individual symbols, but they must also agree on such matters as to how to take turns at speaking, how to be polite or how to insult, to greet, and so forth. If every symbol user manipulated symbols at random, the result would be chaos rather than communication."

The formation of the rule may be a result of a behavior which is contrary to the expectations of the group. This deviant behavior may not have been intentionally deviant. When this behavior occurs, it creates a crisis situation in which the group may decide to state the rule, therefore making the rule explicit. Implicit rules exist when members of the group know what is expected of them as a consequence of observed behavior of other members of the group (Ford, 1983).

Rule violation occurs when a member of a group defined by the rule acts contrary to the suggested behavior. This may require specific knowledge of the rule. If the individual group member is unaware of the rule, then the rule violation is an
unintentional deviation from expected behavior. If a group member is aware of the rule, then a true violation occurs.

Shimanoff (1980) delineates rule following and rule deviating into four types of behaviors each. Rule fulfilling and rule ignorant behaviors involve acting without knowing the rule. Rule conforming and rule error behaviors involve unconscious following or nonfollowing of a known rule. Rule following behavior is conscious compliance with the rule. Rule violating behavior is conscious violation of the rule. Positive reflective behavior is conscious following of a rule that has been positively evaluated by the individual. Negative reflective behavior is conscious violating of a rule that has been negatively evaluated by the individual.

A violation of a rule may entail negative sanctions by the authority setting the rule, or by the group which is defined by the rule. These negative sanctions can include punishment, ostracism, or alienation from the group. Consistent violation of the rule may result in reformulation of the rule, or a withdrawal of the rule.

Rules serve the function of structuring language. However, rules also define relationships. Rules set boundaries so that members of systems can tell who is in the system and who does not belong to the system.

Littlejohn (1989) states that rules approaches incorporate two assumptions. First, although some human activity is mechanical and determined by uncontrollable factors, the most important behaviors are considered to be actively initiated by the individual. Second, social behavior is structured and organized.

Pearson (1989) holds that rules are important for three reasons. First, the development of rules reinforces relational development. Second, rule development encourages relational satisfaction. Third, rules allow individuals to define any given relationship.

Rules, therefore, are learned and used in everyday interactions. For example, Burgoon and Saine (1978) have found that our society has evolved rules about how and when one gazes at another. Also, proximity rules dictate that closeness communicates friendliness, but too much closeness creates discomfort in others. Ford (1983) found: "rules can be inferred from any repetitive family behavior."

Rules also affect how persons interact with one another. For instance, the style of expression and the skill of communication are influenced by the emotional expressiveness of the family environment (Halberstadt, 1986). "In a society where being liked is important, the child is often taught . . . to fit smoothly with all his age peers." (Bell, 1963).

As a consequence of the development and use of rules, persons have expectancies regarding the compliance of persons to rules in any given context. Individuals in a system are expected to follow rules, and noncompliance is viewed as a violation. In this study, we are interested in the rules regarding nonverbal behavior in the classroom. Nonverbal behavior has a communicative function. As a form of language, it has rules regarding its use in certain social contexts.

Ekman and Friesen (1969) specified the origins of nonverbal behavior as including: (a) innate reflexes of the nervous system, (b) the anatomy of the human species (such as the existence of hands), and (c) experience of the use of
nonverbal behavior from other members of one's culture, class, or family. The last
origin supposes a function for nonverbal behavior such as communication in social
interaction.

Burgoon and Hale (1988) researched violations of expected nonverbal
behavior and have created a model which incorporates the following concepts:
arousal, communicator reward valence, violation valence, and the interpretation and
evaluation of behaviors. Arousal occurs when a noticeable deviation from the norm
is performed. This arousal may have been sought by the deviant, as a means to get
attention. That is, deviation may have been intentional or unintentional.

Communicator reward valence influences the perception of positive or
negative affect of the deviant. This may affect further violations for the purpose of
gaining attention. This may also affect further evaluations of the deviant due to
continued violation, i.e. negative evaluation contributes to further violation with
contributes to further negative evaluation.

In terms of behavior interpretation and evaluation, regard for the
communicator may affect selection of meaning for the implicit relational message.
Negative regard for the violator may result in negative interpretation of the deviant
behavior.

And finally, in terms of violation valence, behaviors are evaluated as positive
or negative as a result of the source of the message, the societal norms regarding
the meaning of the message, and the degree to which the violation exceeds the
range of acceptability.

Present Study

In school classrooms, rules are essential for the smooth operation of
classroom interaction. In this context, the teacher may act as an authority figure.
Rules are set in the classroom by the teacher, or by the school. In this example the
rules are formally stated and are explicit. However, some classroom rules may be
implicit, that is students are expected to have learned proper behavior from home
through socialization. Examples of implicit rules in the classroom may be: (a)
respect the teacher (elder), (b) pay attention to the teacher (elder), or (c) do not
distract others from paying attention to the teacher (elder).

Examples of non-observance of rules, or violations of expected behavior, are
evident from the school records of students in high schools. Approximately one and
one-half years ago, here in Baton Rouge at Istrouma High School, a student was
killed by another student with a knife. Prohibition against carrying weapons on
school grounds is a formally stated, explicit rule. Other examples of rule violations
are common.

While some students may present discipline problems for school
administrators, other students may never get into trouble. Although violations of
explicit rules are easy examples for any study, that is outside the scope of this
paper. This study is interested in violations of implicit nonverbal rules regarding
student/teacher interaction in the classroom.

The type of nonverbal rules of interest in this study include proxemics,
oculesics, regulation of conversation, and rules regarding the use of environment
and territory.
As argued above, students are expected to learn implicitly and follow these types of rules. As students progress through grades, their grasp of proper behavior should become more acute. Andersen, et al. (1985) studied rule development. This study looked at teachers' perceptions of students', grades K through 12, development of nonverbal communication. They studied five types of nonverbal communication including proxemics, haptics, oculines, vocalics, and physical appearance. The authors found that teachers perceived that students increased interactional distances between themselves and their peers as well as themselves and adults as grade level increased. Teachers reported that students decreased the amount of touch given as grade level increased. No difference was found in eye gaze between kindergarten through twelfth grade students. Teachers reported a small but significant increase in the appropriate use of loudness and rate as students increased in grade. Students were found to be more inclined to be concerned with their physical appearance as they increased in age. And finally, the researchers obtained mixed results regarding the development of kinesic behavior (facial expression).

It was suggested that development of nonverbal communication may be related to overall language development rather than the classroom experience per se. However, this study is relevant in that it shows that: (a) teachers can code nonverbal behaviors of their students, (b) that students do follow expected nonverbal behaviors, and (c) that development of nonverbal communication with age through grade 12 suggests a socialization pattern.

Conversational interaction rules include following the proper cues for switching speakers. This is known as turn taking. In a study, researchers have identified behaviors such as a raised index finger, and an inhalation of breath coupled with a straightening of the back as cues by the listener to select the next turn at talk (Wiemann & Knapp, 1975). Harrigan (1985) also found that body movement (eye gaze and hand movement) prefaced turn-taking. Duncan (1972) found that strong regularities exist in behaviors regarding the rules of turn-taking.

In the classroom, students are taught to raise their hand in order to speak. This behavior, presumably taught at an early age, has been observed in other social context. Students are also expected to wait until they are called upon to speak. There are also constraints on the types of topics which can be discussed in the classroom.

Eye gaze behavior carries with it a set of rules. In order to show that a person is attentive, that person, occasionally at least, should direct eye gaze toward the speaker. According to Burgooon, et al. (1984) low eye contact, distal position, backward body lean, and the absence of smiling and touch communicated greater detachment. High eye contact and close proximity alone communicated greater dominance and control.

Eye contact communicates intimacy. When strangers make eye contact, that contact typically lasts for a few moments and then is followed with a downward glance. When a stranger maintains eye contact for longer periods of time, it can become uncomfortable for the individual. Our society has rules against staring.
In a classroom setting, however, teacher and student must develop a rapport. Immediacy to the task or interaction is required and expected. Hale and Burgoon (1984) found that a dominant pattern of reciprocity occurred when immediacy was increased, especially on evaluative measures. Burgoon, Newton, Walther, and Baesler (1989) found that greatly increased involvement communicated being very immediate, receptive and equal, whereas decreased involvement communicated nonimmediacy, dissimilarity, neutral receptivity, moderate equality, moderate submissiveness if the communicator had high reward value, and high submissiveness if the communicator had low reward value. Maintaining eye contact with the teacher is an indicator of immediacy and attentiveness.

To sustain immediacy, the teacher should reciprocate attentiveness. Ginott (1972) stated: "A teacher can expect unpredictable group behavior." Two ways to deal effectively with misbehavior include demonstrated attentiveness of the teacher to occurrences in the classroom, and the ability to deal with more than one issue simultaneously. The teacher has to demonstrate control regardless of the actions of the violator.

The violator may be acting for the purpose of gaining attention. Ickes, et al. (1982) suggest that when low reward persons violate rules, others in the interaction tend to evaluate the violator negatively. The violation also has the effect of generating positive evaluations for the nonviolator. This would suggest that the teacher could affect further violations by others in the classroom according to the way the violation is handled. Ultimately, the teacher is charged with evaluating the student on disciplinary or academic grounds.

Aronson and Linder (1965) found that subjects liked the evaluator best when the evaluations moved from negative to positive when compared to evaluations that moved from positive to positive, from negative to negative, or from positive to negative (in rank order). This suggests that a student's esteem may be increased if teachers pay more positive attention to those students who have received prior negative evaluations. This gives the initiative for action to intervention measures.

If, perhaps, the teacher does not pay attention to students who violate rules of classroom interaction, then the student may continue to violate norms which eventually may lead to disciplinary problems and/or expulsion. A second possibility may be the potential for these students to drop out of school.

Students who have been diagnosed by school personnel as having a high potential for dropping out of school have been labeled "At Risk" students. Typically, (According to Elizabeth Dent, education consultant) "at risk" students are diagnosed according to academic and disciplinary records. If students who violate rules get into disciplinary trouble, then perhaps the question to ask is why do they violate the rules. Before answering that question, however, one has to determine if there exist a connection between the violation of rules and the potential for dropping out.

Given the findings of earlier research, relevant research questions for this study may include: (a) What type of nonverbal expectancy violations occur in student/teacher relationships? (b) Are there implicit rules regarding nonverbal behavior between high school students and their instructors, and if so what are these rules? (c) Are the implicit rules different in the context of "at risk" students?
when compared to their little or no risk counterparts, and if so, what are these differences? and (d) Do or should "at risk" students know what these differences are, if they exist?

**Hypotheses**

H1 "At risk" students differ from nonrisk students in compliance to implicit nonverbal classroom interaction rules.

H2 "At risk" students differ from nonrisk students in their perceptions regarding compliance to implicit nonverbal classroom interaction rules.

H3 "At risk" students differ from nonrisk students in their attitudes regarding the importance of implicit nonverbal classroom interaction rules.

H4 "At risk" students differ from teachers in their attitudes regarding the importance of implicit nonverbal classroom interaction rules.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted to test the validity and reliability of the test instrument to be used for the proposed study involving "At risk" students in high school classrooms. The first step was to create a questionnaire regarding attitudes toward compliance to rules, and the importance of each of those rules from the perspective of both the teachers and the students.

The first step involved generating a composite list of rules for classroom interaction. This was accomplished by having undergraduates at Louisiana State University answer an open ended questionnaire. The questionnaire requested that they think back to their high school experience and make a list of all the rules they could remember.

The list was then compiled into two categories of restrictive and prescriptive rules (see Appendix A). This list was compared to a list compiled by a high school teacher. From these two lists of rules a questionnaire was created (see Appendix B).

The questionnaire was distributed to forty-two Louisiana State University undergraduates, twenty-eight instructors at Spencer Community College in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and to two hundred thirty-one students at Spencer College. The LSU students were the control group which was compared to teachers and students at Spencer College. The students at Spencer were divided according to two categories: time of day school was attended, and high school graduation status.

For time of day there were three categories: morning student, day student, and evening student. According to interviews with school administrators at Spencer, students from these three time intervals display different characteristics in terms of demographics, and attentiveness.

For high school graduation status, there were three types of students in attendance at Spencer. Most students at Spencer finished high school and received a diploma. A large number of students dropped out of high school and received a
GED (Graduate Equivalency Diploma) for unspecified reasons. A smaller number of students at Spencer College have neither finished high school nor received a GED. For purposes of the pilot study, it is assumed that GED and non-graduate students are "de facto" "at risk" students. This is assumed because "at risk" students have been defined as having a high potential for dropping out of high school. GED and non-graduate students at Spencer have in fact dropped out of high school. All students in the control group have reported finishing high school and receiving a diploma.

Returned questionnaires from five students from each of the groups: (a) LSU students, (b) Spencer morning students, (c) Spencer day students, and (d) Spencer night students (for a total of twenty) were coded. Within each of the groups of students from Spencer, high school graduates, GED students, and non-graduate students were coded. A total of seventeen returned questionnaires from teachers at Spencer College were coded.

Findings are reported in Appendix C. Due to small numbers of scores coded, the findings do not carry much power. However, some interesting trends do take place which may warrant further investigation. Students in each of the four time groups, as well as by graduate status consistently scored lower than the teachers for both perceptions of compliance and importance of rules.

Other interesting findings include: both male teachers and male students scored consistently lower than their female counterparts in both perceptions of compliance and importance of rules; in regards to perceptions about compliance, no differences were found racially for either teachers or students. White students scored lower on perceptions of rule importance than other races.

If these findings hold for a larger sample size, they may confound differences between students according to graduate status. That remains to be seen.

Proposed Study

The pilot study above serves as the ground work for testing the hypotheses regarding perceptions of rules, and rule violations for "at risk" students in high school. Not only should perceptions of "at risk" students be measured, but also their actual behaviors. If perceptions differ, the differences may correlate to actual violations of rules. If the perceptions do not differ, then one might infer that the observed violations are intentional.

As stated before, it was the belief of both the educational consultant and the high school teacher interviewed that these students may violate rules as a way to get attention.

Some general observations regarding "at risk" students were made by the consultant Elizabeth Dent and her assistant Ann: (a) "at risk" students appear to have a difficult time expressing their feelings verbally, (b) "at risk" students appear to put much effort into expressing their feelings nonverbally, and (c) teachers may have difficulty decoding the nonverbal messages of "at risk" students.

Some difficulties that "at risk" students may be that they believe they are in a Double-bind or Catch-22. The parameters of the Catch-22 are:

1. They need special attention due to disadvantages.
2. They cannot receive special attention unless they violate rules.
3. Violation of rules results in negative evaluations by teachers.
4. Negative evaluations create the desire to drop-out.
5. Curbing the tendency to drop-out cannot be achieved unless "at risk" students receive special attention.

In order to test the hypotheses, this methodology should be followed. First, all of the responses from the pilot study should be completely coded. A factor analysis should be performed to derive dimensions of rule types on the test instrument. These dimensions should be analyzed for reliability. Provided the questionnaire is reliable, it should be distributed to a random sample of high schools in the state of Louisiana.

The population of students and teachers in Louisiana is sufficient because presumably, they have a consistent means for diagnosing "at risk" Students. Also, practical constraints regarding the use of minors in a study, may make it very difficult to obtain permission in other states.

These questionnaires should be coded and analyzed to find differences as outlined above. The results of the analysis will be used to create a coding scheme. The coding scheme will be used for observing videotaped classroom interactions. These videotaped interactions are to be provided by PATHFINDER, a dropout intervention program conducted by Elizabeth Dent and colleagues. The videotaped segments have already been created prior to the present observation. This will inhibit any deviations created by this observation.

Coding will be conducted in two parts. Teachers involved in the interactions will be asked to check off rules, from the list compiled above, that are violated by the students in the videotaped segments. Undergraduates will be utilized for comparison purposes. Results will be analyzed according to the following criteria: (a) rank order expectancies according to questionnaire results, and (b) rank order violations according to frequency of occurrence.

The purpose of the analysis is to determine if "at risk" students perceptions and attitudes match their behavior. The questionnaire results will be analyzed the determine if differences in perceptions or attitudes exist between "at risk" students and their non-risk counterparts, as well as comparisons with teachers.

Conclusion

It is hoped that this study may lead to a better method of diagnosing "at risk" students prior to serious discipline problems. If nonverbal expectancy violations committed by "at risk" students differ from their non-risk counterparts, then educators can be made aware of these differences so that early detection and intervention can occur. This may have serious implications for primary and secondary education techniques as well as drop out rates.
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Appendix A

Rules for the high school classroom:

RESTRICTIVE:

Students should not talk.
Students should not speak out of turn.
Students should not talk when teacher is talking.
Students should not use vulgar language.
Students should not use vulgar language when speaking to the staff.
Students should not use racist terms.
Students should not raise their voice or holler at the teacher.
Students should not speak when others are talking.
Students should not interrupt a teacher in a personal conversation with another teacher.
Students should not blurt out.
Students should not lie to the teacher or staff.
Students should not ask questions or speak in class in another language other than English.
Students should not distract other's attention.
Students should not be late for class.
Students should not get up and leave in the middle of class.
Students should not be mean to other students.
Students should not share lockers.
Students should not dig through the teacher's desk.
Students should not go up to the teacher at his or her desk.
Students should not sit at the teacher's desk.
Students should not touch the teacher's grade book.
Students should not look on their neighbor's paper.
Students should not pass notes to other students during class.
Students should not sleep in class.
Students should not eat or drink in class.
Students should not remove food from cafeteria.
Students should not chew gum in class.
Students should not smoke.
Students should not walk in halls during recess.
Students should not run in the halls, or anywhere in the building.
Students should not leave the school grounds without permission.
Students should not wear shorts.
Students should not publicly display affection, including hand holding.
Students, who are members of one social group, should not invade the space of another social group without being invited.
Students should not park on the grass.
Students should not carry weapons.
Students should not throw things.
Students should not throw spitballs.
Students should not throw pencils at the ceiling.
Students should not gamble.
PRESCRIPTIVE:

Students should raise their hand when they want to speak and then wait until they are called on.
Students should respond with an acceptable tone, but strong enough that everyone in the classroom can hear.
Students should stay in their designated place.
Students should keep their hands to themselves.
Students should ask to borrow materials of another student.
Students should respect the rights of other students.
Students should respect the teacher.
Students should address teacher as Mr. or Mrs. with their last name.
Students should confront the teacher, but in a respectful manner, if a student has a disagreement with a teacher.
Students should pay attention.
Students should bring books to class.
Students should gain permission to leave the classroom for any reason, including going to the bathroom.
Students should have a hall pass to walk on campus during class (unless you are an athlete, then you can do anything).
Students should have a parking permit.
Students should have a written (doctor's) excuse in order to be granted an excused absence, and to make up assignments.
Students should dress out for Physical Education class.
Students should dress neatly.
Students should go to their own particular space according to the social group in which they belong.

FROM A PEER'S PERSPECTIVE:

Students should never be on their best behavior, but should get into trouble.
Students should not eat in the cafeteria, bring your own food.
Popular girls should date football players.
Students should drive to school and not ride the bus which is uncool.
Seniors should take a designated skip day.
Students should take a particular seat in class, if not assigned by the teacher, and should carve initials in the desk.
Classroom Interaction Rules Survey: November 6, 1990

For Teachers:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify rules that students are expected to follow. These rules may be formally stated in class or by the school. Or, these rules may be unstated, that is students are expected to have learned them from earlier grades or from home.

Please fill out or check the following demographic information, then list all the rules students must follow in the classroom.

____ Years of Teaching Experience

____ Female  ____ Male

Race: Please circle one
1 - Black  2 - White
3 - Hispanic  4 - Oriental
5 - Other

Which grade do you teach? _______

Which subject(s) do you teach? ________________________________________________

Rule: Students should maintain eye contact with the teacher to show they are paying attention.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not sleep in class.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not speak out of turn.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not cheat.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not get up and leave in the middle of class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not dig through the teachers desk.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not use vulgar language.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should do their own work, or homework.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should clean up after themselves.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not make noise in class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not throw things.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not publicly display affection, including hand holding.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not pass notes to other students during class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not be late for class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should sit up straight in their desk.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should raise their hand when they want to speak and then wait until they are called.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not raise their voice or yell at the teacher.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should maintain a respectful and appropriate distance when speaking to a teacher.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not bring up topics of discussion which are unrelated to the subject matter of the class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not rub lotion, put on make-up, brush hair, or take care of other personal needs during class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not eat or drink in class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not talk when the teacher is talking.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not come to class intoxicated or high.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not sit at the teacher's desk.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should keep their hands to themselves.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Classroom Interaction Rules Survey: November 6, 1990

For Students:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to identify rules that students are expected to follow. These rules may be formally stated in class or by the school. Or, these rules may be unstated, that is students are expected to have learned them from earlier grades or from home.

Please fill out or check the following demographic information, then list all the rules students must follow in the classroom.

____ Age

____ Female ______ Male

Race: Please circle one

1 - Black 2 - White
3 - Hispanic 4 - Oriental
5 - Other

Did you receive your high school diploma? _____ Yes _____ No

Did you receive a GED? _____ Yes _____ No

__________________________________________________________________

Rule: Students should maintain eye contact with the teacher to show they are paying attention.

a. Never follow this rule ___::::::::::::::: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___::::::::::::::: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not sleep in class.

a. Never follow this rule ___::::::::::::: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___::::::::::: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not speak out of turn.

a. Never follow this rule ___:::::::::::: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___::::::::: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not cheat.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not get up and leave in the middle of class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not dig through the teachers desk.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not use vulgar language.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should do their own work, or homework.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should clean up after themselves.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not make noise in class.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not throw things.
   a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not publicly display affection, including hand holding.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not pass notes to other students during class.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not be late for class.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should sit up straight in their desk.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should raise their hand when they want to speak and then wait until they are called.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not raise their voice or yell at the teacher.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should maintain a respectful and appropriate distance when speaking to a teacher.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not bring up topics of discussion which are unrelated to the subject matter of the class.
   a. Never follow this rule: Always follow this rule.
   b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
      Not at all important: Extremely important.
Rule: Students should not rub lotion, put on make-up, brush hair, or take care of other personal needs during class.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not eat or drink in class.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not talk when the teacher is talking.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not come to class intoxicated or high.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should not sit at the teacher’s desk.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.

Rule: Students should keep their hands to themselves.

a. Never follow this rule ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Always follow this rule.

b. How important is it that this rule be followed?
   Not at all important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: Extremely important.
Appendix C

Findings:

1) Students:
   a.) COMPLIANCE
       mean = 116.350  std. dev. = 14.67
       minimum = 88     valid no. of scores = 20
       maximum = 140    valid no. of scores = 20
       alpha = 0.8669
       compliance by sex: mean
          male = 108.67   valid no. of scores = 3
          female = 117.71 valid no. of scores = 17
       compliance by race: mean
          white = 116.36  valid no. of scores = 14
          other = 116.33 valid no. of scores = 6
       compliance by sex & race: mean
          White male = 108.67 valid no. of scores = 3
          Other male = 0.00  valid no. of scores = 0
          White female = 118.45 valid no. of scores = 11
          Other female = 116.33 valid no. of scores = 6

   b.) IMPORTANCE
       mean = 111.300  std. dev. = 17.86
       minimum = 73     valid no. of scores = 20
       maximum = 140    valid no. of scores = 20
       alpha = 0.8896
       importance by sex: mean
          male = 104.00   valid no. of scores = 3
          female = 112.59 valid no. of scores = 17
       importance by race: mean
          white = 109.21  valid no. of scores = 14
          other = 116.17  valid no. of scores = 6
       importance by sex & race: mean
          White male = 104.00 valid no. of scores = 3
          Other male = 0.00  valid no. of scores = 0
          White female = 110.64 valid no. of scores = 11
          Other female = 116.17 valid no. of scores = 6

   c.) AGE
       mean = 21.700

   d.) SCALE TOTAL
       alpha = 0.9353
2) Teachers:
   a.) COMPLIANCE
      mean = 121.29  std.dev. = 13.08
      minimum = 89  valid no. of scores = 17
      maximum = 137
      alpha = 0.8992
      compliance by sex: mean
      male = 110.50  valid no. of scores = 4
      female = 124.62 valid no. of scores = 13
      compliance by race: mean
      white = 121.67 valid no. of scores = 12
      other = 120.40  valid no. of scores = 5
      compliance by sex & race: mean
      White male = 110.50  valid no. of scores = 4
      Other male = 0.00  valid no. of scores = 0
      White female = 127.25 valid no. of scores = 8
      Other female = 120.40  valid no. of scores = 5
   b.) IMPORTANCE
      mean = 119.410 std.dev. = 16.30
      minimum = 71  valid no. of scores = 17
      maximum = 138
      alpha = 0.9304
      importance by sex: mean
      male = 112.62  valid no. of scores = 4
      female = 121.62 valid no. of scores = 13
      importance by race: mean
      white = 120.83  valid no. of scores = 12
      other = 116.00  valid no. of scores = 5
      importance by sex & race: mean
      White male = 112.25  valid no. of scores = 4
      Other male = 0.00  valid no. of scores = 0
      White female = 125.12 valid no. of scores = 8
      Other female = 116.00 valid no. of scores = 5
   c.) SCALE TOTAL
      alpha = 0.9579

3) Student & Teachers:
   a.) COMPLIANCE:
      mean = 118.622 std.dev. = 13.99
      minimum = 88  valid no. of scores = 37
      maximum = 140
      alpha = 0.8778
   b.) IMPORTANCE
      mean = 115.027 std.dev. = 17.42
      minimum = 71  valid no. of scores = 37
      maximum = 140
      alpha = 0.9070
c.) t-tests: means

i) Teachers vs. LSU students
   COMPLIANCE  a) 121.29  b) 112.80
   IMPORTANCE  a) 119.41  b) 108.60

ii) Teachers vs. Spencer students who have graduated from high school
    COMPLIANCE  a) 121.29  b) 113.83
    IMPORTANCE  a) 119.41  b) 107.67

iii) Teachers vs. Spencer students who have received a GED
     COMPLIANCE  a) 121.29  b) 122.16
     IMPORTANCE  a) 119.41  b) 117.50

iv) Teachers vs. Spencer students who have not graduated from high school
    COMPLIANCE  a) 121.29  b) 115.67
    IMPORTANCE  a) 119.41  b) 110.67

v) LSU students vs. Spencer students who have graduated from high school
   COMPLIANCE  a) 112.80  b) 113.83
   IMPORTANCE  a) 108.60  b) 107.67

vi) LSU students vs. Spencer students who have received a GED
    COMPLIANCE  a) 112.80  b) 122.16
    IMPORTANCE  a) 108.60  b) 117.50

vii) LSU students vs. Spencer students who have not graduated from high school
     COMPLIANCE  a) 112.80  b) 115.67
     IMPORTANCE  a) 108.60  b) 110.67

viii) Spencer students who have graduated from high school vs. Spencer students who have received a GED
      COMPLIANCE  a) 113.83  b) 122.16
      IMPORTANCE  a) 107.67  b) 117.50

ix) Spencer students who have graduated from high school vs. Spencer students who have not graduated from high school
    COMPLIANCE  a) 113.83  b) 115.67
    IMPORTANCE  a) 107.67  b) 110.67

x) Spencer students who have received a GED vs. Spencer students who have not graduated from high school
    COMPLIANCE  a) 122.16  b) 115.67
    IMPORTANCE  a) 117.50  b) 110.67

xi) Teachers vs. all students
    COMPLIANCE  a) 121.29  b) 116.35
    IMPORTANCE  a) 119.41  b) 111.30

d.) SCALE TOTAL
   alpha = 0.9446
Master of Arts Comprehensive Exams
Question 1: Jim Honeycutt

Argyle and Henderson (1985) discuss rules for friendship across a number of cultures. What does a rules-based perspective for friendship maintenance assume? How do we know a "rule" is a rule? How are their rules similar or different from the rules you identified in your thesis study? Can people really identify rules? What are the most important, universal rules for friendship? What is gained from studying rules in personal relationships rather than social exchange processes?

Assumptions of the rules-based perspective include: (a) rules are developed to coordinate behaviors for the purpose of achieving some mutually desired goal(s), (b) people learn rules and behave according to those rules in order to be accepted into a group, and (c) violations of these rules can incur social sanctions such as punishment, ostracization, alienation from the group, rejection, and sometimes positive outcomes (as will be described in the discussion of the expectancy-violations model).

Different types of rules may be developed for given situations because they are determined by the goals which are hoped to be achieved by the members of the group (or dyad). For example, rules for friendships may differ from rules for task-oriented groups because the goals for the two situations are different. In the case of the friendship, the goals to be gained may include mutual enjoyment, shared intimacy, help in times of trouble, and ability to trust with confidences. For task-oriented groups, the main goal may be to complete the task for which the group was formed such as a committee. Task-oriented groups may include work groups which are formed to generate monetary profit. Because the goals for these types of relationships are different, it is reasonable to assume that the rules differ for group types.

Within a friendship, a primary goal may be to maintain the relationship. In Social Exchange terms, the relationship will continue as long as the relationship is mutually profitable for the members, given less profitable alternatives. According to Maslow, the need for love and belongingness (or intimacy) is a primary need, and persons will seek relationships with others in order to meet that need. Therefore, persons have a motivation to maintain relationships.

According to the chapter by Argyle and Henderson, persons maintain relationships, such as friendships, by following the rules of that friendship. They argue that rules for relationships are universal. They also argue that some rules for relationships apply to friendships and close relationships as well as task-oriented relationships. Examples of these rules include: (a) respecting the privacy of others, (b) not disclosing confidences, and (c) being helpful.

We learn rules from our observations of other relationships, our understanding of what works in our own experience, and social norms which are developed through history from others' experiences of what works in relationships. For example, as children we watch mom and dad behave in certain ways toward each other. We learn what behaviors are appropriate in that type of relationship.
Within groups, rules for the coordination of behaviors may be worked out through trial and error, or reasoning about productive methods for achieving some desired goal. If these rules are stated, they are explicit and become part of the narrative of the group for which they apply. If they are simply learned through observation they become implicit, and their compliance becomes a matter of habituation within the group.

In Argyle and Henderson’s study rules were defined as reward rules or maintenance rules. They suggested that the maintenance rules of friendships, as described above, exist in all relationships. If this is the case, as they suggested, individuals are fairly aware of the rules for relationships. They also found that relationships begin to dissolve when the reward rules are no longer followed, but relationships terminate when maintenance rules are violated.

Maintenance and reward rules also occur in the classroom. The classroom is a unique environment in which a task-orientation occurs, i.e. the dissemination of knowledge from the teacher to the students, as well as the socialization of appropriate behavior for friendships and other relationships is meant to occur. In the classroom, the coordination of behavior is necessary in order to accomplish the tasks at hand. Rules for the classroom are developed for this purpose. As was suggested in the thesis, as show by Tikunoff and Ward, the understanding of rules for behavior in the classroom is developed early in the student's career.

Rules from Argyle and Henderson, are similar to the rules in the thesis study in that they promote the maintenance of classroom order to achieve the goal of learning. They are also similar in that some rules promote polite behavior between students. The behaviors which the rules in the thesis are developed to promote or prevent could help students understand the nature of relationships and the behaviors involved which maintain relationships. The differences between the specific rules of the thesis study and the rules described in the Argyle and Henderson chapter are based on the specifics of the classroom environment, and the behavior coordination needed to achieve the particular desired goal of education.

Ultimately, the study of rules for relationships goes further in describing particular behaviors which enhance and maintain relationships, as well as contribute to its’ dissolution, whereas Social Exchange theory only describes the outcomes of the balance sheet within the relationship.
Discuss the **assumptions** behind the expectancy-violations model of nonverbal behavior. What is the model trying to explain? What are the major findings in this research program? How is the model different from the equilibrium or discrepancy-arousal model of nonverbal behavior?

Assumptions behind the expectancy-violations model of nonverbal behavior include those described in the question regarding rules. Our expectancies regarding the nonverbal behaviors of others are based on our observation of ourselves and others in relationships. Individuals develop schemas regarding behaviors which should or should not be performed within the confines of a relationship. These expectancies are based on: (a) social norms, that is what we learn to be appropriate or inappropriate behavior within the context of relationships, and (b) idiosyncratic behaviors which may be peculiar to the individuals in the relationship. These idiosyncratic behaviors become known throughout the process of learning about the other individual within the stages of relational development. This is learned primarily in (Knapp's) experimenting and intensifying stages of relational development.

The Nonverbal Expectancies-Violation model proposes that violations of expected behavior may be evaluated as positive or negative depending on the evaluations of the communicator or the behavior itself, the magnitude of the behavior, or all three components. Communication models for expectancy violation go beyond the sociological assumption that all violation of norms will be negatively evaluated. Communication models in general propose the possibility that some violations may produce positive evaluations given constraints such as the magnitude of the violation. Burgoon's Nonverbal Expectancies-Violation model proposes that even extreme violations of expectancies may be positively evaluated.

Major elements of the model include: (a) expectancies, (b) violations and arousal, (c) the communicator reward valence, (d) the behavior interpretation and evaluation, and (e) the violation valence. As suggested above, individuals have expectancies regarding behavior that should or should not be performed within the context of a relationship. These expectancies allow individuals to function within a relationship, to develop trust, to determine appropriate levels of disclosure and intimacy, and to share resources with others. Burgoon's model proposes that individuals have expectancies regarding the nonverbal behavior of others with whom individuals have relationships. These expectancies fall within a continuum with a range of acceptable behaviors being determined by social norms or idiosyncratically. When a behavior falls outside that acceptable range an arousal occurs in which the aroused individual changes the focus of attention away from the content of the message and starts paying attention to the behaviors and characteristics of the communicator as well as the characteristics of the situation.

Prior to the occurrence of the violation, an individual may have determined the likeableness of the communicator. If the communicator is likeable (due to attractiveness, competence, gender, potential for intimacy, etc.) then he or she is
determined to have high reward valence. If the communicator is not likeable, then he or she is determined to have low reward valence. This reward valence may be a consequence of the violatee's experience with the individual or a first impression in the case of the stranger.

The violatee may also have a pre-determined attitude toward the behavior itself, prior to the violator's commission of the act. The behavior may be a likeable or uncomfortable one. Burgoon proposes that the evaluation of the violation may be positive or negative depending on the characteristics of the situation, behavior, and persons involved. For example, if a high reward person violates an expectancy with a behavior that is positively viewed, then the violation will be positively evaluated. Whereas, if the same behavior is committed by a low reward person, and that behavior is viewed as a violation of expectations, then the evaluation of the violation becomes a function of the magnitude of the violation.

The major findings of this study, therefore, include the notion that violations of expected behaviors may be a more effective strategy for communication than conforming to norms. This is dependent upon the reward valence of the communicator and the valence of the behavior. Burgoon also discovered that the magnitude of the violation may also effect its evaluation, in that the violation of a single nonverbal cue can have a positive effect, whereas the combination of several cues which violate nonverbal expectancies can have a negative effect.

This model differs from the other communication models in that it proposes expectancies are generated cognitively, affectively, and conatively, and that arousal may be a function of each or all of these levels. For example, in the equilibrium or discrepancy-arousal model, the arousal state develops from a cognitive understanding of the incongruence between the expected nonverbal behavior and the violation. The Nonverbal Expectancies-Violation model proposes that this arousal may be automatic, and induced when habituated behavior is not forthcoming. Burgoon's model also differs from the other models in that it allows for the possibility of extreme violation being positively evaluated under certain conditions.
A researcher is interested in investigating how at-risk students reciprocate positive or negative emotions during actual conversations. Pose a research question in this area and briefly describe the methods and procedures you would use to answer the research question.

It has been determined through an interview with an educational consultant and confirmed in an interview with a high school teacher, that at-risk students typically have difficulty expressing themselves in the classroom environment. Reasons why this may be the case include the characteristics of at-risk students such as: (a) lack of parental support, (b) academic development of the student, and (c) school environment. The first step in examining the reciprocating of emotions by at-risk students, therefore, should include an assessment of ability to express emotions. Research questions to investigate the problem include:

RQ1 How are at-risk students defined?

RQ2 Do these characteristics of at-risk students manifest themselves through behavioral patterns such as verbal and nonverbal expression of emotions?

RQ3 Is there a correlation between the characteristics of at-risk students and their tendency to express their emotions in a specific way?

RQ4 How might at-risk students reciprocate the expression of emotions with other at-risk or non-risk students in a conversation?

The critical step in examining the behaviors of at-risk students in comparison with non-risk counterparts is determining which students are at-risk and why? Presently, the way these determinations are made is through subjective and intuitive teacher evaluations of students. Educational research on this topic is fairly inconsistent and non-systematic. However, to approach the research question some method must be used to determine which students are at-risk. Therefore, the researcher must use the present education research to determine which characteristics define at-risk students.

These characteristics will be used to distinguish a group of at-risk students from a group of non-risk students. A test school should be selected at random. Then, all teachers at the test school should be interviewed regarding their perceptions of students as fitting the profile of an at-risk student as determined by the characteristics of at-risk students in the education research. A student profile will be completed on each student at the test school. This profile will be compared to known demographic, home environment, and personality characteristics of the student by the school. The students then will be grouped into at-risk students and
non-risk students, and a stratified sampling procedure will be used to randomly sample the students for each group.

The students will then be observed in a classroom setting under normal conditions by video camera. This procedure will be conducted for at least three weeks for two purposes: (a) to allow the tape coders enough data to make an assessment regarding the nature of the behavior performed by all students, and (b) to allow for students' behavioral changes which may occur at the outset of the video camera's placement in the room.

Behaviors will be identified by student and coded by category according to purpose and by appropriateness of each as determined by a panel of classroom teachers. The student will be coded as either at-risk or non-risk. This data will then be analyzed to determine if differences occur in the frequency of inappropriate behaviors between at-risk students and non-risk students and by the nature of the behaviors. t-Tests will be run between the two groups for each behavior type and appropriateness in order to make the assessment of difference.

The next step will be to run a correlation analysis between the behaviors of the at-risk students and the characteristics for those students. This analysis will be used to determine if particular characteristics affect the behaviors that have been observed in the classroom situation.

Finally, students will be divided and randomly assigned to four groups of equal number. Group one will contain non-risk students. Groups two through four will contain at-risk students. Student dyads will be formed and randomly assigned between groups one and two, and groups three and four. Each dyad will be observed via videotape in conversations about their parents.

The videotapes will be coded and analyzed using the same category system for the previous experiment. Three dichotomous dependent variables at the nominal level of measurement will be used: (a) existence of the emotional expression (for each behavioral category), (b) the appropriateness of the expression if it existed, and (c) whether the emotion was a reciprocation. Each of these dependent variables can be coded as yes or no. A fourth dichotomous dependent variable measuring the positive or negative nature of the emotional expression will be coded as positive or negative. All four groups will be compared using Analysis of Variance to determine if there is a significant difference in the reciprocation levels of emotional expression for each group, the degree of appropriateness of the expression for each group, the mean frequency of the expression for each group, and the behavior's nature as positive or negative.

Finally a correlation analysis will be run to determine if there is a relationship between at-risk characteristics for each student and the students tendency to reciprocate a positive or negative emotion.
Discuss the fundamental tenets of social penetration theory, then demonstrate your understanding by providing an illustration of its application in relational communication. Knapp's trajectory model of relational development and dissolution may be used here. To what extent is social exchange theory useful in understanding such models?

Social penetration theory is based on the assumption that individuals seek out relationships to fulfill some need. The need for love and belongingness, or intimacy, as suggested by Maslow, is met through interaction with others and the subsequent development of relationships. The major notion of Social penetration is that relationships develop from less intimate to more intimate, and that the motivation to develop toward intimacy is a function of the need for love.

The Social penetration model is concerned with the mechanism for developing relationships from less intimate to more intimate and contains two axes: breadth and depth of conversational topics. Relationships are defined by the breadth and depth of conversational topics between the partners. Each relationship may differ on these axes. For example, an individual may have a friendship which is defined by a broad range of discussion topics which do not have any depth. This relationship may not be defined by large amounts of deep disclosure. A more intimate relationship, on the other hand, may contain intimate disclosure of selected topics which are not discussed with others outside the relationship. Psychological centrality is the degree to which a certain aspect of an individual is considered by the individual to be core to his or her being. At intimate levels of self-disclosure, this core is revealed to the other.

Knapp’s trajectory model of relational development and dissolution is based on the assumptions of the social penetration model. In the first stage, initiating, individuals do not know much about the potential mate. They develop a first impression, then decide whether the relationship should be pursued or not, and what the characteristics of the relationship might be. At this stage, there is not much depth in the conversation. Most communication is phatic and superficial. The partners may decide, implicitly, to continue developing the relationship. If this is the case, they move into the experimenting stage.

The experimenting stage is characterized by exchanging of demographic information. At this point, the communication reaches a deeper level of intimacy than simple phatic communication as in the initiating stage. However, the information is still relatively superficial. Partners may begin to engage in uncertainty reduction, and information gaining strategies such as passive (simple observation), active (gaining information from other sources), and interactive (direct questioning) strategies.

The intensifying stage, in Knapp's trajectory, is characterized by still deeper disclosure. At this point in the relationship, individuals may be exchanging information of a more sensitive nature such as religious beliefs, attitudes towards
sex, feelings towards parents, and desires for the future. This type of information is of a more intimate nature than demographic information or tastes in movies or music. This progression continues through the integration and bonding stages of Knapp's typology, with the bonding stage being the point in which full disclosure occurs.

Social penetration theory also suggest that relationship dissolve in the opposite direction with the discussion of topics moving from more intimate to less intimate. This progression is also posited in Knapp's trajectory of relationship dissolution. The first stage in the trajectory is differentiation. In this stage, partners begin to notice differences which were either unseen or ignored. These differences serve to set up barriers between partners and contribute to the tendency to stop communicating about certain intimate topics. This tendency occurs in the next stage, circumscribing. In the circumscribing stage, partners will begin to avoid each other communicatively. Partners may even start to suggest time away from each other. Individuals in a relationship may turn to others outside of the relationship for answers about the troubled relationship.

In the stagnating stage, the form of the relationship is there but not the substance. Individuals from the relationship will only talk about intimate topics when it is necessary to avoid a direct breakup. Otherwise, individuals will discontinue intimate discussion through the avoiding stage and ultimately the termination stage.

Knapp's trajectory for relational development and dissolution, therefore, follows the social penetration model's communication from less intimate topics to more intimate and back. However, the quality of the relationship may also be judged by partners based on the number of topics available for discussion.

If the relationship is judged to be satisfactory, this may motivate partners to remain in the relationship. This is usually a function of both the breadth and the depth of intimacy in the relationship. However, according to social exchange theory, it is a matter of profit. Social exchange theory suggests that persons will remain in relationships as long as it is profitable to do so, that is the rewards of remaining in the relationship outweigh the costs. If individuals enter into and maintain relationships to meet the need for love and belongingness, then it is reasonable to assume that meeting that need is the profit to be gained. If that is the case, then as long as intimacy is being exchanged, then the motivation to remain in the relationship may be strong. This is consistent with both social penetration theory and Knapp's trajectory of relational development and dissolution.
Question 5: J. Don Ragsdale

Discuss the principal models or theories of attitude and behavior change comparing and contrasting them in terms of their adequacy to account for response to persuasive messages.

Heider’s Balance theory was an early theory which tried to account for changes in attitude. Basically, the theory posited that individuals will attempt to maintain mental equilibrium between their attitudes and self-perceptions of their own behaviors. Heider’s theory suggested that behaviors were derived from attitudes, that is, an individual will act according to his or her beliefs or attitudes thus maintaining balance. If an individual acts in discordance with a held attitude, then the system will not be in equilibrium.

Festinger’s Cognitive Dissonance theory built upon Heider’s theory but included the notion that individuals will feel mental discomfort if an incongruency exists between the held attitude or belief and perceptions regarding their behavior. Festinger’s theory further stated that this mental discomfort, or cognitive dissonance, can be relieved. Individuals will attempt to relieve the discomfort by either changing the attitude, justifying the behavior or altering the behavior. Persuasion may occur if an individual could be made aware of the incongruency between stated beliefs or attitudes and the observed behavior. Also, the possibility of persuasion, therefore attitude change, may be realized if the individual is compelled to change his or her behavior. A change in the individual's behavior, which is inconsistent with his or her stated belief, may precipitate cognitive dissonance which can motivate the individual to change his or her attitude.

McGuire’s Inoculation theory suggests that an individual may be motivated to hold an attitude in the absence of counter-arguments. However, in the presence of counter-arguments, the individual may be motivated to accept the counter-argument due to recency effects. For example, if an individual is not predisposed to hold a certain attitude on a topic, and a speaker gives a impassioned but one sided speech on that topic, then the listener may be temporarily motivated to accept the first speaker's argument. However, if a second speaker gives a counter-argument, the listener may be motivated to accept the second speaker's argument over that of the first speaker, due to recency effects. Yet, if the first speaker gives both sides of the argument, and then describes the advantages of his or her side over the opponents arguments, the listener may be inoculated against any counter-arguments.

Perhaps the reason why this occurs is a tendency for individuals to accept the validity of an argument without critical thought. If the argument does not counter some already held belief, then mental balance is not an issue. In the case of Inoculation theory, if the individual is prepared for the counter-argument, then critique is not necessary. The critique may cause mental discomfort, leading to a desire to achieve equilibrium.
Ultimately, each theory was built upon the assumptions of the earlier theory. All these theories are based on the assumption that psychological homeostasis is a desirable condition. If this is the case, persuasion works by upsetting the balance or homeostasis. This requires the individual to construct a new schema regarding the new information, or change the attitude, in order to recapture the homeostatic state, thus relieving cognitive dissonance.
Discuss recent trends in communication research. Which would have been unexpected a decade ago.

Recent trends in communication research may have begun as early as Behavioralism in the 1930's. Certainly, communication scholars are heir to the research methodologies put forth in the early days of social scientific research. (For purposes of this argument, I will restrict the essay to trends in the social science of communication.) Recently, there have been arguments posited within the field of communication regarding methodology (experimental versus field study versus field experimentation), theoretical framework (covering laws versus situational approaches versus rules perspectives), and the nature of communication theorizing itself, i.e. the philosophy of communication.

As a historical sketch, communication as a separate discipline is relatively new to academia. Departments of communication began to open in schools by the second decade of the twentieth century. Interests in rhetorical studies developed into interests in persuasive mechanisms which developed into interests in other communicative mechanisms. The first model of communication, per se, was Shannon and Weaver's (1949) mathematical model of communication. Communication scholars then began to modify that model to include notions such as feedback and simultaneous processing.

Communication scholars desired to achieve prominence as an academic field by using a scientific model for research methodology. Bormann argued that this was limiting in the field of communication, especially since communication theory building had not progressed to a point which would allow this form of methodology to be used. This methodology was most useful in testing theories. (There is more on this argument below.)

In a recent essay, Berger (see Communication Monographs) stated that very little theorizing has been done in the field of communication. To be sure, recent communication theories include Action Assembly theory (Greene), Nonverbal Expectancies-Violation theory (Burgoon), Uncertainty Reduction theory (Berger), Coordinated Management of Meaning (Pearce and Cronen) and Cognitive-Schema theory. However, Berger argued that much communication research has been the derivation of theory from cognate areas and application to communication issues. In another article, Burleson (see Communication Monographs) argues that the issue is that very little theorizing in human communication has been forthcoming.

The issue appears to be that communication meta-theory or foundational paradigms do not yet exist for the field of social scientific communication. Although arguments within the field have revolved around which methodology should be used or which assumptions (theoretical perspective) should be taken, the issue of a field meta-theory has not been truly resolved. Certainly, a decade ago this was not the argument of consideration. Hopefully, we will not spend dark ages arguing over how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.
Discuss the work of a scholar you greatly admire. Why do you admire this person? the ethic? the subject matter? the swashbuckling style? the grace? the questing mission?

Although I have been introduced to many scholars in the field through studies, there have been relatively few I have met. I find it difficult to say what I admire about people that I have not met because I cannot tell from a distance what motivates them to study what they do. For that reason, I will limit the possible candidates to the one’s that I have met.

Of the communication scholars I have met, the one I most admire is Mark L. Knapp. There are several reasons for this. First, with his relational trajectory model, I believe he has tapped into something that most people can understand and relate. Communication scholarship specifically, and education in general, must be an end in itself. Scholarship must promote itself in order to continue the search for knowledge. My bias on this matter is that we will always have more to learn. However, one important purpose of scholarship is to make knowledge known to others. In two years of teaching interpersonal communication, Knapp's relational trajectories model is one part of communication scholarship that has been easy to understand and grasp for undergraduate students. Indeed, the majority of relationship analysis papers I have received from students have used this model. Two things are being accomplished with this: (a) students learn an appreciation for what we do as communication scholars, and (b) ultimately the model, and other communication studies, are taken back to the real world as methods for helping individuals develop more healthy and functional relationships. I personally believe that this second point is extremely important in our world. As you are aware, I may have motivation for making this world a better place to live. And, ineffective communication strategies contribute to dysfunction and fragmentation in our society and world. For example, (an example which I have used in class) the riots in Los Angeles and throughout the country following are not isolated incidents but rather a symptom of a very large problem which has been plaguing our country since at least the Watts riots, and probably longer. That is, the tendency for our society to deal with uncomfortable reality, such as the discrepancy between have and have not, by denying the problem exists. I have learned through studying interpersonal communication that this is not an effective strategy for building relationships. If it does not work at the micro level, certainly it cannot work at the macro level.

Given this example, I believe disseminating knowledge of what we have learned about communication to the masses is very important. Mark Knapp accomplished this goal, in a small way, by making the theory understandable.

Along those lines, when Mark Knapp visited campus, he gave a talk about relational commitment. It is an important topic, and he made it understandable.
Many of my students commented on how easy it was to follow what he was saying. If this was the case, then maybe the students got the point.

In talking to Dr. Honeycutt about Knapp's arrival, Honeycutt intimated to me that Mark Knapp was his mentor. He also told me that Knapp developed his theory after going through a separation. This, of course, is third-party information. However, I think there is something to say about theorizing about a personal experience. I remember Michael Adee once telling me that it is difficult to do research on a topic that one is personally involved in because it is difficult to be objective. However, I dispute the notion, for philosophical reasons outside the scope of this essay, that anyone can be totally objective about any subject matter. And, I also think an individual who has been through an experience has a unique perspective that cannot be seen from outside. Yet, the fruit on one's scholarship should be judged by how well it explains phenomena. Even if Mark Knapp experienced relational dissolution first hand, his students understand it, and that is what education is all about. For those reasons, I respect and admire the scholarship of Mark Knapp.