Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

7-16-1986

A Contextual Analysis of Selected Communication Strategies Associated With Dyadic and Situation Characteristics: A Field Study

Gisele Marie Tierney
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Tierney, Gisele Marie, "A Contextual Analysis of Selected Communication Strategies Associated With Dyadic and Situation Characteristics: A Field Study" (1986). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3653.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5537>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Gisele Marie Tierney for the Master of Science in Speech Communication presented July 16, 1986.

Title: A Contextual Analysis of Selected Communication Strategies
Associated with Dyadic and Situational Characteristics:
A Field Study.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Theodore G. Grove, Chair

Elaine E. Limbaugh

Larry Steward

A contextual analysis investigation of related communication acts is concerned with the multidimensional nature of human interdependence. The communication strategy is a category of relational communication acts that can be viewed as one of the ways in which interactants promote or maintain a working consensus and enhance interpersonal discovery. Strategy use is motivated by the nature of the relationship rather than by the speaker's conscious attempts to direct outcomes.

A wide range of interconnected situational variables contributes

significantly to frequency of strategy use in message exchanges. Interactants use strategies according to perceived situational appropriateness which entails a process contributing to overall communicator competence.

The contextual analysis method of investigation for this study employed a participant-observer field study to gain the widest understanding of communication behavior in process. An observation form was developed as a recording instrument to use in a self-report method of data collection. Participant-observers (PO's) were recruited and trained in all facets of data collection in the field. The data were coded and analyzed according to frequency, demographic, and situational breakdowns. Outcomes were discussed with implications for situational appropriateness, contextual meaning, and overall communicator competence.

The findings here indicated that normative strategy use could be suggested according to frequency, and implications for the competent communicator could be drawn. Communication competence was indicated as the ability to employ communication strategies according to situational appropriateness.

Strategy use was described as a socially learned behavior and normative use as a social requirement. Situations in which most strategy uses are expected, then, are those interactions that occur between friends who share in equity, not only in level of power, but in the direction of the conversation.

These findings were unexpected since the known situational

variables used in this study are somewhat contradictory. Differential power levels were expected to produce the highest frequency. For example, locus of control, level of power, and relationship were expected to be weighted, according to the user, as not being in control, having a lower level of power, and being a subordinate. When viewed in this way, strategy use is a negative, but necessary measure for people at a disadvantage. As already stated, the most frequent uses occurred when both parties were in control, of equal level of power and friends.

For the most part, the frequency of strategy use for women and men was the same, except in the cases where they reported inequitable situations. Women used strategies, men did not, when their positions were higher than their partners' positions. When they reported to be in a lower position, women and men used more strategies than did their partners, but men far surpassed women in frequency. Each of these results was surprising since the literature does not predict such outcomes.

Strategy use in friendship relationships fosters interpersonal satisfaction and therefore is helpful to promote and maintain friendships. Strategy use may thus be seen as a positive and necessary measure that recognizes and acknowledges human interdependence.

This study aimed at discovering what relationship exists between frequency and known situational variables. Otherwise stated, this study intended to identify the situational demands that are present in dyadic interactions. The utilization of the contextual analysis successfully provided a much-needed multidimensional overview of the phenomena of

relational communication strategies.

A CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES
ASSOCIATED WITH DYADIC AND SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:
A FIELD STUDY

by
GISELE MARIE TIERNEY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University

1986

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Gisele Marie Tierney presented July 16, 1986.

Theodore G. Grove, Chairman

Elaine E. Limbaugh

Larry Steward

APPROVED:

Theodore G. Grove, Head, Department of Speech Communication

Bernard Ross, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank my husband, Alan Pennington, for his help, encouragement, and pride in my endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
 CHAPTER	
I PURPOSE	1
Introduction	1
Communication Strategies and Communicator Competence	5
II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	7
Review of Relational Communication Acts Research .	7
A Review of Communication Strategies	10
Review of Situational Variables	15
Appropriateness and Communication Competence . . .	16
Situational Appropriateness	18
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	20
Method Overview	20
Contextual Analysis Method	21
Participant-Observer Selection	23
Development of Recording Instrument	24
Item 1: Strategy User	
Item 2: Strategy Type	
Item 3: Minute of Strategy Use	
Item 4: General Description of Purpose	

	Item 5: Initiator of Interaction	
	Item 6: Length of Interaction	
	Item 7: Satisfaction of Self and Item 8: Satisfaction of Other	
	Item 9: Locus of Control in this Episode	
	Item 10: Your Characteristic Power with Other	
	Item 11: Relationship to Other and Item 12: Your Characteristic Familiarity with Other	
	Item 13: Overall Significance	
	Item 14: General Description of Location and Item 15: Level of Formality	
	Item 16: Sex of Other	
	Item 17: Age of Other	
	Recording Procedures	33
	Participant-Observer Training	36
	Participant-Observer Booklet	
	Video Training Tape	
	First Training Session	
	Second Training Session	
	Data Analysis Procedures	40
	Summary	40
IV	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	41
	Design	41
	Reliability Tests	42
	Assessment of Interrater Reliability	
	Assessment of Occurrence/Nonoccurrence Observations	
	Results: Communication Strategy Use	45
	Demographics	
	Overview of Frequency and Strategy Type	
	Overview of Frequency According to Sex	
	Overview of Frequency and Miscellaneous Subitems	
	Summary	70
	Situational Appropriateness and Communicative Competence	

Strategy Frequency, Appropriateness, and
Competence

V	LIMITATIONS AND SUMMARY	76
	Limitations and Recommendations	76
	Summary	77
	REFERENCES	80
	APPENDICES	83
	A - Original Observation Form	84
	B - Participant-Observer Booklet	85
	C - Scripts for Video Training Tape	97
	D - Second Script for First Reliability Test	103
	E - Cohen's Kappa Statistic on Data from Study	104
	F - Script for Second Reliability Test	105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	General Description of Purpose and Strategy Type . . .	48
II	General Description of Purpose and Strategy User . . .	50
III	PO's Relationships to Partners and Percent for Strategy Type	53
IV	Initiator of Interaction and Strategy User	54
V	Locus of Control and Strategy Type	56
VI	Locus of Control and User	57
VII	PO's Characteristic Power with Partners and Strategy Type	58
VIII	PO's Characteristic Power with Partner and Strategy User	60
IX	Average Strategy Uses According to PO Sex	62
X	Frequency of Strategy Use According to Sex, User, and Locus of Control	64
XI	Frequency of Strategy Use According to Sex, User, and Characteristic Level of Power	65
XII	Frequency of Strategy Use and Satisfaction of Interactants	69

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Observation Form	25
2. Summary Matrix for Assessment of Cohen's Kappa on Interrater Reliability	44

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE

INTRODUCTION

The essence of human experience is interdependence; one person's relational outcomes are dependent on another, just as the other's outcomes are affected by one's own behavior (Goffman, 1971; Baxter, 1984). The communicative ability to get another to do what one wants is an essential skill for participating in society (Weinstein, 1966). One avenue of study that communication researchers have taken to examine this interdependent nature of participation in society is through relational communication acts.

Relational communication act research developed out of the distinction between two levels of communication from Bateson's (1972) research where all message exchanges contain a "report" level which carries digital information and a "command" level which implies how that information is to be taken. Relational communication acts are those acts in the command level of message exchange that are metacommunicational; that is, they classify the content of the message. For example, a mother might say to her child, "Listen to me right now!"

Relational communication theorists refer to "control aspects" in message exchange as those aspects by which interactants reciprocally define the nature of their relative position or dominance in their

interaction (Rogers and Farace, 1975). Burgoon and Hale (1984) state, "Relational subtexts may color readings of verbal discourse; they may reveal hidden agendas, and they may serve as true causes of observed phenomena." Thus communication acts, as command or control aspects in message exchange, function to reveal relational information.

Relational communication acts research has taken a variety of approaches, some of which are: the communication strategy (Eakins and Eakins, 1978); the interpersonal tactic (Weinstein, 1966); alignment talk (Ragan and Hopper, 1981); and compliance-gaining techniques (Tracy et al., 1984; Baxter, 1984). Communication acts are separated into implicit and explicit categories. For example, the tag question from Eakins and Eakins (1978) communication strategies is an explicit communication act as seen in "It is cold, isn't it?" The extra words "isn't it" compose the communication act. In another example, an appeal to esteem is an implicit communication act as seen in "If you drive the 40 miles in the snow to get the proposal delivered before the deadline, the board will be very pleased." This communication act is an appeal to esteem, one of the compliance-gaining strategies discussed by Tracy et al. (1984).

This study explored the various relational communication act categories, but focused primarily on the communication "strategies" from Eakins and Eakins; the term "communication strategy" will be used hereinafter. The reader should anticipate a potential misunderstanding deriving from the connotation of "strategy" as a conscious, preplanned device in everyday language usage. The term "strategy" used here refers

only to those communication behaviors that occur outside awareness.

This present study, employing Eakins and Eakins' categories of communication strategies, addressed the question of how individuals use strategies in everyday dyadic interactions. Specifically, what is the relationship between frequency of communication strategy use and relational, situational variables (i.e., age, sex, significance of message, etc), and what are the implications of frequency of strategy use with respect to situational appropriateness? In short, this work aspires to a contextual analysis (Jones and Yarbrough, 1985) of selected communication strategies.

The selection of Eakins and Eakins' categories of communication strategies from among the several category systems of relational communication strategies was determined in order to facilitate the contextual analysis approach in this investigation. Eakins and Eakins' categories of strategies, generated by relational communication act theory, provide the framework from which the present study was performed.

Intrinsic to our understanding of strategies is that they occur in the context of an interaction that reflects the existing relationship development between interactants. Weinstein (1966) and Baxter (1984) indicate that as interactors, we constantly employ strategies as we go about the business of living and trying to "get along." Further, these strategies are well designed to elicit responses from others. They are not used because we are aware of their tactical advantages or disadvantages, but because we have learned that they are situationally

appropriate (Weinstein, 1966). This is consistent with Bateson's (1972) analysis of the command level of message exchange, wherein almost all communication has to do with labeling contexts and patterns of relationships. To use the previous example of the tag question, the use of "isn't it" at the end of "It is cold" functions to "acknowledge" and thereby maintain the existing relationship.

Relational communication act research indicates that frequency of strategy use occurs differentially among individuals (Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Ragan and Hopper, 1981; Fishman, 1982; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Pearson, 1985) and is influenced by situational factors (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1971; Rogers and Farace, 1976; Ragan and Hopper, 1981; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Burgoon and Hale, 1984; Donahue, 1985). However, it is unclear how specific strategy use varies among individuals, how individuals respond differently in different situations, or what such differences may mean to the interactants.

For example, there are indications that women use strategies more frequently than do men. In fact, gender is frequently a consideration in communication strategy research. Eakins and Eakins (1968), Lakoff (1973), Fishman (1982), and Pearson (1985) all suggest that women use strategies more frequently during interactions with men than during interactions with other women. Sattel (1982) suggests that men may use strategies more frequently during interactions with other men than during interactions with women. However, there are no data available to support that these contentions are valid for situations beyond those circumscribed contexts provided by a few laboratory investigations. Nor

is there an analysis that satisfactorily explains why such differences would exist.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND COMMUNICATOR COMPETENCE

There are implications that the frequency of strategy use may be an indicator of communication competence (Weinstein, 1966; Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Lustig and King, 1980; Tracy et al., 1984). Eakins and Eakins suggest that overuse may indicate that the speaker is uninteresting and incapable of making decisions, both of which represent a relatively low communication competence. However, they also predict that strategy use will be the orientation of the future, due to increased emphasis on communicator competence (Eakins and Eakins, 1978). Such use may promote getting along in groups and achieving cooperation, interpersonal discovery and self-expression, all of which are correlates of relatively high communication competence.

Weinstein (1966), Goffman (1971), and Eakins and Eakins (1978) claim that all interactants use strategies at one time or another, but it remains to be determined whether a normative use does indeed exist. That is, are there conditions wherein strategies are relationally "required"? Weinstein states that interactors use strategies not to influence others, but rather to establish a working consensus. Goffman describes "working consensus" as a "tacit agreement as to whose claims to what issues will be honored." The working consensus necessarily involves agreement upon the social identities of the participants. Therefore, strategies are used to promote or maintain the working

consensus.

Further, Lustig and King (1980) describe the competent communicator as "one who, at minimum, possesses a broad communication repertoire, the requisite skills to choose among the available communication options in a particular situation." And finally, Burgoon and Hale (1984) suggest that communication competence could be a person's ability to send and recognize relational communication messages. Thus, communicator competence can be discussed as the ability of a person to appropriately utilize message options, thereby effectively promoting or maintaining the working consensus.

After briefly introducing some relational communication act research for a broad view of this phenomena, a review of Eakins and Eakins' (1978) categories of strategies will be discussed with respect to the relational "influence" that strategy use may have on message content. Related work on situational appropriateness, communication competence, and situational variables will be reviewed as well. Finally, some background on the method of contextual analysis, which has particular importance for this study, is presented.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

REVIEW OF RELATIONAL COMMUNICATION ACTS RESEARCH

Drawing on the work of Lakoff (1973) and Stokes and Hewitt (1975), Eakins and Eakins (1978) define communication strategies as techniques of communication that promote getting along with members in a group and achieving cooperation, interpersonal discovery and self-expression. Individuals use "tag questions," "lengthening of requests," "qualifiers," "fillers," and "disclaimers" which stress "the goals and welfare of the group, self-realization and the importance of who one is, rather than what one has accomplished." Further, Eakins and Eakins describe these techniques as "systems prescribed for lower-ranking members of our society." Each of these communication strategies will be discussed in detail in the following section.

In his work on interpersonal tactics, Weinstein (1966) tackled the question, "How do people go about the business of getting others to do, think, or feel what they want them to?" Weinstein defines interpersonal tactics as the ways that interactants manage the problem of "evaluative implication" in everyday social intercourse. He maintains that individuals bring personal purpose into all interactions and that "Interpersonal tasks are pursued (and sometimes even formulated) in encounters." Thus, by using the pre-interpretation, post-

interpretation, pre-apology, motive revelation and identity confirmation categories of interpersonal tactics, an individual "maximizes the likelihood of task success by insuring appropriate interpretation." Note the following illustrations of Weinstein's categories:

1. "I know you didn't mean to do this, but you erased my file."
(pre-interpretation)
2. "No, no it's all right; I can easily do it over." (post-interpretation)
3. "I've never used this text before, so please bear with me."
(pre-apology)
4. There are four sub-categories of "motive revelations":
 - a. "I know you may think I'm rude when I say this."
(personalized revelations)
 - b. "I couldn't finish this paper because my roommate locked me out of our apartment." (depersonalized revelations)
 - c. "Therefore I think it is important for you to hear what I have to say." (altruistic revelations)
 - d. "So you must understand this!" (involvement revelation)
5. "I studied with Jane Smart at Highpower University" (identity confirmation)

The concept of "alignment," from Stokes and Hewitt (1976), is based on a series of symbolic interactionist studies on "motive talk." Whenever one explains one's acts to others, one must sample from a vocabulary of motives for the terms of that explanation (Ragan and

Hopper, 1981). Motive talk, disclaimers and accounts are descriptive of the communication acts featured in alignment talk. Ragan and Hopper (1981) explain the use of alignment talk as a necessary function of relational exchange where "communicators frequently take time out from talk about other matters to clarify to each other what they are doing and how their actions square with social norms."

Research on compliance-gaining communication acts utilizes Goffman's (1967) work on "impression management" and "face work," wherein Goffman claims that individuals project particular impressions; that is, a person may wish another to think highly of her, or to think that she thinks highly of them, or to perceive how in fact she feels toward them, or to obtain no clear-cut impression whatsoever. Brown and Levinson (1978), in their work based on Goffman's idea of impression management and face work, contend that there are two types of face present in all human exchanges: positive face--whether one feels liked, respected and/or valued by one other, and negative face--whether one feels constrained or restricted in one's actions with a loss of autonomy or freedom.

Thus in compliance-gaining research, politeness strategies and strategies of request formation are used by interactants whenever someone has a request to make of another person, because negative face is challenged to some extent (Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). The request, Baxter states, automatically constrains the other's autonomy of action. Positive face may also be challenged depending on the nature of the request; a request may imply that the other person's attitude/action

is not liked or respected. An individual is less likely to be cooperative if her face has been threatened; thus individuals use face redress or politeness strategies in their discourse.

Summarizing these approaches to relational communication acts research, strategy use is an indication that the speaker desires to communicate to the hearer that her intentions are honorable, non-threatening respectful, etc. Thus communication strategy use can be viewed as the subconscious desire to appear to facilitate honorable, nonthreatening, respectful impressions during interpersonal encounters.

A REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

A brief review of Eakins and Eakins' (1978) categories of communication strategies will provide information regarding actual strategy use and implications for relational involvement and perception of appropriateness. These communication strategies are explicit; that is, they are identifiable "extra" words in message exchange. Their uttered character separates them from compliance-gaining and alignment talk strategies which are implicit. This implicit characteristic is also an important feature in the present study since the procedure for collecting data required people to recognize these "extra" words. The communication strategies used here comprise the following five categories: tag question, qualifier, lengthening of request, filler, and disclaimer.

The tag question is a device employed in the mode of politeness which serves to foster the appearance that the speaker is avoiding

making strong statements. The tag question in the following example, "This is rotten weather, isn't it?" falls between an outright statement and a question. The speaker does not force belief or agreement on the listener; rather, the tag question requests belief or agreement. Eakins and Eakins state that the use of tag questions is helpful in conflict situations to avoid escalations or unpleasant confrontations.

Qualifiers are devices which soften or blunt the impact of what is said. They are used to avoid negative or unwanted reactions to the speaker's message. Qualifiers make statements less absolute in tone, making the speaker sound tentative as seen in the following comparison, "You shouldn't do that," versus "It seems to me you shouldn't do that." The speaker in both examples is making a statement of belief or opinion to the listener. However, in the former, the speaker imposes belief on the listener in a demand of agreement, while in the second, the speaker suggests agreement, allowing the listener to make the decision on her own. Qualifiers function to protect or enhance the identity of the speaker and/or the listener. The use of qualifiers, Eakins and Eakins state, is seen as an appropriate measure when one wishes to soften potential negative reactions to what one says or to break some social rules without evoking an angry reaction.

Lengthening of requests are devices used in the mode of politeness through the addition of extra words within the sentence structure. Eakins and Eakins explain that the shorter the request, the more force it appears to convey; and the longer the request, the less the speaker appears to press for agreement or compliance by the listener. This

allows the listener to feel free to make the decision without constraint. Note the following comparison, "Do you want to see this movie?" versus "I was wondering if you thought you might like to see this movie?" In the first question, the speaker appears straightforward, while in the second, the speaker appears tentative. This device is useful in situations where bluntness could trigger hostility, anger or irrational outbursts from listeners. Eakins and Eakins claim that lengthening of requests are employed as a way to make one's wishes or needs heard in a situation where the speaker does not hold the power or autonomy.

The filler is a verbalization which, when employed, conveys lack of assertiveness, hesitancy and increased responsiveness. Note the following comparisons, "I want to see this movie," versus "I think that I uhm want to see this movie." In the first sentence a straightforward statement is made; and in the second, the speaker appears hesitant. Eakins and Eakins claim that the use of fillers tends to weaken the force of the utterance from the listener's perspective.

The disclaimer is similar to the qualifier in that it provides a prior message to the listener that may prepare the listener for the coming message. Unlike the qualifier, the disclaimer functions as an apology. Note the following comparisons, "Let's go see this movie," versus "You're probably not in the mood, but let's go see this movie." In the first example, the speaker makes a straightforward statement; and in the second, the speaker does not appear to press for compliance as strongly. The use of disclaimers requests that others refrain from

negatively evaluating the speaker, thereby separating a possible negative evaluation of her actions from her identity.

When these strategies are applied to primary messages, a variety of impressions is created. Note the following impressions based on the sentence, "Let's have cake."

1. "It seems to me we could have cake." (Qualifier)
2. "Don't you think it would be nice if we could have cake?"
(Lengthening of request)
3. "We could have cake, couldn't we?" (Tag question)
4. "We uhm could have cake." (Filler)
5. "You're probably full, but we could have cake." (Disclaimer)

In a dyadic encounter, a relational interpretation or impression of such strategy uses is implied. The following examples and interpretations illustrate these implications:

1. "It is hot!" (All things being equal, this is a statement of fact.)
2. "It is hot, isn't it?" (Using a tag question, the speaker requests the listener to confirm the speaker's perception of the temperature.)

In #1, the speaker would be projecting her judgement of "hot" to the listener, whereas in #2, the speaker would be projecting uncertainty and regard of the listener's opinion over her own.

3. "Here's your dessert." (All things being equal, this is a statement of fact.)

4. "I've only cooked this once, but here's your dessert." (Using a disclaimer, the speaker requests the listener, as the receiver of the dessert, to refrain from thinking of the speaker, who created the dessert, negatively in the event the dessert turns out poorly. Or, this is a covert request for praise.)

In #3, the speaker would be projecting her own interpretation of dessert to the listener. In #4, the speaker would be projecting uncertainty and a need for the listener to regard her positively, regardless of how the dessert turns out. Or, the speaker would be eliciting from the listener need of recognition of the act of cooking the dessert.

5. "Can you attend the conference?" (All things being equal, this is a request regarding the attendance at an event.)
6. "I was just wondering if it is possible for you to attend the conference?" (Using a lengthening of request, the speaker asks the listener to regard the speaker as not pressuring or pressing for compliance and appears to be coaxing the listener.)

In #5, the speaker is expressing her own curiosity to the listener. In #6, the speaker is expressing her reluctance to embrace a position of authority, leaving that option to the listener. Or, the speaker is expressing her desire for agreement from the listener without appearing to be doing so.

The communication strategies defined here are representative of the many categories of communication acts wherein strategy use is motivated

by the nature of the relationship rather than by the speaker's conscious attempts to direct outcomes. Referring again to Goffman, interactors use communication strategies in order to promote or maintain a working consensus (Goffman, 1971).

REVIEW OF SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

The influence of gender as a situational variable is often mentioned in relational communication research, although it is rarely a focal point (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1967; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). When gender is used as a research variable, it is often linked to status (Fishman, 1982; Pearson, 1985; Donahue et al., 1985). However, as previously mentioned, it is not clear how or in what ways gender influences communication outcomes.

Status and dominance are frequently used as situational variables, sometimes referred to as bases of power, rights to resist, locus of control or identity management (Goffman, 1967; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenk-Hamlin, 1981; Jackson and Backus, 1982; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Burgoon and Hale, 1984).

A wide range of other interpersonal variables have been identified and examined. Some of these are intimacy, degree of interpersonal relationship, stranger/personal dimensions, familiarity, relational consequences, formality and trust (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1967; Lakoff, 1973; Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Clark, 1979; Lustig and King, 1980; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenk-Hamlin, 1981; Jackson and Backus, 1982; Sattel, 1982; Fishman, 1982; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair,

1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Pearson, 1985; Donahue et al., 1985).

The variables chosen for the present study are representative of the research variables mentioned above in that these situational factors have been found to directly impinge on communication choices. These variables have also been discussed in Burgoon and Hale's (1984) extensive overview of relational communication research where they compiled 12 topoi for relational communication messages. These relational themes include: dominance-submission, intimacy, emotional arousal, composure, similarity, formality, and task-social orientation.

Burgoon and Hale's topoi are analytically inclusive of the above research variables and, in fact, lend credibility to the repetitive use of these variables in relational act research. However, assessing interpersonal effects becomes difficult when considering the large number of these interconnected variables.

APPROPRIATENESS AND COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) describe communicator competence as the process whereby interactants shape interpersonal impressions and derive satisfactory outcomes. They maintain that competence is reflective of the existing relationship. "Competence itself is a dyadic or interpersonal impression and must include the perspective of both interactants." They have identified four components of competence which they regard as critical when analyzing communicator competence: motivation, knowledge, skills, and outcomes. They illustrate:

Person A is more likely to create impressions of appropriateness and effectiveness and achieve functional outcomes if she is motivated to interact with person B, in context C, at time T; is knowledgeable about person B, context C, and topical subject S; and is skilled behaviorally in enacting these knowledge and motivational states.

This is consistent with Eakins and Eakins' (1978) view of strategy use as that which facilitates interpersonal cooperation, interpersonal discovery and self-expression and with Weinstein's (1966) view of strategy use as the way in which interactors manage the relationship between the participants while pursuing goals.

Tracy et al. (1984) suggest that people do not possess this skill in equal measure: "Some do it very well; others terribly. Unfortunately the consequences of not performing the communication act successfully may be severe." Goffman (1971) claims that the seriousness of being in "wrong face" occurs when a person feels ashamed and inferior over what may have happened in the activity at hand and what may subsequently happen to the person's reputation as a participant. Goffman maintains that a person's manner and bearing may falter, collapse and crumble, resulting in a momentary incapacitation as an interactant.

Given the potential for punishment for "wrong face," how effective or competent people are in maintaining face in their communicative abilities is an important question to pursue. However, according to Tracy et al. (1984), "What accounts as effectiveness in one situation

may not in another." Situational variability complicates finding an answer to how people maintain face. Lustig and King (1980) agree:

" . . . the competent communicator is one who, at minimum, possesses a broad communication repertoire, the requisite skills to choose among the available communication options in a particular situation. . . ."

Therefore, discovery of when individuals use communication strategies will provide insight into how people manage face in a variety of situations.

SITUATIONAL APPROPRIATENESS

Communication researchers agree that strategy use is one of the ways in which we attempt to get along with one another, but it is unclear when strategy use is employed. That is, in what situations do interactants appropriately use strategies? The issue of appropriateness has been addressed by Goffman (1977): "One's own face and the face of others are constructs of the same order; it is the rules of the group and the definition of the situation which determine how much feeling one is to have for face and how this feeling is to be distributed among the faces involved." Tracy et al. (1984) contend that situations where requests are made have hierarchical elements and are conducive to strategy use: "Requests for favors almost always contain altruism strategies; that is, speakers ask listeners to comply for the benefit of speakers."

Eakins and Eakins suggest that low-ranking people use strategies in order to suggest or request rather than make direct statements or

commands. Tracy et al. posit two components of request formation that are consistent with Eakins and Eakins' suggestions. A speaker must establish some reason for making the request, and an inquiry is present regarding the listener's willingness to perform the requested act. The inquiry about willingness is thought to be the "speaker's attempt, given the context of the relationship and the act, to identify one's action as a request rather than some other type of directive such as one that presupposes an obligation to comply (a command)."

Much research suggests that people are heavily constrained by the nature of the situation (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1967; Ragan and Hopper, 1981; Tracy et al., 1984; Baxter, 1984). Factors of status, gender and role obligations may be governing elements in this constraint, which may indicate that there are systematic ways in which situations influence what speakers must say in order to ensure that their messages are interpreted appropriately (Weinstein, 1966; Eakins and Eakins 1978; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Pearson, 1985). Communication strategy use suggests that we as interactors place a relatively high degree of significance on situational appropriateness. Implications can be drawn for normative strategy use which in turn may indicate communication competence.

Human interdependence is manifested in a complex system of communication behaviors. We can unravel some of this complexity and learn from observing how strategies are used in a variety of situations, thereby gaining insight regarding appropriateness and communicator competence through examination of strategy use.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

METHOD OVERVIEW

The overall method of investigation for this study is based on the contextual analysis method developed by Jones and Yarbrough (1985) in their research on the meanings of touch. Their method, employing a participant-observation technique, was adapted from a traditional approach (Scheflen, 1973) wherein visual and auditory records of events were obtained and then analyzed to draw information regarding "behavior in context."

Recording procedures and the recording instrument for this study were derived from the Jones and Yarbrough instrument. However, it was necessary to modify their procedures and instrument in order to accommodate the distinct elements of communication strategy use in dyadic interactions for the present study.

The present study also utilized participant-observers (PO's) who were trained through the use of a training booklet, a video training tape and discussions to observe and record communication strategies as they occurred in their dyadic interactions. PO's participated in two training sessions and a one-week practice period before beginning two weeks of final data collection. The data were coded and analyzed to explore frequency and contextuality of communication strategy usage.

CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS METHOD

Communication is a process which occurs in a context, and outcomes are mutually created by the interactants. Thus, static communication contexts for communication strategy research, wherein only a few variables can be manipulated, leave researchers questioning validity and result in somewhat limited information regarding strategy use. The rating of pre-formed messages and subject generation of messages in response to pre-formed situations has been utilized. However, these approaches have not resolved the inherent problem of static contexts. (See McLaughlin, Cody, and O'Hair, 1983; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin, 1981; Jackson and Backus, 1982; Jackson and Jacobs, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Burleson, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; and Donohue et al., 1985).

Jackson and Jacobs (1983) argue that this common research practice creates problems for internal and external validity: " . . . one serious design flaw, which involves use of a single message to represent a category of messages, occurs in nearly all of the experimental research on communication effects." They claim that the most common random effect in communication is the subject, and "variance due to differences between subjects within the same experimental condition is regarded as unexplained (i.e., error)." Generalizability is limited under these research conditions. Thus, information regarding who is using communication strategies, in what contexts, and with whom is also limited.

Further, message variables present an inferential problem because

researchers are not investigating the properties of particular messages but rather generalizations about abstract categories of messages.

"Within the traditional view, language and message samples would almost always have to be considered fixed because of the arbitrary way in which the samples are collected or constructed" (Jackson and Jacobs, 1983).

Burgoon and Hale (1984) note that there is danger in embracing reductive perspectives because the resulting body of relational communication research may be too narrow and simplistic, masking the "diversity of relational message themes . . . and may lead to an underestimation of how much relational meaning is present in a typical exchange." For these reasons, a contextual analysis method was applied in the present study in order to address the widest possible range of situational variables.

Jones and Yarbrough (1985) provide an analysis of the contextual model that is useful here: " . . . the fact that each form of touch does not have a single interpretation does not show that touches cannot have clear meanings." Rather, they suggest that touches may have a variety of precise meanings which could be examined and identified if the context of each touch could be identified.

Given the interpersonal dimensions discussed here, it might be that strategy use provides a rich variety of precise and contextually interpretable interpersonal meanings. Scheflen (1973) states, "A basic tenet of the method is that the meaning of an event may be abstracted by seeing it in context." Scheflen regards the contextual analysis method as a study of behavioral integration, "a study of how communicative

behaviors are integrated to enact social process."

Tucker et al. (1981), in their evaluation of current status and trends in communication research, find that researchers need to deal with both a definitional problem that affects research and with a methodological problem that affects what research questions can be raised. They claim that communication researchers make assumptions about communication but then violate those assumptions in research. They write, " . . . we need to find, develop, and employ methods to investigate relationship messages of control, complementarity, and symmetry, the sequential structure of interaction, and communication as it develops over time." Thus, if communication behavior is largely context-specific, some attempt to grapple with naturalistic field observations must be made.

Burgoon and Hale (1984) support this notion in their review of relational communication research, stating that much research "points to the existence of a constellation of relational message themes that play a primary role in social relationships." Therefore, they reasonably speculate that a "fundamental set of relational message categories inheres in interpersonal exchanges." Future research, they recommend, must aim at examining a "multi-faceted prism." Thus, it is appropriate that relational communication strategy research move in the direction of contextual analysis to uncover the richness of that prism.

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER SELECTION

Participant-observers were chosen from the graduate student

population in the Department of Speech Communication at Portland State University. The age range of the seven women and two men was 24 to 47. All of the PO's, with the exception of one, were graduate teaching assistants at the time of the study, or had been in the previous year.

This sample was selected because these people have a substantial knowledge of the communication process and the proven capability to be trained to recognize the five categories of communication strategies and their use in conversations. However, as graduate students, they were also fairly new professionals in the communication field and therefore brought some of the advantages of the naive-observer perspective to the data collection process for this field experiment. And finally, they could be counted on to take the project seriously and try their best to record data carefully and honestly.

DEVELOPMENT OF RECORDING INSTRUMENT

The recording instrument consisted of the Observation Form displayed in Figure 1. It was largely based on the format of the Jones and Yarbrough (1985) instrument. Jones and Yarbrough found that a condensed one-page version of the form facilitated the recording of events. The items were ordered on the form so that those elements of the interaction which might be easily forgotten could be recorded first.

The form is divided into "A" and "B" sections. Section A included information relevant to each strategy occurrence; e.g., PO's noted "Strategy User" as "me" or "other." Section B included information pertaining to the interactors and the interaction as a whole--

OBSERVATION FORM

Name _____
 Date _____
 Interaction _____
 Strategy # _____

SECTION A

1. <u>Strategy User</u>
_____ me
_____ other | 2. <u>Strategy Type</u>
_____ qualifier
_____ length. of request
_____ tag question
_____ filler
_____ disclaimer | 3. <u>Minute of Strategy Use (Approx.)</u>
_____ minute | 4. <u>General Description of Purpose (Note "S" and "O")</u>
_____ give information
_____ receive information
_____ make a request
_____ receive a request
_____ small talk
_____ spontaneous talk
_____ greeting
_____ departing |
|--|--|--|--|

SECTION B

5. <u>Initiator of Interaction</u>
_____ me
_____ other
_____ mutual	6. <u>Length of Interaction (Approx.)</u>
_____ minutes	7. <u>Overall Satisfaction of Self (Circle)</u>
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW	8. <u>Overall Satisfaction of Other (Circle)</u>
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW
9. <u>Locus of Control in this Episode</u>
_____ me
_____ other
_____ mutual	10. <u>Your Characteristic Power with Other</u>
_____ higher
_____ lower
_____ equal
_____ n/a	11. <u>Relationship to Other</u>
_____ relative
_____ friend
_____ non-friend
_____ acquaintance
_____ co-worker/peer
_____ superior
_____ subordinate
_____ stranger
_____ other	12. <u>Your Characteristic Familiarity w/Other</u>
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW
13. <u>Overall Significance (Circle)</u>
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW	14. <u>General Description of Location</u>
_____	15. <u>Level of Formality (Circle)</u>
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW	16. <u>Sex of Other</u>
_____ female
_____ male
17. <u>Age of Other (Approx.)</u>
_____ years	<u>NOTES:</u>		

Figure 1. Observation form.

information which did not necessitate repetition for every interaction, e.g., "Sex of Other."

The recording instrument was revised several times before the final Observation Form in Figure 1 was produced for the final data collection. The final revisions were made as a result of discussions and observations that took place during the first training session and in the week that followed. (See Appendix A for original Observation Form.) Elaboration of the items on the Observation Form follows.

Item 1: Strategy User (The PO notation of the strategy user)

While the observation form is designed for the PO self-report, the strategy user can be Other." The data collected when "other" uses the strategy might prove useful in understanding how self reacts to actual strategy use. All information recorded on the Observation Form was based on PO perception of the interaction regardless of who used the strategy.

Item 2: Strategy Type

The communication strategies used here were those described by Eakins and Eakins (1978). These include: "qualifiers," "tag questions," "fillers," "lengthening of requests," and "disclaimers." These strategies are the "extra" words in message exchange and comprise part of a family of relational communication messages that interactants use to define their relationship at a moment in time. These strategies were chosen over other possible relational message strategies because they appeared to be manageable; that is, they are explicit, and

therefore PO's could be trained to recognize them with a minimum of interpretation. They are representative of the many communication strategies that are defined as containing relational information and are not considered intentional word choices.

Item 3: Minute of Strategy Use

This item required the PO's to approximate when strategies occurred throughout their interactions. According to Goffman (1967), interactants go through an initial relational adjustment period, a "checking each other out" period. If so, strategy use may occur more frequently at the onset of the interaction than at any other time.

Item 4: General Description of Purpose

Purpose refers to the task-at-hand. Burgoon and Hale (1984) note that context refers not only to social factors, but to task factors as well. The task-oriented dimension here includes: the giving or receiving of information, the formulation or reception of a request, participation in small talk, participation in spontaneous talk, and the greeting or leave-taking part of the interaction.

This "at the moment" item is based on the assumption that strategy use, as an indicator of relational information, can be invoked at any time during an interaction. Donohue et al. (1985) state, " . . . that any given utterance can reveal a wide variety of information about the relationship the speaker assumes is in force at the time the utterance is presented."

After observing the difficulty that PO's had when practicing the

recording of purpose for the first 20 role-play sequences on the video training tape during the first training session, "small talk" and "spontaneous talk" were included in this item. It was agreed that some interactions did not necessarily involve the sub-items, giving or receiving of information. Therefore, "small talk" was included to encompass those interactions that involved "getting ready to talk," "weather talk," or "phatic talk" that often takes place at the onset of conversations. "Spontaneous talk" was included to encompass those interactions which involved spontaneous or chance meetings, such as in the hallway or elevator, and which were too short to be categorized as "small talk."

Since it was probable that interactants would have different purposes, PO's noted "s" (self) for their own purpose and "o" (other) for their perception of other's purpose, except where it would be possible for "s" and "o" to have the same purpose such as in the case of small talk or spontaneous talk.

Item 5: Initiator of Interaction

The initiator of an interaction exerts some degree of control over another person because attention is required in return and is therefore related to the dominance-submission dimension seen in relational communication research (Goffman, 1966; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). Knowing how we go about this kind of intrusion would be useful. That is, a pre-apology may be the requisite verbal behavior; and failing to use one would be rude, with implications for communication effectiveness. For example, greeting in the halls where both parties

intrude at the same time may require a mutual adjustment strategy; absence of one could cause an interpersonal misunderstanding. PO's designated which party initiated the interaction (me, other, mutual).

Item 6: Length of Interaction

PO's approximation of the length of the interaction is an attempt to gather a baseline for frequency of strategy use within a time frame (minutes) for interactions.

Item 7: Satisfaction of Self and Item 8: Satisfaction of Other

Level of satisfaction is concerned with the degree to which the subject feels that the task and the social goals were accomplished. Eakins and Eakins (1978) state that frequent users of strategies may also be defined as overusers and are perceived as lacking confidence, thereby creating questions of credibility (trust) in a listener's mind, in turn reducing the overall satisfaction of the interaction.

On the other hand, infrequent or underuse of strategies may be perceived as rude in particular contexts, thereby creating hostile feelings and again affecting overall satisfaction levels. PO's rated their own level of satisfaction with the overall outcome of the interaction and their perception of their partner's level of satisfaction on a scale of (1) low to (9) high.

Item 9: Locus of Control in this Episode

Locus of control refers to the interactant who appeared to the PO to be dominating, steering, guiding or directing the flow of the interaction. Locus of control is related to the power dimension (refer

to Item 10) in that control can refer to whether one is "in" or "out of" control of their own behavior. Locus of control is connected to Burgoon and Hale's (1984) discussion of composure or self-control and has been described as "rights to resist" by Jackson and Backus (1982). PO's noted their perception of who seemed to be in control of the interaction (self, other, mutual).

Item 10: Your Characteristic Power with Other

Level of power refers to perceived relational status which appears frequently as a variable in relational communication research (Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin, 1981; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). Status is connected to the dominance-submission or control dimension as a base of power. How status influences relational message outcomes is unclear as noted by Tracy et al. (1984), who found status to be an influencing factor in message choices but acknowledged that other situational variables also influence outcomes.

Since the communication strategies described here (refer to Item 2) appear to promote getting along by deferring to others (Eakins and Eakins, 1978), it is likely that a person of perceived lower status or power would use strategies more frequently than those of perceived higher status. Item 10 asked PO's to record the general history of power with other, that is who is psychologically more powerful in the relationship. PO's noted their characteristic or history of the level of power that they have in relation to other (higher, lower, equal). The sub-item, "N/A" (not applicable), was added to this item to

encompass stranger-to-stranger encounters where no history of power could be present. PO's recorded "N/A" when appropriate.

Item 11: Relationship to Other and Item 12: Your Characteristic Familiarity with Other

Interactants' relationship to each other has often been used as a research variable in communication research with varying degrees of success (Brown and Levinson, 1978; Clark, 1979; Sillars, 1980; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). It is important to discuss "familiarity" in terms of the relationship dimension, because the nature of relationships involves certain degrees of intimacy.

Since strategy use is defined by Eakins and Eakins (1978) as one of the ways in which interactants promote getting along, strategies might be used more frequently in relationships that "mattered" than in those that did not. The characteristic level of familiarity is essentially concerned with, "How well do you know other?"

In Item 11, PO's recorded the way in which they were related to other in terms of the sociologically-defined role relationship with other (relative, friend, non-friend, acquaintance, co-worker/peer, superior, subordinate, stranger, other). PO's recorded their characteristic level or history of familiarity with other along a scale of (1) low to (9) high.

Item 13: Overall Significance

Given the above discussion (Items 11 and 12), significance refers

to relational consequences; that is, self's perception that the outcome will have some degree of impact or significance on the future relationship of the interactants (future here referring to either minutes or years away). Significance or consequences has been found important in several relational communication studies (Clark, 1979; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin, 1981; Jackson and Backus, 1982; MaLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984).

It is reasonable to assume that strategy use would increase when significance of impact increases. There is some support for this assumption, as for example in Sillars' (1980) work on stranger/spouse strategy use wherein spouses used strategies more frequently than did strangers. PO's rated overall significance of the interaction on a scale of (1) low to (9) high.

Item 14: General Description of Location and Item 15: Level of Formality

Location and formality refer to the social environment as well as to the location where the interaction is taking place. Interactants may be very formal at a business meeting, then drop their formality when they go to lunch; the reverse is also possible. In any case, strategy use is expected to be influenced by the occasion resulting in differential strategy use among interactants. PO's noted in Item 14 where they were at the time of the interaction, and for Item 15 they rated their perception of the level of familiarity on a scale (1) low to (9) high.

Item 16: Sex of Other

P0's notation of the sex of other is based on the frequency of this variable's appearance in communication research (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1971; Lakoff, 1973; Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Fishman, 1982; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984; Donohue et al., 1985; Pearson, 1985). However, it is unclear whether the sex of the interactants influences strategy use. Lakoff (1973) and Eakins and Eakins (1978) suggest that women are less confident than men in their communication behavior and therefore use more strategies than men use.

The implications of this suggestion are confusing. On the one hand, strategy use is seen as a weakening factor, and on the other as useful in promoting the business of getting along. This ambiguity may indicate that the sex of the strategy user may reflect societal interpretation of strategy use rather than actual motives for strategy use. P0's recorded the sex of other.

Item 17: Age of Other

Age as a situational variable influencing strategy use has appeared in communication research (Burelson, 1984) and may be a factor of status along the dominance-submission dimension. Furthermore, those data may be more important for establishing age differences between interactants in relation to strategy use. P0's approximated and recorded the age of other.

RECORDING PROCEDURES

The procedures for recording strategy use events were outlined in

the Participant-Observer Booklet (see Appendix B) as an instructional basis for PO training. The following procedures reflect these instructions as well as the modifications that were made during the first training session and the practice week. PO's received verbal and written instructions regarding the revisions that were made.

PO's were instructed to record, with a few exceptions, every strategy use that occurred during their dyadic conversations. Those PO's who teach were told to omit strategy events that occurred during in-class interactions even if the interactions were dyadic. Dyadic interactions that occurred immediately before or after the class period were acceptable. In another exception, it was noted that since many of the PO's worked together, the data would be confounded by having two PO's reporting the same strategy use event. Therefore, PO's were told to omit any interactions that involved another participant in this study.

Two additional exceptions were specific to two individual PO's. One woman was temporarily working in a busy university office as a secretary/receptionist. She was instructed to omit strategy events that occurred in this capacity because her interactions were too homogenous and numerous. Further, the position was temporary and therefore outside her normal routine. The other PO was in the process of interviewing for employment. He was told to forego recording strategy events during these encounters.

In order to get the widest range of encounters, PO's were directed to include no more than three encounters with the same person. PO's

were also instructed to record in the "Note" section on the Observation Form when two different encounters involved the same person. Regarding lengthy interactions with the same person, PO's were told to limit reporting to a maximum of three strategy occurrences. For example, a couple who lives together is likely to have a series of interactions in one evening, and it would be difficult to discern one interaction from another.

PO's were instructed to immediately record the items in "Section A" when a strategy event occurred. "Other" was simply informed that the PO was involved in a communication behavior experiment. The items in "Section B" were filled out immediately after the interaction, when PO's were no longer in the presence of "other."

Since it was likely that more than one strategy would be used in one interaction, PO's were told to fill out Section A for each strategy event but Section B only once per interaction. Interactions were to be recorded using an alphabetized format, and strategy events within interactions were to be recorded numerically, as in the following examples: Interaction A, Strategy #3; Interaction F, Strategy #1; or Interaction M, Strategy #5.

All uses of "well" were omitted from the study since "well" is frequently used as a filler and at the beginning of qualifiers, disclaimers, and lengthening of requests. PO's were instructed to ignore all uses of "well."

The uses of "uhm" as fillers at the beginning of sentences were omitted from the study, since a legitimate filler literally must fill up

a sentence. The "uhms" used at the beginnings of sentences are often used by people to "get started" and are frequently considered to be disfluencies rather than fillers.

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER TRAINING

PO's were informed that they would be participating in a three-week experiment during which time they would identify the extra words in conversations that reveal relational information in order to discover when people use communication strategies. They were told that they would receive a booklet (Participant-Observer Booklet) describing the communication strategies in detail, the dimensions of their involvement, and instructions regarding recording procedures. They were also told that they would participate in two training sessions.

PO's were given the Participant-Observer Booklet several days before the first training session and were asked to complete their review of the booklet before the first training session. Two training sessions, a practice week, and reliability tests were completed before PO's began the actual data collection.

Participant-Observer Booklet

A Participant-Observer Booklet (see Appendix B) was designed to train PO's to recognize the five categories of communication strategies. The booklet included: an overview of the study, instructions regarding PO obligation and involvement, a self-inventory, definitions and illustrations of each of the five categories of strategies, a "quiz" designed to further illustrate the distinctions between the categories

and a test of P0's ability to recognize the strategies, directions on recording procedures for actual data collection, and detailed information on each item on the recording instrument (see Figure 1).

Video Training Tape

A video training tape was made to implement P0 training and one of the two reliability tests. Two scripts were written for the video tape (see Appendix C); the first consisted of 20 dyadic conversations. Four examples of each of the five categories of communication strategies incorporated some of the situational variables that appeared on the Observation Form. The second script consisted of a set of 20 one-sentence statements with four examples of each of the five categories of strategies.

The first part of the video training tape displayed two collaborating instructors who role-played the 20 dyadic conversations from the first script. The sequences were numbered, and the actors alternated playing "self." Index cards were used to make these designations. P0's were told to regard themselves as "self" when viewing the tape and during the scoring segment in the first training session. This part of the training tape was designed to train P0's to recognize the strategies embedded in a conversation context as well as the distinctions between the strategies. It was also used to train P0's to use the Observation Form.

The second segment of the training tape presented the same two collaborators who alternated stating the 20 strategy utterances from the second script. The purpose of the second test was to test P0

recognition of the strategy types in one of the reliability tests implemented during the second training session.

First Training Session

The first training session, a ninety-minute session, took place on April 16, 1986. PO's viewed the video training tape with the script of the role-played conversations in hand. The training tape was viewed again with script in hand, and the tape was stopped after the viewing of each set of the five strategy categories in order for a discussion and review to take place. On the third viewing of the training tape, PO's were asked to refrain from talking and to put the script aside. They were tested on their ability to recognize the strategy user, recognize the strategies and decide the purpose(s) of the interaction. They were provided with sample Observation Forms and told to fill out only Section A of the form. Scores and answers were discussed.

The discussion during this training session aimed at identifying the differences in strategies and possible situations where each might occur. The similarity of word choices in qualifiers and disclaimers was pointed out. It was clearly acknowledged that while there are many other communication strategies, this study was concerned with only the specified five strategy categories.

Clarifications were made regarding the items on the Observation Form, the recording procedures for the data collection, and the researcher's expectations of PO involvement. This training session was successful. By the end of the time period, PO's were creating their own examples and instructing each other in the distinctions among strategies.

PO's were then given 30 Observation Forms and directed to practice using the forms for the next seven days, according to recording procedures, as explained in their booklets and reviewed during this session. They were also told to approximate the number of interactions that they had during each day for this seven-day period.

Second Training Session

The final step in the training process was a second ninety-minute training session, which took place on April 23, 1986. This session began with a review and update of changes in recording procedures and the Observation Form.

PO's practice forms were collected. These were reviewed later that day, and individual comments on procedures were made to individual PO's. For example, one PO used a numbering system for designation of strategy occurrences where an alphabetized format had been designed.

PO's discussed various observations and/or problems that they experienced during the practice week. PO's unanimously agreed that the most difficult aspect so far was remembering to record strategy occurrences when they were engaged in highly important interactions (note Item 13 on Observation Form). PO's said that they either forgot or they were too embarrassed to use the forms during these encounters. Since Section A on the Observation Form required immediate response, PO's were asked to push themselves to record strategy occurrences during these encounters. PO's were reminded of the response they should give to "other" when they took time out to record (see recording procedures sections). PO's agreed to follow this advice.

The reliability tests, discussed in Chapter IV, further acted as a training tool, since they reinforced PO awareness of the distinctions among the communication strategies. Once again, PO's were given 30 of the revised Observation Forms with instructions to wait until notified to begin the actual data collection.

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

After assessing interrater reliability (to be discussed in Chapter IV), PO's proceeded to collect data for a two-week period. A series of charts was devised to tabulate the data according to the strategy user and the many situational variables used in this study. Also, the data were submitted to a statistical cross-tabulation. The results were analyzed and interpreted. Implications for situational appropriateness and communicator competence were made.

SUMMARY

The present study aimed at both discovering when people use communication strategies in their dyadic encounters and what meaning they attach to that behavior. An observation form was developed as a recording instrument to use in a self-report method of data collection in order to gain the wisest and most realistic view of this communication behavior. PO's were recruited and trained in all facets of data collection in the field. The data were coded and analyzed. Subsequently, implications for situational appropriateness and communicator competence were discussed.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationships between communication strategy use in message exchange and selected situational variables identified in the literature as having potential impact on dyadic communication behavior. Participant-observers collected data on strategy use according to frequency, demographic, and situational breakdowns. These breakdowns were collated and analyzed by the investigator. Outcomes are discussed with implications for situational appropriateness, contextual meaning, and overall communicator competence.

DESIGN

Trained participant-observers (PO's) collected data in the field on 202 incidents of communication strategy use in mutually occurring interactions over a two-week period. The contextual analysis method was applied without problems, with only one exception. One PO's book bag containing her packet of Observation Forms was stolen. Since this misfortune occurred 10 days into the final data collection period, she was dropped from the study. Therefore, the final data collection included data from eight PO's rather than nine. Two reliability assessments were conducted to ensure that PO's recognition of strategy use within their conversations and the precision of coding for the five

strategy categories were sufficiently high to proceed with the final data collection.

RELIABILITY TESTS

Following the discussion and review during the second training session, PO's participated in two reliability tests. The first test consisted of two sets of 20 illustrations involving four examples of each of the five categories. These were designed to test PO recognition the five categories. As previously discussed in Chapter III, the first set consisted of 20 video taped statements, and the second set consisted of 20 orally delivered statements. With respect to the second test, 25 utterances designed to test PO recognition of strategy occurrence or nonoccurrence were utilized (see Appendix D).

PO's were given pre-formed scoring sheets, the first in a multiple-choice format, containing columns labelled "Qualifiers," "Tag Questions," "Fillers," "Lengthening of Requests," and "Disclaimers." PO's were instructed to circle the correct strategy. When the first set of 20 was viewed, the video tape was stopped after each statement for approximately 30 seconds to facilitate scoring.

In the second test, the scoring sheet contained "Yes" and "No" columns wherein PO's were instructed to circle "Yes" if they heard a strategy being used in the sentence illustrations and "No" if they did not. PO's were instructed not to talk during the tests. There were three instances of requests for repeated statements, and these were repeated.

Assessment of Interrater Reliability

The first reliability test utilized Cohen's Kappa (Cohen, 1960), a statistical measure of interrater reliability (see Appendix E). The Kappa is a measure of agreement, corrected for chance, between classifications of a group of objects by two judges. Otherwise stated, the Kappa is a measure of agreement between pairs of individuals, all of whom are responding to the same nominal categories for each scorable item (Cohen, 1972). This procedure was used in this study to indicate not only how well PO's could distinguish among the five communication strategies, but which strategies were easier to identify than others. Therefore, had another training session been required, information from the Kappa could provide ingredients to increase precision for the necessary adjustments in training.

Thirty-six matrices were utilized to compile the observations made by all possible sets of paired coders. Results are summarized in Figure 2 in a matrix which shows that 1440 actual observations were made by the nine coders. There was precise interrater agreement on 1306 of the intervals, resulting in a $+0.88$ Kappa coefficient and indicating a high degree of rater congruence after chance agreement had been excluded. In other words, after adjusting for chance agreement, coders corresponded in 88 percent of their judgments overall. Therefore, following this assessment, further training was unnecessary, and PO's were able to proceed with the final data collection.

		Observer B					
		Q	TQ	F	LR	D	
Observer A	Q	00000 00000 00000 00000 00000 0...			00000 0	0.....	348
	TQ		00000 00000 00000 00000 00000 000.....				288
	F			00000 00000 00000 00000 00000 00...			273
	LR	00.....			00000 00000 00000 00000 00...		255
	D				.	00000 00000 00000 00000 00000	276
		296	288	288	284	284	

Key: 0 = 10 corresponding observations
 . = 1 corresponding observations

Q Qualifiers
 TQ Tag Question
 F Fillers
 LR Lengthening of Requests
 D Disclaimers

Figure 2. Summary matrix for assessment of Cohen's Kappa on interrater reliability.

Assessment of Occurrence/Nonoccurrence Observations

All nine PO's participated in the second reliability test wherein they responded "Yes" or "No" to 25 statements designed to test PO recognition of the occurrence/nonoccurrence of strategy use within messages (see Appendix F). The 13 statements containing strategies represented all five categories of the strategies used in this study. Unlike the first reliability test, interstrategy discrimination was not a factor here. The 12 statements that did not contain strategies comprised a variety of utterances similar to those in the sentences with strategies.

The results collected from this test revealed that PO recognition of strategy use was very high. Of the total 225 actual observations, 205 were correctly made. Error responses per PO ranged from zero to seven. The mean number of wrong judgments per PO was 2.22 for the 25 judgments, and the resulting average rater accuracy was high at 91 percent. These results confirmed the first reliability test findings that the PO's were sufficiently trained and were ready to proceed to the data collection phase.

RESULTS: COMMUNICATION STRATEGY USE

The data on the returned observation forms were reviewed for complete and correct recording, and unusable forms were eliminated. Of the 270 returned forms, 202 were complete, 53 were unused, eight had incomplete data, and two had incorrectly recorded data. That is, only ten out of 212 observations had to be discarded for incomplete data.

There were only five cases of multiple uses wherein more than one strategy occurred in one sentence. These were eliminated because there were not enough data to explore this multiple use.

Information regarding the estimated number of total interactions that PO's engaged in for a one-week period was omitted. PO's found it very difficult to make the requested approximations, reporting that their numbers were probably very inaccurate. This information was not crucial to this study; therefore, dropping it did not jeopardize the results.

The results discussed in this study are based on the PO's recognition and notation of 202 instances of communication strategies in their conversations. Including the PO's age and sex, there were 19 situational variables that were tracked in the recording of these strategy events. These 19 items were treated to a cross-tabulation coding system by frequency of occurrence.

The frequencies of strategy type by user and by purpose are presented first. This is followed by a summary of the frequency of strategy use analyzed according to the key features of this study, the situational variables outlined on the recording instrument.

Demographics

The eight PO's who participated in this study consisted of six women and two men in the age range of 24 to 47. All were in various stages of graduate work in the Speech Communication Department at Portland State University. All but one were currently, or had been in the previous year, graduate teaching assistants. They collected data on

202 conversations with naive subjects who were comprised of 132 women and 70 men with an overall age range of 14 to 75. The average age of all interactants was 32.

Overview of Frequency and Strategy Type

User and Strategy Type. There were 107 strategy uses made by P0's (53%) and 95 made by their partners (47%). Of these, 36% of P0 strategy uses were qualifiers, 21% lengthening of requests, 10% tag questions, 22% fillers, and 10% disclaimers. P0's indicated their partners to have used 16% qualifiers, 18% lengthening of requests, 17% tag questions, 34% fillers, and 16% disclaimers. These results showed that P0's noted more qualifiers when used by themselves (72% of the cases) than they did for their partners (28% of cases), but noted more fillers when used by partners (58% of the cases) than of their own (41% of the cases).

As these results show, people use more qualifiers and fillers in their interactions than they do lengthening of requests, tag questions, or disclaimers. The purpose(s) of the interactants determined the types of strategies that were employed, as discussed below.

Purpose and Strategy Type. Qualifiers and fillers were used more frequently than the other three strategy types: 54 cases of qualifiers, 55 cases of fillers, 39 cases of lengthening of requests, 27 tag questions, and 26 disclaimers. Under Item 4, "General Description of Purpose" wherein P0's noted "self's" and "other's" purposes, 50% of the strategy uses were recorded under the sub-items, "give information" (53 cases) and "receive information" (47 cases).

The giving or receiving of information was described to P0's as the

sharing of information and was distinguished from "small talk" and "spontaneous talk" in that the latter categories lead up to information sharing. Qualifiers and fillers made up 66% of the strategy types recorded under these subitems. Disclaimers appeared in 18 cases, tag questions in 14 cases, and lengthening of requests in only 2 cases under these subitems. However, 69% of all disclaimer uses and 52% of all tag question uses were also recorded under the "give information" and "receive information" subitems (see Table I).

TABLE I
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PURPOSE AND STRATEGY TYPE
PERCENT OF TOTAL USES
(N=202)

PURPOSE	STRATEGY TYPE					TOTAL
	Q.	L.R.	T.Q.	F.	D.	
Give info	6.9	1.0	3.5	10.9	4.0	26.3
Receive info	7.4	0	3.5	7.4	5.0	23.3
Make request	2.0	12.9	0	.5	.5	15.9
Receive request	1.0	5.4	1.0	.5	0	7.9
Small talk	3.0	0	1.5	4.5	1.0	10.0
Spont. talk	3.0	0	2.5	2.5	1.5	9.5
Greeting	2.5	0	1.0	1.0	0	4.5
Departing	1.0	0	.5	0	.5	2.0
Total	26.8	19.3	13.5	27.3	12.5	100.0

Lengthening of requests was the only strategy type to appear more frequently in other subitems. Under "make a request" and "receive a request," lengthening of requests comprised 77% of the strategy uses. The four other strategy types comprised only 23% of the rest of the strategy uses in these subitems. Of all strategy uses, 24% were recorded under "make a request" and "receive a request."

Under the subitem, "small talk," 9% of all strategy uses were recorded with nine cases of fillers, six qualifiers, three tag questions, and two disclaimers. Of all strategy uses, 9% were also recorded under the subitem "spontaneous talk," with six cases of qualifiers, five tag questions, five fillers and three disclaimers. Lengthening of requests was not used in either of these subitems.

Of all strategy uses, 4% and 2% were recorded under the "greeting" and "departing" subitems, respectively. Of these, seven were cases of qualifiers, three tag questions, two fillers, and one disclaimer. Again, lengthening of requests was not used in these nonrequest subitems.

Purpose and User. There were 35 cases of strategies used by P0's when their purpose was to "give information" and, respectively, 13 cases for "receive information," 28 for "make a request," 1 for "receive a request," 5 for "small talk," 16 for "spontaneous talk," 6 for "greeting," and 3 for "departing."

When partners were the strategy users, similar results were found under their own purposes, with 38 cases recorded to "give information," 19 for "receive information," 12 for "make a request," 4 for "receive a

request," 5 for "small talk," 13 for "spontaneous talk," 3 for "greeting," and 1 for "departing."

These tabulations show that more strategies were used when interactants were giving and receiving information than for any other purpose. They also show that strategies were used more frequently when the user was making a request rather than receiving one, 28 and 12 versus 1 and 4 occurrences, respectively (see Table II).

TABLE II
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PURPOSE AND STRATEGY USER
PERCENT OF TOTAL USES
(N=202)

PURPOSE	STRATEGY USER		
	P0	PARTNER	TOTAL
Give information	17.3	18.8	36.1
Receive information	6.4	9.4	15.8
Make Request	13.8	1.9	15.7
Receive Request	.4	5.9	6.3
Small talk	2.4	2.4	4.8
Spontaneous talk	7.9	6.4	14.3
Greeting	2.9	1.4	4.3
Departing	1.4	.4	1.8
Total	52.5	46.5	100.0

To summarize, qualifiers and fillers occur predominantly when interactants are giving and receiving information which can be regarded as nonrequest message exchanges, these being usually of greater depth than small talk or spontaneous talk. Qualifiers function to protect or enhance the identity of the speaker and/or listener. They are also seen as the appropriate measure to soften potential negative reactions to what we say (Eakins and Eakins, 1978).

Fillers, like qualifiers, function to downplay potentially strong statements. Use of fillers conveys nonassertiveness, hesitancy and increased responsiveness (Eakins and Eakins, 1978). Both qualifier and filler strategies appear to facilitate the promotion and maintenance of the working consensus, the "tacit agreement as to whose claims to what issues will be honored" (Goffman, 1967). In this way, these strategies appear to allow interactants to successfully share information.

Tag questions and disclaimers are rarely employed, but when they are, they are usually used when interactants are giving and receiving information. Tag questions were never used when requests were made, but rather occurred during information-sharing exchanges and appeared to be a strategy used to affirm one's statement, hence, functions to confirm the speaker's identity.

As expected, lengthening of requests is used when people make requests. People do use more strategies when they make requests than when they receive them, supporting the view that whenever someone has a request to make of another person, that person's autonomy of action is automatically constrained (Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984).

When people engage in small talk, spontaneous interactions, and greetings or leave takings, they employ mostly qualifiers and fillers. Communication strategies, then, are more important to interactions in which people are exchanging information than to those in which people want or need something from each other.

Relationship and Strategy Type. Strategy uses were recorded most frequently when PO's relationship to their partners was that of a friend (33%). As a coworker/peer, PO's indicated 14% of the strategy uses and, respectively, 13% occurrences as a superior, 9% as a relative, 9% as a subordinate, 9% as a stranger, 8% as an acquaintance, and 3% as other. Table III presents the frequency of all strategy types according to PO's relationship to partners.

These percentages show that most strategies were used between friends, again a departure from the expectation that more strategies would be used in a superior/subordinate relationship. Clearly, strategy use, as one of the ways in which people promote getting along, is much more important in terms of friendships than in other kinds of relationships.

As discussed above, qualifiers and fillers facilitate the sharing of information between interactants. The results here, with most frequent use occurring between friends, further support this assumption. In order to establish and maintain friendship relationships, it is important that both parties desire to facilitate interpersonal discovery by appearing honorable, nonthreatening, and respectful to each other.

TABLE III
PO'S RELATIONSHIPS TO PARTNERS AND
PERCENT FOR STRATEGY TYPE
(N=100)

RELATIONSHIP	STRATEGY TYPE				
	Q.	L.R.	T.Q.	F.	D.
Relative	7.4	10.3	22.2	1.8	15.4
Friend	38.9	20.5	40.7	34.5	30.8
Acquaintance	9.3	2.6	11.1	9.1	11.5
Coworker/Peer	11.1	15.4	0	16.4	26.9
Superior	13.0	17.9	0	20.0	3.8
Subordinate	9.3	15.4	18.5	5.5	0
Stranger	7.4	12.8	7.4	9.1	7.7
Other	3.7	5.1	0	3.6	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Initiator and Strategy Type. When PO's initiated conversations, they noted that 30% of the strategy uses were qualifiers, 23% lengthening of requests, 19% tag questions, 17% fillers, and 11% disclaimers. When partners initiated conversations, 21% were qualifiers, 25% lengthening of requests, 6% tag questions, 40% fillers, and 8% disclaimers. Conversations that were mutually initiated contained 285 qualifiers, 9% lengthening of requests, 12% tag questions, 33% fillers, and 19% disclaimers.

Initiator and User. PO's initiated 45% of the interactions, partners initiated 26% of the time, and 29% of the interactions were initiated mutually. PO's recorded more strategies used by themselves when initiating interactions, 70% of the cases versus 30% used by partners. When partners initiated, 54% of the strategies were used by themselves and 46% by PO's. Clearly strategy use occurs more frequently when the user initiates conversations. When interactions were mutually initiated, PO's noted their partners using more strategies, 62% occurrences versus 37% used by PO (see Table IV).

TABLE IV
INITIATOR OF INTERACTION AND STRATEGY USER
PERCENT OF TOTAL USES
(N=202)

USER	INITIATOR			TOTAL
	PO	PARTNER	MUTUAL	
PO	30.7	12.9	10.9	54.5
Partner	12.9	14.9	17.8	45.6
Total	43.6	27.8	28.7	100.0

Therefore, strategies are used more frequently when conversations are mutually initiated, with qualifiers and fillers predominantly occurring at these times. However, when interactions are initiated by only one of the interactants, lengthening of requests appeared frequently. Therefore, when interactants make requests, they initiate

conversations. Lengthening of requests is rarely employed when interactions are mutually initiated.

Locus of Control in this Episode and Strategy Type. Most strategies occurred when the locus of control was mutual (65%). Only 18% were used when P0's were in control of the conversation and 16% when partners were in control. Further breakdown of strategy user under this subitem is discussed in a later section.

These results can be seen in the following breakdown: 11% of the qualifiers were used when P0's were in control, 15% were used when partners were in control, and 75% were used when the control was mutual. Respectively, tag questions were used 15% (P0) and 15% (partner). Fillers were used 22% (P0), 9% (partner), and 69% (mutual). Disclaimers were used 4% (P0), 19% (partner), and 73% (mutual). However, this pattern changes with lengthening of requests, where the results are fairly even with 33% (P0), 28% (partner), and 38% (mutual) (see Table V).

These results show that when the flow of the conversation is controlled mutually, most strategies occur with the exception of lengthening of requests, which is used as often when the control is mutual as when one or the other interactant is in control. Again, indicating support for strategy use is a means for people to get along. The same holds true for request messages, the difference being that the nature of request formation constrains the receiver of the request, requiring appropriate measures on the speaker's part.

TABLE V
LOCUS OF CONTROL AND STRATEGY TYPE
PERCENT OF STRATEGY TYPE
(N=100)

STRATEGY TYPE	LOCUS OF CONTROL			TOTAL
	P0	PARTNER	MUTUAL	
Qualifier	11.1	14.8	74.1	100.0
Lengthening of Request	33.3	28.2	38.5	100.0
Tag Question	14.8	14.8	70.4	100.0
Filler	21.8	9.1	69.1	100.0
Disclaimer	3.8	19.2	73.1	100.0

Locus of Control in the Episode and User. When the flow of the conversation was mutually controlled, 63% of the strategy uses occurred. Of these, 47% were used by P0's, and 53% were used by their partners. During interactions where P0's were in control, 20% of the strategies were used, with a fairly even spread of 46% used by P0's and 54% by partners. However, when partners were in control (wherein 17% of the strategies were used), P0's used strategies much more frequently than did their partners, 76% versus 24% of the strategies, respectively. (See Table VI.)

This evidence shows that when people do employ strategies in conversations where mutual control is nonexistent, those who are not in control of their conversations use more strategies than those who are in

control. Explained by Brown and Levinson (1978), strategy use in these instances appears to occur when speakers feel constrained or restricted in their actions with loss of freedom or autonomy.

This is supported in the literature on the dimension(s) or bases of power, composure, or self-control (Burgoon and Hale, 1984) and on interactants' rights to resist (Jackson and Backus, 1982). (See the discussion below for further treatment of bases of power.)

TABLE VI
LOCUS OF CONTROL AND USER
PERCENT OF USER
(N=100)

USER	LOCUS OF CONTROL		
	P0	PARTNER	MUTUAL
P0	46.0	76.0	47.0
Partner	54.0	24.0	53.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

P0's Characteristic Power and Strategy Type. The results in this item were similar to those reported above. Most strategies were used when P0's reported that their characteristic power with partners was equal (52%), followed by 19% used when they were in higher power, 17% when they were in lower power, and 12% when characteristic power did not exist between interactants.

Under the "equal" subitem, the most frequently used strategies were

qualifiers and fillers (60%), with the other three strategies comprising 40% of the uses. Also similar to the above section, lengthening of requests was spread fairly evenly across the "higher" (26%), "lower" (26%), and "equal" (36%) subitems, whereas strategy type frequencies were recorded predominantly in the "equal" subitem, as follows: 57% qualifiers, 48% tag questions, 58% fillers, and 58% disclaimers (see Table VII).

TABLE VII
PO'S CHARACTERISTIC POWER WITH PARTNERS AND STRATEGY TYPE
PERCENT OF TYPE
(N=202)

STRATEGY TYPE	CHARACTERISTIC POWER WITH PARTNER				TOTAL
	HIGHER	LOWER	EQUAL	N/A	
Qualifier	11.1	20.4	57.4	11.1	100.0
Lengthening of Request	25.6	25.6	35.9	12.8	100.0
Tag Question	18.5	18.5	48.1	14.8	100.0
Filler	23.6	10.9	58.2	7.3	100.0
Disclaimer	15.4	3.8	57.7	19.2	100.0

There were 24 cases of strategy use under "not/applicable," interactions where there was no history together or level of power. Strategy types were fairly even with 25% qualifiers, 21% lengthening of requests, 17% tag questions, 17% fillers, and 21% disclaimers.

Similar to the findings in the locus of control, most strategy

occurrences appeared when the characteristic level of power was equal. These results are surprising since strategies were expected to be used more frequently when interactants were in lower positions of power. These findings are consistent with those discussed above where, in the purpose of giving and receiving information, most strategies were employed.

PO's Characteristic Power w/Partner and User. When PO's noted their characteristic power or the history of power that they held in relation to their partners, they recorded 52% under the subitem "equal," 19% under "higher," 17% under "lower," and 12% under "n/a." Of the uses spread according to PO and partner, fairly even uses were recorded only under the "equal" subitem; PO's used 52% versus 48% used by their partners.

PO's used far more strategies than did their partners when they recorded that their characteristic level of power was lower than that of their partner, 79% versus 21% occurrences, and when they recorded "n/a," 68% versus 32% occurrences, respectively. However, the reverse was true when they perceived their power as higher, using 26% compared with partners' use of 74% (see Table VIII).

Clearly again, strategy use occurs more frequently when interactants are of equal level of power or status. However when status is unequal, strategies are most often employed by the person of lower status. When PO's recorded that they were of higher power, they also recorded, in the "Relationship to Other" section, that they were in a superior relationship to their partners. When they recorded that they

were in a lower level of power than their partners, they also listed themselves as "subordinates."

This finding was expected since there is much literature supporting the view that power or status influences message choices (Lakoff, 1973; Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin, 1981; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984).

TABLE VIII
PO'S CHARACTERISTIC POWER WITH PARTNER AND STRATEGY USER
PERCENT OF USER
(N=100)

USER	PO'S CHARACTERISTIC POWER			
	HIGHER	LOWER	EQUAL	N/A
PO	26.0	79.0	52.0	68.0
Partner	74.0	21.0	48.0	32.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

To restate, strategy use functions to promote and maintain the working consensus that exists between interactants (Goffman, 1967; Eakins and Eakins, 1978). Apparently, status or level of power constrains lower status people to ensure that higher status people of their intention of respect, thereby maintaining the working consensus. In these terms, strategy use is the recognition and acknowledgement by the speaker of the respect due the hearer.

Overview of Frequency According To Sex

The following results were addressed separately from those above, because gender issues are of particular interest to this researcher. These highlights were not necessarily different from those already reviewed, though some differences according to sex were found. It is the lack of difference that is important to the overall picture of communication strategy use.

Sex and User. When women interacted with other women, they recorded 71% of the strategies' occurrences and during interactions with men, 25% of the strategies. When men interacted with women, they used 24% of the strategies and with other men, 10%.

Although strategy frequency indicated that female P0's used 41% of all strategies, the average use for each of the six female P0's was +14. The two male P0's used 13% of all strategies with an average of +13. P0's recorded female partners to have used 25% of all strategies and male partners, 21%. Clearly, there was little difference in strategy use for women and for men.

Further, when female P0's interacted with female partners, they used an average of +7.5 strategies; and when interacting with male partners, they used an average of +6.5 strategies. When male P0's interacted with female partners, they used an average of +6; and when interacting with male partners, they used an average of +6 (see Table IX.)

TABLE IX
AVERAGE STRATEGY USES ACCORDING TO PO SEX
(N=202)

PO SEX	SEX OF PARTNER	
	FEMALE	MALE
Female	7.5	6.5
Male	6.0	6.5

These findings of fairly even strategy usage for both females and males were unexpected, since the literature indicated women as the more frequent users of communication strategies (Lakoff, 1973; Thorne and Henley, 1975; Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Fishman, 1982; Sattel, 1982; Baxter, 1974; Tracy et al., 1984; Pearson, 1985). Much of this research simply generalizes that women use more strategies than do men. However, without knowing who is using strategies with whom, it is clear that these research findings cannot be generalized to all situations.

Also, based on research connecting gender and bases of power (Eakins and Eakins, 1978; Sattel, 1982; Fishman, 1982; Pearson, 1985; Donahue, 1985), it was expected that women would use more strategies during interactions with men and fewer with women and that men would use strategies with men, but not so with women. As seen in the results, this was not the case because use was spread evenly across the sex of the speaker and the hearer.

Sex and Locus of Control. When female PO's indicated their

frequency of use under the item, "Locus of Control in this Episode," they recorded 100% use in the subitem "me," whereas male PO's recorded none.

Because of the differences in number of female PO's to male PO's, it is necessary to discuss these uses according to averages. Women employed all strategy uses (16.7 per PO) when PO's recorded that they were in control of the conversation. This finding is consistent with the research that indicates male inexpressiveness as a base of power where men, as superiors, withhold expression as a way to maintain their position (Sattel, 1982; Fishman, 1982).

The fact that women used strategies while in control, i.e., a more powerful position than their partners, indicates that women do not withhold expression as a way to maintain their position. If withholding expression is seen as powerful, then it is easy to see why the research on gender and power cites women as less powerful.

As in previous findings, those in every other subitem were unexpected. Across all users, women and men employed strategies fairly evenly. (Refer to Table X for a breakdown of frequency, user, and locus of control.)

Sex and Characteristic Level of Power. The frequency of strategy use in the item, "Your Characteristic Power with Other," varied widely according to PO, partner, and sex. As revealed in the section above, when female PO's recorded that their level of power was higher than that of their partners, they used 100% of the strategies in this subitem, whereas male PO's used none.

TABLE X
 FREQUENCY OF STRATEGY USE ACCORDING TO SEX,
 USER, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL
 PERCENT OF SUB-ITEM USE
 (N=100)

USER	LOCUS OF CONTROL		
	PO	PARTNER	MUTUAL
Female PO's	100.0	50.0	74.0
Male PO's	0	50.0	26.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Female Partners	54.0	48.0	56.0
Male Partners	46.0	52.0	44.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Again, there is an indication of male inexpressiveness as a base of power as discussed in the previous section. This is further supported by the results of partner usages. Female partners, who were responsible for 54% of the total partner frequencies, used 70% of the strategies in this subitem. However, male partners, responsible for 46% of the total partner frequencies, used on 30% here. The breakdown of frequencies in this item according to the sex of the user is shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI
 FREQUENCY OF STRATEGY USE ACCORDING TO SEX, USER
 AND CHARACTERISTIC LEVEL OF POWER
 PERCENT OF SUBITEM USE
 (N=100)

USER	PO CHARACTERISTIC LEVEL OF POWER			
	HIGHER	LOWER	EQUAL	N/A
Female PO's	100.0	38.0	75.0	75.0
Male PO's	0	62.0	25.0	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Female Partners	70.0	42.0	66.0	31.0
Male Partners	30.0	58.0	36.0	69.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

A breakdown of PO uses, when they reported that they were in a lower level of power than their partners, provided more evidence to support the above contentions. Women used an average of 6.3 strategies, whereas men used an average of 31 strategies. When men perceived themselves to be in a lower position, they used more strategies than did women in the same position. This is an interesting finding because it presents the appearance that men are not used to being in a lower power position and feel constrained, thus providing possible evidence for a situation in which strategies are overused.

Women, on the other hand, actually averaged less strategy use when

they perceived themselves to be in a lower power position (6.3) than they did when they were in a higher power position (16.7) or an equal one (12.5), thus providing evidence that women may expect to be in a lower position. But when women are in a higher position, they are constrained, again providing a possible example where strategies could be overused.

Overview of Frequency and Miscellaneous Subitems

Minute of Use, Interaction Length, and Frequency. Strategies occurred most frequently in the first minute of the interaction (43%), and most interactions were from one to five minutes (54%). In the second minute of the interaction, 12% of the strategies were used, 9% in the third minute, 2% in the fourth, and 9% in the fifth.

The range of "minute of use" was one minute to 149 minutes, with a mean minute of use of 7.96 minutes. The range of "Length of Interaction" was one minute to 160 minutes, with a mean length of interaction of 21.68. these scores, providing a ratio of 7.96:21.68, show that strategy use was most frequent in the beginning minute(s) of the interactions.

The results of this item, "Minute of Strategy Use," were insightful since they supported the notion that the working consensus of the interactants is established at the beginning of interactions (Goffman, 1968). It was expected that most of the strategy uses would occur at this time of "checking each other out." However, the ratio of minute to length uses, while also showing that strategies occur most frequently at the outset of conversations, also reveals that strategies are used

throughout message exchange.

Interactants frequently take time out during their conversations to adjust or square with each other what they are doing (Ragan and Hopper, 1981). These results also support Donahue et al.'s (1985) posit that interactants reveal a variety of relational information by the utterances employed at-the-moment. This is consistent with the idea of strategy use as one of the ways we go about the business of getting along by promoting and maintaining the working consensus (Goffman, 1968; Eakins and Eakins, 1978).

Frequency and Overall Significance. The highest number of frequencies, when PO's noted their perception of the significance of the interaction at hand to the relationship as a whole, was recorded at the midway point on the scale of (1) low to (9) high. Levels five, three, and six contained the most uses, with 24%, 20%, and 16% occurrences, respectively. Levels seven (11%) and four (9%) followed. The least recorded uses came at either end of the scale as follows: 7% under level one, 7% under level two, 4% under level eight, and 1% under level nine.

The literature regarding significance or relational consequences indicates that where there is high salience, there will be a more frequent use of strategies (Sillars, 1980; Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin, 1981; Jackson and Backus, 1982; McLaughlin, Cody and O'Hair, 1983; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). This was not indicated in the findings of this study wherein strategies are seen to be used more often when relational significance is at a moderate level.

Frequency and Familiarity. PO's recorded on a scale of (1) low to (9) high how well they knew their partner. The uses under this item were fairly close, with the most frequent uses recorded under level four (20%) and the least recorded under level two (5%). Strategy uses along the scale were recorded as follows: 9% level one, 5% level two, 7% level three, 20% level four, 19% level five, 12% level six, 8% level seven, 7% level eight, and 11% level nine.

Familiarity, discussed in the literature, is connected to intimacy, an interpersonal dimension (Burgoon and Hale, 1984). Strategy use was expected to be more frequent when familiarity was high because people are more likely to caretake a relationship in which the parties know each other very well. This assumption was supported under the items, "Satisfaction of Self" and "Satisfaction of Other." Scales of (1) low to (9) high were used by PO's to record their perception of their own and their partners' levels of satisfaction.

In both items, the most frequent uses came under level seven, with POs' satisfaction at 29% of uses and partners' at 30%. (Refer to Table XII for a breakdown and comparison of frequency and satisfaction of PO's and their partners.)

Clearly, these results show that more strategies were used when the levels of satisfaction were fairly high. This is not surprising because communication strategy use is thought to promote and maintain a working consensus (Goffman, 1967; Eakins and Eakins, 1978).

It can be assumed that if interactants could successfully promote and maintain a working consensus, they would feel satisfied. This is

consistent with Weinstein's (1966) statement regarding interpersonal acts: "An individual maximizes the likelihood of task success by insuring appropriate interpretation."

TABLE XII
FREQUENCY OF STRATEGY USE AND
SATISFACTION OF INTERACTANTS
(N=100)

SATISFACTION LEVELS (1) LOW TO (9) HIGH	INTERACTANTS	
	P0	PARTNER
One	.5	.5
Two	1.0	1.5
Three	4.0	2.5
Four	8.4	10.4
Five	17.3	17.3
Six	14.4	12.9
Seven	28.7	29.7
Eight	19.8	18.3
Nine	5.0	5.9
Total	100.0	100.0

Frequency and Formality. Most of the strategy uses occurred when the level of formality was under the halfway point on the scale of (1) low to (9) high, with levels one and three having 21% of the uses each, the most uses recorded.

Under level two, P0's recorded 15% of the uses, and levels four and

five each contained 14% of the uses. The least frequent uses came when the formality level was high, with no uses recorded under the highest level of nine, 2% under level eight, 4% under level seven and 9% under six.

These findings were unexpected because in situations where formality is high, it would seem that interactants would be more constrained to maintain a working consensus and thereby use more strategies than when formality was low (Burgoon and Hale, 1984).

However, this was not the case. These findings are congruent with those previously discussed which indicated that predominant use of strategies occurred when interactants are friends, where presumably formality would be fairly low. Again, this supports Eakins and Eakins' (1978) analysis of the function of strategies as the ways in which interactants promote getting along, interpersonal discovery, and self-expression.

Frequency and Location. PO's recorded the locations where their interactions took place. Home and workplace were listed 98% of the time. These findings provided no information regarding frequency of strategy use.

SUMMARY

The results outlined in this chapter are by no means exhaustive of all the possible cross-tabulations that a contextual analysis study could provide. However, the results have accomplished the aim of this study. That is, the question, "What is the relationship between

frequency of communication strategy use and known situational variables?" has, to a satisfactory degree, been answered through an extensive overview of the data collected in the field.

The percentage breakdowns, as presented throughout this chapter, provide a cross-sectional view of strategy frequency across situations. However, these percentages were analyzed and discussed throughout the text, a practice modeled after Jones and Yarbrough (1985), which facilitated immediate interpretation of the phenomenon.

Communication strategy frequency, as revealed in this contextual analysis, has implications for situational appropriateness and communication competence. These implications are incorporated into the following discussion which summarizes the predominant patterns of communication strategy use.

Situational Appropriateness and Communication Competence

Situational appropriateness was described in Chapter II as the process involved in the message choices that interactants employ to ensure interpersonal success (Weinstein, 1966; Goffman, 1967; Ragan and Hopper, 1981; Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). Further, this literature indicates that people are heavily constrained by the nature of the situation.

The fact that patterns were found in the data indicates that there are indeed situations in which strategy use is required to ensure task success. Thus, appropriateness can be discussed according to the frequencies outlined above.

Communication competence, according to Spitzberg and Hecht (1984),

entails the process wherein interactants shape interpersonal impressions in order to achieve satisfactory outcomes. In dyadic interactions, competence is the ability to take in the perspectives of both interactants and the situation. This is consistent with Weinstein's (1966) description of strategy use, the way interactants manage the relationship between them while pursuing goals.

Clearly, situational appropriateness is an important factor in communication competence. Simply stated, the competent communicator successfully interprets the situation and thereby employs the appropriate communication messages. Also important in this description is the fact that interactants choose the required messages, not because they are aware of their advantages or disadvantages, but because they have learned what is situationally appropriate (Weinstein, 1966).

Therefore, it can be said that communication strategy use is a socially learned behavior. As specified in Chapter II, strategy use is an indication that the speaker desires to communicate to the hearer that her intentions are honorable, nonthreatening, and respectful. The results, in the following summary, support this assumption.

Strategy Frequency, Appropriateness, and Competence

Strategy use occurs most frequently when interactants are friends who are engaged in the sharing of information. At these times, interactants employ qualifiers and fillers to encourage and enhance feelings of well being and satisfaction, i.e., interpersonal goals. In order to successfully or competently promote and maintain friendships, it is appropriate, hence relationally required, that communicators use

communication strategies.

Further supporting this analysis, people use strategies most often when they feel equal to their interacting partner, as well as when they are mutually involved in the course that the interaction takes. Evidence in these results indicates that when people are in lower power positions, they use more strategies than do people of higher power.

For example, in request situations, as previously described, the speakers making the requests automatically restrict their autonomy of action, a challenge to positive face wants (Baxter, 1984; Tracy et al., 1984). The competent communicator relieves the burden of this constraint by using the softening effect by lengthening the requests. Request lengthening tends to convey politeness and the desire to not press for agreement, essentially letting the listener "off the hook."

Regarding strategy use during inequitable interactions, men, when in lower power situations, use five times as many strategies as do women who are engaged in lower power situations. Of further interest, and a departure from the previous statement of equity in strategy use, when women are in higher power positions, they use 100 times as many strategies as do men.

This is further evidence of situational appropriateness; that is, these large differences in frequency imply that there are normative situations according to sex. Obviously, the interactants in this study met the requisite message needs of these situations by employing or not employing strategies.

In every other situation, women and men used strategies fairly

evenly. Women used strategies as often with women as they did with men. The same holds true for men. There was no evidence that the sex of the strategy user alone determines strategy use, but rather when combined with inequitable levels of power, differing usages occurred.

The findings on significance, satisfaction, and formality also support the analysis of communication strategy use as that which facilitates attaining interpersonal goals. Significance was moderate, indicating neither an intense or meaningless interaction. Strategy use appears to foster feelings of satisfaction, important in maintaining friendships. And it was low levels of formality that were conducive to strategy use rather than the expected high level.

The findings in this study are not consistent with the major focus of Eakins and Eakins' (1978) analysis of the five categories of strategies that were utilized in this study. They predominantly focused on strategy use, as the systems prescribed for lower-ranking members. Simply stated, according to their analysis, when people feel less powerful, they use strategies in order to be perceived as less powerful. While they state that communication strategy use promotes achievement of relational goals, they do not advance this notion in their descriptions of the five strategies.

In the present study, this latter analysis has proven to be the appropriate one. People use very few strategies when in situationally less powerful positions. The results clearly reveal that the conditions under which people most often employ communication strategies are those in which people feel comfortable, equitable, nonthreatened, and

respected.

A brief summary and discussion of implications for future research are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

LIMITATIONS AND SUMMARY

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The contextual analysis method, while providing a necessary cross-situational approach to communication research, forces the researcher to make decisions regarding which variables will be addressed after the data are collected. Though each variable contributed to the whole picture, the method precludes precise inspection of each variable.

Important research decisions are thus made after the data have been collected, a practice that cannot be entirely healthy. Since this approach did what it was intended, that is, provided a broad view of the phenomena, it could be the new wave of future research. According to Tucker et al. (1981), in an extensive discussion of the directions for future communication research, methods of research that are consonant with the definitions of communication as processual, relational, and intentional must be developed.

Future research utilizing the contextual analysis method is recommended. A multi-dimensional approach is crucial to communication research because communication behaviors do not occur in static contexts. Thus, the contextual analysis approach was an appropriate method. Future research could include a two-step process of developing research questions, once before collecting data and again afterward.

And finally, the five categories of Eakins and Eakins' (1978) communication strategies as representative of all relational communication acts may not have realistically provided a thorough view of relational act use since different governing principles may be in operation when implicit strategies are used rather than explicit ones. Future research should incorporate implicit as well as explicit strategies.

SUMMARY

The present study employed a contextual analysis method, developed by Scheflen (1973) and Jones and Yarbrough (1985), but was adapted to accommodate the distinct elements of communication strategy use in the context of dyadic interactions. Participant-observers recorded 202 strategy uses in as many conversations with naive subjects. Their collected data were coded and analyzed to discover when people use selected communication strategies.

The frequency of strategy type, the user of strategies, the sex of the interactants, and frequencies of known situational variables were cross-tabulated. Since there were 19 variables coded for each of the 202 strategy events, the results could have been cross-tabulated many times over. Therefore, decisions were made regarding which variables would provide the broadest view of this phenomenon.

The general direction for the tabulations of variables was based on known situational variables represented in the literature. Though the results in this study represent only a portion of the multi-faceted

prism that a contextual analysis allows, they do provide an extensive overview of strategy-use-in-context.

The results were analyzed, largely according to percentages, which alone provided information regarding the conditions under which people use strategies. However, patterns were drawn from the result and generalized to indicate normative communication strategy use. Also, implications were suggested regarding communication competence and situational appropriateness. Communication competence was indicated as the ability to employ communication strategies according to situational appropriateness.

Strategy use was described as a socially learned behavior and normative use as a social requirement. Situations in which most strategy uses are expected, then, are those interactions that occur between friends, who share in equity, not only in level of power, but in the direction of the conversation.

These findings were unexpected since the known situational variables used in this study are somewhat contradictory. Differential power levels were expected to produce the highest frequency. For example, locus of control, level of power, and relationship were expected to be weighted, according to the user, as not being in control, having a lower level of power, and being a subordinate. When viewed in this way, strategy use is seen as a negative but necessary measure for people at a disadvantage. As already stated, the most frequent uses occurred when both parties were in control, of equal level of power and friends.

For the most part, the frequency of strategy use for women and men was the same, except in the cases where they reported inequitable situations. Women used strategies, men did not, when their positions were higher than their partners'. When they reported to be in a lower position, women and men used more strategies than did their partners, but men far surpassed women in frequency. Each of these results was surprising since the literature does not predict these outcomes.

Some of the more predominant assumptions in relational communication act research are: women use more strategies than men; men use few, if any, strategies; and low ranking people use strategies, whereas high ranking people do not. In most of the cases, women and men used the same number of strategies with same-sex partners as they did with different-sex partners. This is an important point: strategies are used situationally. Individual differences probably exist, but people use them selectively according to situational demands.

Strategy use in friendship relationships fosters interpersonal satisfaction and therefore helps to promote and maintain relationships. Further evidence of this premise is seen in the low level of formality and high level of satisfaction. Strategy use, thus seen as a positive and necessary measure, recognizes and acknowledges human interdependence.

This study aimed at discovering what relationship existed between frequency and known situational variables. Otherwise stated, this study intended to identify the situational demands that are present in dyadic interactions. The utilization of the contextual analysis successfully

provided a much needed multi-dimensional overview of the phenomena of relational communication strategies.

REFERENCES

- Bateson, G. Steps to an ecology of mind. New York: Ballantine, 1972.
- Baxter, L. A. An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. Human Communication Research, 1984, 10(3):427-456.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. N. (Ed.), Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Burelson, B. R. Age, social-cognitive development, and the use of comforting strategies. Communication Monographs, 1984, 51:140-153.
- Burgoon, J. K. and Hale, J. L. The fundamental topoi of relational communication. Communication Monographs, 1984, 51:193-214.
- Clark, R. A., The impact of self interest and desire for liking on the selection of communicative strategies. Communication Monographs, 1979, 16:257-275.
- Cohen, J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20:37-47.
- Cohen, J. Weighted chi square: An extension of the Kappa method. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1972, 32:61-74.
- Donahue, W. A., Weider-Hatfield, D., Hamilton, M., and Diez, M. E. Relational distance in managing conflict. Human Communication Research, 1985, 11(3):387-405.
- Eakins, B. W. and Eakins, R. G. Sex differences in human communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Fishman, P. M. Interaction: The work women do. In Kahn-Hut, R. Daniels, A. and Colvard, R. (Eds.), Women and work: Problems and Perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Goffman, E. Interaction ritual. Garden City: Anchor Books/Doubleday, 1967.
- Goffman, E. Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1971.

- Jackson, S. and Backus, D. Are compliance-gaining strategies dependent on situational variables? Central States Speech Journal, 1982, 33:469-479.
- Jackson, S. and Jacobs, S. Generalizing about messages: Suggestion for design and analysis of experiments. Human Communication Research, 1983, 9(2):169-191.
- Jones, S. E. and Yarbrough, A. E. A naturalistic study of the meaning of touch. Communication Monographs, 1985, 52:19-56.
- Lakoff, R. Language and women's place, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.
- Lustig, M. W. and King, S. W. The effect of communication apprehension and situation on communication strategy choices. Human Communication Research, 1980, 7(1):74-82.
- McLaughlin, M. L., Cody, M., and O'Hair, H. D. The management of failure events: Some contextual determinants of accounting behavior. Human Communication Research, 1983, 9(2):208-224.
- Pearson, J. C. Gender and communication. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1985.
- Ragan, S. L. and Hopper, R. Alignment talk in the job interview. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 1981, 9(2):85-103.
- Rogers, L. and Farace, R. Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement of procedures. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1:222-239.
- Sattel, J. W. The inexpressive male: Tragedy or sexual politics? R. In Kahn-Hut, R., Daniels, A., and Colvard, R. (Eds.) Women and work: Problems and perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Schefflen, A. E. Communicational structure: Analysis of psychotherapy transaction. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1973.
- Sillars, A. L. The stranger and the spouse as target persons for compliance-gaining strategies: A subjective expected utility model. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6:265-279.
- Spitzberg, B. H. and Hecht, M. L. A component model of relational competence. Human Communication Research, 1984, 10(4):575-599.
- Stokes, R. and Hewitt, J. Disclaimers. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40:1-11.

- Thorne, B. and Henley, N. Difference and dominance: An overview of language, gender, and society. In Thorne, B. and Henley, N. (Eds.), Language and sex: Difference and dominance, 1975.
- Tracy, K., Craig, R. T., Smith, M., and Spisak, F. The discourse of requests: Assessment of compliance-gaining, Human Communication Research, 1984 10(4):513-538.
- Tucker, R., Weaver II, R., and Berryman-Fink, C. Research in speech communication. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.
- Weinstein, E. Toward a theory of interpersonal tactics. In Problems in social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1966.
- Wiseman, R. L. and Schenk-Hamlin, W. A multidimensional scaling validation of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Monographs, 1981, 48:215-270.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL OBSERVATION FORM

OBSERVATION FORM

Name _____
 Date _____
 Interaction _____
 Strategy # _____

SECTION A

<p>1. Strategy User</p> <p>___ me
 ___ other</p> | <p>2. Strategy Type</p> <p>___ qualifier
 ___ length. of request
 ___ tag question
 ___ filler
 ___ disclaimer</p> | <p>3. Minute of Strategy Use (Approx.)</p> <p>___ minute</p> | <p>4. General Description of Purpose</p> <p>___ give information
 ___ receive information
 ___ make a request
 ___ receive a request
 ___ greeting
 ___ departing</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

SECTION B

<p>5. Initiator of Interaction</p> <p>___ me
___ other
___ mutual</p>	6. Length of Interaction (Approx.) ___ minutes	<p>7. Overall Satisfaction of Self (Circle)</p> <p>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW</p>	<p>8. Overall Satisfaction of Other (Circle)</p> <p>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW</p>
<p>9. Level of Power</p> <p>___ higher
___ lower
___ equal</p>	<p>10. Locus of Control</p> <p>___ me
___ other
___ mutual</p>	<p>11. Relationship to Other</p> <p>___ relative
___ friend
___ non-friend
___ acquaintance
___ co-worker/peer
___ superior
___ subordinate
___ stranger
___ other</p>	<p>12. Level of Familiarity (Circle)</p> <p>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW</p>
<p>13. Overall Significance (Circle)</p> <p>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW</p>	14. General Description of Location _____	<p>15. Level of Formality (Circle)</p> <p>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
HIGH LOW</p>	<p>16. Sex of Other</p> <p>___ female
___ male</p>
17. Age of Other (Approx.) ___ years	NOTES:		

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER BOOKLET

You are participating in an experiment designed to discover when people use communication strategies. Communication strategies are the extra words in conversations that reveal information about how people interact with each other.

You will be trained, through the instructions in this booklet and observation of a video tape, to recognize particular communication strategies when they occur in dyadic interactions. Through the method of self-report, you will record information pertinent to communication strategy use.

It is important that you follow the instructions in the order that they are written.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Fill out Self-inventory, page 4 of this booklet. This information is necessarily gathered for the purpose of drawing comparisons to your responses on the Observation Forms. This information will remain confidential and will be used only for the purposes of this study where your name will not be used.
2. Baseline Information - For the purposes of gathering information on the frequency of strategy use, it is necessary to obtain baseline information regarding how many interactions you engage in during the course of one week (7 days). This information can be recorded during the practice week and can be an estimation at the end of each day. Record this baseline information on the Self-inventory form, page 4, where indicated.
3. Description of Strategies - The communication strategies that you are required to recognize for this study are explained and illustrated (pages 5-8). Your training requires that you become familiar with these strategies, their use in sentences, and their occurrence in conversations. Therefore, after reviewing this booklet you will participate in a training session in which you will observe a video tape with strategy use and discuss the individual strategies as they may occur in your own interactions.
4. Observation Form - The Observation Form (available at the end of this booklet) is designed for easy recording of the information relevant to this study. The items on the Observation Form are thoroughly defined in this booklet (pages 10-13). After reviewing the items you will practice using them during the video/discussion training session.
5. After you have participated in the video/discussion training session you will practice recording communication strategies for the period of one week (seven days). At the end of this period, your data will be collected and reviewed. You will have the opportunity to ask questions that you might have concerning your recording of events.
6. Data Collection - After the practice week, you will then begin a two-week period (14 days) wherein you will record all communication strategies that occur during your dyadic interactions.

SELF-INVENTORY

1. Name _____
2. Sex _____
3. Age _____

BASELINE: Number of Total Interactions for the Period of One Week

(Estimate, at the end of the day, how many interactions you have participated in during that day. If you have interacted with the same person more than once in a period of time, such as you might with someone you live with, note only one interaction.)

Day One _____

Day Two _____

Day Three _____

Day Four _____

Day Five _____

Day Six _____

Day Seven _____

Note: The above information should be gathered during the same week you are practicing using the Observation Forms.

DESCRIPTION OF STRATEGIES

Communication strategies: qualifiers
 lengthening of words
 tag questions
 fillers
 disclaimers

The strategies you will be recording in this experiment are fairly easy to recognize. They are extra words in sentences that do not necessarily contribute to the overall content of the message itself.

Some of these strategies are similar and could be confusing. For example, in the strategies "qualifiers" and "disclaimers," both examples contain fragments at the beginning of sentences and are connected to the "content" of the sentence by a single word. Note in example #1, the subordinating conjunction "that" is used; and in #2, the conjunction "but" is used.

1. "It seems to me that you need a job." (Qualifier)
2. "You're going to think this is stupid, but you need a job."
 (Disclaimer)

On the next two pages are descriptions of the strategies and examples of how they are used in sentences. Following these explanations is a "quiz" designed to challenge you to recognize the strategies on sight, the first step toward recognizing them when you hear them spoken by someone or speak them yourself.

After you have completed reviewing this booklet, you will observe a video tape wherein you will be further tested on your ability to recognize communication strategies in use.

QUALIFIERS

Qualifiers are thought to soften the impact of what we say. They are words at the beginnings and endings of sentences. Examples are: well, let's see, perhaps, possibly, I suppose, it seems to me, I guess, and I wonder if.

Examples as they might appear in sentences:

1. "Well, it is cold outside."
2. "I suppose it is cold outside."
3. "It is cold outside, I guess."
4. "It seems to me that you need a job."
5. "You need a job, I guess."
6. "Possibly you need a job."
7. "I wonder if you need a job."

LENGTHENING OF REQUESTS

Lengthening of requests is thought to be used in the mode of politeness, in order to avoid pressing the listener for agreement.

Examples as they might appear in sentences:

1. "I would just like to ask how much does this cost?"
2. "I wonder if you could please tell me how much this costs?"
3. "Excuse me please, how much does this cost?"
4. "Do you think it would be okay with you if I lend ten dollars to Julie?"
5. "Well, let me just ask this, can you afford it?"
6. "Won't you please do the dishes?"

TAG QUESTIONS

Tag questions are thought of as devices used to avoid making a statement and a question. These strategies "tag" the sentence; that is, they are found at the end of sentences.

Examples as they might appear in sentences:

1. "This is a great game, isn't it?"
2. "Turn up the volume, won't you?"
3. "They are going to win, aren't they?"
4. "You're not going, are you?"
5. "The weather is lousy, isn't it?"
6. "She paid the bill, didn't she?"

FILLERS

Fillers are verbalizations that make the speaker appear hesitant. These strategies are found interspersed throughout sentences. Examples are: uhm, well, like, you know, okay, and see. Examples as they might appear in sentences:

Examples as they might appear in sentences:

1. "Well, it is cold, you know."
2. "Like, uhm, you have uhm no manners."
3. "Well, it's just that see I'm falling behind on my work."
4. "So, okay I'll talk for 45 minutes."

DISCLAIMERS

Disclaimers are often thought of as pre-apologies, that is, as apologies before the fact. They are found at the beginning of sentences, and the word "but" links the strategy with the message.

Examples as they might appear in sentences:

1. "I know this sounds silly, but call a tow truck."
2. "Well I'm not the expert, but call a tow truck."
3. "This may strike you as odd, but call a tow truck."
4. "You're probably tired, but call a tow truck."
5. "I know you probably hate to hear this, but call a tow truck."

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY "QUIZ"

1. _____ "Well, I'm late again."
2. _____ "Perhaps you should go."
3. _____ "It seems to me we could have cake."
4. _____ "We could have cake, couldn't we?"
5. _____ "Uhm, you will accept this uhm late paper?"
6. _____ "I know you probably hate to hear this, but will you accept this late paper?"
7. _____ "Don't you think it would be nice if we could have cake?"
8. _____ "Well, you know, I think we could have cake."
9. _____ "You're probably full, but we could have cake."
10. _____ "Do you think it is at all possible that you will accept this late paper?"
11. _____ "You will accept this late paper, won't you?"
12. _____ "Possibly you will accept this late paper?"
13. _____ "If you don't mind, could I please have a little more coffee?"
14. _____ "You're furious, aren't you?"
15. _____ "It may sound odd to you, but I feel great right now!"

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING EVENTS ON OBSERVATION FORMS

1. Familiarize yourself with the items on the Observation Forms and then review the descriptions of the items on pages 10 through 13 in this booklet.

2. Record every strategy use that occurs during interactions in which you are participating with one other person (dyadic or private interaction) for the period of two weeks. Record information in Section A of the Observation Form immediately when the strategy occurs. Excuse yourself and simply state that you are participating in an experiment about communication behavior.

Record information in Section B immediately after the interaction when you are no longer in the presence of the person with whom you were interacting.

3. Since it is likely that more than one strategy will be used during one interaction, you need to follow the format below, remembering to fill out Section A immediately after the strategy use has occurred; therefore, you may have three or four forms per interaction. Section B items do not need to be repeated for each strategy use. Make a notation of the Interaction Letter and Strategy Number at the top of each form to follow:

Interaction A
Strategy # 3

Interaction E
Strategy # 1

Note: The Interaction Letter refers to separate interaction (A through Z), and the Strategy Number refers to the number of strategies that occur within each interaction.

4. At the end of the two-week testing period, return the Participant-Observer Booklet with the completed forms to me.

DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS ON OBSERVATION FORM

- Item 1 Strategy User - You indicate who used the communication strategy (me, other).
- Item 2 Strategy Type - You indicate which communication strategy was used at this time. Refer to description of strategies (p.) in this booklet for complete information on strategy type.
- Item 3 Minute of Strategy Use - You need to closely approximate at what minute this strategy occurred after the start of the interaction.
- Item 4 General Description of Purpose - At the time of this strategy use, indicate the general description of the message; that is, what kind of conversation are you having?
- Item 5 Initiator of Interaction - Indicate who started the conversation (me, other). If you and other started the conversation at the same time, indicate "mutual."
- Item 6 Length of Interaction - You need to closely approximate, in minutes, the length of the conversation.
- Item 7 Overall Satisfaction of Self - On the scale, indicate how you feel in general about the degree to which you are satisfied with the outcome of this interaction. (9) indicates that you are very satisfied, (5) indicates that you are moderately satisfied, and (1) indicates that you are not satisfied at all.
- Item 8 Overall Satisfaction of Other - On the scale, indicate how you perceive other feels about the degree to which she/he is satisfied with the outcome of this interaction. (9) indicates that you perceive the other person to have felt very satisfied, (5) indicates that you perceived the other person to have felt moderately satisfied, and (1) indicates your perception that the other person was not satisfied at all. Note: Do not ask the other person for this response.
- Item 9 Level of Power - You need to indicate whether the person with whom you are interacting has a higher or lower overall level of power than you. If neither, indicate "equal," noting that you perceive yourself to have an equal level of overall power with this person.

- Item 10 Locus of Control - Indicate whom you perceive to be directing or in control of the flow of the conversation; that is, is the conversation going your way or the other person's way? If neither, indicate "mutual," noting that you perceive that both of you are equally directing or controlling the conversation.
- Item 11 Relationship to Other - Indicate how you are related to this person, as follows:
- "Relative" refers to someone in your family or primary relationship.
- "Friend" refers to someone whom you know fairly well and hold in positive regard.
- "Non-friend" refers to someone whom you know fairly well and hold in negative regard.
- "Acquaintance" refers to someone whom you know on a speaking basis, but whom you do not know well, for example, your mail carrier.
- "Co-worker/peer" refers to someone with whom you work or take classes and who is at the same level or position as you.
- "Superior" refers to someone who holds a higher position than you, for example, a parent, a teacher, and employer or a minister.
- "Subordinate" refers to someone who holds a lower position than you, for example, a child, a student, or an employee.
- "Stranger" refers to someone whom you do not know and have never come into contact with before this interaction.
- "Other" refers to someone who cannot be placed into one of the above categories. Explain on the line provided.
- Item 12 Level of Familiarity - On the scale, indicate your perception of the level of familiarity that you have with this person. (9) indicates that you know this person very well, (5) indicates that you know this person moderately well, and (1) indicates that you do not know this person at all. For example, a friend may fall anywhere from a 5 to a 9; an acquaintance might be a 2 or a 3, and a stranger a 1.

- Item 13 Overall Significance - On the scale, indicate what you feel is the level of impact of this interaction on your relationship with this person. (9) indicates that the interaction will have a strong impact on your relationship, (5) indicates that the interaction will have a moderate impact on your relationship, and (1) indicates that the interaction will have little or no impact on your relationship.
- Item 14 General Description of Location - Indicate where you are located at the time of this interaction. Explain on the line provided.
- Item 15 Level of Formality - Indicate what overall atmosphere or level of formality is present during this interaction. (9) indicates that you perceive the interaction to have a very formal atmosphere, (5) indicates that you perceive the interaction to have a moderately formal atmosphere, and (1) indicates that you perceive the interaction not to be formal at all, but rather informal.
- Item 16 Sex of Other - Indicate the sex of the person with whom you are interacting.
- Item 17 Age of Other - You need to closely approximate the age of the person with whom you are interacting. Note: Do not ask the other person for this information.

APPENDIX C

SCRIPTS FOR VIDEO TRAINING TAPE

The following scripts were used in the production of a video training tape. Two collaborating instructors role-played dyadic interactions in which strategy uses were demonstrated.

The first script was used to make the first segment of the video training tape which was used to train PO's to recognize the distinctions between the categories of strategies. The collaborators role-played four possible situations for each of the five categories of communication strategies. The first example in each category demonstrated an interaction with strategies and one without in order to train PO's to hear occurrences and nonoccurrences of strategy use.

The second script was used in the second segment of the training tape which was used in the reliability test to assess interrater agreement. This script presented four statements for each of the five categories, which were alternately delivered by the collaborators.

SCRIPT ONE

Training

Qualifiers-

1. with strategies:

S: What is our time line on this?

O: It seems to me only a few days.

S: I can't do it that quickly.

O: I guess I'll ask for an extension.

without strategies:

S: What is our time line on this?

O: A few days.

S: I can't do it that quickly.

O: I'll ask for an extension.

2.

S: I'm going to the cafeteria. Do you want anything?

O: Perhaps a cup of coffee.

S: That's all?

O: I suppose so, yes.

3.

S: I wonder if you need a job.

O: Why do you say that?

S: You seem bored, I guess.

4.

S: Did you see "Rambo"?

O: Lord no! Did you?

S: Well, yes.

Lengthening of Requests-

5. with strategies:

S: I would just like to know if it would be okay to see you tonight?

O: No.

without strategies:

S: I would like to see you tonight.

O: No.

6.

S: Excuse me please, could I borrow that pen?

O: No problem.

7.

S: Let me just ask you this, are you really going to fire Pete?
 O: Yes, I am.
 S: Won't you please reconsider?
 O: No.
 S: I just wonder if it is possible that you might be overreacting?
 O: This doesn't concern you.

8.

S: Do you think it would be okay with you if I could teach a course on sexism in communication?
 O: Yes" When?
 S: I would just like to find out from you when you think would be a good time?
 O: Any time!

Fillers-

9. with strategies:

S: Hell-o! Uhm, I've been wanting to uhm talk with you.
 O: Oh?
 S: yeah. See, you're failing this class.
 O: Failing? What do you mean?
 S: Well, your work is not up to graduate level standards.
 O: I didn't realize this.
 S: That's the problem.

without strategies:

S: Hell-o! I've been wanting to talk to you.
 O: Oh?
 S: Yeah. You're failing this class.
 O: Failing? What do you mean?
 S: Your work is not up to graduate level standards.
 O: I didn't realize this.
 S: That's the problem.

10.

S: What's the problem?
 O: The program like has just been zero-funded and see we're about to be out of work.
 S: You're kidding?
 O: Well, I'm not.

11.

S: Close the window!
 O: I want it open.
 S: It's you know cold in here.

12.

S: The film I saw last night was really interesting, and I mean you'd be interested in seeing it.

O: Oh? I'll check it out.

Tag Questions-

13. with strategy

S: You're home.

O: Yeah. Hi!

S: You're not going out again, are you?

O: No.

without strategy

S: You're home.

O: Yeah. Hi!

S: You're not going out again.

O: No.

14.

S: Where are you going sir?

O: What do you mean? She paid the bill didn't she?

S: No, she didn't.

O: This is really funny, isn't it?

15.

S: You'll accept this late paper, won't you?

O: Certainly.

S: My grade won't be affected, will it?

O: (frown)

16.

S: You don't expect me to be happy about this, do you?

O: I'd like you to be.

S: I'm not.

O: I can't help that, can I?

Disclaimers-

17. with strategies:

S: I'm sure you hear this all the time, but I loved your class.

O: Thank you!

without strategies:

S: I loved your class!

O: Thank you!

18.

S: Have you got a minute?

O: Sure. What is it?

S: Well, I know you'll hate to hear this, but your plans for the project are not feasible.

O: Oh? What's the problem?

S: I'm not the expert, but you don't have enough people to accomplish the job in the time you have projected.

O: Oh.

19.

S: You may think I'm crazy, but I love statistics!

O: You're right.

S: What?

O: You're crazy!

20.

S: Why did you leave early?

O: This may sound odd to you, but I wanted to go home and watch t.v.

SCRIPT TWO

Reliability Test

1. Take out the garbage, won't you?
2. I would just like to know how much you plan to eat.
3. Possibly you could give me the schedule.
4. I know you're tired, but I have to talk with you now.
5. The weather is lousy, isn't it?
6. I know you're going to think I'm lazy, but I can't do your paper.
7. I'm planning to like be there at noon.
8. I guess we should get to the meeting.
9. Excuse me please, do you think it would be okay with you if I took the day off?
10. This is a great proposal, isn't it?
11. I wonder if you need a break?
12. I just uhm need to give you this information.
13. She presented the argument, didn't she?
14. Let me just ask you this, can you afford the time?
15. It seems to me that you need to take time for yourself.
16. It's just that, see you write so much better than me.
17. Okay, so your papers are due on Friday.
18. I know you're in a hurry, but please help me clean up this mess.
19. I just need to know if you think it would be okay if I borrowed your typewriter.
20. You're not going to think this is fair, but you need to work late tonight.

APPENDIX D

SECOND SCRIPT FOR THE FIRST RELIABILITY TEST

1. This is great fun, isn't it?
2. You're you know going to have to make a decision about this.
3. I'm sorry to say this to you, but you're in the wrong class.
4. I would just like to know if you could lend me \$100.
5. I could be wrong, but that's what I think.
6. Perhaps you could lend me the money.
7. And, uhm I had to uhm borrow the money for tuition.
8. He works hard on his homework, doesn't he?
9. For my sake would you please take care of this problem?
10. Now I had nothing to do with this situation, but we're going to have to let you go.
11. I guess I'll go shopping after work.
12. You just couldn't stay out of it, could you?
13. You need a job, I suppose.
14. Do you think it would be okay with you if I put this in your office until I give my speech?
15. I'm furious, and see, you're going to pay for this.
16. Let's see if we can fit you in at nine.
17. We're going to have a good time, aren't we?
18. Excuse me please, could you tell me how I might get to 5th Avenue from here?
19. It's just like I'm so tired all the time.
20. I know you're going to hate to hear this, but we're almost done with the testing.

APPENDIX E

COHEN'S KAPPA STATISTIC ON DATA FROM STUDY

- N = Number of intervals or observations
 N_o = Number of observation that are the same or in agreement
 N_e = $\frac{\text{Column} \times \text{Row} + \text{the rest of the columns} \times \text{rows}}{N}$
 P_o = $\frac{N_o}{N}$ Sum of diagonal entries/total of all entries
 P_e = $\frac{N_e}{N}$ Chance proportions action of agreements
 K = $\frac{N_o - N_e}{N - N_e} = \frac{P_o - P_e}{1 - P_e}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 N &= 1440 \\
 N_o &= 1306 \\
 N_e &= \frac{269 \times 348}{1440} + \frac{288 \times 288}{1440} + \frac{288 \times 273}{1440} + \frac{284 \times 255}{1440} + \\
 &\quad \frac{284 \times 276}{1440} = 65.01 + 57.6 + 50.29 + 54.43 = 281.93 \\
 P_o &= \frac{1306}{1440} = .91 \\
 P_e &= \frac{281.93}{1440} = .20 \\
 K &= \frac{1306 - 281.93}{1440 - 281.93} = .88 \\
 &\quad \frac{.91 - .20}{1 - .20} = \frac{.71}{.8} = .89
 \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX F

SCRIPT FOR SECOND RELIABILITY TEST

1. I'm going shopping after work to buy new shoes.
2. The weather is so disappointing in Oregon that I've decided to move to California.
3. Perhaps I'll go to the library after work.
4. You're so lazy that you can't get through one day without a nap.
5. You're uhm going to have to get a job real soon.
6. I know you really tried hard, but I'm going to have to give you an F.
7. I tried very hard in that class, and I deserve a better grade.
8. We're going to see Tina Turner, aren't we?
9. I'm going to have to find someone else because your language is too harsh for this age group.
10. That's ridiculous. You're not going to work 40 hours a week plus do your school work?
11. I would just like to know if it's possible for you to attend the meeting?
12. Yes. I'll sign your petition. May I borrow your pen?
13. I suppose I could carry your gear as well as my own.
14. This is wonderful! You know I'm finally going to be done with school.
15. It's 5:30 in the morning. What are you doing up?
16. Mom, if I eat all of my dinner and I'm quiet while you work, couldn't I please stay up and watch t.v.?
17. You're not going to like this, but you have to re-enter all of your data into the computer.
18. The computer is down so you'll have to wait a week before I can give you that reference.

19. So then I said it would see be no problem, and he was thinking about something else so see he didn't hear me.
20. Will you babysit for me Saturday night?
21. It seems to me that you are working too hard.
22. You're going to have to rewrite this paper, aren't you?
23. What time are we going to the concert?
24. After work today I went outside to sit in the sun and have a cup of coffee.
25. I may be wrong, but aren't you expected in class right now?