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Abstract

This research is an analysis of compliance-gaining techniques used in naturally-occurring conversation in faculty meetings. The central concern of the study is the influence of sex, of status and of the interaction of sex and status on verbal compliance-gaining behavior.

Application of a coding scheme derived from Marwell and Schmitt's 16 compliance-gaining techniques isolated few compliance-gaining attempts in 370 conversational episodes, even though participants reported that compliance gaining was occurring. Total turn time was calculated for the sex/status subgroups. Males had significantly more average turn time per meeting than females. Tenured faculty had significantly more average turn time than tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty; tenure-track faculty had significantly more average turn time than non-tenure-track faculty. The tenured male had significantly more average turn time per meeting than all other
sex/status subgroups. Although the data analysis was inconclusive, no significant differences were obtained among subgroups in the use of compliance-gaining techniques.

As a result of this analysis, a descriptive approach to the data was proposed, and an original, data-based model of compliance-gaining techniques was developed. The new coding scheme was applied to the data from one faculty meeting, and 61 compliance-gaining attempts were isolated in 82 episodes. One third of the attempts either occurred in a series with other attempts by the same interlocutor, or occurred as reactions to other techniques by different interlocutors. The technique Simple Statement was the most used technique. Distribution of compliance-gaining techniques across the faculty subgroups was found to be essentially even, excluding the department chair, who used far more techniques than the other subgroups. The number of identifiable compliance-gaining attempts was believed to reflect the greater validity of behavior-based coding categories.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

"Every human being is motivated to interact effectively with his environment; the drive to be interpersonally competent is the drive to produce effects on or influence one's world."

(Bochner & Kelly, 1974, p. 286)

Overview and purpose. The purpose of this research is to examine the use of compliance-gaining techniques in conversation as affected by sex of the speaker, status of the speaker, and the interaction of sex and status. In order to define the role of compliance gaining in interpersonal communication, it is first necessary to review this behavior in light of what other researchers have said about interpersonal power and relational control in interaction.

Interpersonal communication. The process by which human beings define themselves and others is interpersonal communication, which has been described as "the transfer of symbolic information which has as its principal goal the coordination of human activity in regard to the presentation, development, and validation of individual self-concepts" (Cushman & Florence, 1974, p. 13). People devote much energy to the control of interaction because interaction is the primary vehicle of
self-definition. Overtly, covertly, knowingly or unknowingly, participants in a conversation set out to manage that conversation, which in turn will manage the relationship, and thus the individual's self-definition (Haley, 1963; Steinberg & Miller, 1975).

Haley (1963) states that a fundamental precept of communication theory is that every individual attempts to control the definition of the relationship. Once the message is sent from one person to another, the sender is, by the act of sending itself, seeking to define the relationship and herself/himself (Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson, 1967; Griffin & Heider, 1967). A social situation, established when two people enter into communication, generates rules and apportions roles to the participants by virtue of their having set in motion a communication system (Reusch, 1968). People begin defining the relationship by first negotiating the communication system that will govern their continued interaction. In this view, every act of message sending becomes an interaction maneuver, implying a degree of purposiveness on the part of the sender, or minimally, a degree of goal orientation (Reusch, 1963; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Further, the receiver, as a necessary contributor to the definition of the relationship, chooses from an array of behaviors to respond to the initial message, and this response itself becomes a maneuver, and so on throughout the course of the interaction. Marwell and Schmitt suggest that all behavior is directed at satisfying an individual's desires through the reorganization of the environment, and consequently that "social behavior becomes the manipulation of other
people to achieve the goals of the actor, and the study of interaction becomes the study of social control" (p.350).

Maneuvers may take the form of descriptions, assertions or denials as interactors work out their self and relational definitions (Cushman & Florence, 1974). Consider, for example, the friend/friend dyad in which Friend #1 has always made the decision concerning Saturday night's activity: When Friend #1 says, "Why don't you decide what we should do tonight?" the remark could be a conversational maneuver aimed at defining or redefining self ("I want to be less bossy") or the relationship ("We should share decision-making responsibilities"). When Friend #2 responds, "No, you go ahead and decide," the maneuver could define self ("I'm a martyr") or relationship ("I like things the way they are between us"). This set of maneuvers includes both assertions and denials in both overt and covert behaviors; and, in fact, both parties are attempting, through their interaction maneuvers, to control the definition of themselves and the relationship. Essentially, then, control is a basic interactional dimension, so basic, in fact, that it underlies all social behavior, and thus all communication.

Control. Control, along with inclusion and affection, is cited as one of the basic interpersonal needs and is defined as "the need to maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to control and power . . . (which) manifests itself as a desire for power, authority or control over others and therefore over one's future" (Shutz, 1966, p.
Elsewhere, power has been defined as attributed power (Schopler & Layton, 1974); potential influence (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970); and coercion, the ability to obtain obedience by force (Weber, 1947). In the estimation of these researchers, power is the potential to do, act, produce or determine. Control, then, is the behavioral and psychological extension of power—it is power put into effect.

Control also has been described as the ability to participate in relational definition (Haley, 1963); social influence (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970); dominance (Brandt, 1980); social induction of behavior change (Kelman, 1974); and inducing appropriate behaviors in others (Kipnis, 1974). The view that any message is an interactional maneuver and hence an attempt to control, makes clear the notion that every individual is a power-user, since any act of communication is an act of control (Frost & Wilmot, 1978).

The study of social control must to a great extent involve the study of verbal behavior, because verbal behavior comprises a significant part of interaction. In conversation, control techniques or maneuvers can surface in any of several dimensions: who speaks, the topics introduced, when speaking begins and ends, how often a speaker gets to speak, and the sorts of messages speakers select.
Control and relational definition. Any conversation, any discourse, involves two dimensions which are known as reporting and commanding (Satir, 1967). The report corresponds to the content dimension of the message, and the command aspect corresponds to the relationship implications of the message (Watzlawick et al., 1967). Further, the report part of the message is analogous to the basic proposition or ideational content of the message (Katz, 1977; Clark & Clark, 1977; Dore, 1979). In short, the primary information contained in the message is its report. Command describes the aspect of a message which structures, circumscribes or imposes behavior between the interactors; there, command is the operation which provides relational information to the interactors. The command function is a relational definition. For example, consider these two statements which contain approximately the same ideational information (proposition): a) "The proper cooking time for this quiche is thirty minutes"; and b) "That quiche should be done by now; it's been in the oven half an hour." While the propositions are roughly identical, the two statements clearly set forth quite different sorts of relational information.

Compliance gaining. Marwell and Schmitt point out that even if interaction-as-social-control is too broad a generalization, it is nevertheless true that people devote much time and energy to trying to get other people to respond in ways they want. For the purpose of this research, this effort at getting other people to respond in desired ways is called compliance gaining.
According to Kipnis (1974), power begins with a power motivation ("an aroused need state that can be satisfied by inducing appropriate behaviors in others"), which causes the power to become a control attempt, i.e., a request for compliance. Thus, compliance gaining is one specific manifestation of control. Power is the underlying motivation of control, and control is the underlying motivation of a compliance-gaining attempt.

One possible conclusion of this reasoning is that a certain percentage of human interaction involves messages designed for gaining compliance of others. While compliance gaining may appear to be a more overt or blatant relational activity than the general command aspect of messages, it is related to the command aspect of messages because of its inherent implications of relational definition and control. However, compliance-gaining as a relational variable does additionally suggest the notions persuasion and persuadability; and persuasion, in turn, implies the "conscious attempt by one individual to change the attitudes, beliefs or behavior of another individual ... through the transmission of some message" (Bettinghaus, 1980, p. 4). Obviously this construct represents, at base, influence; and compliance-gaining attempts are attempts at relational influence.

At issue, then, are questions regarding what constitute compliance-gaining messages, how these messages differ from one another, and what factors determine who uses which type of compliance-gaining
messages and in what contexts. That which constitutes a compliance-gaining attempt in one context might not in another, depending on the status of the participants. For example, the question "Do you want to go to the store?" when directed to a child from a mother might be a clear order to go to the store. When directed from one spouse to another, it may be merely a request for information or clarification. One way to examine who uses which type of compliance-gaining attempts is to examine the effects of status on compliance-gaining behavior. Similarly, because the sex variable appears to significantly influence many behaviors, this variable is one to consider when attempting to examine differences in compliance-gaining messages. A number of researchers suggest that a way to approach these questions is to examine the effects of speaker status and speaker sex on conversation (Thorne & Henley, 1975; Lakoff, 1975; Zimmerman & West, 1975; Parlee, 1979). This, then, is the aim of this research.

**Status influence.** The question of who uses a compliance-gaining technique and in which settings is partially addressed within the dimension of status. Influence can be obtained through exchanges of competency, wherein the influencer can further another's goal by virtue of his/her skill, or through exchanges of material goods or wealth. Additionally, influence can be exercised because of a person's "right," by position, to ask for compliance and because of a target's "obligation" to comply (French & Raven, 1959; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970; Raven, 1974). According to Michener and Burt (1974), *legitimacy* differs
from other forms of power because it centers in the context of the group and can operate only within the group. These researchers further define the legitimate influence situation as a hierarchical one in which those of superior status generally influence those of subordinate status. In the legitimacy condition, compliance-gaining techniques might logically proceed from the power of the position, i.e., the status of the influencer, as opposed to the power of the individual in the position (Michener & Burt, 1974).

A situation that contrasts the difference between these two powers would be the case of the teacher who asks for and receives cooperation from students in obeying a "No Smoking" regulation while in that teacher's class; however, the same teacher could conceivably exercise little or no influence (obtaining little or no compliance) with the same request made to students drinking at the local tavern. Legitimacy, then, with its attendant status variable, is both role- and situation-specific. Where status is clear-cut, as is often the case in organizational hierarchies, compliance-gaining strategies may differ from those used where status is ambiguous.

Michener and Burt underscore the fact that in natural settings, influence can be multi-directional. Fox and Moore (1973), in their development of an expectation states model, describe power and prestige in a group in terms of four behaviors: action opportunities, performance outputs, agreement and disagreement, and acceptance or
rejection of influence. They suggest that these behaviors result from self/other expectations based on specific and diffuse characteristics. Specific characteristics include skills and talents, and diffuse characteristics include sex, race and status characteristics. This definition of status does not imply the same legitimacy that hierarchical status does; and, in fact, discussions of status inconsistency (in which persons are ranked as both low and high in status depending on the status characteristics) do not generally include status clarified or legitimized by title or position within the group (Crosbie, 1979).

In social settings, status of individuals must be inferred from status cues of either the specific (e.g., skills) or diffuse characteristics (e.g., sex) suggested by Fox and Moore. Lacking any sort of overt, unambiguous status markers (such as badges or titles), interactors in social situations would be most likely to assume what is socially or stereotypically the norm. Thus issues of sex and race could be integral in influencing an individual's status determinations, and an individual's choice of compliance-gaining technique. Once status assumptions are made, interaction patterns may tend to reflect those assumptions. In general, verbal behavior reflects the nature of sex, class, racial and ethnic dominance; it is a subtle social indicator of social structure (Thorne & Henley, 1975; Kramer, 1974).
Sex influences. In recent years social science has begun to explore the differences between male and female behavior. Linguistic pragmatics and contemporary interpersonal communication study are addressing sex as a variable which influences language and interactive style. Nonverbal behaviors appear to reflect differential use of influence (Henley, 1975). Males and females show marked differences in self-disclosure, touching behavior and interrupting behavior such that the behaviors of males parallel high power behaviors, and those of females, low power. In male/female dyads, gender has a significant impact on power strategies. Men perceive themselves as having greater power and women, less power; thus men use direct, bilateral strategies in expectation of compliance, while women use indirect, unilateral strategies (Falbo & Peplau, 1980). The control dimension of relationships is of primary importance in these studies and has implications for the effects of powerfulness/powerlessness on male/female self-definition. Lakoff (1975), in her discussion of language, points out the disparities in English that "reflect in (their) pattern of usage the difference between the role of women . . . and that of men" (p. 49). There can be little doubt that language and speech style affect the way people define themselves and define others (Erikson et al., 1973). As a result, sex-role stereotyping is an important consideration in the analysis of contrasts between male and female speech styles.
Conventional sex-role stereotypes include notions of female powerlessness, as reflected in "weaker sex" descriptions ranging from the female in organizational settings who "lacks true leadership potential," to the one in the "Coldpower" commercial who smiles happily, simperingly (and silently) when a masculine voice-over advises her how to do the laundry (a reflection of social setting). In the latter example, the unseen male has somehow a greater status than the visible, but brainless, female. The communication styles, including compliance-gaining and compliance-giving, simply reinforce what is already there: Men are listened to; women aren't. The language and style of this commercial make this point clear.

Despite the research done in a variety of contexts ranging from courtrooms (Erikson et al., 1978) to intimate dyads (Falbo & Peplau, 1980), many questions regarding the issue of male versus female communication still remain. And, indeed, many questions regarding the actual behaviors people use in "getting their own way" remain. A central concern of this research is to try to determine what actually takes place when people talk to people. It is not enough to infer entire profiles of behavior and complete strategies on the basis of questionnaires administered after the fact. Naturally-occurring behaviors in natural settings would seem to be the best indicators of exactly what it is that people do when they interact with one another (Greenberg, 1975; Pearce, 1977; Hickson, 1977). To thoroughly examine power, influence or control, analysis of face-to-face interaction is essential.
Interaction of sex and status. In social situations, status can be a very subtle, ambiguous variable, whereas sex of speaker generally is not. Like other manifestations of stereotyping, given a lack of relevant cues regarding one's status in a conversation, traditional stereotypes prevail. Thus women can be expected to talk less, interrupt less, offer more topics and more reinforcement than men do because women do not have the same "legitimacy," as defined by French and Raven, that men do (Bakins & Bakins, 1978). These behaviors are generally expected; the ambiguity of status would tend to produce socially-scripted interactions between males and females, with males being more powerful and females being less powerful. Naturally-occurring conversation should provide some insight into the effects of status and sex on speaker conversational style, particularly in terms of compliance-gaining techniques. However, whether or not interactive maneuvers employed by males and females result from innate predispositions is, as yet, unclear. These styles may result from speakers' attempts to seek consistency between their behavioral enactments and others' behavioral expectations. In either case, the effects of status and sex cannot easily be addressed by observing conversations in social settings where status ambiguities exist. Thus research is needed that separates these status and sex variables in some natural context where the status hierarchy is clear.
The problem. The central concern of this study is the influence of sex, of status, and of sex and status on verbal compliance-gaining behavior. In non-occupational social settings, the impact of sex or of status or of both on conversation cannot be readily identified, because research has revealed that males are accorded higher social status merely by virtue of being male. In non-occupational settings, females cannot arbitrarily be assigned higher social status so that conversation could then be examined to see if the differences, as for example in quantity of talk, are the result of either the sex or status variable.

This dilemma can be solved by studying a setting in which females can be identified as having higher status than some males. The occupational setting provides observable status distinctions in the form of occupational position titles. A university is such a setting. The question, then, is what effect will status (as indicated by a person's titular position within a department) or sex or both status and sex have in determining the speaker's compliance-gaining attempts in conversation?

The mechanism through which compliance gaining will be explored is a coding scheme based on the compliance-gaining techniques proposed by Marwell and Schmitt. The techniques are:

1. Promise: If you comply, I will reward you.
2. Threat: If you do not comply, I will punish you.
3. Expertise-positive: If you comply, you will be rewarded because of the nature of things.

4. Expertise-negative: If you do not comply, you will be punished because of the nature of things.

5. Liking: Actor is friendly and helpful to get target in "good frame of mind" so that s/he will comply with request.

6. Pre-giving: Actor rewards target before requesting compliance.


8. Debt: You owe me compliance because of past favors.

9. Moral Appeal: You are immoral if you do not comply.

10. Self-feeling-positive: You will feel better about yourself if you comply.

11. Self-feeling-negative: You will feel worse about yourself if you do not comply.

12. Altercasting-positive: A person with good qualities would comply.

13. Altercasting-negative: Only a person with bad qualities would not comply.

14. Altruism: I need your compliance badly, so it would be altruistic of you to do it for me.

15. Esteem-positive: People you value will think better of you if you comply.

16. Esteem-negative: People you value will think worse of you if you do not comply.

17. Sycophantic Flattery: Because you are such a wonderful person, you will want to comply.

18. Camaraderie: Since we are all in this together, you will want to comply.
See Appendix D for Marwell and Schmitt's first- and second-order factors.

For a complete description of the coding scheme, see Appendix B.

*Coding information added to original Marwell and Schmitt list of compliance-gaining techniques by researcher.

The following research questions are structured to explore the influences of sex and status and their interaction on conversational compliance-gaining attempts, assessed through the Marwell and Schmitt typology and total turn time measures. The faculty meeting setting is the specific occupational context in which these questions will be explored.

Research Questions:

1. Will males and females differ in their use of and preference for compliance-gaining techniques?

2. Will status or occupational position be a factor in determining trends in the use of and preference for compliance-gaining techniques?
3. Will any particular compliance-gaining technique be used more than other techniques by the group as a whole?

4. Will participants respond to the compliance-gaining questionnaire in a manner consistent with their previously recorded natural verbal behaviors?

5. Will compliance-gaining techniques in conversation tend to form clusters, or strategies, defined as "groups of techniques towards which potential actors tend to respond similarly"? (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; p. 351)

6. Will the techniques recorded in actual conversation tend to fall predominantly within any one of the Marwell and Schmitt first- and second-order factors? (See Appendix D for description of first- and second-order factors.)

7. Will measures of total talking time (suggested as an indication of a speaker's social power by Eakins and Eakins), reflect status and sex differences of the speakers, and will this measure correspond to the speaker's use of compliance-gaining techniques?

Implications. The implications of the problem and related research questions are extensive. To begin with, as Miller et al. (1977) suggest, if compliance-gaining strategies used by interactors can be unambiguously specified in natural settings, researchers interested in a
host of persuasive problems and situations could use this vehicle for
their investigations. Furthermore, compliance-gaining techniques as a
part of conversational strategies in general could augment an
individual's social control, reflect credibility and enhance status (and
perhaps self-esteem). In the hands of the psychologist, or counselor,
or communicologist these strategies and techniques could be taught to
others for use in a variety of interpersonal or organizational settings.
Indeed, if the current trend in "assertiveness training" continues,
conversational compliance-gaining techniques may become useful,
teachable behaviors for effective, assertive communication. Finally, if
status and sex appear to have no effect on use of compliance-gaining
techniques then perhaps the conclusions regarding power and
powerlessness heretofore ascribed to these two variables could stand
renewed scrutiny and exploration.

The succeeding chapters of this investigation will first review the
literature relating to power and social control, status, sex
stereotyping, compliance-gaining strategies, and arguments for
naturalistic study of communication. Next, the methods for data
collection, measurement and analysis will be described. Then, the
results of the data analysis, discussion of the results and implications
of the results will be detailed. A proposal and application of a
data-based coding scheme will follow. Finally, conclusions and
recommendations for future research will be discussed.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

To fully illustrate the magnitude and pervasiveness of power, status and sex stereotyping in their impact on behavior, an exploration of the research pertaining to each of the factors is required. A number of researchers suggest that these variables are key influences on conversation, the primary mechanism through which people define their behavior (Thorne & Henley, 1975; Lakoff, 1975; Zimmerman & West, 1975; Parlee, 1979). If people define their behaviors through conversation, a key consideration for examining any specific conversational behavior is the environment in which the conversation occurs. An attempt to focus what happens in real-world settings should include analysis developed in those settings; to explore naturally-occurring compliance-gaining attempts, naturally-occurring behavior should be the data base. Since the aim of this research is to analyze compliance-gaining attempts in conversation, an examination of the research which argues for naturalistic conversational analysis is required.
The power concept surfaces in a number of different interactional situations; but of specific importance is the literature involving the use of power in relationships (particularly power bases), in organizations and in social environments. Within these contexts there are related issues which warrant a closer look: the role of power as it pertains to conflict situations, and power use as affected by user sex.

Although researchers often equate power with status, an occasional investigation of status alone is available in the literature. A key consideration underlying this study is the effect of status on behavior and perceptions of behavior. To highlight these effects and perceptions of status, studies on reasons for status inconsistency and emergence, the relationship of communication strategies to status, the role of status in organizations and interpersonal relationships, and the interactive effects of status and sex on the use of power as it is expressed verbally will also be reviewed.

A third significant area of the literature review focuses on sex stereotyping. This discussion treats sex stereotyping as a form of social stereotyping and includes studies involving sex-typed characteristics, unconscious sex stereotyping, and both social and occupational effects of sex stereotyping.
A fourth research area reviewed in the literature is compliance gaining. This portion of the literature discussion centers on studies of the use of compliance-gaining techniques in varying situations, clusters of techniques that form strategies, and interactors' perceptions of compliance-gaining situations.

The final section of the literature review will cover the desirability of naturalistic study and conversational analysis as a research method.

POWER

Power in relationships. Discussions of power and control tend to inspire images of power corrupting its wielders or the destructive effects of power used abusively by enemies. However, power is a basic dynamic of any relationship. May (1972) suggests that much of human behavior is the conflict between power (which he defines as "effective ways of influencing others, achieving the sense in interpersonal relations of the significance of one's self") (p. 20) and powerlessness. This point of view suggests that power is created by the relationships that occur between individuals; thus power is a relational attribute as opposed to a characteristic of the individual (Henley, 1977; Blau, 1964; Kipnis, 1974; Frost & Wilmot, 1978). The effectiveness of any projection of power by an individual is determined within the boundaries of the relationship; in short, power projection (control) depends utterly on its interpretation by interactors (Fast, 1977). The fact
that a statement like, "Is that a threat or a promise?" can be an effective parry in verbal power struggles indicates that power must be defined relationally. Raven and Kruglanski (1970) state that power users need to anticipate the effectiveness of any particular power base and avoid those bases which would be ineffective in influencing a target. Thus the behavior of the target is an essential consideration in power choice. For example, if the relationship between power-user and target were one of sadist to masochist, a "threat" of physical coercion used by the sadist to obtain compliance could well be interpreted by the masochist as a "promise" of reward for failure to comply.

Many power exchanges subtly influence social behaviors and are built into interaction norms. The bases of power describe relations between those who influence and control and those who are influenced or controlled.

**Power bases.** Friese, Parsons, Johnson, Ruble and Zellman (1978), building on the work of French and Raven, describe six power bases which are apparent in either direct or indirect power use: 1) reward, which involves the ability to give positive sanctions; 2) coercion, which involves the ability to give negative sanctions; 3) referent, which refers to identification resulting from familiarity or likeableness; 4) expert, which is derived from superior knowledge or skills; 5) legitimate, which is considered the right, by virtue of position, to
influence others; and a final power base, 6) informational, which involves the ability to provide explanations for the benefit derived from another's change. The legitimate power base is the one which involves the individual's overt right, through rules and norms, to exercise influence or control; thus legitimate power forms a primary power base in organizations (Weber, 1949). Legitimate power in this sense is synonymous with authority (Koehler, Anatol & Applbaum, 1976). In an organizational setting, power and control can derive from an individual's hierarchical placement within the organization (organizational status), the alliances an individual forms, the competence an individual displays and the relative centralization or decentralization of the decision-making (Kanter, 1977; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Harragan, 1977). The power structure of an organization somewhat formalizes who must yield to influence attempts and who is entitled to make influence attempts or resist influence attempts (Koehler, Anatol & Applbaum, 1976). In short, organizational hierarchies provide a ready-made framework for "power of position" legitimized by an individual's role (Michener and Burt, 1974).

Power in social situations. Both within the organization and within broader social situations, power and the need for control assume enormous importance in personal definitions of self-worth. Structurally-based power has been established as a causal link between the interpersonal bargaining process and perceived personal competence in experiments involving manipulations of network centrality (Stolte,
For example, persons at the center of networks rate themselves higher in self-perceptions of competence than those located on the network's periphery. Power as a function of a person's roles, statuses and power-dependence relations has been established in studies of social exchange processes in families; the thrust of these investigations centers on reward power and a person's perception of reward distribution as commensurate with expectation (Osmond, 1978). Blau (1964) differentiates between power and exchange as being two separate considerations in human relations, and argues that rewards are not part of power. But others have argued that social exchange relations are really subsets of power relations since a successful influence attempt includes benefits and costs (Baldwin, 1978). Social exchange relations, like those found in networks and families, can be conceptualized as power relations.

In this view of power, which assumes the development of strategic relations in which the power-user weighs rewards and costs to self, control includes several variables that determine whether relationships are collaborative, negotiated or conflicted. These variables include: the extent to which the individuals involved perceive each other as having similar or dissimilar objectives; the degree to which one can act independently; "issue priority"; time, as it relates to the period during which individuals must act; and legitimacy, as the extent to which an individual has inherent and acknowledged power to act within a given situation (Torczyner, 1978). This discussion of strategy includes
several of the elements of control alluded to previously.

**Power and conflict.** The use of power in a social context can affect cooperation among interactors and conflict resolution. In one study, participants interacted with others who either consistently cooperated or competed, or alternately competed and cooperated. It was found that low-power persons acted more cooperatively, showed more attraction for, and were willing to facilitate other's outcomes to the extent that the other had cooperated with the low-power individual. In contrast, a high-power person's cooperativeness was unaffected by the actions of low-power persons (Tjosvold & Okun, 1979). The underlying theme of this research is that unequal power and unequal cooperation incentives are related.

**Power and compliance.** Different types of social power, e.g., reward, coercion, etc., lead to different expectations about compliance and satisfaction among persons on whom varying types of influence are used. In a study of head and staff nurses, head nurses expected more compliance on the part of staff nurses than staff nurses predicted they would give. Targets of power maneuvers were shown to be more sensitive to the type of power used than were powerholders. Both head and staff nurses perceived the use of legitimate, coercive and expert power as leading to low satisfaction; but staff nurses expected far less satisfaction than head nurses. Status was shown to affect one's perceptions of power use (Fontaine & Beerman, 1977).
The effects of power motivation on an individual's use of power is somewhat unclear. Kipnis (1974) discusses power motivation as the need a person experiences that can be satisfied only by causing others to behave in certain ways; consequently, this need state could result from an irrational impulse, from perception of role-appropriate behaviors (as in the case of legitimate authority), or from some innate universal drive. Kipnis points out that in the case of organizational involvement, individuals see institutions as the determiners of the authority structure. An individual's "need for absolution" upon exerting influence may have its counterpart in an individual's need to perceive himself/herself as having influence. In an industrial simulation, Fodor and Farrow (1979) found that supervisors high in the need for power perceived themselves as exerting greater influence on the work of the group. This finding is somewhat analogous to the results of the Fontaine and Beerman research.

**Sex differences in power.** Power use is influenced by effectiveness and evaluation by others as well as power motivation and need for power. Sex role expectations regulate behavior, determining the appropriateness of male/female behaviors. Behaviors enacted contrary to expectations may be seen negatively, and use of power is no exception. Sex stereotypes show women as being noncompetitive and nonaggressive; thus women are attributed with less direct, more manipulative use of power (Frieze et al., 1978). According to Frieze et al., even if a woman is strong and assertive, it has been socially expedient for her to appear
weak. Although Harragan (1977) suggests that the use of power by women in organizational settings may be limited by their lack of experience as team players, other writers suggest that all the knowledge of gamesmanship and hierarchies will not advance a woman in the power plays of organizational interaction, since, by the way she speaks, she is seen as less credible than her male counterpart (Elias, 1980; Lakoff, 1975; Miller & Swift, 1977; Parlee, 1979). This low-power, lack of credibility effect of women's conversational styles may be the result of actual word choice (as in the use of tag questions and intensifiers), total talking time, nonverbal paralanguage, features of submissiveness, interruptions and silences (Eakins & Eakins, 1973; Thorne & Henley, 1975; Zimmerman and West, 1975). One provocative study used three "female" linguistic forms (tag questions, qualifiers and compound requests) as stimuli presented by both male and female speakers. In ratings of person perception, those using "female" forms were seen as less assertive with speaker sex not a significant factor (Newcombe & Arnkoff, 1979).

STATUS

Much of the literature addressing the issue of status tends to fall into two general types: social status, as defined by the social situation, and hierarchical status, as found in organizational settings. The operationalization of status is by no means clear-cut, however. Many of the factors which influence an individual's power or control
also influence an individual's social status, or at least the way that individual is perceived by other individuals.

**Status and behavior.** Aside from the usual physical artifacts of status, (such as faster cars, greener lawns, larger desks, offices with windows), status is often prescribed by behaviors. Leadership, assertiveness, competence and even physical location or group position can describe a kind of status situation (Michener & Burt, 1974; Frieze, et al., 1978; Henley, 1977). Research in small group behavior often cites status as a pivotal intervening variable in person perception. Michener and Burt found when negative sanctions were permissible for high status persons, strong sanctions received more compliance than weak sanctions. For behavior in general, it has been found that estimates of an individual's current performance are based on that person's already-established status within the group (Sherif, White & Harvey, 1955).

In a study of status in experimentally produced groups, boys at summer camp were put into interactive situations conducive to natural group formation; once groups had formed and stabilized, the boys were asked to judge one another's task performance. Results tended to indicate that the higher an individual's status within the group, the greater the tendency of others to overestimate his performance; and conversely, the lower his status, the less of a tendency to overestimate and, indeed, in some cases, an increase in the tendency to underestimate
his performance (Sherif, White & Harvey, 1955). While this study revealed a number of compelling group behaviors, the primary finding seems to highlight the effects of status—in short, nothing succeeds like success. If an individual is perceived as having greater status, performance perceptions of others are accordingly high.

This particular case is illustrative of balance theory, which is a significant force in attitude formation (Heider, 1945). Briefly, attitudes toward an individual and a person's attitudes toward acts performed by that individual are interrelated. In order to reduce imbalance, the boys in the Sherif study perceived the performance of their peers such that high status and good performance perceptions merged.

Like balance theory, script theory offers a possible explanation for the symmetry between status and evaluation of performance. A script is a coherent sequence of events expected by an individual, and a script can involve the individual as participant or observer. Attitudes toward a person are said to consist of an ensemble of scripts concerning that person (Abelson, 1976). The results of the boys' camp study suggest that scripts were conceived for individuals high in status, and those scripts, in order to remain consistent, later determined evaluations of performance. The possibility that social scripts and status may be mutually reinforcing underscores the importance of status as a consideration in interaction. High status, at least socially, seems to
be its own reward.

**Status and compliance.** Intuitively, the relation between compliance and status appears to be clear. It is generally believed that those higher in status are good at gaining compliance of lower status others, and that these high status persons are not so good at complying when it becomes their turn to be the lower status others. One reason posited for high status persons being freer in regard to compliance is the concept of "idiosyncratic credits"—privileges of position—which allow noncompliance with the norms of the group. In a study undertaken with hospital personnel, investigators attempted to discover if, in fact, higher status persons exercised idiosyncratic credits with regard to a request to sign one's name when taking a cup of coffee. Higher status persons revealed themselves to be less likely to comply than lower status persons. The researchers speculated that since the pressure to comply was not very strong (the use of a written notice), the higher status persons used their idiosyncratic credits in not complying (Howell, Lederman, Owen & Solomon, 1978). This research suggests that higher status persons feel somewhat less pressure to conform to the norms of the group (or the situation—organizational in this case). Furthermore, high status can constitute a power base, giving individuals greater latitude in influence attempts. Idiosyncratic credits can be used in the exercise of influence as well as in failure to comply with influence attempts (Frieze et al., 1978). The idea of idiosyncratic credits is an important concept to consider in
any discussion of actual differences in talk between high and low status persons because it amplifies the relation between compliance and status.

**Status emergence.** From the research on status characteristics, some of the behaviors which combine to generate a person's status have been isolated. Among these observable behaviors are: socially distributed chances to perform (action opportunities), problem-solving attempts (performance), communicated evaluation (agreement/disagreement), and acceptance or rejection of influence. These behaviors are believed to be the consequence of underlying self/other expectations. Power and prestige-order in task-oriented groups are believed to emerge from these four behaviors (Fox & Moore, 1979). At the moment, research is under way to test the reliability of these behaviors as measures of status. Noticeably absent from discussions of status emergence and status-organizing processes is any mention of communication/relational style.

Ervin-Tripp (1974) discovered that these status distinctions do occur with respect to the use of directives by adults. Directives are utterances whose intention is to elicit services or goods or to regulate behavior of others in some way. There were consistent differences in the types of directives speakers used that resulted as a function of the social situation, particularly with respect to superior/subordinate relationships. For instance, the statement, "I need a match," which Ervin-Tripp classifies as a personal need statement, is unambiguously a
directive when addressed from a superior to a subordinate. A subordinate would be more likely to use an imbedded imperative, such as, "Could you give me a match?" The consistent social distribution found in the use of directives suggests that speaker status and receiver status are important considerations in the study of interactions.

Status and communication strategies. Since status impacts on behavior, it must therefore influence verbal behavior and the selection of communication strategies. In the sociolinguistic view, setting, events, situations and participants determine an individual's choice of language style, from intimate style to frozen style (Joos, 1959). Social and linguistic features combine to offer alternative communication strategies which are selected by speakers. Semantic, grammatical and phonological alternatives are predictably patterned on the basis of the social system (Blom & Gumperz, 1972). The social system would necessarily include some provision for status of speaker and status of speaking style. Described earlier, the research of Ervin-Tripp (1974) into adult directives, showing consistent social distribution in use of directives, supports this conclusion.

Status in organizations. As a subsystem within a larger social system, the organization or institution can reflect changes in traditional status definitions. The hierarchical arrangement for decision-making in many organizations makes the superior-subordinate arrangement fairly unambiguous. However, the influx of women into
occupational settings has somewhat confused traditional occupational status scores; for instance, when the traditional male labor force scores were compared to scores that included both men and women, status scores for clerical persons and craftspersons reversed showing an increase in status for craftsmen, and a decrease for clerical persons (Powers & Holmberg, 1978). These authors suggest that traditional occupational status measures need revising since the sex composition of the work force has changed. In measuring occupational status prior to 1970, researchers consistently ignored the characteristics of women; occupational status scores were based on characteristics of the male labor force. When women were accounted for, the prestige level of various occupations altered, as for example, professional occupations which showed lower scores.

Status, sex and power. Income, education and hierarchical position are among the determinants of status, both socially and organizationally. However, a critical point to consider, especially in the organizational setting, is that status can be reinforced by more than the social perceptions of others. Many times status and power are virtually synonymous, since the determinants of power use (resources, expertise, confidence, etc.) are often possessed by high status persons (Frieze et al., 1978). Higher status generally means more power access and vice-versa. A central social construct of status, however, that may or may not imply power, is sex (Henley, 1977; Bradley, 1990). Frequently, just being male implies higher status a cognitive artifact
socialization begins; differences between male and female infants are attributed along traditional sex stereotypic lines, i.e., girl babies are seen by parents as softer, calmer, less active, etc., than boy babies. However, the infants in the study were, in reality, comparable in terms of weight, activity, time of birth, etc. These findings indicate that one cannot realistically isolate behaviors in terms of biology versus socialization.

**Sex-typed characteristics.** A necessary step in the discussion of sex stereotyping is the isolation of those characteristics that are sex-typed. While this literature review is by no means extensive enough to include all sex-typed variables, a few are certainly worth specific mention. Some of the actual terms used to describe typical men and women need to be examined. Women are supposed to be poised, well-mannered, pleasant, lovable, modest, submissive, sentimental, vain, moody, spontaneous and supportive, just to name a few (Miller & Swift, 1977; Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Males, in contrast, are viewed as frank, courageous, ambitious, aggressive, dominant, outspoken, stubborn, rational, hard-headed and authoritative (Miller & Swift, 1977; Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Male stereotypes, as these adjectives suggest, tend to be more socially desirable than female stereotypes. Who would not rather be viewed as rational, courageous or frank if the only other choice was to be seen as lovable, sentimental and pleasant? Although these sets of adjectives would lead one to believe there are strong, consistent differences between males and females, this is apparently not
the case. When Frieze et al. summarized sex-difference research findings, they found that the differences between males and females in such stereotyped characteristics as aggression, verbal and math skills, and emotionality were moderate, not strong, or the findings were largely inconclusive, as opposed to consistent.

Sex stereotypes and the "nonconscious ideology." The major difficulty of sex stereotyping resides not in the fact that such attributional differences exist, but in their utter subtlety. Even individuals who profess to be open-minded may, in fact, be motivated to discriminate between males and females simply because egalitarianism is a veneer, and a deeper belief, or nonconscious ideology, prevails (Bem & Bem, 1971). This idea of nonconscious stereotyping has been illuminated in a number of studies.

In a study involving clinical judgments of mental health, traits that characterized healthy, mature individuals varied as a function of sex. This finding illustrated a rather powerful instance of double-bind: Women cannot be mature, healthy women and mature, healthy adults at the same time. Mature, healthy women were characterized as more submissive, less independent, less aggressive, etc. As the researchers poignantly comment, these are odd characteristics to attribute to healthy anyone. Further, clinicians were much less likely to attribute healthy adult traits to females, and much more likely to attribute these traits to males (Bröverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz &
Clinicians' perceptions of behavior should be uncontaminated by sex stereotyping; the fact that such contamination occurs illustrates the power of the nonconscious ideology.

Another example of unconscious stereotyping is offered in the Goldberg experiments (1968). Identical articles were evaluated by female readers, and when the author was given a female name, Joan T. McKay, the articles were seen as consistently less valuable than the same articles supposedly authored by John T. McKay. Goldberg suggests that these findings show that women automatically see their differences from men as deficiencies.

The unconscious power and pervasiveness of sex stereotyping appears in study after study; and an explanation for this pervasiveness and reasons why these stereotypes persist are suggested by Nisbett and Wilson (1977). In their analysis of verbal reports of mental processes, they essentially describe the fact that individuals simply do not really know why they think what they think. An individual's cognitive strategies are not easily accessed nor easily described.

Nisbett and Wilson conclude that higher order mental processes "such as those involved in evaluation, judgment, problem-solving and the initiation of behavior" cannot be directly observed by individuals engaged in those activities (p. 232). Rather, when asked to explain how they arrived at certain behaviors in various experimental set-ups, subjects invoked a priori causal links between a behavior and a
culturally supplied rule. For example, when subjects were asked to evaluate four identical pairs of nylon stockings for quality, they overwhelmingly selected the right-most pair as being the best. Upon subsequent interviewing, however, the participants either did not mention position as influencing their choice, or, when asked directly, they denied that the position of the objects influenced their choice. They explained their behavior through cognitive causal links other than the apparent stimulus cause.

The implications of such findings raise a question regarding at what point a cognitive system can be breached, so that new information instead of existing stereotypes can be utilized.

Effects of sex stereotyping. Sex stereotyping may exact costs from those who attempt to depart from anticipated sex-typed behaviors. Social penalties are incurred by either sex for violating sex-role norms (Costich, Feinstein & Kidder, 1974); yet other research has shown that when sex-roles are reversed, personality and status attributions are also reversed (Geis, Jennings (Walstedt), Corrado-Taylor & Brown, note 1).

In some cases, observers' social judgments are controlled by sex stereotypes such that overt cues of leadership are discounted in favor of the stereotype (Porter, Geis, & Jennings, note 3). This result suggests how individuals perceptually resolve role violations; the "head of the table" cue was discounted in favor of the sex-role
stereotype when a female occupied that leadership position in a mixed-sex group. The tendency toward this type of dissonance reduction has alarming implications for women in organizational settings. For instance, the tendency to treat all females as secretaries results in women taking over secretarial and clerical duties to conform to expectations (Harragan, 1977). Women in organizations may be pressured into social tasks involving stereotypes, such as getting coffee, doing Xeroxing and the like (Hennig & Jardim, 1977). Kanter (1977) refers to this type of stereotype-to-behavior progression as role entrapment, which seems a reasonable label, considering the difficulties women have in breaching organizational networks.

Once a woman makes it into the supervisor's position, the stereotype does not necessarily fade. A study of the influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male-female supervisory behavior has shown that these stereotypes do impact significantly on perceptions of some supervisory styles; for example, reward style was rated as more effective when used by males than females (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973). These two researchers also found that managers tend to make personnel decisions using traditional male-female stereotypes (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974).

One study, however, found a somewhat more positive relationship between supervisory positions and occupant behavior. Male and female supervisors occupying parallel positions were evaluated and described by
subordinates as exhibiting similar patterns of leadership behavior and similar levels of effectiveness. Lest this result be too largely construed as a positive trend, the study also noted that similar behaviors by male and female supervisors led to different outcomes: Males tended to advance rapidly as a result of effectiveness and influence; but for females, rate of advancement appeared virtually unrelated to effectiveness (Day & Stodgill, 1972).

The preceding section of the literature review on the effects of sex-stereotyping concludes the discussion of the variables presently under examination. These variables, power, status and sex-role stereotyping, have been shown to be key influences on human interaction.

The discussion now focuses on literature relating more specifically to the methods by which these variables may be studied in interpersonal communication and on the specific behavior, compliance gaining, that is the focus of this research.

RELATIONAL COMMUNICATION AND COMPLIANCE-GAINING

Relational communication. The advantage to relational communication analysis includes the fact that it focuses on naturally-occurring, ongoing interaction, and it offers a systemic view of communication behavior. The basic premise of relational approaches to communication is that "people become aware of themselves only within the context of their social relationships" (Millar & Rogers, 1976, p.
Relational approaches to communication assume a co-defining or co-orientation of individuals engaged in interaction. Millar & Rogers (1976) identify three transactional dimensions of relationships: control, trust and intimacy. The control dimension in this relational view is visible in behaviors exhibited by both persons in a communication dyad; thus the researchers advocate a coding scheme which includes both content and relational aspects, and which will reveal message sequences and transactional patterns. The coding scheme developed by Millar and Rogers (1976) has been used in the study of communication patterns in marital dyads. In additional studies building on the Millar and Rogers work, the measurement procedures outlined by Rogers and Farace (1975) could be applied to other interpersonal transactions since relational analysis requires dyadic interaction as a minimum.

One researcher in relational communication, Roloff (1976), integrates two important research concepts: control and compliance gaining. First, he suggests that the transactional dimension, control, becomes manifest as strategies that are attempts to obtain relational rewards. Second, he discusses as a typology of behavior for obtaining these rewards the compliance-gaining techniques of Marwell and Schmitt (1967).
Compliance-gaining behavior. As previously shown, compliance gaining is one behavior through which attempts at relational control can be observed. Compliance gaining also has been shown to be a suitable topic for relational communication analysis. This section of the literature review centers on studies of compliance-gaining behavior, beginning with the prototypical study of Marwell and Schmitt.

Using a questionnaire method, Marwell and Schmitt explored the possibility of using assorted compliance-gaining techniques in four different situations. Sixteen possible behaviors, each designed to describe a technique, were presented; respondents were asked to rate how likely they would be to use each of the techniques. (See Appendix B for the list of techniques.) The researchers defined a strategy as "a group of techniques towards which potential actors tend to respond similarly" (p 351). When factored, the techniques loaded into five clusters: rewarding activity, punishing activity, expertise, activation of impersonal commitments, and activation of personal commitments. Second-order factors included: tendency to use socially acceptable techniques and tendency to use socially unacceptable techniques. There appeared to be significant correspondence between clusters of compliance-gaining techniques and the French and Raven power bases. Marwell and Schmitt suggest that respondents may segment compliance-gaining techniques in terms of types of interpersonal power; as a result, an individual may completely reject techniques or strategies because s/he does not have the power to use them or because
the techniques themselves are too unsavory.

The taxonomy described by Marwell and Schmitt provided the basis for a study by Miller et al. (1977), who found that the use of strategies was highly situation specific, and that clusters of compliance-gaining behaviors varied drastically by situation. Miller et al. used a broader population sample for their research than did Marwell and Schmitt; but like Marwell and Schmitt, the researchers used questionnaire data developed from responses to the 16 pre-formulated compliance-gaining categories cited previously. In this study, however, preference for strategies was sought in the following situations: noninterpersonal (non-intimate), short-term consequences; noninterpersonal, long-term consequences; interpersonal (intimate), short-term consequences; and interpersonal, long-term consequences. The preference for strategies varied depending on whether a situation was interpersonal or not, and on the duration of consequences. One conclusion of the study was that further research into both situational and individual variables in compliance-gaining technique use is needed to more fully illuminate the interaction of source and situation in control strategy selection.

In order to explore source variables, Falbo (1977) developed a 16-strategy coding scheme for compliance-gaining behavior. Through inductive method, the strategies obtained were: assertion, bargaining, compromise, deceit, emotion-agent, emotion-target, evasion, expertise,
fait accompli, hinting, persistence, persuasion, reason, simple statement, thought manipulation, and threat. The strategy conceptualization was based on the combination of intuitions of eight experts, and 91% of the strategies reported in essays on "How I get my way" were codable in this scheme. The expectations of relations between personality variables and power-strategies were substantiated; most notably, positive peer ratings occurred with the use of rational strategies, and low peer ratings occurred with indirect and nonrational strategies. These results were obtained when personality measures were projected onto the scaling of power strategies. Although the coding scheme proved viable for the analysis, situational influences were not generally considered in this study.

Perceptions of compliance-gaining situations were studied by Cody and McLaughlin (1980) through multidimensional analysis. Two dimensions, Intimacy and Resistance/Unfriendly, appeared across the persuasive situations which were developed from situations offered by respondents in pretesting. Four additional dimensions were found: Personal Benefits, Consequences, Dominance, and Rights. Including the Miller et al. situations in their study, Cody and McLaughlin factor-analyzed respondents' perceptions of nine compliance-gaining situations. The results indicated significant differences in perceptions of compliance-gaining, based on the six dimensions in each situation. The aim of this research was to develop scales for measuring compliance-gaining; and the researchers come somewhat closer to a
data-based model of situational factors since their initial situations were culled from a corpus of essays written by participants.

Building from this research into the role of environment in message strategy selection, multidimensional scaling of compliance-gaining strategies has been attempted (Cody, McLaughlin, & Jordan, 1980). Cody et al. address the issue of whether or not the Marwell and Schmitt strategies are relevant to interpersonal communication and whether the strategies they suggest are exhaustive. They argue that preformulated strategies are of limited relevance since respondents may indicate a low likelihood of use for socially unacceptable techniques, and yet may include those techniques when they are asked to write essays about their own compliance-gaining behavior. The researchers asked participants to write about compliance-gaining strategies they would employ in three different situations: The first situation involved a higher level of intimacy and a lower level of resistance to persuasion than the second and third situations, and also involved long-term consequences; the second situation involved a higher level of situation apprehension and long-term consequences; and the third situation was a negotiation situation with short term consequences. When analyzed, the responses for the first situation resulted in eight strategies: threat, hinting, simple statement-question, altruism, deceit, disclaimer, simple statement, and reason. Responses to the second situation resulted in nine strategies: negative esteem, hinting, suggest negative alternatives, cooperation, reason, simple statement, threat, coercion,
inaction. Responses to the third situation resulted in eight strategies: inaction, expertise claims, negotiate, reason, deceit, flattery, negotiating alternatives, simple statement. These results indicate that the Marwell and Schmitt typology is only marginally applicable to compliance-gaining situations since only three of the Marwell and Schmitt techniques (threat, altruism, and negative esteem) were found in this analysis. The researchers suggest that the multidimensional scaling has revealed a more representative set of compliance-gaining behaviors in differing situations.

Although the work of Cody et al. enlarges on previous explorations in compliance-gaining, few studies have investigated or described the actual verbal behaviors involved in manipulation, compliance-gaining or persuasion (Grimshaw, 1980). In attempting to describe these verbal behaviors, Grimshaw suggests that one needs to find the sociological variables that determine verbal manipulation, and one needs to determine the semantic mapping of strategies. In a largely descriptive study, he concludes that the sociological constraints on verbal manipulation are utility (to the participants), power, and affect in the relationships among participants. The verbal behaviors Grimshaw labels for persuasion of compliance-gaining are: ask, beg, cajole, con, order, persuade, and suggest. These behaviors are more global and less finely tuned than those suggested by Cody et al. and Marwell and Schmitt. Grimshaw appears to be labelling styles of verbal compliance-gaining as opposed to actual, specific behaviors. Nevertheless, he approaches persuasion
from the basis of typing possible verbalizations as opposed to behavior in general, and his broader categories are implicitly evident in the typologies suggested by other researchers.

The studies of Miller et al. and Cody et al. emphasize both situational and individual variables, and both conclude that further work is needed to uncover the interaction of source and situation in control strategy selection. Miller et al. point out that use of compliance-gaining techniques is highly situationally bound, and that the interaction of source variables with situational variables accounts for as much or more variation in behavior than does each set of variables alone. To increase understanding of this interaction, naturally-occurring situations need to be examined for compliance-gaining attempts. These situations will allow for the non-manipulated interaction of source and situational variables. This conclusion provides an argument for communication research in naturalistic settings with naturally-occurring behavior.

NATURALISTIC COMMUNICATION STUDY

Naturalistic study in communication. Insofar as the study of compliance-gaining behavior is concerned, several researchers have concluded their discussion with recommendations that actual compliance-gaining behavior be examined. Falbo (1977) argued for inductive study into compliance-gaining behavior and developed a coding scheme based on open-ended essays. Likewise, Cody and McLaughlin (1980)
used open-ended methods for deriving compliance-gaining situations; and the later research of Cody et al. used open-ended essays to find clusters of strategies. These open-ended methods of inquiry come somewhat closer to naturalistic methods than does the research of Marwell and Schmitt which relies on preformulated compliance-gaining strategies as the basis for reactive data. However, Marwell and Schmitt themselves stress the need for using different types of respondents and "concrete behavior instead of verbal reports" (p. 364).

Miller et al. in their exploration of compliance-gaining message strategies noted that further research should attempt to account for the interactions of source traits, situational effects, and strategy choices, which are all operative in naturally-occurring interaction.

Finally, in developing a system for the measurement of dominance in interaction, Brandt (1980) indicated that "face-to-face" interaction is the appropriate data-base for the study of dominance; one of his methodological considerations is the use of the naturalistic approach to elucidate frames of reference employed by participants in the context under investigation. This consideration, when viewed in light of the recommendations of other compliance-gaining investigators, provides additional bulwark to arguments for the analysis of naturally-occurring compliance-gaining behavior.
An adequate study of the communication event should include both the actors' meanings and a description of their behaviors. Pearce (1977) claims that objective and naturalistic inquiry are complementary, and that neither one is in itself sufficient to develop a theory of conversation. Traditional questionnaire approaches have been criticized as mechanisms for investigating interaction; the argument is that the actual conversation needs to be used as the unit of analysis (Greenberg, 1975). Nofsinger (1977) sees conversational analysis as deriving from a naturalistic perspective, since "talk is an empirical fact" (p. 12) and therefore should be explored as such. Finally, there is a need for studying people in their natural environments, with the research emphasis placed on qualitative methods aimed at producing descriptive data (Hickson, 1977). Such descriptive studies may yield a foundation for further categorizing and, of course, quantifying of conversation.

Litton-Hawes (1977) brings together several points of view--psycholinguistic, sociological, anthropological--to organize a complete communication perspective that views talk as both resource and phenomenon. She argues that formal description explication is needed to understand how talk works in everyday use, and her conceptualization relies on the premises of ethnomethodology.

Wilson (1977) builds several strong arguments for naturalistic research in his discussion of ethnography as a research approach in education. The rationale for ethnographic methods includes the belief
that to truly understand behavior one must understand in what context participants are interpreting actions or thoughts. In short, observable behavior needs a framework in which to be explored. Additionally Wilson points out that the problem of experimenter influences—long the concern of quantitative analysts—can be minimized in studies of naturally-occurring, non-manipulated behavior.

Sociolinguistic inquiry has also provided rationales for naturalistic research. Once the communicative intent of an interaction is established, the communicator needs to evaluate the limitations of context on his/her choice of communicative strategies (Gumperz, 1972). Similarly, Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (1977) suggested natural conversation as a source for sociolinguistic study using ethnographic methods. These methods help to obviate the difficulties of experimenter influences while they allow for the access of contextual information. In general, research that is sociolinguistically based utilized naturalistic method by observing actual speech performance and actual verbal behavior (Ochs, 1979).

Summary. The issues of power, status and sex stereotyping impact on individuals in all of their interpersonal relationships. Consequently, these variables figure prominently in a person's definition of self and estimation of self-worth. A likely manifestation of the interactions of these factors is conversational or relational style as reflected in an individual's conversational strategies. One's
conversational style may be as unique as a fingerprint; but in certain situations, predictable patterns of speaking may occur. Compliance-gaining techniques revealed in natural, ongoing conversation may vary as a consequence of an individual's status within the organization or group, or of an individual's sex. At present, the predictability of compliance-gaining behavior is uncertain. The question of whether or not a person's status has greater impact than traditional stereotypes in terms of directing that person's conversational maneuvers has yet to be explored. Will the power that goes with greater status, particularly in the organizational setting, emerge as or be reflected in trends of control techniques in actual conversation? The aim of this research is to provide some insight into the effects of sex and status on actual, non-manipulated interaction.
CHAPTER III: METHOD

Subjects. The participants in this study were a college dean, 13 full-time faculty members and six of the full-time graduate students of the Department of Communication at the University of Delaware. Participants were categorized by sex and departmental status, i.e., tenured, tenure-track, one-year appointment; full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, teaching assistant or graduate fellow. During the entire series of conversational samplings, the subject population remained relatively stable. However, the dean was a participant in only one of the faculty meetings in the sample. Furthermore, the graduate student participants did not remain constant throughout sampling since the graduate students attended faculty meetings on a rotating basis consisting of one new student (current year appointment) and one experienced student (prior year appointment). Wherever these participants occurred, they were accounted for in the data analysis and addressed in the results section of this research.
Sampling strategy. During the period from October through December (Fall Semester 1980), regularly scheduled faculty meetings—a total of five—were tape-recorded in their entirety. Recordings varied between approximately one hour and one-and-a-half hours in length. Recordings were made via a concealed tape recorder with the microphone and recorder located well above eye level at the conference room table. Recordings commenced at approximately 4 p.m., the scheduled beginning of faculty meetings, and ran until the conclusion of the meeting. Although faculty members were aware they were being recorded, they were not informed as to the purpose or rationale of the research.

The first recorded faculty meeting was not used in the data analysis; rather, this initial recording was used as training material for conversational coders since it closely approximated actual raw data gathered later. This approach also allowed for some control of "social desirability" effects on interaction as the participants became used to and eventually disregarded a "live" microphone present at the meetings.

Protection of source identity was assured to all participants; interactors were identified in tape transcripts by first name only. Informed consent forms were obtained from each participant prior to the first taping session (see Appendix A).
Recorded material was examined only by the researcher and assistants; with the exception of the use of sample statements from which any names were edited, confidentiality of interaction was maintained.

In addition to participating in the faculty meetings, interactors were asked to respond to two modified forms of the Marwell and Schmitt compliance-gaining questionnaire, which were administered at two different times after the final taping session. Additionally participants were asked to respond to a questionnaire about faculty meeting functions (see Appendix F).

**Tape transcription.** Each tape was transcribed and marked to identify speakers by first name only. Transcribed conversation was marked for episodes which were defined as sequences of conversation which maintained a common focus of attention or centered on a common topic (Haslett, note 2).

**Data analysis.** To account for possible sex biases in interpreting either frequency or type of compliance-gaining techniques, two coders, one male and one female, were used. Reliability between coders was computed after their initial attempts to code the preliminary training material and was found to be 90%. Reliability between coders on the coding of the actual data was 89%. Coders used both the recordings and the transcriptions to code each utterance based on a conversational coding scheme adapted from the 16 Marwell and Schmitt Compliance-Gaining
Techniques (see Appendix B). The selection of four situations by Marwell and Schmitt (job, family, sales, roommate) was not systematic; rather, these researchers selected these situations because a variety of techniques could be used in each (as is more probably the case in natural interactive contexts), and because these situations met three criteria: 1) they allow for concentration on short-term compliance (vs. long-run or repetitive); 2) they vary the actor-target authority relationships which could influence technique selection; 3) they allow for some empathy on the part of the students used in the research sample. Since this current research focuses on a very specific situation, the faculty meeting, both the questionnaire and the conversational coding scheme used as examples probable utterances appropriate to that context (see Appendix C).

The duration (to the nearest 1/10 second) of each participant's utterances was recorded so that a measure of each subject's total turn time could be obtained.

The data analysis was essentially descriptive and focused on the following:

1) Frequency of particular verbal compliance-gaining techniques used by the group as a whole based on the Marwell and Schmitt first- and second-order factor loadings (see Appendix D).
2) Contrasts between sex, status variables, noting trends in compliance-gaining techniques.

3) Relationship of total talking time to frequency of technique choice by individual interactors.

4) Degree of correlation between participants' responses to the questionnaire and actual compliance-gaining techniques used in interaction.

5) Applicability of the experimental coding scheme to naturally-occurring conversation.

Frequencies of responses to the questionnaire and frequencies of strategies as determined by the coded verbal behavior were examined for effects of the two variables, status and sex.

The two administrations of the questionnaire were compared for stability in responses by means of a Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Scores used in the comparison were the responses on the six-point scale by each participant for each technique, and a comparison using mean scores for each participant for the questionnaire as a whole was made also.

Techniques were rank ordered by mean score of faculty responses to the questionnaire. Comparisons of all sex and status populations for differences in responses to the compliance-gaining questionnaire were
made by means of t-tests for each population comparison for each technique.

Total turn time measures were analyzed through a 2 × 3 factorial design ANOVA and an ANCOVA on sex controlling for status effects.

Compliance-gaining technique analysis based on the actual coded data from the recordings was performed by means of simple count and percentages.

Additional questionnaire data obtained in the "Faculty Meeting Questionnaire" (Appendix G) was analyzed through mean score comparisons for each questionnaire item.

The proposed coding scheme derived from the data was analyzed descriptively and on a raw count comparison basis.

Research assumptions. The basic assumption of the procedures outlined above was that the observation of naturally-occurring interaction allows for greater external validity than either an experimental or manipulated approach to the problem, or complete dependence on a behavioral questionnaire which may be contaminated by social desirability factors on the part of respondents. However, several inherent weaknesses of this method were apparent. First, because the analysis was primarily descriptive as opposed to statistical, the findings may be too open to interpretation and the analysis considered too subjective in nature. Coder reliability, at
least insofar as isolating actual compliance-gaining techniques, ameliorated this drawback. Second, the coding itself entailed some degree of inference on the part of the coders since codes were not totally unambiguous, nor were utterances conveniently discrete in the recorded material. Also, although prosodic features were not transcribed, coders were certainly aware of intonation contours and other paralinguistic data as they listened to the tapes. This fact may have had some effect on the coding even though coders were ostensibly concerned only with the verbal content of the utterances. However, the high degree of agreement makes this limitation negligible.

A further assumption of the outlined procedures was that participants would "forget" the fact that they were being recorded and would behave as they normally did when unobserved. The limitation in the event that subjects were not accustomed to the recorder was the possibility of contamination with social desirability effects made worse by the sophistication (as Communication faculty) of the participants.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

To answer the research questions posed in Chapter I, three general data sets were examined: 1) the questionnaire data, 2) total turn time data, and 3) the coded data of the actual taped conversations.

The questionnaire data was analyzed with attention to four specific dimensions. The first, test-retest reliability, was determined in order to evaluate the stability of the questionnaire responses over a period of time. The second dimension, rank order to technique preference, was analyzed with respect to the general faculty response for technique preference and the relationship of that response to Marwell and Schmitt's second-order factors. The third and fourth dimensions explored in the questionnaire data were differences on responses to each item on the questionnaire as a function of the sex and status variables.

Total turn time analysis included a summary of general turn time measures and specific results of the analysis of variance performed to determine the effects of the sex and status variables on total turn time.
The final area of analysis was the data examined by the coders who evaluated the taped, transcribed conversations. This last section included both the results obtained with partial coder agreement and those obtained with total coder agreement.

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Test-retest reliability. The compliance-gaining questionnaire was administered twice to the same participants. Approximately 60 days elapsed between the first and second testings. Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed to determine the test-retest reliability coefficient between the first and second administrations of the compliance-gaining questionnaire. A mean score for each participant for each test administration was obtained. These pairs of scores were used in computing the first measure of test-retest reliability. The resulting coefficient of correlation was \( r = +.79 \).

In addition, a mean score for each questionnaire item (across participants) was obtained for the first test and for the second test. These pairs of scores for the 17 original questionnaire items were then used in computing the second measure of test-retest reliability. The resulting coefficient of correlation was \( r = +.96 \).

Rank order of technique preference. The second administration of the questionnaire was examined in depth since it included both the original Marwell and Schmitt techniques and the two added techniques,
Sycophantic Flattery and Camaraderie. Additionally, the second compliance-gaining questionnaire omitted the names of the techniques and listed only the 1-6 rating scale and the technique descriptions with examples. (See Appendix D for the complete questionnaire.)

Mean scores based on the responses of all participants were computed for each questionnaire item and a rank ordering of technique preference was obtained. (See Table 1.) Based on the mean scores, the participants showed greatest preference for Camaraderie and least preference for Aversive Stimulation.

A score of 4.00 placed a technique within the "might possibly not use" preference range; thus a smaller score indicates some willingness to use that particular technique. According to the rank ordering of compliance-gaining technique preference, one-half of the items resulted in scores of less than 4.00. Of these first nine choices, five were among those included in Marwell and Schmitt's second-order factor, (tendency to use socially acceptable techniques); two choices, Altruism and Debt were included in the second-order factor, (tendency to use socially unacceptable techniques); and two choices, Camaraderie and Sycophantic Flattery, were those added to the questionnaire and coding scheme by the researcher.
## TABLE 1

**Rank-Ordering of Compliance-Gaining Technique Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Mean Score[a]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Liking; Altercasting (positive)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Esteem (positive)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-feeling (positive)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sycophantic Flattery</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Expertise (negative)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Promise</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pre-giving</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Self-feeling (negative)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Esteem (negative)</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Moral Appeal</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Altercasting (negative)</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aversive Stimulation</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] The smaller the mean score, the greater the preference for that particular technique.
Sex differences. Mean scores for the responses of males and of females for each questionnaire item were computed. (See Table 2.) To determine if the differences between these scores were significant, t-tests were performed on each questionnaire item. Overall, the mean scores for males were less than for females on 14 of the 19 techniques; however, the t-tests indicated that for no technique were the differences between males and females statistically significant. (See Table 3.)

Status differences. For each questionnaire item, a mean score for tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and one-year appointments plus graduate students (hereinafter designated as "non-tenure-track") was obtained. (See Table 2.) To determine if the differences in mean scores among the three status levels were significant, t-tests were performed for each status comparison. The differences in mean scores between status levels were not statistically significant for any of the compliance-gaining techniques. (See Table 3.)

TOTAL TURN TIME

General measures. Actual total turn time (TTT) to the nearest .10 second, number of turns, and mean turn length (MTL) to the nearest .10 second were tallied for each interlocutor. (See Table 4.) Also included in Table 4 are the average turn times for each individual. These average times were computed by summing the individual's turn times for
### TABLE 2

Mean Scores For All Data Classifications
For All Compliance-Gaining Techniques (Questionnaire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

-t-Test Results for Questionnaire Data
Differences Between Mean Scores for All Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Males/Females</th>
<th>Tenured/Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Tenure/Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Tenure-Track/Non-Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df=16) p&lt;</td>
<td>t (df=7) p&lt;</td>
<td>t (df=10) p&lt;</td>
<td>t (df=13) p&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.628 .20</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
<td>.637 n.s.</td>
<td>.784 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.102 n.s.</td>
<td>.884 .20</td>
<td>.968 .20</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.111 n.s.</td>
<td>.624 n.s.</td>
<td>.510 n.s.</td>
<td>1.331 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.060 n.s.</td>
<td>.837 .20</td>
<td>.997 .20</td>
<td>.249 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.800 .20</td>
<td>.870 .20</td>
<td>1.415 .20</td>
<td>.637 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.514 n.s.</td>
<td>.321 n.s.</td>
<td>.148 n.s.</td>
<td>.660 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.186 n.s.</td>
<td>1.535 .20</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
<td>1.137 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.704 .20</td>
<td>.741 .20</td>
<td>.354 n.s.</td>
<td>1.555 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.000 .10</td>
<td>.306 n.s.</td>
<td>.454 n.s.</td>
<td>.926 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.341 .20</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
<td>.258 n.s.</td>
<td>.301 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.718 .20</td>
<td>.920 .20</td>
<td>1.208 .20</td>
<td>.079 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.139 n.s.</td>
<td>.350 n.s.</td>
<td>1.738 .20</td>
<td>.276 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.594 n.s.</td>
<td>1.000 .20</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
<td>1.309 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.444 n.s.</td>
<td>.196 n.s.</td>
<td>.384 n.s.</td>
<td>.091 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.435 .20</td>
<td>.577 n.s.</td>
<td>1.274 .20</td>
<td>.887 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.838 .20</td>
<td>.357 n.s.</td>
<td>.659 n.s.</td>
<td>1.272 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.571 n.s.</td>
<td>.957 .20</td>
<td>.371 n.s.</td>
<td>.772 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.597 n.s.</td>
<td>.000 n.s.</td>
<td>1.206 .20</td>
<td>.079 n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All comparisons show no statistically significant differences in responses to the questionnaire.
**TABLE 4**

Total Turn Time, Number of Turns, Mean Turn Length and Average Turn Time for Each Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>TTT (seconds)</th>
<th># of Turns</th>
<th>MTL (seconds)</th>
<th>Average TT (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (chair-male)</td>
<td>4697.1</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1174.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (tenured male)</td>
<td>1633.3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>544.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (t-track male)</td>
<td>836.8</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>209.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (t-track male)</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (tenured female)</td>
<td>463.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>115.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (ntt female)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (ntt female)</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (t-track male)</td>
<td>819.9</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>205.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (ntt male)</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (t-track male)</td>
<td>251.8</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (t-track female)</td>
<td>841.6</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>210.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (ntt female)</td>
<td>308.5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>102.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (t-track male)</td>
<td>727.5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>181.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (male grad)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (female grad)</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X (dean-female)</td>
<td>1505.5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1505.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TTT for all participants for all meetings = 12501.2 seconds, including 8.5 seconds of unidentified speakers.

chair = departmental chair

tenured = currently a tenured faculty member

t-track = currently a tenure-seeking faculty member

ntt = a non-tenure-seeking faculty member (1-year appointment)

grad = graduate students

dean = dean of college
all the meetings s/he attended, and dividing this number by the number of meetings attended.

Because meeting attendance was rotated among the graduate students, all males graduate students were treated as one interlocutor, as were all female graduate students. Thus, the graduate student TTT's are actually the summed participation of all graduate students of each sex. (See Appendix E for total turn time per meeting.)

The 2 X 3 factorial design ANOVA was computed to determine the effects of sex, status, and the interaction of sex and status in combination on average turn time. (See Table 5 for individual cell average turn times.) The measures used in the calculation were the average turn times for each interlocutor, excluding the participation of the department chair and the dean. These two exclusions were deemed necessary since the person or persons who nominally control the meeting would normally be expected to dominate turn time. (See Table 4 for TTT's for these excluded interlocutors.)

The department chair and the dean were included in the final analysis, an analysis of covariance. This analysis looked at the effect of sex on total turn time with status statistically controlled.
### TABLE 5

ANOVA Subgroup Average Turn Times:
Sex X Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Average Turn Time (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-male</td>
<td>544.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-female</td>
<td>115.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-males</td>
<td>143.5 (s.d. = 78.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-female</td>
<td>210.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT-males</td>
<td>18.1 (s.d. = 22.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT-females</td>
<td>38.1 (s.d. = 44.62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Subgroups with more than one participant show standard deviation as well as average turn time.
ANALYSIS OF TOTAL TURN TIME

Sex. The results of the ANOVA indicated that sex has a significant impact on average turn time ($F(1,8) = 6.039, p < .05$). In general, males had a significantly more average turn time per meeting than females. Average turn time for males was 162.2 seconds ($SD = 175.0$ seconds). For females, the average turn time was 79.8 seconds ($SD = 79.1$ seconds).

The results of the ANCOVA indicated that even with status statistically controlled, the sex variable significantly influenced average turn time. As in the ANOVA results, the ANCOVA procedure revealed that the males produced greater average turn time than the females ($F(1,3) = 4.842, p < .05$).

Status. As with the sex variable, the status variable significantly influenced average turn time. A Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated that the differences in turn time when the three status groups were compared were significant at the .05 level in all cases. (See Table 6). Tenured faculty had significantly more average turn time than did tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty; and tenure-track faculty showed significantly more average turn time per meeting than non-tenure-track faculty. Tenured faculty average turn time per meeting was 330.2 seconds ($SD = 303.0$ seconds); tenure-track faculty, 154.5 seconds ($SD = 75.0$ seconds); and non-tenure-track faculty, 31.4 seconds ($SD = 37.5$ seconds) ($F(2,8) = 18.384, p < .005$).
### TABLE 6

Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Tests
Comparing ANOVA Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups Compared</th>
<th>Differences Between the Means</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T vs. TT</td>
<td>175.6</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T vs. NTT</td>
<td>298.8</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT vs. NTT</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-male vs. NTT-males</td>
<td>526.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-male vs. NTT-females</td>
<td>506.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-male vs. TT-males</td>
<td>400.9</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-male vs. TT-female</td>
<td>334.0</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-male vs. T-female</td>
<td>428.5</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-female vs. NTT-males</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-female vs. NTT-females</td>
<td>172.3</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-female vs. TT-males</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-female vs. T-female</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-males vs. T-female</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-males vs. NTT-males</td>
<td>125.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT-males vs. NTT-females</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-female vs. NTT-females</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-female vs. TT-males</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT-males vs. NTT-females</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T = tenured; TT = tenure-track; NTT = non-tenure-track
Sex X Status. The interactive effects of sex and status also yielded a significant effect \( F(2,8) = 9.429, p < .01 \). A computation of a Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated that six of the 15 comparisons were significant at the .05 level. (See Table 6 for the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range test comparing individual cells.) The tenured male accounted for significantly more average turn time per meeting than all other cells. The tenure-track female showed the second highest level of participation; however, she was significantly different from only the tenured male, who was higher, and the non-tenure-track males who had a lower average score. Although the tenure-track female showed greater average turn time than the tenure-track males, this difference was not statistically significant. Similarly, although the average turn time of the non-tenure-track females exceeded that of non-tenure-track males, the difference was not statistically significant. All other cell comparisons yielded no statistical significance.

Coding of Taped Conversation

The approximately 4-1/2 hours of taped conversation yielded 370 episodes. Each episode was coded for compliance-gaining techniques (see Appendix B for coder instructions and guidelines). Intercoder reliability for all episodes was 89%. For episodes in which coders agreed that techniques were being used, intercoder reliability in isolating the techniques was 62%. Of 370 episodes, 43 episodes resulted in non-agreement between coders; of these 43 episodes, 5 showed
intercoder agreement on who was speaking and agreement on the fact that a technique was being employed, with disagreement on the type of technique. The remaining 38 episodes involved decisions by one coder that a technique was in use, with a decision by the other coder that no compliance-gaining attempt was apparent in the episode. Episodes with speaker agreement, technique disagreement are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Compliance-Gaining Technique Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Expertise (positive) or Liking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Expertise (positive) or Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Moral Appeal or Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Moral Appeal or Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Female</td>
<td>Expertise (positive) or Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the remaining 327 episodes, the coders agreed that 319 did not involve any compliance-gaining technique. The eight episodes that were coded as containing compliance-gaining attempts and that coders agreed on the techniques and the speaker are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Compliance-Gaining Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Moral Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Male</td>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize, of 327 instances of intercoder agreement, 2.4% of the episodes contained compliance-gaining attempts.

SUMMARY

Overall, test-retest stability was very strong when the first and second questionnaires were compared across items. Rank ordering of techniques indicated a greater preference by faculty members for socially acceptable techniques as well as for the additional techniques included by the researcher. There were no significant differences across techniques as a function of sex and status of the respondent.

The analysis of total turn time based on average turn time for each participant revealed significant differences in the participation of the interlocutors based on their sex, on their status, and especially on the interaction of both the sex and status variables.

Finally, the examination of the coded data from the taped conversations indicated that intercoder agreement was satisfactory, but that few compliance-gaining attempts were found in the total number of episodes.

The following chapter focuses on a discussion of these results and highlights the research implications of the findings, particularly within the context of the research questions.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

DISCUSSION

In this section the data are discussed in terms of the research questions posed in Chapter I. The results of the questionnaire data analysis, total turn time analysis and conversational data analysis are included. In light of this discussion, the implications for additional analysis of compliance-gaining attempts in the data are explored.

The first question posed in the statement of the problem was: Will males and females differ in their use of and preference for compliance-gaining techniques? Regarding the issue of compliance-gaining technique preference, the questionnaire data revealed that although males and females showed some differences in responses as exemplified by differing mean scores for most items, when examined statistically these differences were not significant. Thus, insofar as the self-report measure is concerned, males and females did not differ significantly in their preference for compliance-gaining techniques when compared across techniques.
Similarly, the second research issue concerned whether or not status or occupational position would be a factor in determining preference for and use of compliance-gaining techniques or strategies. Regarding the issue of compliance-gaining technique preference, the status variable did not create significant differences in responses to the questionnaire when the three different status populations were compared statistically.

The high level of test-retest reliability suggests that the respondents were relatively consistent in their reactions to the use of compliance-gaining techniques as described in the questionnaire.

For the 18 techniques, responses of the faculty as a group remained stable with relatively little drift from one test administration to the other. This suggests that testing effects and statistical regression effects were minimal. However, this self-report instrument was not necessarily an accurate reflection of the real behaviors the respondents would use in a natural context. Consequently, the important consideration for the first two research questions is whether or not the use of compliance-gaining techniques reflected in actual verbal behavior would differ by sex or by status since the self-report measures suggested that no differences would be evident.
Recall that the coding of the faculty meeting conversations yielded 89 percent intercoder agreement, but that the majority of episodes of intercoder agreement contained no compliance-gaining attempts. Although conclusions drawn from so few coded techniques must necessarily be highly speculative, one such conclusion from conversational data is that neither males and females, nor tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty differ greatly in their use of the modified Marwell and Schmitt categories of compliance-gaining techniques, since all groups used virtually no compliance-gaining techniques at all in 4-1/2 hours of conversation.

Despite this apparent lack of compliance-gaining in faculty meeting conversation, one very important result of the data analysis requires mention: Of the 13 episodes for which coders agreed that compliance-gaining techniques were in use, in every case the speaker agreed upon by the coders was an individual of high status. The order of status designations from greatest status to least status within the university organizations is: dean, chair, tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and graduate students. Thus, the top three status levels were detected in the coding of the data; the bottom three levels were not. Furthermore, the department chair, who attended all four meetings, accounted for nine of the compliance-gaining attempts; the dean, present at only one meeting, accounted for two attempts; and the tenured faculty members accounted for the remaining two attempts. While these data are far too few from which to generalize
about status and compliance-gaining technique use, it is important to note that the only instances of technique use were the province of the higher status individuals. The questionnaire data are clearly at odds with the conversational data, since the questionnaire results do not suggest any differences in use depending on status. Other factors appear to be influencing the use of compliance-gaining techniques, and will be addressed later.

The sex variable produced no striking contrasts in the coded conversational data. The technique use by the dean (female) was roughly equivalent to that of the chair (male) when viewed in terms of technique use per meetings attended. Similarly, the tenured male and tenured female exhibited equivalent technique use, with each individual accounting for one compliance-gaining attempt. Although the data are far too scant to be conclusive, this result augments the questionnaire results, which indicated no significant difference in technique preference between males and females.

The third research inquiry centered upon whether or not any particular compliance-gaining technique would be used more than other techniques by the group. Again, the coded conversational data, although limited, indicate that Camaraderie was used more than any other technique (four instances of intercoder agreement, four instances in which only one coder suggested Camaraderie). Expertise (positive) was the second most frequently used technique (three instances of intercoder
agreement, three instances in which only one coder suggested Expertise (positive). Moral Appeal was the third most popular technique (one instance of intercoder agreement, two instances in which only one coder suggested Moral Appeal). The final choice was Liking, although there was no intercoder agreement on this technique. No other compliance-gaining techniques were evident in the data with partial or total coder agreement. It is interesting to note that Expertise, Moral Appeal and Liking are all members of Marwell and Schmitt's second-order factor, "tendency to use socially acceptable techniques." It is further argued here that Camaraderie, described in the questionnaire and the coding scheme "since we are all in this together, you will want to comply," can be considered a socially acceptable technique, especially when contrasted with the techniques that appear in the "socially unacceptable" category. The fact that the use of Camaraderie exceeds all other techniques suggests that, at least within this faculty meeting setting, this technique is socially acceptable.

The actual use of these techniques leads to the concern expressed in the fourth research question: Will participants tend to respond to the compliance-gaining questionnaire in a manner consistent with their previously recorded natural verbal behaviors? The rank ordering of compliance-gaining technique preference by the group as a whole suggests that there is some correspondence between questionnaire responses and actual behavior. The technique most preferred by the faculty was Camaraderie with a mean score of 2.06. As was just discussed,
Camaraderie was the most frequent choice of the coders in evaluating the conversational data. To this extent, then, there is some correspondence between self-reported preference and actual technique use. One must bear in mind, however, that the rank-ordering of techniques was based on responses for the entire faculty; actual technique use involved only four faculty. The correspondence weakens at this point; the second preference of the faculty was Altruism, whereas in actual behavior Expertise (positive) was the most frequent. Perhaps the starkest contrast is the third choice. The faculty selected Expertise (positive) (second in actual use), but the third in actual use was Moral Appeal, which was ranked as 14th—not even among the top half of the ranking which included techniques the faculty might possibly use. The fourth-ranked faculty choice was either Liking or Altercasting (positive); in actual behavior Liking was fourth, although with no coder agreement. There appears to be some slight correspondence between technique preference and actual technique use. Although the use of Moral Appeal clearly contradicts the ranking given by the faculty, it is important to note that this technique is used by the dean and the chair, and not other faculty members. These comparisons once again raise the question that recurs in social science: Will people respond to questionnaires about behavior in ways that are consistent with actual behavior? This illustration suggests that this may be the case to a limited degree. The paucity of coded compliance-gaining techniques makes conclusions regarding consistency between questionnaire responses...
The fifth research question was: Will compliance-gaining techniques in conversation tend to form clusters, or strategies, as defined by Marwell and Schmitt? It is impossible to discern this information from the coded data, which were too few to factor analyze. At this point, this question must remain unanswered until a larger or perhaps different body of data can be analyzed, or the current data can be coded with a more comprehensive coding scheme. With regard to the current data analysis, this question must be discarded.

The sixth research question touched on an issue already briefly discussed: Will the techniques recorded in actual conversation tend to be predominantly in any one of Marwell and Schmitt's first- and second-order factors? The data do not suggest any particular predominance with respect to the first-order factors. Expertise (positive) is a technique in the factor "Expertise"; Moral Appeal appears in "Activation of Impersonal Commitments"; Liking appears in "Rewarding Activity"; and Camaraderie does not appear in any of the first-order factors since it was added by the researcher to the group of techniques. However, as noted before, the first three of these techniques are members of the second-order factor, "tendency to use socially acceptable techniques," and, for reasons cited earlier, Camaraderie may also be considered part of this factor. Essentially, this result reinforces what most people familiar with a university
setting would suspect: Socially acceptable compliance-gaining techniques are more normative than non-socially acceptable techniques.

The final research question asked for two separate analyses. First, would measures of total turn time reflect status and sex differences of the speakers; and second, would total turn time correspond to speakers' use of compliance-gaining techniques. For the first part of the inquiry, the results clearly indicate that, indeed, sex, status and their interaction produce significant differences in total turn time. However, there is evidence to support the notion that a speaker's social power is reflected in total turn time, as suggested by Eakins and Eakins (1979), or that, as Thorne and Henley (1975) pointed out, total turn time may be related to greater "influence." The ANOVA yielded statistically significant results indicating, as previous research has found, that males have greater average turn time than females. In short, males in this mixed-sex context dominate the opportunity to talk; in terms of average turn time, females talk less than half as much as the males do.

Some of the contemporary research into sex differences in human behavior claims that males enjoy greater social status by virtue of their sex and are thus socially entitled to more talk time. If social status is a determinant in talk time, one would suspect that overt status within an organization might perceptibly influence the amount of talk allotted to interlocutors. The results of the ANCOVA, which showed
significant sex differences with status controlled, indicated that these conclusions are supported. Within the faculty setting, status does appear to have an influence on total turn time since the ANOVA showed a significant difference in average turn time as a function of participants' departmental status. These differences, compared in the multiple range test, show that tenured faculty have both greater status and greater average turn time than tenure-track faculty (more than twice as much turn time, in fact); and tenure-track faculty who have greater departmental status than non-tenure-track faculty also have significantly more turn time (nearly five times more). The greatest disparity in turn time is that tenured faculty enjoy more than 10 times as much turn time, on the average, as non-tenure-track faculty.

Thus far the total turn time data seem to support both previous research in this area and the reasonable intuitions communicators have about the privileges of status. Greater status often provides the possibility of larger salaries, bigger houses, and more automobiles; it appears that greater status provides more turn time in conversation, as well.

It is reasonable to predict that the interaction of sex and status would produce significant effects, as well. Indeed, as the ANOVA revealed, turn time does appear to be influenced by the interaction of sex and status, but with some rather interesting and atypical results.
One possible effect of the interaction of sex and status would be that males with greater status would have greatest average turn time and females with least status would have least average turn time. Further, it would seem likely that in comparisons between males and females of equal status, males would exhibit greater turn times since normal social status variables, i.e., status by virtue of sex, would be operative. As the data indicate, neither prediction is substantiated. While the tenured male did account for greatest average turn time, the non-tenure-track males (not the females) accounted for the least. In fact, although the tenured female talked significantly less than her male counterpart, the other two female populations (tenure-track and non-tenure-track) did not talk significantly less than their male counterparts; in fact, although there was no statistical significance, these female populations averaged greater turn time. If sex was the predominant factor involving turn time, then one could argue that the average turn time of any male population should exceed that of any female population. This was clearly not the case. Similarly, if status was the predominant influence on turn time, individuals with greater status should consistently display greater average turn times than individuals of lesser status. Again, this was not the case. The tenure-track female was the second most dominant participant in terms of turn time. Apparently males in status levels below the top level abdicate their rights to the turn time that one would expect them to have by virtue of their greater social status, sex; it may be that
social status is not a relevant factor within this setting. The female in the highest status level apparently yields the right to turn time that would normally be accorded her by virtue of her organizational status.

In the original statement of the problem, one of the issues raised was the concept that in many social, non-occupational settings there is no easy method of delimiting the influence of sex and status on talk, no way to arbitrarily give females greater status and males lesser status and then observe the effects on conversation. It was hoped that the organizational setting with its hierarchical arrangement of occupational positions would allow for this confounding of sex and status variables. In reality, the average turn time analysis reveals that the interactive effects of sex and status are convoluted and complex, since neither one nor the other influenced the data in any predictable direction, although influences were evident.

Individual personality characteristics undoubtedly influence turn time to some extent, and the small cell sizes in the ANOVA allow for considerable impact of individual personality variables. One concern, consequently, is whether the findings based on a small sample size will generalize to other and perhaps larger populations of interlocutors. Although this clearly requires further study, if the variables of status and sex were influential in producing the turn time results, then it seems likely that larger populations would produce the same or stronger
Essentially, the average turn time findings suggest that the organizational setting may be a fruitful one for examining influence in terms of dominance in volume of talk. Unlike non-occupational settings, where studies have revealed that sex differences and their implied status differences are reasonable predictors of conversational participation, the organizational setting makes prediction less neat. In fact, these results suggest that neither males nor females need be hampered by their sex stereotypic roles when participating in conversations in organizational contexts. It may be that the interaction of sex and status will allow for greater latitude of individual variation in turn time, since status and sex do not necessarily work in concert in determining the quantity of an individual's participation.

The second part of the final research question was: Would total turn time correspond to speakers' use of compliance-gaining techniques? One area of correspondence worth examining involves the opportunity for compliance-gaining technique use. Essentially, the more turn time available to a speaker, the greater the opportunity, in terms of "having the floor" for that speaker to use verbal compliance-gaining techniques. Although the limited number of compliance-gaining techniques found in the coded data make conclusions hazardous at best, there appears to be a slight association between turn time and technique use. The chair and
the dean, overwhelmingly dominant in terms of average turn time, are the pre-eminent users of compliance-gaining techniques on a per-meeting-attended basis. The tenured faculty, who in combination produced the second highest average turn time after the chair and the dean, were responsible for the only other coded instances of compliance-gaining technique use. More turn time may increase the number of possible opportunities for the use of compliance-gaining techniques in conversation. The issue of "opportunity" needs to be evaluated. Discussions of the influence of situational variables need to include this consideration in order to adequately describe contextual information and participants.

IMPLICATIONS

The research findings have raised more questions than they have answered, and the implications for further research into conversational compliance-gaining attempts are profound.

The average turn time data indicate that organizational situations may not parallel non-occupational situations insofar as the effects of sex and status are concerned. In order to establish that a sex/status interaction creates some unusual and relatively unpredictable turn time results, however, a variety of organizational settings as well as the academic setting need to be investigated. The findings that obtain in a faculty meeting context may not be evident in, for example, a meeting of department heads in a local business. The faculty meeting situation may
involve a host of variables (as, for example, the status that may come with an individual's length of service) which are not readily apparent but which may influence turn time. If the sex X status interactive effects on turn time were examined across a number of different types of meetings, and if the same kinds of turn time distributions occurred, one could more safely argue that the organizational context provides for greater turn time variety, since neither the sex nor status of the speaker would predictably influence turn time.

The consistency of questionnaire responses, both in terms of the test-retest reliability and in terms of the sex and status sub-group comparisons, may be due to the fact that the respondents were relatively homogeneous, especially with regard to place and general type of vocation, level of education (all having a minimum of a baccalaureate degree, and all having or planning on obtaining advanced degrees), socio-economic and social class level. In addition, there was a certain amount of homogeneity in age, with no respondent being either very old or very young. Another important factor in questionnaire response consistency is that the situations given in the items were designed to be faculty situations, thus allowing respondents to relate the items to their own experiences. Given that some of those experiences would be similar, since the participants were all members of the same department, consistency of response across the sex and status sub-groups is not entirely surprising.
The two variables that would seem likely to influence responses were sex and status. Sex of respondent was a likely influence because of the implications that sex differences are socialization differences; and status was a likely influence because this otherwise homogeneous group could be differentiated by status within the university system. Since no differences in responses to the questionnaire were significant, it seems that group homogeneity transcended sex or status variables insofar as the questionnaire responses were concerned.

Finally, the major issue raised by the findings is the applicability of the compliance-gaining technique coding scheme. It is impossible to ignore the fact that out of a fairly large number of conversational episodes, relatively few compliance-gaining attempts were found. This disparity could have been the result of three possible factors: inadequate coding, lack of compliance-gaining in the chosen setting, or inadequacies in the coding scheme itself.

The first possibility is that the individual coders were unreliable in their coding of the data, or that they failed to comprehend the compliance-gaining techniques as described in the coding scheme. However, the high degree of intercoder agreement makes this an unlikely possibility, and the fact that coders did agree on some episodes containing compliance-gaining attempts makes it still more unlikely. One would expect that if the actual coding of the conversations was the problem, intercoder reliability would be erratic or absent.
The second possibility is that the context for data collection is at fault. The faculty meeting setting may not have been an ideal forum for investigating compliance-gaining attempts. This factor is especially likely if the faculty perceives itself and the function of its meetings as being more socio-emotional than task-oriented. As a participant in and observer of this faculty's departmental meetings, the researcher concluded that the faculty group seems to emphasize the task and information-sharing orientation within its meetings, as well as the socio-emotional orientation. Furthermore, through informal conversations with the participants, the researcher determined that both orientations are operative within this faculty group. Despite the fact that some faculty members tend to interact more from one orientation than the other, most faculty members function within both orientations. However, if in fact the faculty felt that compliance-gaining and related activities were of little importance in the faculty meeting situation, then the data base for exploring compliance-gaining attempts could be questioned.

To explore this possibility, when the apparent lack of compliance-gaining was found in the coded data, a third questionnaire was administered to the faculty. This final instrument was designed to determine the faculty meeting functions that faculty members felt were important, and to ascertain the frequency of their occurrence. (See Appendix F for complete questionnaire.) Thirteen faculty meeting functions derived from interviews with faculty members were listed in
### TABLE 7

Mean Scores for Functions Listed in Faculty Meeting Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Importance to me[a]</th>
<th>Frequency w/ which I do</th>
<th>Importance to Faculty</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>giving information</td>
<td>1.73 (1)</td>
<td>4.00 (6)</td>
<td>1.60 (1)</td>
<td>2.47 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building camaraderie</td>
<td>2.93 (7)</td>
<td>3.60 (3)</td>
<td>2.07 (3)</td>
<td>2.27 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeking cooperation</td>
<td>2.50 (5)</td>
<td>3.80 (5)</td>
<td>2.20 (4)</td>
<td>2.67 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializing</td>
<td>4.00 (10)</td>
<td>3.33 (2)</td>
<td>2.20 (4)</td>
<td>2.07 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting action</td>
<td>1.93 (2)</td>
<td>3.67 (4)</td>
<td>2.47 (5)</td>
<td>3.33 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting agreement</td>
<td>2.67 (6)</td>
<td>4.00 (6)</td>
<td>2.47 (5)</td>
<td>2.93 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving information</td>
<td>1.93 (2)</td>
<td>2.47 (1)</td>
<td>2.07 (3)</td>
<td>2.20 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving opinions</td>
<td>2.33 (4)</td>
<td>3.33 (2)</td>
<td>1.67 (2)</td>
<td>1.73 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaining compliance</td>
<td>3.07 (8)</td>
<td>4.27 (7)</td>
<td>2.67 (7)</td>
<td>3.00 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trying to change opinions</td>
<td>3.47 (9)</td>
<td>4.40 (8)</td>
<td>3.07 (8)</td>
<td>3.47 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeking self-confirmation</td>
<td>4.63 (12)</td>
<td>5.00 (10)</td>
<td>3.28 (9)</td>
<td>3.43 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making policy decisions</td>
<td>2.13 (3)</td>
<td>4.71 (9)</td>
<td>2.07 (3)</td>
<td>3.40 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertaining</td>
<td>4.47 (11)</td>
<td>3.80 (5)</td>
<td>2.53 (6)</td>
<td>2.07 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The smaller the mean score, the greater the importance or the greater the frequency.  
[a] Numbers in parentheses are rank order numbers.
fairly important and slightly important, contrasted with the rating of 3.07 on the "importance to me" scale, where it fell between slightly important and neither important or unimportant. These results indicate that the faculty as individuals are likely to see compliance gaining as less important to themselves than to the other faculty members as a group. A similar contrast occurred in terms of the assessment of the frequency of compliance gaining. Frequency for self was rated 4.27, between occasionally and infrequently, whereas frequency of occurrence for the faculty as a whole was rated 3.0 - often. This finding is consistent with the responses to the importance scale, wherein the faculty as individuals perceive their compliance gaining as occurring less frequently than the compliance gaining of the faculty as a whole. In general, for the faculty as a whole and to a lesser extent for the faculty as individuals, compliance gaining has some importance and occurs fairly often. Given these, one would anticipate that the coded data would yield far more than 13 compliance-gaining attempts in 4-1/2 hours of meeting time containing 370 conversational episodes.

A third possible explanation for the conversational coding results is that the compliance-gaining techniques devised by Marwell and Schmitt are inadequate for the task of evaluating naturally-occurring conversation. Several factors lend credence to this explanation, and primary among them is the general nature of compliance-gaining research to date.
Compliance-gaining behavior has heretofore been accessed almost entirely through the use of paper-and-pencil measures, as Marwell and Schmitt (1967) used in their original development of the first- and second-order factors. Similarly, Miller et al. (1977) developed a questionnaire instrument to investigate compliance-gaining techniques in terms of their use depending on long- or short-term consequences in interpersonal and non-interpersonal situations. More recently Cody McLaughlin, and Jordan (1980) have attempted to go beyond the pre-formulated techniques suggested by Marwell and Schmitt and have investigated compliance-gaining strategies through multi-dimensional scaling of participant reports. Although Cody, et al. have taken a more exhaustive approach by having students write about what strategies they would use to gain compliance in three different situations, rather than having them respond to pre-formulated techniques, the fact remains that the situations themselves are essentially "pre-formulated" and the techniques described are those that are reported by subjects rather than those that might actually be observed in their behavior.

The principal aim of this research was to observe compliance-gaining attempts as they naturally occur, not as they are suspected to occur, nor as they are reported to occur. To this end, the techniques constructed by Marwell and Schmitt appear to have little generalizability from questionnaire measures to behavioral measures. The one instance of correspondence between questionnaire and performance (the Camaraderie technique) involved a technique suggested by the
researcher after initial access to the faculty meeting situation and was not part of the original list of compliance-gaining techniques suggested by Marwell and Schmitt.

The best interests of compliance-gaining research or of conversational research, however, are not served if the issue is abandoned at this point. Since pre-formulated categories of compliance-gaining behavior do not apply to these data to any great extent, and since self-reported compliance-gaining techniques are as yet untried as to their applicability to actual conversational behavior, an alternative solution is to develop a data-based model of compliance-gaining techniques in conversation.

Such a model can be developed through an ethnographic approach which capitalizes on the natural influences within the setting and minimizes influences due to the research project itself. Wilson specifically addresses the use of coding schemes for categorizing behavior:

Theoretically a coding scheme . . . for interpreting observed behaviors can be developed and communicated so that anyone who has learned the scheme, with training and practice, will interpret the behaviors in approximately the same way. (1977, p. 249)

He further points out that such schemes are arbitrary, and that the most important frame in which to understand the behavior are those of participants, not the researchers. The data-based model proposed in the
following chapter is an attempt to reduce the arbitrariness of compliance-gaining coding schemes and introduce participant/observer knowledge into the descriptions of verbal behavior. This approach will unify both qualitative and quantitative methods of inquiry by suggesting measurable categories of compliance-gaining techniques which are derived from behaviors the participants themselves acknowledge. The ethnographic approach allows descriptions which will account for the interlocutors' meanings as well as objectivistic descriptions of their behavior (Pearce, 1977).

The attempt to empirically explore compliance gaining in conversation has fallen short of providing the substance for conclusive analysis but has suggested that the behaviors are nevertheless viable in the context. The next logical step is to develop an understanding of those compliance-gaining behaviors as they exist in the data. In order for the description of these behaviors to proceed, some sort of heuristic framework is required (Hymes, 1972).

The ethnographic method suggested here is designed to develop a coding scheme which is not a priori, but rather data-based. An important assumption of this aim is that the resultant scheme will account for behavior not only in the context from which it was derived, but in other conversational contexts of the same type, as well.
The following chapter will focus on the development of a data-driven coding scheme garnered from three of the four recorded faculty meetings. Techniques will be evaluated and labeled, using the relevant contextual features and participant/observer knowledge of the researcher; and the conversation in the fourth faculty meeting will be coded and analyzed using the proposed scheme. The results of the coding will then be evaluated in terms of generalizability beyond the faculty context, and the issue of external validity will be discussed.
CHAPTER VI: DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF A MODEL
FOR CONVERSATIONAL COMPLIANCE-GAINING TECHNIQUES

THE RATIONALE

A basic premise of this research is that human beings seek self-definition through conversational control. As Marwell and Schmitt and others have suggested, an analysis of compliance-gaining is a means to examine social control. The coding scheme derived from the Marwell and Schmitt categories yielded limited results when applied to the data, yet the participants who generated the data indicated that compliance-gaining was a function within the faculty meeting context. This apparent contradiction led to the conclusion that the coding scheme, not the situation or participants, was suspect.

The concluding section of Chapter V discussed the advisability of constructing a data-based model of compliance-gaining behavior, and an ethnographic approach to the codifying of compliance-gaining behavior was suggested. This calls for qualitative contextual information and description of the actual behaviors of the participants in their compliance-gaining attempts. Since the issue here is verbal compliance-gaining attempts, they will be viewed in their conversational...
context in order to clarify the ways in which compliance-gaining attempts occur in conversation.

A new coding scheme, one which incorporates the salient categories of compliance-gaining behavior from both the current data base and the typologies of other researchers, is hereby proposed.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CODING SCHEME

General resources. The proposed compliance-gaining coding scheme was developed from three resource areas. First, the compliance-gaining typologies suggested by other researchers were examined in light of the conversational data of three faculty meetings. Techniques that were applicable to the data were selected for inclusion in the new coding scheme. Second, compliance-gaining techniques suggested by the participants themselves to the researcher were considered for inclusion in the coding scheme. As with the techniques culled from previous research, these participant-based techniques were examined for applicability to the three faculty meetings. Finally, the researcher included categories that, in her judgment, were relevant to the data. These judgments were made from the researcher's informal contextual knowledge and knowledge of the participants. These three resources will now be examined in depth.
Prior research in compliance-gaining behavior. The typology suggested by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) has already been shown to have only limited applicability to the conversational data collected in this study. However, these categories were not discarded without further consideration; rather, these categories were preserved as a whole and applied to the data from one faculty meeting as a further check on the instances of intercoder agreement produced by the original Marwell and Schmitt coding. This was done simultaneously with the application of the proposed coding scheme to the same faculty meeting data.

In addition, two other compliance-gaining typologies were evaluated for salient techniques. The first of these was the recent research of Cody, McLaughlin and Jordan (1980). Their investigation into compliance-gaining behavior included consideration of the strategies mapped by Falbo (1977), and their approach to the construction of strategies was similar to Falbo's inductive method. Cody et al. derived strategies from essays written by respondents who were asked to report the message strategy they would use in each of three situations (a situation with high intimacy, low resistance to persuasion, and long-term consequences; a situation with low level of situation apprehension and long-term consequences; and a negotiation situation). The three stimulus situations produced differing clusters of strategies, with some duplication in strategies across situations. Eliminating duplicate categories, 15 compliance-gaining techniques were derived from the data (see Chapter II for review of strategies obtained in each
stimulus situation). The research had taken into account the typologies of Marwell and Schmitt, Miller et al. and Falbo, and had explored compliance-gaining across three differing situations. These 15 techniques were then examined. Therefore, the list of 15 techniques from the Cody et al. research was considered the most comprehensive to date derived from a self-report data base. In the context of the current data base, and the relevant techniques selected for inclusion in the coding scheme were: Simple Statement, Disclaimer, Hinting, Negotiating Alternatives, and Simple Expertise. (See Description of compliance-gaining techniques, which follows, for fuller explication of techniques.)

The research of Grimshaw (1980) into what he called the "instrumentalities of verbal manipulation" was considered for inclusion in the coding scheme. The research seemed a likely resource since Grimshaw was specifically investigating verbal compliance gaining; however, the categories he proposed (Ask, Beg, Cajole, Con, Order, Persuade, Suggest) seemed to be accounted for more specifically in the Cody et al. list or were too indeterminate to be useful. For example, Grimshaw's technique Suggest seemed to be accounted for in Hinting; and the technique Persuade could actually represent most verbal compliance-gaining attempts. Consequently, although this list of techniques was considered, none were included in the final scheme.
Techniques based on participant reports. In the weeks that followed the collection of the conversational data, the researcher had opportunity to discuss compliance-gaining with several departmental faculty. During these discussions, the faculty participants occasionally suggested techniques which they felt that either they or other faculty members used to gain compliance in faculty meetings. These remarks, when summed and distilled, suggested the following message techniques: Information, Humor, Hinting, Sarcast and Put-Downs. Despite the fact that these techniques were derived directly from the reports of the participants, not all of the techniques were applicable as they were described to the researcher. The first of these, Information, was considered a viable compliance-gaining technique by several faculty; however, the difficulties in trying to code informational statements used as compliance-gaining attempts were too considerable to overcome if informative value alone was the criterion for judgment. Simply, based on the data, uses of information were not identifiably different except as had already been accounted for within other techniques. One of the basic premises of this research is that every conversational offering is an attempt at social control. In light of this premise and the coding difficulties, Information, as a category in its own right, was discarded as too broad to be useful.
Similarly, **Humor** was described by several faculty members as a viable compliance-gaining technique. However, once again, the category **Humor** was too broad to be useful and subsumed other categories which made finer discriminations possible. Several of the categories are discussed in the next section. The two suggestions, **Sarcasm** and **Put-Downs**, for example, were subsets of the category **Humor**. These two were included in the coding scheme, but were combined into a single category since discriminations between a sarcastic remark and a put-down seemed entirely arbitrary and not particularly meaningful in light of the data.

The category **Hinting** had already appeared in the Cody et al. typology for two of the three stimulus situations. This further supported the inclusion of **Hinting** in the new coding scheme.

**Participant/observer-based techniques.** The last resource considered in developing the coding scheme was the informal contextual and participant familiarity of the researcher, who had not only attended faculty meetings but knew all of the participants, excluding the dean, through informal contacts within the Communication Department. Additionally, the researcher had continual access to the conversations that constitute the data of this research, allowing her to develop considerable familiarity with these conversations. Three of the four faculty meetings were examined in depth for compliance-gaining attempts. The fourth was preserved for testing the applicability of the new coding
recorded, the researcher was able to listen to the interactions as they were occurring, and was able to audit the conversations that preceded and followed the recorded conversations.

From this background, then, the researcher made evaluations about the types of compliance-gaining techniques she saw evidenced in three of the faculty meetings. The decisions regarding these techniques were to some extent based on knowledge of individual participant styles, since some individuals showed relative consistency in the use of some techniques and eschewed others. The aim in selecting categories was to isolate techniques that were generally applicable to the data as a whole. The techniques isolated were: Historical Claim, Reminder, Challenge, Summarizing, Assumed Compliance, and Camaraderie. The Camaraderie category had been included in the coding scheme used for the initial coding of the data. Its inclusion at that time was based on the participant/observer knowledge of the researcher, and consequently it is re-stated here for inclusion in the new coding scheme. The technique Sycophantic Flattery, also added to the original coding scheme, was not included in the new scheme as it was found to be inappropriate to the data, even though this technique was also suggested by Cody et al. and Falbo in their compliance-gaining paradigms. Flattery in any form did not surface in the data base from the three faculty meetings.
Description of the compliance-gaining techniques. Twelve compliance-gaining message techniques were derived from previous research, participant verbal reports and the researcher's participant/observer knowledge. These 12 techniques constitute the compliance-gaining paradigm by which one faculty meeting was explored in depth. Each of the selected techniques had ample support from the data of three faculty meetings to be included in the scheme. Descriptions of techniques include examples, and in cases where there may be ambiguity or the examples require clarification, relevant contextual information is added.

The 12 compliance-gaining techniques are:

1. DISCLAIMER -

A.) Includes qualifying statements in advance of what follows. (E.g., "If you don't have it, you might want to get yours." One faculty member is suggesting that the other faculty have the course description in front of them before the discussion begins.)

B.) Includes hedging which reveals uncertainty about surrounding statements. (E.g., "I don't know, but I don't think this ... I think, yes, we have to strike a balance ... It's not the course. What else do we do, or where's the rest?" The participant is trying to persuade other faculty members that two courses are needed where one is presently offered.)

C.) Includes requests for permission or latitude until the act can be placed in correct context. (E.g., "May I, while everybody is signing and socializing and chaining out, uh ask that ..." The participant apparently wanted to intrude into ongoing conversation and discuss an item while the other faculty completed their immediate tasks. In this case, the item went undisussed since the faculty chose to discuss what "chaining out" meant.)
2. SARCASM/PUT-DOWNS - Includes statements that are overtly sarcastic in either content or presentation or that imply social disapproval or ostracism to quell opposition. These are often humorous in context and must be evaluated on the basis of prosodic features as well as content. (E.g., "Is this what we call the product of consensus in decision-making?" This question was asked immediately after a verbal exchange in which the chair announces a change in meeting style based on faculty consensus, and the remarks of the faculty include: "What planet were you on?" "Was this a different meeting than the one we all attended?" "Seig heil! Seig heil!")

(E.g., "You tell them as soon as the faculty comes to grips with it, we'll let you know." This statement is offered in response to information given by a faculty member regarding the fact that new graduate students want to "come to grips" with what communication is all about before beginning their graduate program.)

3. HINTING - Includes statements or questions which merely allude to or insinuate desired behaviors without overtly stating what the target should do. (E.g., "If this would work and if L doesn't mind taking on the task..." This statement occurs in a discussion in which the participant (L) has raised objections to a proposal regarding the training of teaching assistants; the objections are resolved, but their resolution means that L will need to assume more responsibility.)

(E.g., "Everyone should have their name, rank, serial number, and what they do in a paragraph under the faculty thing." This occurs in a discussion about updating the graduate handbook. The participant is implying that if faculty members have not provided that information, they should do so.)

4. HISTORICAL CLAIM - Makes reference to agreement or consensus that took place some time in the past; this includes either real or fictitious agreement. (E.g., "During the graduate meeting there was unanimous agreement that we should change the style of the meetings." This is an example of a fictitious agreement historical claim; subsequent remarks--see Sarcast/Put-Down description--indicate that there was no agreement.)

(E.g., "We've decided... the policy is this, that these data are not released." The participant is referring to a
past decision regarding course evaluations which had hitherto been the departmental policy.)

5. REMINDER - Admonishes targets to remember or recall previous discussions as a basis for compliance now. Often contains the words remember or recall. (E.g., "Remember that if you're giving graduate student internships . . . they have to be given a grade on the graduate level." The participant is urging the faculty to give the appropriate grades for internships.)

(E.g., "This year, if you recall, we have . . . because it's not in the handbook and I want to keep reminding you of this . . . we have required that all graduate students give their thesis advisor a copy of their thesis." The participant is admonishing the faculty to tell their graduate students about the additional required thesis copy.)

6. SIMPLE STATEMENT - Includes simple demands, requests and questions which clearly require some behavior from the target. Coding decisions need to be based on the illocutionary force of the utterance; in other words, "please return it" can have the same illocutionary force as, "Will whoever took it return it." Questions and requests which have the same illocutionary force as simple commands or demands do not generally require a verbal response from the target because they are merely telling the target, "Do X." This technique excludes simple statements of fact or information, simple requests for information, or questions of a purely information-seeking nature which do not require that the target "Do X."

(E.g., "Put down an item about the possibility of a departmental retreat in Newark.")

(E.g., "You all decide.")

(E.g., "That's no longer acceptable." This statement, said flatly, was in response to the chair's use of the generic "he" instead of "she or he." The participant is trying to get the chair to modify his form of generic address.)

7. CHALLENGE - Involves verbalizations of an inflammatory or "cheerleading" nature to arouse agreement or compliance. Coding decisions need to be based on prosody as well as content since these remarks are often humorous or exaggerated. (E.g., "Are we going to take this sitting
... down?" The participant is humorously asking for support to override the chair's attempt to change the style of the meetings.)

(E.g., "What is this shit, A?" The participant is attempting to override the chair in the situation described in the previous example.)

3. CAMARADERIE - Includes verbalizations that suggest "we are all in this together" and imply collective behavior. These nearly always contain the word we in the technique. (E.g., "We're going to have to make a decision fairly soon on what we have called G's job." The participant wants to discuss this job and is urging the faculty to participate in the decision.)

(E.g., "If we look at our own experiences at the --quote--good schools we went to, they seem to be operating quite well under the double-listing." The participant says this in a discussion about double-listed courses where it had been suggested by one faculty member that graduate courses be listed separately. The participant is calling upon commonality of experience to gain compliance.)

9. SUMMARIZING - Includes statements or questions that sum up all that has been said on a given subject, with the expectation of compliance or agreement. (E.g., "The consensus seems to be, then, that we don't like that idea." The participant has summarized the discussion of giving students course evaluations and expects agreement from the other faculty members.)

(E.g., "Then that's the point. No. We will not have a replacement." The participant is summing up a discussion regarding a faculty member who will be on sabbatical leave. This statement is a demand for clarification regarding the status of faculty during that sabbatical.)

10. NEGOTIATING ALTERNATIVES - Involves an explanation and presentation of options in order to reach agreement or gain compliance. (E.g., "We could give them copies of our course syllabi." This is offered as an alternative to giving students course evaluations, since that choice was generally unacceptable to the faculty.)

(E.g., "... could you alter it to intercultural perspectives on method or something like that?" The
participant is presenting an alternative label for a section of the research methods course since he feels that the proposed label is not really descriptive of the material he will teach.)

11. SIMPLE EXPERTISE - Involves an interlocutor's claim to superior knowledge or skill as the basis for seeking compliance or agreement. (E.g., "I think I may be able to shed a little insight. I've talked with J about her motivation." This occurs in the discussion of giving course evaluations to students; the participant is claiming knowledge which will reveal the motivation of the students for wanting the course evaluations, with the intent of overriding this suggestion.)

(E.g., "But when they first started I know that the department really encouraged them." The participant claims knowledge based on his seniority within the department; the discussion centers on trying to get the present faculty to encourage the various undergraduate student organizations.)

12. ASSUMED COMPLIANCE - Involves the overt assumption that the group agrees or complies; often contains phrases like: "I'm sure" or "I'm certain." (E.g., "I'm sure you don't, either." The participant has been discussing having the faculty involved in student recruitment and has said that she does not want to test the relationship between an involved faculty and student enrollment.)

(E.g., "I'm sure you share the load." This was said in reference to having faculty members giving up time to participate in recruitment.)

CODING THE CONVERSATIONAL DATA

Method and data analysis. The decisions made in evaluating the data relied on: prosodic information, knowledge of the participants, knowledge of the situation, the Marwell and Schmitt scheme and the new coding scheme. The data of one faculty meeting was coded by the researcher on an episode by episode basis. Coding judgments were made
primarily with reference to information within a given episode but with preceding episodes in mind. There was no attempt by the researcher to "over-analyze"; if a compliance-gaining attempt was not readily apparent within an episode, the episode was designated, No Strategy. In short, coding decisions were based on the same sort of information and interpretation communicators naturally rely upon in every-day conversation. Remarks in the faculty meeting were interpreted through content, prosody and presumed intent of the interlocutor.

The data available for coding included both the written transcript of the conversation and the recording of the conversation itself. This data sample was one meeting out of a series of five faculty meetings. The first recording was not used in the data sample nor in the development of the coding scheme since it was thought that the participants needed one meeting in which to become accustomed to being recorded. Three of the remaining meetings were analyzed for the development of the coding scheme.

All of the participants listed in Table 4, excluding X (dean), were present at the meeting currently under analysis.

Because the aim of this part of the research is qualitative as opposed to quantitative, the data analysis involves excerpts or conversational data which illustrate the use of techniques, and raw counts of techniques by the faculty subgroups originally described for the ANOVA. The data from one faculty meeting were too few for
statistical analyses.

**Coding illustration.** In order to more fully describe the contextual and participant information used in making coding judgments, a sample from the data is provided below, with commentary as to what is believed to be transpiring among the participants. Remarks include references to the occurrences of compliance gaining within the verbal and social context.

The topic that A is discussing is the Academic Activities Report, which all of the faculty are required to fill out. When this episode begins, A has been describing the function of the report and urging the faculty to attend workshops which will help them in filling out the report.

**Conversation**

A: I want to stress that, while I'm not into this kind of thing, because it is productivity and results which are important, we do need to--

G: Sorry, George, no one said anything for the first hour.

A: --y'know, to use this, because a lot of this information is enormously helpful to our department. (Camaraderie) It has to do with the number of students in class, the numbers of hours we teach, and this kind of thing. Basically, (unintelligible).

**Commentary**

A's statement, "we do need to, y'know, use this because a lot of this information is enormously helpful to our department," was coded as Camaraderie, since A includes himself and all of the department. A frequently uses this technique, softening the attempt to gain compliance by including himself among all who need to comply. G's comment, which interrupts A, is addressed to a faculty member just joining the meeting.
C: Can we work on this uh as a group?

L: Yeh.

A: A group project?

C: No, I uh-uh I would really, seriously, y'know.

A: A lot of it is very - a lot of it doesn't apply.

The statement by C evokes laughter from the group and was apparently an attempt at humor, while also indicating resistance to filling out such an elaborate form. Two turns later, C indicates that he desires clarification. His remark, which follows A's cryptic comment about a group project, is rather ambiguous and does not really state what the intention of his previous turn was. A's response that "a lot of it doesn't apply" seems to be A's attempt to soothe the misgivings which C has revealed in the preceding turns.

H: Well, would you give us some examples here? (Simple Statement)

A: Sponsored research.

H: Just-just to give perspective?

A: Well.

H: I mean, one item?

The question by H asking for examples was coded as a Simple Statement compliance-gaining technique. H appears to be referring to a need for examples of what does and does not apply, and his compliance-gaining attempt is plainly a demand for more information. However, the example given by A goes unnoticed, since H continues by indicating why examples are needed. A's response occurs after a brief pause, which is apparently interpreted by H as a need for further clarification. H provides clarification by saying, "I mean, one item?"
A: A lot of this—again, research, scholarly activities, sponsored related research, if you had a contract with the uh with the government, then that goes—that goes down here, but that's cranked into the reporting activity for government grants. If you have a contract for—with the university, UDRF grant, that kind of thing, it comes in here, too. That shows your uh (unintelligible).

H: But what goes in? I mean, just uh . . .

K: Percentage of time spent on that?

In an effort to clarify matters for H, K suggests interrogatively that what finally goes into the report is percentage of time spent on the activities which A has given as examples.

M: Oh, so you're—so you're not estimating hours.

A: No hours. No hours.

M: Just percentages of your total time. That's not too bad.

M assumes that K is correct in her suggestion and further clarifies by saying that "you're not estimating hours." At this point, A, repeating himself for emphasis, corroborates the fact that the report does not involve estimation of hours. M re-states this conclusion just to be sure and remarks that percentages are not too bad.

The Simple Statement technique, asking for examples, followed by elaboration, finally results in A's compliance. He gives several examples of what goes into the report. Despite this, H is still unclear as to what is included, and says so. This is still more elaboration proceeding from H's original Simple Statement compliance-gaining attempt.
H: Oh, and-and-what's the base? What's the time base?

H, however, is still unclear as to how this measure of time is based; in fact, he interrupts M just before M says, "That's not too bad," to ask what the base is.

J: Hours.

A: A hundred percent.

Simultaneously, J and A provide answers, but before these answers can generate further discussion, D makes a humorous remark regarding "a place for sleeping" on the form. This remark evokes laughter from the group since it refers to an inside joke regarding the sleep habits of the speaker.

D: They've got a place in there for sleeping, too.

C: So it's a hundred percent of 100 hours, or a hundred percent of 40 hours, is that it? And they don't-they don't--

C then pursued the topic of percentage of time in an effort to further clarify what is required, and K responds with a clarification. M, who moments before had commented that percentage of time was "not too bad," now also needs clarification as a result of the preceding discussion. He inquires if what is meant by time is working time.

K: A hundred percent of your time.

M: Do they-do they mean working time?
B: What time you devote to your academic . . .

M: Okay.

B: Enterprises.

K: So that when you put in all your work activities, they add up to a hundred, so it's a hundred percent of work time. (Summarizing)

A: Whether--whether that is--

B responds to M's question, trailing off after "academic," but apparently it is clear to M what B meant, since he immediately says, "okay," and B finishes his incomplete statement with "enterprises." B has successfully indicated that the time frame is indeed work time.

At this point, K, who often summarizes discussions after all other speakers who intend to contribute have contributed, uses the compliance-gaining technique, Summarizing, to bring the discussion to a close. This is probably necessary because of factors which the tape recorder has not revealed. H, who has been silent since asking about what the time base was, is very likely showing nonverbally that he is still unsatisfied.

C: Boy, you throw a number around this guy, and he just . . .

(Laughter)

C: It's back to the Old Country.

(Laughter)

The final remark by C about "back to the Old Country" supports this supposition and indicates that C probably is trying to support K's effort to bring the discussion to a close. It is apparent that C is referring specifically to H because the "Old Country" refers to H's ethnic background (frequently the subject of humor in faculty meetings) and also because the "throw a number around this guy" refers to H's renowned disdain for numbers-oriented research, which has also been the subject of much humor within faculty meetings. K's summary appears to be primarily for H's benefit.
The foregoing conversational excerpt with commentary is included here to illustrate the kinds of general conversational, contextual and participant information which were considered in coding decisions. As can be seen in this example, the relation of one turn to another needs to be considered so that compliance-gaining attempts can be charted from the points in conversation where they begin. Additionally, this type of contextual information allows for distinctions between turns which include compliance-gaining attempts and those which do not.

Results and discussions. Application of the new coding scheme yielded 61 compliance-gaining attempts in a total of 82 episodes. However, only 42 episodes contained compliance-gaining techniques; this discrepancy is accounted for by the fact that some episodes contained more than one technique: 28 episodes had one technique; 10 episodes had two; and one episode had four techniques. These findings contrast with the first coding of this data, which yielded only five compliance-gaining techniques. The results of the second coding suggest two important possibilities: First, that in a faculty meeting setting, compliance gaining is being attempted roughly 50 percent of the time; and second, that when compliance-gaining attempts occur, approximately one-third of the attempts are either series of techniques (more than one technique used by the same interlocutor) and might then be considered strategies, or they are reactions to techniques which precede them in the episode (more than one technique by more than one interlocutor).
Combinations of compliance-gaining techniques. The examination of the data base for developing the new coding scheme revealed that compliance-gaining techniques may result as resistance to or reaction to techniques employed by other interlocutors. Argument or negotiation among interlocutors is likely to produce this linking of compliance-gaining techniques. Consider the following excerpts from a discussion episode:

(Deletions from episodes include asides by faculty members, offhand remarks, etc. Deletions were made to preserve linear relationships among utterances in lengthy episodes.)

D: We want to put down prerequisite courses in that description, too. I don't know if they were included or not. Were they, M---?

A: Yeh.

D: ... I just wanted to make sure.

M: Not specific course numbers.

D: Yeh, well, that's what we want to put, in the um first 45 words. (CAMARADERIE) ... 

L: Can't you say, "prereq of instructor"? (SIMPLE STATEMENT) ...

D: I don't have any qualms at all about any of that. I would like to have "permission of instructor" on all our courses. (SIMPLE STATEMENT)

This episode involves three compliance-gaining attempts by two different interlocutors, indicating that attempts may be reactive. During the discussion of the inclusion of prerequisite courses in the description in the handbook, D indicates, using the Camaraderie
technique, that he wants specific prerequisite course numbers at the beginning of the description. The reaction to this Camaraderie technique is L's blunt statement, "Can't you say, 'prereq of instructor'?" which is L's desired addition to the description. D, in response to L's Simple Statement, employs a Simple Statement technique of his own which expands upon L's attempt by bringing in the new information that D would like "prereq of instructor" on all of the courses. The second technique is an elaboration of the third.

Similarly, the following exchange indicates that the second technique is a reaction to the first technique:

(The subject under discussion is an academic activities report, which the faculty is unenthusiastic about filling out.)

A: I want to stress that, while I'm not into this kind of thing, because it is productivity and results which are important, we do need to, y'know, use this. (CAMARADERIE) . . .

H: Well, would you give us some "for examples" here? (SIMPLE STATEMENT)

In response to A's urging for compliance in filling out the form, H demands more information.
A third example of reactive compliance-gaining occurs in this episode:

J: May I ask you a sort of semi-pertinent question? (DISCLAIMER) How can we know ahead of time whether something is approved by you and therefore comes out of the department budget on the telephone or whether it's personal?

A: Go back and read the famous statement in the orange book. (SIMPLE STATEMENT)

It was noted that more than one technique may be used by the same interlocutor in a single episode. Consider the following example:

A: ... The problem is some of the calls are, y'know, unnecessary. (HINTING) If you're ... if you're dealing with a publisher, call the publisher collect. (SIMPLE STATEMENT) They will take the call. It's amazing. And if you're ... if you're ... if you need some information, unless it's an unusual situation and you need it quickly, write a letter, because the mail is free. (SIMPLE STATEMENT)

In this example, the strategy seems to be to hint at which behaviors are undesirable, and simply demand desirable behaviors. Likewise, this next example shows a strategy involving two compliance-gaining techniques:

H: Before we leave the phones, uh, and I don't mean this, really, to--I'm not--I'm not trying to be belligerent. (DISCLAIMER) Does anybody--everybody know about MCI? (HINTING)

The speaker begins the compliance-gaining attempt with a disclaimer,
probably because the subject of the telephones had been dropped several episodes prior to the example; the reintroduction of the topic after closure was reached could have been construed as belligerent by other participants without the disclaimer. It should be noted that H had given a number of arguments against reduced telephone usage. The hinting technique in the strategy is the suggestion that MCI could be introduced into the department to allow for greater telephone latitude.

As was noted earlier, these linkages of compliance-gaining techniques occurred 14 times (10 episodes with two techniques; three episodes with three; and one episode with four) in 42 compliance-gaining episodes, which suggests that techniques will appear as combinations in the form of strategies for a single interlocutor, or as reactive links to previous techniques by other interlocutors.

**Frequency of compliance-gaining techniques.** The overwhelming favorite compliance-gaining technique in the new coding scheme was Simple Statement, which occurred 20 times. (See Table 8 for the number of occurrences of each technique.) The data-based category Simple Expertise, which was supported from three of the faculty meetings, did not occur at all in the fourth meeting. Three compliance-gaining attempts were coded as Hinting in combination with one other technique. These three instances had elements of both hinting and an additional technique, so both were listed on the coding sheet. The following example illustrates how two techniques appear inseparably within a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance-Gaining Technique</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Statement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcasm/Put-Downs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination[a]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Appeal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Claim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-feeling (positive)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating Alternatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Combinations are: Hinting/Simple Statement; Historical Claim/Hinting; Hinting/Altruism.
single brief utterance:

J: It would help me to know, like, who has taped what.

(HINTING/ALTRUISM)

The participant is trying to get other faculty members to inform him of the videotapes they have. This seems to have elements of Hinting, since he does not really state what exactly he wants, and of Altruism, which in the Marwell and Schmitt scheme was described as, "I need your compliance badly, so it would be altruistic of you to do it for me."

Although Simple Statement was the technique most frequently used, Hinting, Camaraderie and Sarcasm/Put-Down were also used relatively frequently (eight, eight and seven uses respectively).

Distribution of compliance-gaining techniques across faculty subgroups. A final area of analysis was the distribution of technique use across the subgroupings that originally appeared in the ANOVA. (See Table 9 for average technique use by each subgroup.)

The department chair accounted for the greatest number of compliance-gaining techniques, and non-tenure-track males accounted for the least. Thus far, this second coding of the data supports the data analysis in previous chapters where the issue of "opportunity" was discussed. The faculty member with the highest level of participation used the greatest number techniques; those members with the lowest participation used the least number of techniques.
### TABLE 9

Average Number of Compliance-Gaining Techniques Used by Each Faculty Subgroup (2nd Data-Coding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Number of Techniques (Raw)</th>
<th>Average Number of Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (excluding Chair)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured (excluding Chair)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure-Track</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Males</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure-Track Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure-Track Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whereas the Marwell and Schmitt coding suggested that tenured faculty ranked second in technique use, the second coding indicates that tenure-track faculty are the second ranked group. They averaged 4.3 techniques to the tenured faculty's one technique.

The first coding also indicated that there were no real differences between males and females in numbers of compliance-gaining attempts, but the second coding revealed that males made far more attempts than females (24 versus 7 respectively). One disparity in the male-female comparisons was between the tenure-track males and the tenure-track female. The tenure-track males made 23 compliance-gaining attempts to the tenure-track female's three attempts. However, on the average, these males had only 4.6 attempts to her three attempts. The tenured male and the tenured female each used one technique. Again, little disparity was displayed between the non-tenure-track groups, in which the females used three techniques overall (or, on the average, one technique) and the males used none.

These findings suggest that over the faculty as a whole, the distribution of compliance-gaining techniques was relatively even on the average, excluding the chair. Average use of techniques only ranged from 4.6 techniques as a maximum to zero techniques as a minimum. (See Table 9 for average number of techniques per subgroup.)
While the comparisons of these subgroups are extremely speculative, they nevertheless indicate that greater numbers of identifiable instances of verbal compliance-gaining attempts may reveal greater disparities between status-based groups in organizational setting. Those of rising status, as exemplified by the tenure-track faculty, seem to use more compliance-gaining techniques than do those of highest status, the tenured faculty. One possible explanation for this is that tenure-track faculty may need to try harder or more often to obtain compliance which may already be accorded tenured faculty by virtue of their higher status. Whether or not this finding would prevail in other organizational settings needs to be explored.

The data analysis does show, however, that a data-based system for coding behavior, when coupled with contextual knowledge, makes behavioral discriminations easier and more valid in terms of the meanings to the participants, since this particular system revealed compliance-gaining attempts that the participants themselves had indicated were occurring in the situation. Further, a data-based coding scheme produces results more truly representative of the situation which is being measured, because it accounts for behaviors within the situation that are meaningful to the participants.

Marwell and Schmitt coding verification. It was noted earlier that during the second coding the Marwell and Schmitt categories would be applied simultaneously as a reliability check of the first coding of the
faculty meeting currently under analysis. The second coding produced agreement on four of the five episodes in which Marwell and Schmitt compliance-gaining techniques were identified and agreed upon by the two coders in the first coding. The one instance of disagreement occurred in an episode the first coding labeled Expertise (positive): The second coding showed the compliance-gaining attempt to be a combination of Hinting and Simple Statement:

(This discussion is about the academic activities form.)

A: You are going to be given an opportunity to go to a series of workshops which reviews this, and I urge you to go. (HINTING/SIMPLE STATEMENT) (EXPERTISE-positive) I spent two hours in a meeting this week already, dealing with the presentation that has to do with the philosophy, the background, the use and the design of this. And I came away from the meeting with a different feeling than I went in . . . .

One reason for the lack of agreement may be that Expertise (positive) may account for the general tone of the entire episode, whereas Hinting and Simple Statement may account more directly for the technique actually used, even though Expertise (positive) is implied.

Another coding discrepancy worth mentioning was an episode originally coded, with no intercoder agreement, as Self-feeling (positive) or as No Strategy. The second coding of the episode concurred with the Self-feeling (positive) selection:

(Once again, the discussion is about the academic activities form. A is telling the faculty how the workshops will help them.)
A: I felt good, not only about this form, but about myself. (SELF-FEELING, POSITIVE)

C: This is a variation of, "I'm okay, the form's okay."

That the second coding agreed with one of the choices of the first coding suggests that the most descriptive coding of this episode was Self-feeling (positive).

SUMMARY

The coding scheme for conversational compliance-gaining behavior proposed here may be applicable in most situations where, as Cody and McLaughlin (1980) have claimed, interlocutors are likely to be motivated by both self-interest and the desire to maintain a liking relationship. Many settings beyond that of the faculty meeting will meet those two criteria. Although it may be argued that a data-driven model of compliance-gaining techniques is highly situation specific, the fact remains that business meetings and faculty meetings, organizational settings and academic settings, have many elements in common, such as hierarchical structure with chain-of-command characteristics. Faculty meetings similar to business meetings can involve group decision-making, information gathering and sharing, problem-solving, and so forth. These similarities mean that the coding scheme may have applicability beyond this particular faculty setting.
The principal advantage of a data-based typology of compliance-gaining techniques is its fundamental external validity. While admittedly one loses the rigor of strong internal controls, one gains the enormous value of being able to investigate naturally-occurring behavior. To this extent, conclusions based on a data-based model, however speculative they may be, are at base grounded in naturally-occurring behaviors, and interpretations of behavior are likely to reflect the aspects of behavior which are meaningful to the participants themselves. As Pearce (1977) has suggested, ethnographic approaches permit descriptions which account for interlocutors' meanings as well as objective descriptions of their behavior. Furthermore, the undesirable influences of experimenter interference are avoided (Wilson, 1977). Wilson points out that behavior in natural settings is subject to the influences of the natural setting, and that the goal of social science—to generalize research findings to the "everyday world" where most behavior occurs—is best reached through the use of a data base and data analysis which accounts for the real frameworks in which people interact.
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

SUMMARY

Fundamental to this research was the perspective that individuals seek to define themselves through their verbal behavior and to exercise conversational control to accomplish that end. As Bochner and Kelly and others suggest, management of interpersonal relationships through conversation is an effort at self-definition. Compliance-gaining techniques represent one dimension of this sort of self/other management, because compliance gaining occurs specifically for the purpose of obtaining desired behaviors from others. The research aim that provided the foundation of this investigation involved the need to observe compliance-gaining behavior in naturally-occurring conversation. Within the exploration of compliance-gaining behavior, three major factors were assessed: sex, status, and the interactive effects of sex and status on compliance-gaining behavior.
The statement of the problem focused on an organizational setting, where the ordinary non-occupational social statuses accorded to males and females were subject to the influences of titular status and position within the organization. The research questions were designed to explore three general areas: 1) the use of compliance-gaining technique as influenced by sex, status and the interaction of sex and status of the participants; 2) the influence of sex, status and their interaction on total turn time of participants in faculty meetings; and 3) the degree of similarity between participants' responses to paper-and-pencil measures and their actual conversational behaviors.

To support the aims of the research, literature was reviewed in several different areas. A body of literature relating to power was reviewed, since power and control in conversation were basic to the research, because control is the behavioral extension of power, and compliance-gaining attempts are manifestations of control. The argument for exploring conversational control was that conversation is the primary instrumentality through which human beings manage their relationships and their self-definitions. The sending of messages, at base, constitutes interactional management, and control in general is cited as one of the primary interpersonal needs. Interlocutors' use of conscious influence and their use of messages that are designed to alter attitudes, beliefs or behavior of targets were revealed as fundamental to the examination of compliance-gaining techniques. Studies relating to the status variable in behavior and communication were discussed to
provide background for the examination of status differences in technique use. Similarly, research that explored sex differences and sex stereotyping was reviewed to justify the analysis of the sex variable in conversation. As a foundation for the data analytic technique, studies focusing on relational communication and compliance-gaining behavior were reviewed, and recent articles that support naturalistic research methods were summarized.

The questionnaire data revealed the faculty's preference for Camaraderie as a compliance-gaining technique, but showed no differences in responses across populations for all techniques. The investigation of total turn time indicated sex, status and the interaction of sex and status do produce significant differences in the amount of talk. Of principal concern, however, was the discovery that the compliance-gaining technique coding scheme isolated very few compliance-gaining attempts and did not appear to have extensive applicability to naturally-occurring conversation in a setting where compliance gaining was occurring, according to the participants. The research questions remained only partially answered. As a result, a new data-based coding scheme was proposed and a portion of the data was re-coded using the new scheme.
CONCLUSIONS

The limited number and the homogeneity of the participants, the general lack of compliance gaining detected in the first coding, and the descriptive approach to the second coding limit conclusions. For these reasons, the data examined in this study primarily suggest trends and implications for conversational compliance-gaining attempts.

The most empirically valid of the speculations stated throughout this study were those in connection with total turn time. The strong influence of sex, status, and the interaction of sex and status indicate that, indeed, the organizational setting, with its obvious status distinctions, may alter the usual outcomes of non-occupational status insofar as quantity of talk is concerned, because it appears that in the organizational setting, the females in positions of rising status do more talking than the males. It also appears likely that greater amounts of talk may constitute opportunities for the use of compliance-gaining techniques for the obvious reason that those responsible for the most turn time were also responsible for the greatest number of compliance-gaining attempts. A qualification of these conclusions, however, is that the cell size for statistical analysis was quite small.
This research also supported the need for field-grounded research as opposed to the mere gathering of questionnaire data. Field-grounded research is fundamentally based on the argument that questionnaire data do not always have a corollary in actual behavior. For example, the data of the study, though far too few to generalize from, suggest that coding based on the questionnaire list of behaviors resulted in few instances of compliance gaining, even though participants were able to indicate their likelihood of using compliance-gaining techniques in their response to the questionnaire. In short, questionnaires only allow for formulated responses and may have no relation to what is done in natural settings.

A final conclusion of the research is that for the purposes of examining naturally-occurring conversation, conversationally data-based models for coding may be more valid than questionnaire, self-report, or a priori models.

This study has contributed to our understanding of the importance of accounting for contextual features and meanings that are salient to the interactors, because with the integration of contextual features and meanings, the behavior of interlocutors could be more thoroughly examined. In combining both qualitative and quantitative methods in a single research aim, a more comprehensive assessment of compliance gaining has been possible. Although compliance-gaining models developed from self-report data have inherent limitations in their behavioral
applicability, a model developed from the behavior itself may have much greater behavioral applicability. A model derived from one context of organizational behavior may apply to other organizational contexts as well. The distribution of the types of compliance-gaining techniques used may vary somewhat from setting to setting as a consequence of the group norms prevailing in each situation. The faculty participants within this particular context have established group norms which tolerate sarcasm and put-downs, for example, thus allowing for the periodic use of Sarcasm/Put-Down as a compliance-gaining technique. A different organizational setting, or even a different department within the same university, might have a different set of group norms that do not permit such social and conversational latitude. In that case one might find that, for example, Simple Expertise occurs more frequently, and Sarcasm/Put-Down does not occur at all. With respect to the issue of the influences of group norms on compliance-gaining attempts across organizational settings, the proposed coding scheme is still likely to be applicable, but with differences in frequency and distribution of techniques when different groups are contrasted.

As with coding schemes in general, the proposed coding scheme in this research could be taught to coders so that a high degree of intercoder agreement could be obtained. However, it seems likely that intercoder reliability would be easier to obtain and more valid using a data-based coding scheme since actual utterances from the data could be used as examples of category types. This approach would allow coders to
become familiar with individual participant styles, thus making their
determinations about compliance-gaining attempts more accurate. Coders
with approximately the same degree of participant/observer knowledge and
with a data-based coding scheme to guide them are likely to make highly
reliable judgments.

In general, this development of a data-based coding scheme for
verbal compliance-gaining techniques will augment future studies into
conversation in organizational settings by adding to the general
descriptive information which needs to be examined before
hypothesis-testing research on conversation is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research has revealed the organizational setting to be a rich
context for examining conversation. Additional research into the
sex/status influences on quantity of talk in organizational setting are
needed. Total turn time, as one measure of conversational dominance,
can be coupled with other conversational dimensions to provide insight
into the question of how interpersonal control is managed in
organizational settings. For example, the turn time distribution in a
faculty meeting might contrast starkly with that of a meeting of
military advisors and therefore could be an indication that differences
regarding conversational control exist as well.
The compliance-gaining techniques developed from this study need to be tested in other situations to determine their overall applicability. Other groups of interlocutors of differing age groups and in differing social settings need to be studied in order for our understanding of compliance gaining to become more comprehensive.

The investigation of compliance-gaining behavior needs to be pursued on many levels. Future research needs to account for not only context and participants, but content and relational variables as well. Also, future research in compliance gaining might include extensive post-conversational interviews with participants to determine interactor intentionality. One method for determining the accuracy of compliance-gaining coding decisions would be to give participants the coding scheme and ask them to code their own utterances following the data collection. The intent of this coding procedure would be to determine if participants themselves agree with coders about when they did or did not attempt to gain compliance and about what techniques they used. This approach would provide a comprehensive view of compliance-gaining attempts within the situation by including both objective judgments by coders and relational judgments by participants. One limitation of having participants code their own behavior is that social desirability for particular behaviors may cause participant judgments to be unduly biased in the participants' favor.
In the data coded with the proposed coding scheme, however, such agreement between the coder and the participants is likely to be substantial since several of the category behaviors were discussed by the participants with the coder prior to the development of the coding scheme. Further, informal conversations with the participants after the coding scheme was conceived revealed several instances of agreement between a participant's judgment regarding the type of technique s/he often used and the coder's judgment.

Another recommendation is that additional compliance-gaining studies attempt to explore the issue of outcomes. This study has centered primarily upon compliance-gaining attempts; however, a systematic look at the outcomes of compliance-gaining attempts may provide information about how strategies develop and why they are used. One method for exploring the outcomes of compliance-gaining attempts would be to have the data coded for instances where compliance or agreement was clearly obtained. A second method for examining outcomes would be to examine conversations within the same group over an extensive period of time. This longitudinal approach assumes that not all instances of compliance or agreement will be adjacent to the compliance-gaining attempt. Weeks or months could intervene between the use of a compliance-gaining attempt and a target's eventual compliance.
Regardless of which approach to outcomes might be used, the successes or failures of compliance-gaining attempts may be one dimension for exploring the functions of conversation in different settings.

Finally, analysis of conversational behaviors and contexts would be greatly enriched by video data collection techniques, because not all compliance-gaining techniques are exclusively verbal. Nonverbal compliance-gaining may occur as well and should be accounted for. Indeed, in the present study the entire issue of non-verbal compliance-gaining attempts has not been addressed; one recommendation is that future research in this area try to replicate these findings and enlarge upon them through the use of video recordings.

Additional studies into naturally-occurring conversation should attempt to capitalize on ethnographic approaches which augment the data with comprehensive contextual and participant information. Such studies would greatly increase our knowledge of situational variables, participant variables, and conversation in general.
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APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I understand that the University of Delaware Communication Department faculty meetings, on the dates listed below, will be tape-recorded and that these conversations will be used as raw data for graduate research on conversational behavior. I further understand that my participation in the various departmental committee meetings may also be recorded for the same purpose.

With the understanding that the recorded material will be kept confidential, available only to the researcher and her assistants in its raw form, I give my permission for my conversation to be recorded and analyzed.

Signature _______________________________ Date _______________________

Faculty meetings to be recorded:

Oct. 9, 1980
Oct. 23, 1980
Nov. 6, 1980
Nov. 20, 1980
Dec. 11, 1980

Departmental Committee meetings: as scheduled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Promise</td>
<td>(If you comply, I will reward you.) &quot;You offer to support your colleague's next proposal if s/he will serve on your committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>(If you do not comply, I will punish you.) &quot;You threaten to withhold support from your colleague's next proposal if s/he does not volunteer for your committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expertise (positive)</td>
<td>(If you comply, you will be rewarded because of the nature of things.) &quot;You point out to your colleague that if s/he serves on your committee, s/he will gain valuable experience and become more promotable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Expertise (negative)</td>
<td>(If you do not comply, you will be punished because of the nature of things.) &quot;You point out to your colleague that if s/he does not serve on your committee, s/he will be inexperienced and unable to obtain promotion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>(Actor is friendly and helpful to get target in &quot;good frame of mind&quot; so that s/he will comply with request.) &quot;You are as friendly as possible to your colleague to get her/him in the right frame of mind to serve on your committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pre-giving</td>
<td>(Actor rewards target before requesting compliance.) &quot;You back your colleague's suggestions and tell her/him you now expect her/him to volunteer for your committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Aversive Stimulation
(Actor continuously punishes target, making cessation contingent on compliance.) 
"You withhold the availability of your ample, much desired library materials and tell your colleague s/he can't use them until s/he volunteers for your committee."

8 Debt
(You owe me compliance because of past favors.) 
"You point out how cooperative you've been in the past, serving on other committees, and you point out to your colleague that s/he owes you serving on yours."

9 Moral Appeal
(You are immoral if you do not comply.) 
"You tell your colleague it is morally wrong for anyone not to volunteer for a committee to formulate new grading policies."

10 Self-feeling (positive)
(You will feel better about yourself if you comply.) 
"You tell your colleague s/he'll feel better about herself/himself if s/he volunteers for the committee."

11 Self-feeling (negative)
(You will feel worse about yourself if you do not comply.) 
"You tell your colleague s/he'll be ashamed of herself/himself if s/he fails to serve on your committee."

12 Altercasting (positive)
(A person with good qualities would comply.) 
"You tell your colleague that as a sophisticated researcher and educator, s/he will naturally want to serve on your committee."

13 Altercasting (negative)
(Only a person with bad qualities would not comply.) 
"You tell your colleague that only someone who is uneducated and sophomoric would not volunteer for your committee."

14 Altruism
(I need your compliance badly, so it would be altruistic of you to do it for me.) 
"You tell your colleague that this committee means a lot to you and that you wish s/he would support it as a favor to you."

15 Esteem (positive)
(People you value will think better of you if you comply.) 
"You tell your colleague that the university community will regard her/him more highly if s/he serves on your committee."
16 Esteem (negative) (People you value will think worse of you if you do not comply.) "You tell your colleague that the university community will look askance at her/him if s/he does not support your committee."

*17 Sycophantic Flattery (Because you are such a wonderful person, you will want to comply.) "You tell your colleague that s/he is the most intelligent, well-informed and fair-minded staff member, and then you ask her/him to volunteer for your committee."

*18 Camaraderie (Since we are all in this together, you will want to comply.) "You tell your colleague that both of you desire to reach the same goals; thus s/he will want to support your committee."

*19 Combination (Two or more techniques used in the same episode by the same speaker. List them.)

*20 No Strategy (Episode contains NO compliance-gaining attempts.)

*Coding information added to original Marwell and Schmitt list of compliance-gaining techniques.
CODING INSTRUCTIONS

1. Record each episode by the number in red on left of transcript. Episodes are numbered consecutively from 1 to 438.

2. Use the names on the transcript in the NAME column.

3. Be sure to mark a STRATEGY # for each episode. Use the numbers of the Compliance-Gaining Coding Categories (see additional sheets) in the STRATEGY # column. If the episode contains no compliance-gaining strategy, then put down #20.

4. If you are unsure of how to code a particular episode, leave some blank spaces on your coding sheets and return to the episode later and try again.

5. A compliance-gaining attempt may or may not be successful. In the COMPLIANCE/AGREEMENT column, indicate only when compliance, cooperation or agreement is evident. (A "yes" or a ✓ will be a fine indication.) Otherwise, leave this column blank. You may find that compliance/agreement to one episode may not appear until several episodes later. If this happens, go back to the episode in which the attempt was made and mark the COMPLIANCE/AGREEMENT column.

   Caution: Although it is helpful when people give obvious agreement, do not expect every attempt to be successful. The key thing to determine is the compliance-gaining strategy itself.

6. The EXPLANATION column is to be used to provide clarification of your reason for selecting a certain code. You do not have to fill this in if a particular attempt seems self-evident to you. However, for Code #19, please put clarification. Also, if within the same episode, the same speaker uses two or more CG attempts, list them separately and in the EXPLANATION column write down a word or two from the text so that I can tell which sentences you are referring to.
Compliance-gaining strategies are different from requests for information and general discussion.

Look for attempts at gaining compliance, cooperation and/or agreement based on the coding scheme you received.

Remember, CG attempts are often subtle, so be alert for these subtleties. They may be prefaced by such phrases as:

"Let's..."
"We will" (You will)
"We should" (you should)
"Don't you think (agree)"
"How about if we...
"The consensus is..."

--and many more.

Although the coding scheme uses statements as examples, CG attempts may occur as questions, demands, orders, etc.

**The key in making your judgments is the statement in parentheses opposite the category name. Check to see if a particular CG attempt will generally fit into the parenthetical description. (The statements in quotation marks are simply illustrations of the type of behavior that might occur in that particular attempt. You will need to think beyond this and consider generally what each category implies.)
If you come across blank spots on the tape, simply use the transcript to fill in the gap, and code the episode as best you can.

For any sort of horrendous problem, call me!!
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USE OF COMPLIANCE-GAINING TECHNIQUES

(Adapted from Marwell's and Schmitt's Questionnaire)

Instructions: Read the situation described below and imagine yourself as the actor trying to gain compliance of another person.

Eighteen possible behaviors are listed below. Please indicate by circling the appropriate number the likelihood that you would employ that particular technique in gaining compliance of another in the described situation.

Situation: You are a(n) professor/instructor at an eastern university. You are trying to get a colleague to volunteer to serve for the remainder of the academic year on your committee to formulate new grading policies.

Response Key:

1 Definitely would use
2 Probably would use
3 Might possibly use
4 Might possibly not use
5 Probably would not use
6 Definitely would not use
1. (If you comply, I will reward you.) "You offer to support your colleague's next proposal if s/he will serve on your committee."

2. (If you do not comply, I will punish you.) "You threaten to withhold support from your colleague's next proposal if s/he does not volunteer for your committee."

3. (If you comply, you will be rewarded because of the nature of things.) "You point out to your colleague that if s/he serves on your committee, s/he will gain valuable experience and become more promotable."

4. (If you do not comply, you will be punished because of the nature of things.) "You point out to your colleague that if s/he does not serve on your committee, s/he will be inexperienced and unable to obtain promotion."

5. (Actor is friendly and helpful to get target in "good frame of mind" so that s/he will comply with request.) "You are as friendly as possible to your colleague to get her/him in the right frame of mind to serve on your committee."

6. (Actor rewards target before requesting compliance.) "You back your colleague's suggestions and tell her/him you now expect her/him to volunteer for your committee."

7. (Actor continuously punishes target, making cessation contingent on compliance.) "You withhold the availability of your ample, much desired library materials and tell your colleague s/he can't use them until s/he volunteers for your committee."
3. (You owe me compliance because of past favors.) "You point out how cooperative you've been in the past, serving on other committees, and you point out to your colleague that s/he owes you serving on yours."

1 2 3 4 5 6

9. (You are immoral if you do not comply.) "You tell your colleague it is morally wrong for anyone not to volunteer for a committee to formulate new grading policies."

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. (You will feel better about yourself if you comply.) "You tell your colleague s/he'll feel better about herself/himself if s/he volunteers for the committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

11. (You will feel worse about yourself if you do not comply.) "You tell your colleague s/he'll be ashamed of herself/himself if s/he fails to serve on your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

12. (A person with good qualities would comply.) "You tell your colleague that as a sophisticated researcher and educator, s/he will naturally want to serve on your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

13. (Only a person with bad qualities would not comply.) "You tell your colleague that only someone who is uneducated and sophomoric would not volunteer for your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

14. (I need your compliance badly, so it would be altruistic of you to do it for me.) "You tell your colleague that this committee means a lot to you and that you wish s/he would support it as a favor to you."

1 2 3 4 5 6
15. (People you value will think better of you if you comply.) "You tell your colleague that the university community will regard her/him more highly if s/he serves on your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

16. (People you value will think worse of you if you do not comply.) "You tell your colleague that the university community will look askance at her/him if s/he does not support your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

*17. (Because you are such a wonderful person, you will want to comply.) "You tell your colleague that s/he is the most intelligent, well-informed and fair-minded staff member, and then you ask her/him to volunteer for your committee."

1 2 3 4 5 6

*18. (Since we are all in this together, you will want to comply.) "You tell your colleague that both of you desire to reach the same goals; thus s/he will want to support your committee."

*Additional categories of compliance-gaining behavior not originally included among those of Marwell and Schmitt.
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF MARWELL AND SCHMITT
FACTOR ANALYSIS OF 16 COMPLIANCE-GAINING BEHAVIORS

First order Factors

Factor 1: Rewarding activity
(Includes Pre-Giving, Liking and Promise)

Factor 2: Punishing activity
(Includes Threat and Aversive Stimulation)

Factor 3: Expertise
(Includes Expertise (positive) and Expertise (negative))

Factor 4: Activation of impersonal commitments
(Self-feeling (positive), Self-feeling (negative),
Altercasting (positive), Altercasting (negative),
Esteem (positive), Esteem (negative), Moral Appeals)

Factor 5: Activation of personal commitments
(Altruism, Esteem (negative), Debt, Altercasting (negative))

Second order factors

Factor 1: Tendency to use socially acceptable techniques
(Includes first-order factors 1, 3, 4)

Factor 2: Tendency to use socially unacceptable techniques
(Includes first order factors 2, 5)
## APPENDIX E

### COMBINED TURN TIME FOR EACH FACULTY MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Total Turn Time (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/23/80</td>
<td>2320.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/80</td>
<td>2528.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/80</td>
<td>4383.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/80</td>
<td>3268.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

FACULTY MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

During the Fall 1990 semester, departmental faculty meetings and committee meetings were held approximately every other week.

PART I

Please indicate your personal self-assessment of the importance to you and the frequency of your participation in the various faculty meeting functions listed below. Think in terms of all the faculty meetings you attended in this department during the fall, and judge your performance in terms of your behavior for the aggregate number of meetings.

If you feel a particular function is "very important," circle #1 on the importance rating scale; if you feel a function is "fairly important," circle #2, and so forth. Likewise, if you feel you personally engaged in that function all the time ("always"), circle #1 on the frequency rating scale; if you feel you engaged in the function "very frequently," circle #2, and so forth.

Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = very important</td>
<td>1 = always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = fairly important</td>
<td>2 = very frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = slightly important</td>
<td>3 = often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>4 = occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = slightly unimportant</td>
<td>5 = infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = fairly unimportant</td>
<td>6 = rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = very unimportant</td>
<td>7 = never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the appropriate number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to me</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency w/which I do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>giving information (facts)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>building camaraderie</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>seeking cooperation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>socializing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>promoting action</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>getting agreement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>receiving information (facts)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>giving opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>gaining compliance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>trying to change opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>seeking self-confirmation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>making policy decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>entertaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II**

As in Part I, you will find a list of faculty meeting functions at the bottom of the page. Again, thinking about the Fall 1980 departmental meetings you attended, please rate these functions in terms of their importance to the faculty as a whole and their frequency of occurrence during the aggregate number of meetings.

If you feel a particular function was "very important" to the faculty, circle #1 on the importance rating scale; if you feel a function is "fairly important," circle #2, and so forth. Likewise, if you feel a certain function occurred all the time ("always"), circle #1 on the frequency rating scale; if you feel a function occurred "very frequently," circle #2, and so forth.

**Rating Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = very important</td>
<td>1 = always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = fairly important</td>
<td>2 = very frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = slightly important</td>
<td>3 = often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>4 = occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = slightly unimportant</td>
<td>5 = infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = fairly unimportant</td>
<td>6 = rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = very unimportant</td>
<td>7 = never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the appropriate number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to me</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency w/which I do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>giving information (facts)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>building camaraderie</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>seeking cooperation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>socializing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>promoting action</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>getting agreement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>receiving information (facts)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>giving opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>gaining compliance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>trying to change opinions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>seeking self-confirmation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>making policy decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>entertaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>