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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how the status of an individual in a selected group of adolescent females was indicated by the use and receipt of directives and whether the indication of status varied as a function of class or ethnicity. The population consisted of fifteen females ages ten to twelve, homogeneously grouped by class and ethnicity; one group was middle-class white, one working-class white, and one working-class black. The use of directives was determined by comparing sociometric ranks and the coerciveness of directives issued and received, the number of directives issued and received, and the compliance of responses issued and received. Degrees of coercion and compliance were calculated according to an instrument developed for this study which quantified relative coerciveness along three dimensions: voluntariness-involuntariness, ambiguity-lack of ambiguity, and power-solidarity-supplcation. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, chi squares, and Spearman Rank Coefficient of Correlation were used for statistical comparisons.

An analysis was conducted to determine whether similar coercion levels were derived from differential selection of component options on the basis of sociometric rank and whether there were class or ethnic-related
differences in the selection of components. Components analyzed included grammatical form of the principal verb, recipient of the benefit, and type of action requested. A final investigation probed the strategies underlying directive formation as it related to sociometric rank.

Middle-class white participants did not indicate status by demonstrating any significant relationship between status and either the number or the coerciveness of directives issued. However, they marked the status of the receiver by demonstrating a correlation between both the number and the coerciveness of directives issued to high status persons. High status was not a factor in determining the compliance of responses; instead, group members responded more favorably to noncoerciveness. In directive component selection, highest status resulted in coerciveness, group goal orientation, and indications of authority. Middle-status resulted in low coercion, more concern for group goals than personal goals, and supplication. Lowest status resulted in coerciveness, ambivalent selections in terms of authority, and choices indicating isolation.

The working-class white group did not indicate status by number of directives issued. Both high and low status resulted in coerciveness, and middle-status resulted in least coerciveness. Low status did not result in greater compliance nor did high status result in less
compliance. Furthermore, the status of the speaker was not significant in eliciting favorable responses. In component selection, high status resulted in highest coercion, group goal orientation, and selections indicating authority. Middle-status resulted in lowest coercion, less group orientation, and greater propensity to ask permission. Lowest status resulted in coercive directives and choices from both ends of the power continuum.

Working-class black participants demonstrated a relationship between status and the coerciveness of directives issued: highest and lowest status participants both issued coercive directives, and the middle-class person exhibited lowest coerciveness. The number of directives issued was directly correlated with status. Black participants did not indicate status by issuing fewer or less coercive directives to high status participants. However, they responded to the status of speaker by complying more favorably with directives issued by higher status participants. In the selection of components, high status resulted in coerciveness, group goal orientation, and authority. Middle-status resulted in lowest coerciveness, less group goal involvement, frequent use of supplication, and few selections indicating power. Lowest status resulted in highest coercion, individual goal orientation, selections from both ends of the power continuum, and selections indicating isolation from the group.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Classroom teachers have long been aware of the differences in speech patterns between the middle-class white children and the minority class and/or ethnic children in their classrooms, and they have attempted to deal with those differences in a variety of ways. However, the structure and uses of nonstandard English did not become central research concerns of linguists and educational psychologists until the early 1960's. The upsurge of interest in the speech of minority children at that juncture was partially a sociopolitical phenomenon, paralleling the social consciousness of that decade. At that time, the educational system was looking for an explanation for minority children's difficulty in learning to read and master the rudiments of English grammar and sentence structure. The theory that this difficulty was due to genetic inferiority was no longer either socially acceptable or scientifically tenable, and the practice of ignoring the problem was made unfashionable by the democratic spirit of the "Great Society" and the "New Frontier."
General Background of the Study

Linguistic Deprivation

To account for the lack of academic success of minority children, researchers began to test the theory of linguistic deprivation. This theory contended that working-class and/or black children did not interact with verbal superiors in quantitatively or qualitatively the same way as did middle-class white children. The difference in amount and quality of interaction left minority children with impaired intellectual ability, the theory contended, because the interaction in their homes was "epitomized by poor syntactical organization and severely limiting structural organization . . . expressing and receiving concrete global descriptive relationships organized within a relatively low level of conceptualization" (Bernstein, 1959:317). It was believed that this type of interaction focused the children's attention on concrete items and emotional content and impaired them in developing the ability to abstract. Furthermore, the theory contended that the working-class child's language was less logical than standard English and that the lack of logic in the language fostered a corresponding lack of logic in the thought processes of the child (Bereiter et al., 1966). Another aspect of the theory held that the children did not consciously formulate their utterances to the same extent
that middle-class children did, using instead set phrases which had been memorized (Bernstein, 1962a). In short, linguistic deprivationists believed that non-middle-class, non-white children did not possess a fully-developed linguistic system and that their own limited system did not allow them to respond in the classroom as fully and meaningfully as middle-class children. In one study, for example, Bereiter and Engleman (1966:112-113) commented that the five-year-olds they examined hardly seemed to possess any language at all.

A considerable amount of research was conducted to test the theory of linguistic deprivation, using techniques ranging from the "structured oral interview" to the involvement of children in discussions, verbal games, and description of pictures. When subjected to the research techniques of many of these studies, the minority children responded with monosyllabic, unintelligible utterances. These responses contributed to the notion that the children were essentially non-verbal, and the linguistic deprivation researchers published volumes of material documenting their contentions with highly significant statistics (Milner, 1951; Thomas, 1962; M. Deutsch, 1967; Bernstein, 1959, 1962a, 1962b, 1965; Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Hess and Shipman, 1965; Jensen, 1968).
Sociolinguistic Concerns

Concurrently, however, the discipline of sociolinguistics was developing, and its contribution to research methodology eventually identified some errors in the assumptions of the earlier researchers in child language difference. Sociolinguists dealt with "situated" speech and, therefore, considered carefully the methods by which language samples were elicited. Rather than using the one-to-one interview techniques of the educational psychologists, sociolinguists concentrated on making the child being studied as comfortable as possible by striving for a naturalistic situation for elicitation. They noted that the amount and quality of verbal production depended to a significant extent on the setting, the addressee, and the method of elicitation. Taking these variables into consideration, they experimented with a variety of techniques intended to elicit natural speech samples.

Most notable among researchers pointing out the difficulties with existing studies was Labov who deviated from current methodology in several significant ways: He did not select children for his study from the classroom setting because of his belief that children selected by teachers to participate in research were frequently "lames" (i.e., social isolates who were marginal to the black English vernacular culture) and that being a lame had significant linguistic consequences. For example,
his studies indicated that social isolates were less skilled verbally in performing the verbal arts of black culture and that their syntax and phonology were demonstrably different from that of the peer group members (Labov, 1972a:255-296). Rather than conducting his research in the schools, he made his observations in the child's community, eliciting responses in the child's natural setting. He also experimented with different types of elicitors in the research process, working with all-child groups and training community members to assist in eliciting speech samples (Labov, 1972a:xiv). As a result of his research, Labov (1972a) was able to tap the verbal resources of participants in the black English vernacular culture and to demonstrate the existence of their keen verbal proficiency which was totally unrelated to performance at school. Labov (1972a) also pointed out the logic of the linguistic system of his informants in an attempt to refute earlier claims that non-standard English left its speakers intellectually impaired.

The Ethnography of Communication

In addition to Labov's work and subsequent studies which it inspired, the use of language by minority children has also come under the scrutiny of ethnographers of communication who are concerned with communicative competence, i.e., "the knowledge a speaker must have to be
able to speak in a socially appropriate fashion" (Philips, 1973). A child's communicative competence includes an understanding of when to speak, when to remain silent, how to indicate respect, how to indicate and understand that something is a joke, what speech forms are appropriate for specific contexts, and the like. Minority children learn the socially appropriate use of language within the homogeneous environment of a segregated speech community; however, in school such children are daily confronted with the task of participating in a speech community whose rules for language use are quite different from those learned in their homes. In recognition of this phenomenon some research has attempted to compare the use of language in the child's own speech community with the use of language in predominantly white, middle-class schools (Philips, 1972; Cazden, 1972; Lein, 1975; Fischer, 1958; Bauman, 1972).

In a comprehensive study of the Warm Springs Indians in central Oregon, Philips (1972, 1973) observed the participant structures (i.e., "the conditions in which communication will take place") in the primarily Indian classrooms on the reservation, in the primarily Anglo classrooms in the towns near the reservation, and in the Indian interactions within the Indian community. She then described the structures used most commonly in the schools and indicated to what extent the Indian children
participated in each structure. Finally, she contrasted the structures in the schools with the structures existing within the Indian community and indicated why the Warm Springs children responded better in some classroom settings than in others based on the characteristic speech practices learned at home. For example, she noted that the children responded verbally more frequently within small groups with peer leaders rather than in sessions in which the teacher interacted with the entire group at once and answers from students were heard by other students. Peer group organization corresponded more closely with the informal learning situations common to the children in their homes and community. Philips (1972:182) concluded:

> Indian children fail to participate verbally in classroom interaction because the social conditions for participation to which they have become accustomed in the Indian community are lacking. . . . Educators cannot assume that because Indian children (or children from other cultural backgrounds than that which is implicit in American classrooms) speak English, or are taught it in school, that they have also assimilated all of the sociolinguistic rules underlying interaction in classrooms and other non-Indian social situations where English is spoken.

In a similar study, Lein (1975) compared the participant structures of a community of black migrants with the structures utilized in the schools. Like Philips, Lein noted that the children from this community responded in school more frequently and positively in situations which were similar to those situations in their community.
which would elicit a verbal response. Nevertheless, she also noted that they talked least at school regardless of the situation and most at home among peers. The migrant children's talk appeared to be limited by the presence of any adult, not just their teachers. Lein also noted that there was a mismatch between migrant students and teachers in what constituted joking. In several exchanges, Lein observed that the teacher was offended by a verbal repartee with a student which would have been considered friendly and humorous within the student's community.

The differential use of English by black students was also studied by Abrahams and Gay (1972a, 1972b). In "Talking Black in the Classroom" Abrahams and Gay (1972b) outlined some of the major forms of black verbal art and demonstrated how these forms were sometimes used by black students to gain power in the alien world of the white middle-class classroom. They included rapping, jiving, shucking, copping a plea, and playing the dozens, pointing out how these forms were used within the black community and suggesting how they might be dealt with in the classroom. In "Black Culture in the Classroom," Abrahams and Gay (1972a) explored the relationship between the participant structures in the black community and those in the school and pointed out sources of potential conflict. They indicated, for example, that black listening patterns were markedly different from the pattern expected by the
teacher. In the black community, intense interest was signaled by movement and murmuring, actions usually denounced by a lecturing teacher. The appropriate white responses of silence and stillness were signs of total boredom for blacks. Because this article was written for the classroom teacher, it also contains information on how one might tap the verbal resources of black students and channel them into appropriate usage in the classroom.

Such research has advanced the understanding of minority children's difficulties in reading and writing Standard English and, more importantly, in participating meaningfully in classroom interaction. It has also had some effect on the school system and the training of potential teachers. Even Bernstein (1971a), an early spokesman for linguistic deprivation, now places much of the blame for minority children's difficulties on the schools rather than the children, and the children are being seen by enlightened professionals as linguistically different rather than linguistically deprived.

Some Areas Which Merit Further Study

Use of Directives. Through recent research like that outlined above, many of the beliefs of the linguistic deprivationists have been replaced with ideas which more adequately account for newly elicited data. However, some
areas are still in need of additional consideration. One such area is the use of directives. Investigators of the linguistic deprivation theory frequently characterized non-standard English as consisting primarily of short commands and directions which provided little verbal mediation between the idea and the action. Hess and Shipman (1965:883) noted, "The cognitive environment of the culturally disadvantaged child is one in which behavior is controlled by imperatives rather than by attention to the individual characteristics of a specific situation . . . ." Similar characterizations were made by Bernstein (1962a, 1962b), Bereiter et al. (1966), C. Deutsch (1967), Jensen (1968), and Turner (1971). However, in spite of the prevalence of this idea among linguistic deprivationists, little research has been done by sociolinguists on a comparison of class differences in the use of directives.

Ervin-Tripp (1976) demonstrated through her observations that directives are a common linguistic phenomenon and are valuable in accomplishing and responding to status within groups. They, therefore, offer a fruitful field for further investigation. Her research also indicated that sociolinguistic rules governing directives are acquired fairly early as part of a child's communicative ability (Ervin-Tripp 1976:150). However, despite the groundwork laid by Ervin-Tripp and others, comparatively
little investigation of directives has as yet been conducted.

Studies such as those conducted by Philips (1972), Lein (1975), and Abrahams and Gay (1972a), point out the potential for conflict between the sociolinguistic rules acquired by minority children within their own communities and those of the middle-class institution of the school. Because of the implications for status marking through the use of directives, a mismatch in directive systems could have serious consequences in interactions between students and teachers. For example, Kashinsky and Weiner (1969) found that middle-class children responded similarly to instructions regardless of the tone of voice in which they were given while lower-class children responded differently to three different intonation patterns. This study indicated that intonation carried a meaning for lower-class children which it did not carry for middle-class children. Lein (1975) also pointed out that the black migrants she studied complied with teacher's directives, but in such a way that the teacher interpreted the compliance as insolent; e.g., one student moved so slowly in carrying out the instructions that the teacher became irritated. A similar dissonance between the teacher's expectation in compliance and the student's performance was reported in Abrahams and Gay (1972b:206). In this situation, the student physically complied with the teacher's instructions
while verbally indicating what the teacher interpreted as rudeness by responding with "Right on, Brother." While both these encounters were taken quite seriously by the teachers involved, it was the opinion of the researchers in both cases that the students were following a joking pattern which would have been quite acceptable in their own communities.

The classroom environment is one in which directives are one of the basic linguistic forms. The teacher gives instructions, and the students seek assistance from the teacher. If the request-directive systems of the teacher and student are different, the potential for lack of understanding is great. For example, Abrahams and Gay (1972a) indicated that black children were seldom questioned directly by adults unless the adult was angry. Therefore, the black child in the classroom could become threatened or confused when asked a question directly by the teacher although the question is a common and fairly polite request form in middle-class white society (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). In addition, there is some evidence (Dirksen, 1975a) that a request form considered polite by a working-class child may be interpreted as rude by a middle-class adult due to a difference in sociolinguistic rules. Because of their centrality to classroom interaction and their potential for creating misunderstanding
in marking and responding to status, directives offer an important field for investigation.

**Children's Use of Directives.** A second area needing further research is that of directive use specifically by children. Although Ervin-Tripp (1976) conducted some of her observations in a nursery school, her generalizations about the use of directives were based on an adult model, and the observation of the children was an attempt to determine how the adult model was acquired. Brown and Levinson (1974) outlined the characteristics of positive and negative politeness, largely through a discussion of directives (see Chapter II for a complete discussion of this study). In their extensive work, they eliminated children from consideration, basing their description on the use of directives by "competent adult members" of society. Likewise Lakoff (1975) used adult usage as the basis for her assertions about directive use. Turner (1971) and Cook-Gumperz (1973) conducted cross class comparisons of the use of directives by children, however, and Montes (1977) conducted research among upper-middle-class children in Washington, D.C. Despite these three exceptions, most directive studies have been concerned with adults, and the area of children's use of the directive system still needs investigation.
Use of Directives in Non-Status-Marked Groups.

Third, most studies on directives have been conducted in status-marked situations where the relative status of participants was ascribed by role or office. Research done on the Watergate Transcripts (Dirksen, 1975b; Murray, 1975; Newmark, 1975) provides the most obvious example in which the office of President assigned highest status to Nixon with gradually lessening status assigned by role to Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Petersen, and Dean. Ervin-Tripp's (1976) observations were carried out in hospitals where the differentiation between doctor and nurse, doctor and technician, and so on was predetermined; in an academic setting where individuals were professors, secretaries, and students, and differences in rank were obvious and significant; and in a nursery school where Ervin-Tripp noted stratification by age.

Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Concerns. The fourth area of concern not included in most existing studies is a sorting out of elements of language use which can be attributed to ethnic identity as opposed to those which are a function of class membership. There are some social class factors which may effect language use regardless of the ethnic identity of the speakers, and conversely, there are some ethnic features of language use which cross class lines. Because ethnic minorities in the United States are
also frequently class minorities, research into the differential use of language by minority children has often collapsed the categories of ethnicity and class. During the 1960's, much research conducted to ascertain differences across class lines made no distinction as to whether the working-class informants were black or white, and when both ethnic groups were represented, the children were grouped according to class membership rather than ethnic identity (Thomas, 1962; M. Deutsch, 1967; Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Hess and Shipman, 1965; Jensen, 1968; Milner, 1951).

In later ethnographic studies, ethnicity was the primary point of focus. Philips (1973) studied Indians; Lein (1975) studied migrant blacks; and Abrahams and Gay (1972a, 1972b) studied inner-city blacks; each attributed the differences in language use between their subjects and the schools to the ethnic identity of the participants rather than to their social class.

Without regard for the sorting of class and ethnic influences, it is impossible to design classroom programs to fit the needs of the individual children involved. For example, if working in peer groups is viewed as a meaningful lower-class learning structure because researchers such as Abrahams and Gay (1972a) have noted that it corresponds with the learning process in the black community, lower-class white children, who are described by Gans (1962) as
isolated from groups outside the extended family, may be completely alienated. On the other hand, if interaction patterns such as those outlined by ethnographers of lower-class black culture are seen as purely ethnic, some middle-class black children who have never participated in the vernacular culture will be mystified by the teacher's expectations of them, and some working-class white children will be eliminated from potentially helpful programs. Therefore, it appears relevant to make an attempt to separate differences in the use of language which are a function of the ethnicity of the participants from those which are a function of their class membership.

Methodology. Finally, methodologically, studies on directives have followed three general courses: the controlled experiment, the naturalistic observation, and the extended corpus. Turner (1971) and Cook-Gumperz (1973), for example, used the experimental approach utilizing one-to-one interviews or taped interactions between parents and their children performed in a laboratory under laboratory conditions. Because of the unnatural setting and restricted conversational form, these experiments produced stilted, cryptic responses from working-class participants.

Observation of natural interactions, the method used by Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Brown and Levinson (1974), has provided some valuable insights into the use of
directives, but it lacks the rigor necessary for short-term research or for replication of studies. It also sidesteps the necessity of dealing with a corpus containing examples which would not fit the description being offered.

Montes (1976) in her work with grade school children in Washington, D. C. developed the extended corpus technique to elicit additional data to supplement her observations of natural interactions in the classroom. The extended corpus consists of structuring an interview based on data already observed in natural interaction. For example, on the video tapes of children in the classroom, she observed a number of sequences relating to the return of borrowed property, so she constructed an interview based on a hypothetical case. She asked such questions as "What would you do if you loaned Phil your crayons, and he didn't give them back? . . . What if he still didn't give them back? . . . What if you said that to him, and he didn't give them back still?" The extended corpus combined the focus of the experiment or interview with the background of natural observation. Nevertheless, what children say and what they say they say may be neither identical nor comparable. Furthermore, Montes conducted her interviews among middle-class children with whom she was well-acquainted, but the interview technique has not proven to be highly successful with minority children (Labov, 1972a: 203-212). A compromise methodology for studying directives
would include the spontaneous informality of natural interaction with some of the scientific rigor of the controlled experiment.

**Statement of the Problem**

In recognition of the need for research in the area of cross-class and cross-ethnic comparisons in the use of directives by children in groups in which relative status is not pre-determined, and in recognition of the need for a viable methodological compromise between the controlled experiment and observation of natural interaction, the present study was conducted with the following characteristics: It involved three homogeneous groups from differing sociocultural backgrounds: one middle-class white, one working-class white, and one working-class black. The participants ranged in age from ten to twelve. The participants did not possess offices or roles which assigned their relative intragroup status; instead, the status of the group members was fluid and was determined through the functioning of the group itself. Naturalistic interactions were structured within a common framework to provide a basis for cross-class and cross-ethnic comparability. The intention of the study was to determine: (1) how the status of an individual in a selected homogeneous group was indicated by that individual's use and receipt of directives, and (2) whether the
indication of an individual's status within a selected homogeneous group varied according to either the ethnicity or social class of the participants. In short, the purpose of the study was to examine the use of directives by the children in each group to determine how their intragroup status was indicated by the use of directives, and to compare the various methods of indicating status and using directives across the lines of class and ethnicity to determine whether certain characteristics could be attributed to class membership without regard to ethnicity or to ethnic identity without regard to class.

This investigation involved the following steps:

1. Children were selected to participate in the study.
2. A series of naturalistic interaction tasks was devised to elicit verbal participation by the children.
3. Sociometric data were collected from each participant, and the sociometric rank of each girl was calculated.
4. The interactions of the children were taped.
5. Directives used in all-child conversations were transcribed with their responses from the tapes which had been selected for analysis.
6. An instrument was devised to calculate the relative coercion of each directive and the relative compliance of each response.
7. Each individual's sociometric rank was compared with each of the following:
   a. The mean coercion level of the directives which she issued.
   b. The number of directives she issued.
   c. The mean coercion level of the directives addressed to her.
   d. Her selection of the various components within the possibilities for directive formation.
   e. The relative compliance of the responses addressed to her.
   f. The relative compliance of the responses she issued.

8. The results of the comparisons were interpreted.

9. The characteristics of the groups were compared across class and ethnic lines.

Importance of the Study

The present study had two possible sources of significance: One, it attempted to extend the investigation of directives into areas not yet adequately considered; i.e., it has dealt with the description of the use of directives by children; it has been concerned with how status is designated through the use of directives among group members who are not differentiated by office or role; and it has attempted to ascertain which existing
differences in the use of the directive system can be attributed to class and which can be attributed to ethnicity.

Two, the study provided some methodological innovations. Data were collected from structured, naturalistic interactions in an attempt to control variables across class and ethnic lines. It possessed some of the advantages of a controlled experiment; e.g., the results of the three separate tapings could be compared since the interaction tasks, number of participants, and the like were constant for each of the groups. It also possessed some of the advantages of natural interaction studies; e.g., the children's speech was not manipulated in any way, and the study was based on all-child interactions which removed much of the difficulty inherent in the observer's paradox (finding out how people talk when unobserved while performing systematic observations [Labov, 1972b:209]) without sacrificing scientific rigor.

Furthermore, the instrument developed to analyze the coercion level of directives was constructed on the basis of theoretical work done by previous researchers (most notably Ervin-Tripp), but it was an attempt to combine and focus theoretical concerns in a practical instrument which could be used in other research. Although it was based on theoretical concerns, the instrument also
accounted specifically for items found in the taped data but not accounted for in existing studies (see Chapter III).

Therefore, the present study carries previous research into new areas of specific concern to the field and does so by devising and implementing a method and instrument which combine successful features from previous studies with less conventional techniques.

Assumptions

1. The instrument for analyzing coercion levels isolated and adequately weighted the essential components in ascertaining the coercion of directives.

2. It is possible and relevant to make cross-class and cross-ethnic comparisons of directive use.

3. The use of directives by the children in the study will have some relevance to the use of directives in a somewhat larger population.

4. The speech of the children recorded during the study was not atypical of their normal interactions under unobserved circumstances.

5. The children were linguistically typical of their social class and ethnic groups.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The present study was an attempt to investigate variation in the use of directives to indicate status in the conversations of selected homogeneous groups of adolescent females. An attempt was made in the study to attribute variations either to the social class or ethnic identity of the participants who were middle-class white, working-class white, or working-class black. Because of its focus on class and ethnic variation and on status designation, the study drew on five major categories of literature to provide background information: First, it was concerned with research into the use of language as a function of social class. Second, it was concerned with the investigation of language use as a function of ethnicity, specifically with the uses of black English as opposed to the uses of non-standard English by whites. Third, it was concerned with studies intended to differentiate class characteristics in language use from ethnic characteristics. Fourth, the emphasis on status designation drew information from literature on status within groups, on the uses of language to designate status and power, and on the use of language to convey politeness.
Finally, because of the attempt by the researcher to arrive at a feasible methodology for studying language use by minority children, it drew information from the methods previously employed to investigate human interaction. These five strains of research, as they pertain to the present study, will be traced historically in this chapter under the following headings: (1) Social Class Dialect Research, (2) Ethnic Dialect Research, (3) Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Research, (4) Investigations of Power and Politeness, and (5) Language Analysis Methodology. Since the categories are not mutually exclusive, there will of necessity be some repetition, overlapping, and cross-referencing.

Social Class Dialect Research

Early Studies

Ever since Panini, linguistic investigation has been concerned with the existence of dialects which corresponded with social class, and for centuries, there has been controversy over how such dialects should be approached methodologically and pedagogically. Despite some insightful work done by researchers in every age since linguistic inquiry began, the language of all but the privileged has frequently been viewed with disdain as incorrect, degenerate, and illogical (Baugh, 1957). Because a sense of linguistic insecurity has pervaded the
study of American English from its inception, the orientation toward the establishment of a correct standard has permeated American English studies since the days of Noah Webster (Baugh, 1957). Nevertheless, there have been some investigations into the structure of non-standard dialects, and a portion of that early research is reviewed in "The Common Speech," in H. L. Mencken's (1937) The American Language. Summarizing the findings of the investigators of the first quarter of the twentieth century as well as his own feelings, Mencken (1937:427) commented:

The chief peculiarity of vulgar American lies . . . among verbs and pronouns. The nouns in common use, in the main, are quite sound in form. Very often, of course, they do not belong to the vocabulary of English, but they, at least belong to the vocabulary of American. . . . The adjectives, too, are treated rather politely, and the adverbs, though commonly transformed into the forms of their corresponding adjectives, are not further mutilated. But the verbs and pronouns undergo changes which set off the common speech very sharply from both correct English and correct American.

Mencken's (1937:416) pronouncement that "vulgar American is virtually uniform throughout the country" indicated the lack of sophistication of the studies conducted at this time and their general orientation toward the investigation of class dialects, a pursuit Mencken (1937:473) described as "very amusing." Nevertheless, such studies produced a considerable amount of data and represented a theoretical advance over the work of individual's referred to by Mencken (1937:472) as "unhappy viewers with alarm" who saw
any deviation from their conception of the correct standard as a serious threat to the "jealously guarded wells of English undefiled."

With the development of descriptive linguistics in the United States came a new perspective on class dialect research as was reflected in work done by Charles C. Fries (1940). Eliminating much of the negative orientation toward class dialects from his work, Fries (1940:5) assumed a "scientific point-of-view with its repudiation of the conventional attitude toward language errors." In contrast, he attempted to describe the differences existing in American English. He identified and investigated three types of speakers, those using Standard English, Vulgar English, and Common English. Subjects were classified into these groups on the basis of their education and occupation.

Regional Dialectology's Contribution to Class Dialect Research

American regional dialectology also played a significant role in the investigation of social class dialects. Attempting to correlate regional settlement patterns and language varieties in American English, area linguists discovered that social class dialects had to be taken into account. In formulating the Handbook of Linguistic Geography of New England, the field manual for dialect research, Hans Kurath (1939:44) outlined three major categories of informants to be included:
Type I: Little formal education, little reading and limited social contacts.

Type II: Better formal education (usually high school), and/or wider reading and social contacts.

Type III: Superior education (usually college), cultured background, wide reading and/or social contacts.

These divisions roughly paralleled those set up by Fries except that Kurath excluded occupation. In addition to the three major classifications, Kurath (1939:44) specified two intersecting criteria: "A: Aged, and/or regarded by field workers as old fashioned. B: Middle-aged or younger, and/or regarded by the field worker as more modern."

Placement of informants into these categories was based on the judgment of the fieldworkers, often without extra-verbal corroboration.

Research data from the work of Kurath and those utilizing his technique, despite its limitations, provided a large amount of data on class differentiation linguistically and opened the way for subsequent work such as that done by McDavid (1958). Again utilizing the three categories originally proposed by Fries, McDavid matched linguistic characteristics with the category of informants who generally used them. From that basis, he subsequently outlined the means for determining the appropriateness of a linguistic form in relation to the classification of its
users. Thus, he attempted to give an empirical foundation to the "Doctrine of Appropriateness" (McDavid, 1968).

However, regional dialectologists, McDavid notwithstanding, were primarily concerned with the relationship between social class and language use only as it explained variation in data which could not be explained in terms of settlement patterns, and their work characterized social class dialect research throughout the 1950’s. Nevertheless, they contributed a description of non-standard English which was more realistic and systematic than that of Mencken and his contemporaries and specified in general terms who the speakers of non-standard English were.

Linguistic Deprivation and Class Dialect Research

During the decade of the 1960’s studies investigating language use across class lines proliferated in an attempt to discover an explanation for the poor performance of non-middle-class children in the public schools. Because non-middle-class frequently also meant non-white, much class and ethnic research was inextricable during this period.

One of the major theoretical frameworks for research during the early 1960’s was the concept of linguistic deprivation, and one of the most influential theorists and researchers in this area was Basil Bernstein whose concept of restricted and elaborated codes
became central to much research done on class dialects during the 60's. Because of his influence on subsequent research and because of the developing nature of his theory, his key works will be reviewed in some detail.

Bernstein's (1971b) *Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 1* contains reprinted versions of his major theoretical works written between 1958 and 1971. Because of the evolution of Bernstein's theories over the period covered in this book, the introduction provides an important chronological and intellectual perspective for the eleven articles the book contains. In the first five articles, Bernstein laid the foundation for much of his work. "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception," first published in 1958, put forth the hypothesis that language forms used during the socialization process contributed to cognitive development. From this premise Bernstein drew three conclusions: First, he put forth the notion that "members of the unskilled and semi-skilled strata, relative to the middle-classes do not merely place different significance upon different classes of objects, but . . . their perception is of a qualitatively different order" (Bernstein, 1971b:24). Second, he contended that middle-class individuals used language to mediate between emotions and social recognition, and that the attention to language as a mediator fostered verbal ability. Third, Bernstein viewed lower-class language as essentially public, intended
for use among peers and, therefore, not capable of the specification and modification necessary for communication outside small groups of people with shared knowledge.

In "A Public Language: Some Sociological Implications of Linguistic Form," originally published in 1959, Bernstein (1971b:42-60) outlined the differences between the public language of the working class and the formal language of the middle-class, giving ten characteristics of the public language. One of the major characteristics put forth in this paper was the use of short commands and questions which forced children to respond without reasoning, thereby limiting their cognitive development. These two articles laid the foundation for "Linguistic Codes, Hesitation Phenomena and Intelligence" (Bernstein, 1971b:76-94), first published in 1962, in which Bernstein formulated his first precise statement of the restricted and elaborated codes. Based on the theoretical concerns already put forward, Bernstein conducted research to verify his description of the difference between the social class dialects. In this same article, he reported on an investigation to test the notion that verbal planning was not necessary for restricted code speakers because of their predominant use of stereotyped constructions. Associating hesitation with verbal planning, he hypothesized that working-class subjects would pause less than middle-class
subjects, regardless of intelligence. His hypothesis was confirmed by the experiment.

"Social Class, Linguistic Codes, and Grammatical Elements" (Bernstein, 1971b:95-117) which first appeared in 1962 reported Bernstein's analysis of taped discussions among homogeneous groups of working and middle-class participants. His findings indicated that, based on his criteria, the restricted code of the working-class was less individuated, more socially centered, more predictable, and less complex syntactically than the elaborated code.

Through these representative papers and numerous other works, Bernstein established the theory of the existence of two linguistic codes, one possessed by lower/working-class speakers and one possessed by middle-class speakers. His theory went beyond the more superficial questions of lexical and phonological variation dealt with by the linguistic geographers to basic questions of the organization of thought processes and the significance of language to the individual's cognitive development and his perception of reality. The basic conclusion of Bernstein's early work was, therefore, that poor school performance by lower-class children was a result of their limited cognitive development via the restricted code.

However, Bernstein's theory was a dynamic one and this early statement of the differences between the language of the middle and working or lower classes was
subsequently rejected. Bernstein (1971b) has been a highly controversial figure in linguistic research because of his formulation of restricted and elaborated codes and his theoretical framework which provided the basis of much subsequent research. However, his present orientation toward the scholastic difficulty of working and lower-class children is that they have adequate cognitive development and possess both linguistic codes, but the schools have been unable to structure a context for the elicitation of their use of the elaborated code.

Bernstein was not alone in his probing of class differences in language use and their relationship to cognitive ability. Bereiter and Engleman (1966), for example, concluded from their investigations that many pre-school lower-class children were underdeveloped cognitively because they did not receive adequate verbal stimulation at home and came to school essentially without language. Their pre-school program for these children was designed to provide them with access to language before they entered middle-class schools.

Martin Deutsch (1967:vii) was an investigator of the cultural deprivation theory which contended that poor school performance was the result of "the massive inequality that characterizes all aspects of our society," and that linguistic deprivation was only one factor, but nevertheless, a significant one. Part II of M. Deutsch's (1967:
147-274) The Disadvantaged Child contains a series of articles concerning "Cognitive and Language Factors in the Education of the Disadvantaged Child." For example, in "Learning in the Disadvantaged," C. Deutsch (1967:143-161) characterized the language of the disadvantaged as "simpler in syntax and less rich in description and modifiers than the language of the middle-class child." She contended that this limitation resulted from the non-verbal atmosphere in the lower-class children's homes in which "verbal interaction tends to be in brief sentences and commands . . ." (C. Deutsch, 1967:149). The result of this limited verbal ability, she believed, was a handicap in solving problems by "verbal mediation."

A possible source of linguistic deprivation was analyzed in the second paper, "The Social Context of Language Acquisition" in which John and Goldstein (1967:163-175) noted that children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds acquired language through "receptive" means, i.e., through listening rather than speaking. They contended that language acquired in this fashion would be of little value in mediating between emotion and action or in solving verbal problems (John and Goldstein, 1967:173). In contrast, they held that middle-class children acquired language through active participation with verbally mature interlocutors and, as a result, "not only developed greater proficiency--as a result of being listened to and
corrected—but also were more likely to rely on, and use effectively, words as mediators" (John and Goldstein, 1967:173).

Another key figure in the research related to deprivation (whether linguistic, cultural, or genetic in origin) was Arthur Jensen (1969) whose references to the concept of "verbal mediation," referred to in the studies above, influenced a considerable amount of research. He defined mediation as "... verbal behavior which facilitates further learning, which controls behavior, and which permits the development of conceptual thinking." He further explained mediation theory as a sort of compromise between the growth-readiness view of learning that "certain organized patterns of growth of neural structures must occur" before certain types of learning can take place and the behaviorist view of learning through stimulus-response experiences (Jensen, 1973:131-132). In his later work, however, Jensen moved to the decidedly more radical position that educability was a biological, rather than experiential factor.

Hess and Shipman (1965) were also influential in promoting the linguistic-cultural deprivation theory, and their work focused on the "lack of cognitive meaning in the mother-child communication system" of lower-class children. Although the informants utilized in much of their research were black, their intention was to
demonstrate class rather than ethnic differences in mother-child interaction. Tying their research to Bernstein's theory of elaborated and restricted codes, they analyzed the speech of black mothers from four socioeconomic groups as they taught their children to perform three tasks. Language was evaluated in terms of such considerations as: mean sentence length, adjective range, adverb range, verb elaboration, syntactic structure, and the like (Hess and Shipman, 1965:875). This experiment demonstrated to the satisfaction of the researchers that Bernstein's description of codes was accurate, that lower-class mothers exhibited less planning and more impulsive behavior than their middle-class counterparts, and that the cognitive modes of the mothers were visited on the children (Hess and Shipman, 1965:884-885). In conclusion, they noted that "the picture that is beginning to emerge is that the meaning of deprivation is a deprivation of meaning" (Hess and Shipman, 1965:885).

Bernstein, Deutsch, Bereiter, Engleman, Hess, Shipman, and Jensen were among the most influential theorists and researchers in the area of linguistic and/or cultural deprivation, and their general thesis was that language acquisition played a crucial role in cognitive development, that the conditions under which language was acquired significantly affected the use of language as a mediator and that lower-class children acquired language
in a manner which handicapped them cognitively, especially in their participation in middle-class schools. This hypothesis was espoused by numerous educational psychologists, and volumes of research data were compiled based on a wide range of investigations. The preceding studies were merely a representation of the ample investigation done in this area.

William Labov's Contribution to Class Dialect Research

The fields of social dialect research in general and research into lower and working-class use of English in particular were given impetus and direction in the mid-1960's by the work of William Labov. Labov's contributions were both theoretical and methodological and departed from earlier linguistic studies of class dialects and from the studies conducted by those investigating linguistic deprivation. Labov's specific methodological contributions will be discussed under the heading "Methodological Approaches to Language Study," but his orientation and theoretical contributions are apropos to any discussion of social class dialect research. Rather than considering his investigations as attempts to correlate language use and social variables, Labov considered them to be attempts to examine language in its social context in order to solve problems which were fundamental to linguistics and to sociology. In "The Social Motivation of a Sound
Change," for example, Labov (1963) used this orientation to demonstrate the relationship between social class and linguistic evolution. In addition to his innovations in the linguistic approaches to class dialects demonstrated in the *Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Labov, 1966) and *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Labov, 1972b), Labov (1972a) also discredited much of the research done on class dialects by educational psychologists and others who had investigated linguistic deprivation in his work *Language in the Inner-City*.

**Ethnic Dialect Research**

With the exception of the work done by Labov, most of the literature discussed thus far has been concerned with class differences to the exclusion of a concern with ethnicity. Especially among investigators of linguistic-cultural deprivation theories, social class identity was seen as central, and the ethnic variable was not dealt with systematically. Consequently, many of the groups used in the studies of this type were ethnically mixed. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, however, studies with a totally ethnic focus began to appear. In fact, the preponderance of research on non-standard English conducted from the middle 1960's to the early 1970's was concerned with various approaches to the analysis and description of the language of black Americans.
General Studies of Black English

The past decade has produced a plethora of studies on the structure and uses of black English. When black English was studied from a variety of theoretical approaches as a separate dialect, it became evident that it was a complex language form with a unique grammar somewhat divergent from, but no less complete than that of standard English. Because the investigation of the structural aspects was of little relevance to this study, these aspects will be referred to only incidentally. With the investigation of the structure of black English came a concurrent investigation of its uses. Through this strain of research, the working/lower-class black child emerged, not as one cognitively handicapped because of inadequate verbal development, but as a skilled practitioner of verbal arts which were not elicited by the middle-class educational system.

A literature review by Joan Baratz (1969) presented an overview of the literature written on black English up to 1969, including resources from education, psychology, and linguistics. In the review she covered the development of the linguistic deprivation theory as a counter to the genetic inferiority theory and spelled out its implications for education. Brasch and Brasch's (1974) A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography of American Black English contains a wide range of references to works concerned with the
structure and uses of black English. "Black English: An Essay Review" (Abrahams and Szwed, 1975) discusses ten of the decade's major works on the uses of black English, placing each one in the intellectual context of the time period in which the research was conducted. This review includes: Brasch and Brasch (1974), Burling (1973), Claerbaut (1972), Dillard (1972), Dundes (1973), Haskins and Butts (1973), Kochman (1972), Labov (1972a), Major (1970), Mitchell-Kernan (1969), and Ward (1971).

The Uses of Black English

Most of the studies performed by those researching the theory of linguistic deprivation contended that lower-class black children did not interact meaningfully with verbal superiors. However, those investigating the uses of black English discovered that verbal interaction was crucial in the black community and that such interaction was often competitive and performed before an impromptu audience which indicated its approval of skillful uses of language. Therefore, a radically different picture of the verbal development of black children and of the use of language in the black community was presented by these investigators.

The specific uses of black English most often investigated include the dozens, sounding, signifying, and toasts. While some of these speech acts overlap and are
differently defined by different investigators, a brief review of the approaches to them will illustrate the kinds of research done on black English during the past decade.

The Dozens. The dozens is a form of verbal art in which two participants duel verbally on topics with highly sexual themes, usually referring to the opponent's female family members, especially the mother. Dollard (1939) was among the first to study the dozens and focused his investigation on the themes utilized in the "game." Typical themes were those most condemned by middle-class society, e.g., incest, sexual liberty with someone's mother, homosexuality, breaking of cleanliness taboos, cowardice, stupidity, and physical defects. Despite this seeming liberty in the selection of themes, Dollard found no instances of the mention of dead relatives, menstruation, or castration, subjects his informants indicated were taboo even for the fiercest verbal battles.

Abrahams (1962) furthered Dollard's investigation of this verbal art form by noting the differences in the use of the form by different aged participants and by tying the game to the psycho-sexual development of the participants. He linked the sexual, misogynistic content of the dozens to the roles played by mother and son in black culture. Abrahams pointed out that, while the black female's role from slavery to the present has been stable,
the male's typical lifestyle has been episodic and transitory. Therefore, the mother rejected the male and his role and served as the foundation of the family herself. Abrahams contended that this situation engendered an ambivalent relationship between mother and son. The son was both a beloved child and a male. As the former, he was to be protected and cared for, and as the latter, he was to be mistrusted and rejected. Conversely, the son had an ambivalent relationship with his mother, Abrahams pointed out. She was at once both his source of love and comfort and his source of restraint and discipline. Therefore, Abrahams contended, the dozens allowed the adolescent male an opportunity to exorcise his negative feelings about his mother in a socially appropriate fashion. Although he could not say anything negative about her himself, for social and psychological reasons, he could engage another adolescent in the dozens, understanding that his addressee would verbally attack his mother (Abrahams, 1972:57).

Kochman (1972) took a less psychological approach to his description of the dozens and other black speech acts in "Toward an Ethnography of Black American Speech Behavior." He equated the dozens with sounding and discussed it as a verbal art. In discussion of the structure of verbal duels, Labov (1972a) described a variety of black
speech acts in "Rules for Ritual Insults." He found that among his informants what was referred to by Kochman, Abrahams, and Dollard as the dozens was generally known as sounding. Therefore, his description of sounding can be compared with previous discussions of the dozens. In his study, he diagrammed the sequencing of the sound, specifying which elements must come first and which must follow. He also enumerated the attributes of the participants in the game of sounding and specified the tacit rules accepted by the participants which, if violated, led to physical rather than verbal combat. Although Labov gave some indication of the use of the sound in black culture, his description was much more oriented toward its structure.

Sounding. A second speech act of some importance in the black community is sounding, defined by Mitchell-Kernan (1969) as a form of verbal combat consisting of direct insults called sounds and indirect insults called signifying. Abrahams (1964) discussed sounding as a pattern of insults usually involving relatives, but he also indicated that among his informants, sounding was the opening insult which introduced the subsequent ritual interchange usually referred to as the dozens.

Signifying. Abrahams (1964) classified signifying as a verbal art practiced primarily by children before they
reached the age of verbal skill and psycho-sexual development which would lead to playing the dozens. Among his informants, signifying consisted primarily of telling one person that something negative had been said about him by a third party. Kochman (1972) identified two types of signifying distinguished by their implicit intent: If the speaker's goal was to elicit action from the addressee, he utilized the type of signifying described by Abrahams, insinuating that a lack of action would result in a serious loss of face. This type of signifying Kochman termed as directive (i.e., its intent was to elicit action), but he characterized the tactic as indirect. When the goal of signifying was to arouse feelings of shame, Kochman found that the speaker used a direct tactic, verbal insult.

Goodwin (1975) discussed what Kochman and Abrahams described as signifying without referring to it by that name. Investigating gossip activities among black children, she outlined the sequencing of a "He said—She said" which consisted of the reporting of a negative comment made by one child to a second child in an attempt to persuade the second child to take action against the first speaker. Her investigation included a component not considered in studies of signifying, the confrontation between the first and third children.
The most extensive examination of signifying was done by Mitchell-Kernan (1969) who, unlike Kochman and Abrahams, used primarily female informants as well as her own experiences as sources of information. According to Mitchell-Kernan (1969:92), "The black concept of signifying incorporates essentially a folk notion that dictionary entries for words are not always sufficient for interpreting meanings or messages or that meanings go beyond such interpretation." Therefore, she found signifying to be an indirect speech act in which the meaning of the utterance was intentionally obscured. An interpretation of many of the examples of signifying in Mitchell-Kernan's paper required explanation by a member of the in-group of speakers in which it was used because of the obscurity of the references.

Toasts. Examined by Labov (1972a), Kochman (1972), and others, the toast is a long narrative poem retained in the oral tradition of black culture. Although it is a highly significant factor in black folklore, and some toasts (e.g., "The Signifying Monkey") contain relevant information about other black speech acts, it is less relevant to the present study since it does not deal with interaction but rather with verbal art as performance.

Other Black Speech Acts. Additional uses of black English such as rapping, shucking and jiving, and whapping
the game, were discussed in Kochman's (1972) "Toward an Ethnography of Black American Speech Behavior." Rapping, jiving, shucking, and copping a plea were outlined by Abrahams and Gay (1972b) in "Talking Black in the Classroom."

The Investigation of Non-Standard White English

Although the investigation of black English became a vital and active research concern during the late 1960's, no corresponding interest in the use of non-standard white English was evident. In The Study of Social Dialects in American English, Wolfram and Fasold (1974) outlined the practical and theoretical reasons for the emphasis on black English studies to the exclusion of corresponding studies of non-standard white English. Pragmatically, because of the emphasis on minority education and the success of the Civil Rights Movement, government funding and private endowments were made available for the study of black dialects. On a more theoretical level, the differences between the language of lower-class blacks and middle-class whites was striking, especially in the northern cities where the blacks had migrated along with their Southern speech styles. As Wolfram and Fasold (1974:33) concluded:

If we have considerable overlap between various nonstandard dialects, as we obviously do, it is reasonable to start describing these varieties
by giving descriptive priority to the more diverse ones. Starting at the furthest point, other nonstandard dialects may be seen as subsets within the continuum of diversity.

Furthermore, as Abrahams and Szwed (1975:329) have noted, studies of black English were not carried out and did not find a receptive audience "until the scholarly community could conceive of black Americans as having sufficiently distinctive patterns of culture. . . . Before that, of course, black language was commonly accounted for . . . as some cultural disability." The dirth of research into non-standard white English may have indicated that the scholarly community had not yet admitted that white class minorities also had "sufficiently distinctive patterns of culture" and that non-standard white English was no more a cultural disability than vernacular black English.

Despite these factors, however, studies of non-standard white English began to appear in the early 1970's. Davis (1971), Hackenburg (1972), Dumas (1975), and Wolfram (1976) investigated different aspects of white Appalachian English. Davis (1971) examined Appalachian English in an urban setting among speakers who had migrated to the North, whereas Hackenburg, Wolfram, and Dumas studied it in its natural setting. Research conducted by Wolfram and Dumas was not specifically class-related since they selected their informants randomly. However, much of the Appalachian area has been characterized as less affluent
than most sections of the country, and a large portion of the informants in both studies were classified as lower or working-class. Crawford Feagin (1976) conducted a study of non-standard white Southern English in the Anniston, Mississippi area, and as indicated above, Labov (1972a) made a partial investigation of verbal duelling in white peer groups. Labov (1966, 1972b) also made significant contributions to the study of the non-standard white English of New Yorkers from various social classes and of the residents of Martha's Vineyard. Nevertheless, uses of non-standard white English have not received the attention given to black English, and much existing research has concentrated on colorful groups such as Appalachian mountaineers rather than on the thousands of non-standard speakers in more typical environments.

**Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Studies**

Even though the study of black English has flourished and the study of non-standard white English has at least begun, little attention has as yet been given to sorting out linguistic characteristics along class and ethnic lines. Research done by investigators of linguistic deprivation was primarily concerned with class differences which resulted in poor school performance. They tended to view the use of non-standard English as a class phenomenon not related to ethnic identity. Conversely, investigators
of black English and of non-standard white English have typically attributed their findings to the ethnicity of their subjects without reference to social class. Attempts to ascertain what is class-related and what is related to ethnicity have been comparatively limited. Interestingly, most existing research in this area has grown out of an attempt to determine the origin of black English.

The Creole One-Language Debate

Perhaps the most systematic and detailed information concerning the relationship between class and ethnicity in the structure and uses of language has come out of the debate between the creolists (scholars who have amassed evidence that black English has a West African origin) and the investigators of the one-language theory (researchers who investigate the hypothesis that black English was derived from non-standard white Southern English and, therefore, has a British origin). L. D. Turner (1949), an early creolist, pointed out the ethnic content of Gullah, a form of black English spoken on the sea islands off Georgia and South Carolina, by tracing four hundred words in that language to their African origins. Turner's work, however, was seen as tangential to the heart of the argument about the main stream of black English due to the social and geographical insolation of Gullah speakers.
McDavid and McDavid (1951) attempted to trace the variety of influences on the speech of blacks which separated black English from white English used by members of the same social class. While their conclusions were tentative, they appeared to indicate some validation of the one-language theory. Davis (1971:337) noted that he could find no purely linguistic means of determining the ethnic identity of Blue Grass Kentuckians of the same social class. However, he did indicate that dialect differences might be greater in inner-city areas such as Chicago.

Dalby (1970) added evidence to the creolist position, attributing black English to the ethnic origins of blacks rather than to their class by demonstrating that varieties of black English could be found in various parts of the world and that the American variety fit onto a historical continuum. Dalby (1972) listed one hundred Africanisms from a number of West African dialects which had found their way into current American English through the language of blacks.

Abrahams (1972) investigated the ethnic aspect of black English speech acts and linked the dozens and other verbal arts to language use in the West Indies and West Africa. Citing specific examples of usages in such places as Tobago, Abrahams discussed the functions of ceremonial uses of language in these communities and tied practices of
joking and masking to current black verbal practices in the United States.

Labov (1972a) took a middle position in the debate. While pointing out the uniqueness of black English and its complexity as a dialect, he espoused the transformational-generative view of black English and standard English as having common deep structures with superficial differences. Labov did not pursue the history of the forms he studied, eliminating concern over their African vs. British origins.

Wolfram (1971) selected twenty-five white and twenty-five black children from the same socioeconomic class and dialect region and compared their use of copula deletion and invariant "be." He concluded:

Some lects of Southern white speech and vernacular black English may use zero copula quite similarly, but there is considerable difference in the uses of invariant be; the distributive function of be appears to be unique VBE in this setting. There is evidence that certain aspects of copula absence in white Southern speech may have been taken from a decreolizing form of Black English (Wolfram, 1971: 498).

The debate remains unresolved, but concerns over the origin of black English and its unique usages have stimulated research which attempts to attribute features either to class or ethnicity.

Investigations of Power and Politeness

Whereas traditional linguistics has been primarily concerned with a sentence-based grammar aiming at a
description of the syntax, phonology, and lexicon of the language, and whereas transformational-generative grammar has been concerned with the internalized rules underlying the production of grammatical sentences by an ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogeneous speech community (Chomsky, 1965), sociolinguistics and the ethnography of communication have been concerned with the "communicative competence" of speakers, which Gumperz and Hymes (1972:vii) defined as:

... what a speaker needs to know to communicate effectively in culturally significant settings. Like Chomsky's term on which it is patterned, communicative competence refers to the ability to perform. An attempt is made to distinguish between what the speaker knows--what his inherent capacities are--and how he behaves in particular instances. However, whereas students of linguistic competence seek to explain those aspects of grammar believed to be common to all humans independent of social roles, and seek to explain their use of language to achieve self-identification and to conduct their activities.... For sociolinguists ... the central notion is the appropriateness of the verbal message in context of their acceptability in the broader sense.

In "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," Goffman (1967) specified some of the content of communicative competence without using that terminology. He contended that the actions of individuals in a social context are governed by two factors: first, obligations; i.e., how the individual is to act, and second, expectations; i.e., how others are to act in regard to him. By extending the concept of obligations and expectations into the area of
language, one approaches the consideration of communicative competence as it applies to status designation; i.e., a description of how the individual is to speak and how others are to speak to him. Goffman contended that the appropriate performance of obligations and expectations was a form of communication; i.e., that the behavior itself indicated the social relationships which lay under it. He further contended that:

An act that is subject to rules of conduct but does not conform to them is also communication . . . for infractions made news and often in such a way as to disconfirm the selves of the participants. Thus rules of conduct transform both action and inaction into expression and whether the individual abides by the rules or breaks them, something significant is likely to be communicated (Goffman, 1967:51).

One aim of sociolinguistics is to specify the obligations and expectations of the interlocutors in a discourse by devising rules which are sensitive to the status of the participants, the setting, the code, the situation, and the content of the messages being transmitted.

The consideration of status relationships has been central to much sociolinguistic investigation because of the interest in interactions in which the status relationships are asymmetrical so that the obligations and expectations of the interlocutors are not equivalent, and the participants' communicative competence provides means for indicating respective status levels. It is a common
assumption underlying the study of asymmetrical speech relationships that high status results in the issuing of coercive forms to lower status persons and the receipt of polite-formal forms from the lower status person. Polite and formal are generally equated (Lakoff, 1972; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Brown and Levinson, 1974). Furthermore, Henley (1975:187) contended that "status and power are usually confounded." In relating politeness and status, Lakoff (1973) concluded that we can assume that there is a universal definition of what constitutes linguistic politeness: part of this involves the speaker's acting as though his status were lower than that of the addressee. Because of these associations, the following literature frequently equates politeness and formality as well as status and power.

Verbal Methods of Marking Status

The classic article in the area of designation of status linguistically is Brown and Gillman (1960), "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In this paper, they discussed the origin of the tu/vous distinction in the languages which use pronouns to discriminate between asymmetrical and solidarity relationships. In describing the power semantic, they defined power in the following manner:
One may be said to have power over another in the degree that he is able to control the behavior of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is non-reciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior (Brown and Gillman, 1960:225).

In discussing the solidarity semantic, they indicated that "Differences of power cause V to emerge in one direction of address; differences not concerned with power cause V to emerge in both directions" (Brown and Gillman, 1960:257). According to Brown and Gillman, the traditional use of tu/vous has been that V (the formal option) was used to superiors and to peers among the upper classes, and T (the informal option) was used to inferiors and to peers among the lower classes. However, mutual T or mutual V has been becoming more common. Nevertheless, the asymmetry of the relationship is still marked since it is the person who is superior in rank who has the right to initiate mutual T.

They further contended that languages not making the tu/vous distinction through pronouns possessed other forms for marking asymmetry: "There are . . . proper names and titles, and many of these operate today on a non-reciprocal power pattern in America and in Europe, in open and equalitarian societies" (Brown and Gillman, 1960:267). Brown and Ford (1961) extended Brown and Gillman's study of the linguistic designation of status into American English by considering the American address term system and the distribution of terms along the lines of status, power,
and solidarity. They found that first names were reciprocated, but that asymmetrical exchanges existed where there was a significant difference in age or occupational rank. They also found a correlation between intimacy and multiple naming.

Drawing from the research of these two studies, Ervin-Tripp (1972) constructed a diagram of the use of American address terms. The diagram constituted the set of rules which govern the selection of a term on the basis of the age, kin relationship, and relative status of the interlocutors (Ervin-Tripp, 1972:219). In addition to her own insights, Ervin-Tripp included a review of the literature on address terms from cross-cultural sources including nineteenth century Russian address (Freidrich, 1964); Yiddish address (Slobin, 1963); and Puerto Rican address (Lambert, 1967). She also discussed the socialization process which leads to the internalization of the rules for designation of status through address.

Lakoff (1972) investigated the use of honorifics to indicate status in American English. In this study, she contended that while honorifics were common and frequently recognized in languages such as Japanese and Korean, they also existed in American English although reliant on uses of the modal auxiliary and contextual meanings. She concluded:
In order to assign the correct distribution to the forms under discussion, it is essential to take extralinguistic contextual factors into account; respective status of speaker and addressee, the type of social situation in which they find themselves, the real-world knowledge of beliefs a speaker brings to a discourse, his lack of desire to commit himself on a position, etc. We cannot hope to describe or explain large segments of any given language by recourse only to factors which play a role in the superficial syntax; we must take account of other levels of language which traditional transformational grammar expressly prevents us from doing (Lakoff, 1972:926).

Dirksen (1975b), Murray (1975), and Newmark (1975) investigated the effects of status on the interactions in the Watergate Transcripts. Dirksen noted that Nixon's highest status allowed him to exercise power over the conversations in four ways: He controlled the topic, he managed the floor, he controlled the on-going sequence, and he influenced the utterances of others by completing their statements. Murray (1975) noted that Nixon did not demonstrate power by talking all or most of the time; however, he did ask almost all the questions, issued most of the directives, received the most traditional honorifics, and interrupted others most frequently. Newmark evaluated the linguistic manifestations of power relationships by examining two conversations between Dean and Nixon.

Directives, Status, and Politeness

Most of the studies discussed above were conducted in contexts in which the relative status of interlocutors
was assumed from their respective roles. However, some sociological, psychological, and linguistic investigation has been made of groups in which status was not determined by pre-existing roles but was negotiated as part of the groups' interaction. When a clear and comprehensive model of asymmetrical speech relationships has been established in sociolinguistics, it will be possible to determine status through linguistic means alone as is presently possible across class lines using methods developed by Labov (1966) and in cases where status ranks are widely diverse as in the studies alluded to above. However, the existing sociolinguistic description does not include a discrimination between the subtle differences in status which emerge from homogeneous groups with small status intervals. Therefore, it is incumbent on the researcher investigating such groups to establish the relative status of the interlocutors by methods external to linguistic considerations and to relate linguistic data to the relationships thus revealed.

One such means of determining intra-group status is through the use of sociometric data. J. L. Moreno (1934) developed the concept of the sociogram in an attempt to diagram the various strains of attraction that group members had for one another. He and his associates questioned each group member about every other member. With school children, for example, they asked which child
each would most like to sit with. The purpose of such questioning was to obtain information indirectly about the interacting roles and statuses in the groups studied.

Lundberg, Larson, and Schrag (1958) recommended asking a series of questions to eliminate the possibility that any one question might be misinterpreted by the addressees and thus elicit incorrect information. Although Moreno probed attractions between group members in terms of desirability or likability, Riley (1963) indicated that sociometric questions could elicit other types of information depending upon how they were framed.

In sociolinguistics, it is frequently important to determine whom other participants consider to be the leader of the group. Sargent (1958:323) pointed out that sociometric questioning has proved useful in studying leadership. Leadership characteristics must be considered in formulating sociometric questions intended to rank group members in terms of their status relative to being leaders.

In a survey of over a hundred studies of "personal factors associated with leadership," Stogdill (1948) found general agreement that such factors as intelligence, scholarship, dependability, activity, and social participation were associated with leadership. In a slightly different approach Homans (1950:188) contended that ". . . in a small group . . . not too closely constrained in its
internal development by its surroundings . . . the leader is the man who comes closest to realizing the norms the group values highest." Finally, Newcomb (1965:473) described leadership in terms of role relationships within the group. He held that leadership was contingent on the individual's performance as a facilitator and concluded, "It is not necessarily any specific behaviors on the part of a leaderlike person that make his contributions of special importance, but rather his relationship to other members" (Newcomb, 1965:473).

Considering these three descriptions of leadership, a composite picture emerges of the group leader as the person who is most instrumental in bringing about the attainment of group goals because he most clearly embodies the characteristics the group values. The list of characteristics compiled by Stogdill (1948) appears to be based on middle-class norms, but leadership in a group depends on the embodiment of the norms of the group itself regardless of what those norms might be.

Homans (1950:188) pointed out the relationship between leadership, status, and power by concluding that

... (The leader's) embodiment of the norms gives him high rank, and his rank attracts people: the leader is the man people come to; the scheme of interaction focuses on him. At the same time, his high rank carries with it the implied right to assume control of the group, and the exercise of control itself helps maintain the leader's prestige.
Therefore, sociometric questions intended to discover the identity of the group leader should probe group evaluations of who is the best facilitator and who best embodies group norms and values. The individual most frequently selected in such questioning would, therefore, be assumed also to possess high status and power over group activities because of abilities as a facilitator.

Concerns such as the description of the use of address terms and asymmetrical speech relationships led to the consideration of how politeness is signaled linguistically. This was considered to be a meaningful issue because it appeared that politeness resulted from proper use of the sociolinguistic rules whereas impolite behavior resulted from an intentional or unknowing deviation from the expected selection among alternatives especially in cases of status differences. Of specific interest in the study of politeness phenomena is the directive, since it is easily observable, and like the address term, carries a heavy load of social meaning.

In "The Logic of Politeness" Lakoff (1973) posited three rules for politeness: (1) do not impose, (2) give options, and (3) make addressee feel good. She contended that one and three were mutually exclusive but that both interacted with two. Comparing these rules with Grice's
(1968) axioms for conversation, she noted that Grice's rule of Be clear was often in violation of her rules for politeness. She further contended that, when the rule of clarity and the rules of politeness conflicted, adults would generally select politeness: "It is considered more important in a conversation to avoid offense than to achieve clarity" (Lakoff, 1973:300).

Brown and Levinson (1974), in an extensive work, described positive and negative politeness largely through a discussion of the use of directives. They assumed that "every competent adult member" of a speech community possessed two basic faces (i.e., "basic wants which every member knows every other member desires" [Brown and Levinson, 1974:6]): Negative Face, the desire to perform actions unimpeded by others; and Positive Face, the desire of everyone that what he wants should also be desired by some others. They also described a series of possible "face threatening acts" or acts which would threaten one of the faces of either the speaker or the addressee. When such a face threatening act was necessary, they contended that the speaker had five options: (1) he could perform the act baldly without redressive action, (2) he could utilize the conventions of positive politeness, (3) he could use the conventions of negative politeness, (4) he could perform the act off the record or so ambiguously that he may not have appeared to perform it at all, and (5) he
could avoid the face threatening act altogether. Giving directives, according to Brown and Levinson, is a face threatening act; therefore, directive use is determined by the above five choices.

Negative politeness in this scheme included "that class of strategies oriented mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) the Hearer's Negative Face, his basic want to claims of territory and self-determination" (Brown and Levinson, 1974:14). Positive politeness is "oriented toward the Positive Face of the Hearer, the positive self-image that he claims for himself" (Brown and Levinson, 1974:14). Positive politeness involves the use of the strategy of implying that the speaker really wants the same thing the hearer wants.

In an elaborate discussion, Brown and Levinson described the contexts in which different options would be selected and the intentions of the speaker behind the selection of options. In essence, they created a complex sociolinguistic rule for the use of directives among adults.

In "Speech Acts and Social Learning," Ervin-Tripp (1976) did a similar analysis of the directive system and explained how addressees disambiguated utterances which had more than one possible interpretation. She divided directives up into five categories: (1) imperatives like "Bring me a sweater," (2) embedded imperatives like "Could
you bring me a sweater?,” (3) question directives like “Have you got a sweater here?,” (4) statements of need like “I'm cold,” and (5) hints like "It's a cold night" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976:128). Each of these forms, she contended, could be modulated by greetings, honorifics, address terms, names, politeness markers, pitch, tag modals, and tag OK's. The types of request forms listed above are in order of their relative coerciveness. Ervin-Tripp arranged them in declining coerciveness based on a consideration of how much voluntariness each form provided the addressee in deciding whether or not to comply. The type of directives selected depended on the social context.

Imperatives without modulation such as "Get me some water," were used primarily to people of lower rank or social status or to equals with solidary relationships, according to Ervin-Tripp's observations. With modulators they were also used in the interchange of goods and services. The use of "please" generally marked the higher rank or age, or it indicated a request for services outside the realm of normal duties, Ervin-Tripp noted.

She ranked the embedded imperative as slightly less coercive than the imperative alone because it provided the addressee with a greater show of voluntariness in compliance. Although non-compliance required an explanation, compliance allowed a demonstration of apparent
voluntariness, according to her analysis. She found that embedded imperatives were used with persons of lower rank, with peers in their own territory, or with peers being asked to perform tasks outside their normal roles. In her observation of request forms, Ervin-Tripp noted the significance of the presence of an outsider (see also Philips, 1975). If a person with high rank was present, but not addressed, the request form used was that which would be used with the observer if he were being addressed.

The request question is the third directive form in order of coerciveness, less coercive than the embedded imperative. "Is John here?" could be used as a request form. The fact that it was a question was often irrelevant since the information was already known. This type of question was usually interpreted as a request according to Ervin-Tripp's observations, and if one was really seeking information, it was necessary to offer a disclaimer in most cases. The request question allowed unexplained non-compliance. It was considered more polite than the other two forms of request because it allowed the addressee to be non-compliant without having to explain. Ervin-Tripp (1976:150) explained that "polite speech leaves the options open."

The statement of need has the potential of being the least coercive form of request; however, when it was used downward socially, it had the force of an imperative.
When a doctor told a technician, "I need these samples by tomorrow," the statement carried much of the force of an imperative. The hint or statement of external condition is the least coercive according to Ervin-Tripp's analysis, and was generally used downward in rank or with peers when the service was unusual or great. It was least coercive because it allowed unexplained non-compliance; the addressee could simply choose not to "take the hint."

Children's Use of Directives

The use of directives by children has been examined in detail by three researchers, Turner (1971), Cook-Gumperz (1973), and Montes (1976). Turner attempted to investigate Bernstein's theory that different family role structures give rise to different linguistic codes and that there are two modes of control, the directive mode and the mode of appeal. The mode of appeal was viewed by Bernstein and Turner as either positional and communalized, appealing to shame and part of the elaborated code or as personal and individualized, appealing to guilt and associated with the restricted code. The imperative mode, in Turner's view, belonged to the restricted code above.

Turner used five and seven-year-olds from working and middle-class backgrounds in his study. He showed the children a picture of an angry man standing near a broken
window with children standing in the background and instructed his informants to explain what they thought the man was saying. He hypothesized that the working-class children would focus on the event while the middle-class children would focus on the affective state of the man. He further hypothesized that the working-class children would choose the more forceful speech options, and the middle-class children would choose the less forceful options. Turner's study produced two findings: (1) social class proved to be the key variable in determining the child's definition of the control situation and his choice of control at ages five and seven; class was more important than sex or verbal ability; and (2) the pattern was consistent regardless of the children's age. He found also that the working-class children in his study used threats more than the middle-class children did.

Cook-Gumperz (1973) examined the manner in which mothers taught their children to perform simple skills, finding that working-class mothers used verbal punishment as a first strategy and physical punishment as a second recourse, whereas middle-class mothers did not use verbal punishment first but resorted to it as a second strategy. These two studies would seem to indicate that middle-class children use less coercive forms than working-class children and that one source of that differential use of coercion is learned in mother-child interactions.
Montes (1976) working with the Center for Applied Linguistics, attempted to ascertain how children used language to bring about desired behavior on the part of other children. She diagrammed the possible responses to the following situation of the children in her study: another child has possession of something to which the first child is entitled. Her examination focused on the use of directives by the children to repossess the desired item. Montes' subjects were all middle-class or upper-middle-class children in a private school in Washington, D. C.

Asymmetry in Male-Female Interactions

Current literature on women's speech and interactions between men and women has addressed the question of how status is marked linguistically in asymmetrical relationships. From existing research, investigators have attempted to establish a model for asymmetrical interactions and to apply that model to male-female interactions. Thorne and Henley (1975b) have compiled a collection of twelve articles and an annotated bibliography containing nearly three hundred items dealing with this issue. The contributions in the volume came from researchers in a variety of disciplines including linguistics (Brend, Trudgill), lexicography (Graham), anthropological linguistics (Bodine), psycholinguistics (Henley),
sociolinguistics (Zimmerman, West and Thorne), speech communication (Kramer), speech physiology (Sachs), child development (Cherry), and English (Shulz, Swacker).

In the introductory article Thorne and Henley (1975a) outlined approaches which have historically been taken to linguistic analysis and presented an overview of the field of the investigation of male-female differences in language use. The collection contains articles probing: (1) sexism in language from literary sources (Graham), (2) the historical development of sexist connotations for words (Schulz), (3) sociolinguistic examinations of sex of speaker as a variable in speech (Swacker), and (4) studies on intonation, patterns of interruption, and floor control (Zimmerman and West, Trudgill, Brend). It also contains some cross-cultural information (Bodine) and studies on language acquisition (Sachs, Cherry).

The annotated bibliography is divided into the following sections: comprehensive sources, phonology, conversational patterns, women's and men's languages, dialects, varieties, multilingual situations, language acquisition, verbal ability, and non-verbal aspects of communication.

A second book on the relationship between male and female speech is Key (1975) Male-Female Language. This work presents an introduction to the study of social dialects and to the biological and social foundations of
sex differentiation. The two major areas of discussion within the work include the asymmetrical use of titles, names, address terms, labels and descriptors in reference to males and females and the differential use of strong language and nonstandard variants by men and women. Key also included discussions of joking behavior and an analysis of cartoons, a chapter on language acquisition, and a consideration of cross-cultural material.

A third major work in this area is Lakoff's (1975) Language and Woman's Place. Divided into two sections, this work deals with differential use of language and asymmetry in references to males and females. It also outlines some rules for politeness and asserts that females follow the rules more closely than males. Lakoff asserted in the second section of the work that women who do not follow the rules for interaction which are tacitly specified for women in middle-class American culture will be condemned for "talking like men," but that those who do follow these rules will not be taken seriously since women's rules for interaction include markers which indicate hesitancy, tentativeness, and a sense of frivolity. Lakoff (1975:83) concluded that "the kinds of politeness used by and of and to women do not arise by accident; that they are indeed stifling, exclusive, and oppressive."

The works included here are only a small indication of the growing body of literature concerning the use of
language to mark status differences between males and females, but they are notable contributions to the field and represent the kinds of research being conducted and the areas currently under inspection in this field.

**Methodological Approaches to Language Study**

It is an axiom in linguistics that the more that is known about a language, the more one can learn about it (Labov, 1972c). Therefore, the development of methods to study language parallels the development of the knowledge of language and how it can best be elicited and investigated. Methods become obsolete as they provide information which makes new methods possible, and nowhere is this phenomenon more evident than in studies of regional, class, and ethnic dialects. Approaches to the gathering of raw materials by linguists include the use of texts, elicitation, intuitions, observations, and experiments (Labov, 1972c). With the exception of texts, each of these avenues to language study will be considered as it relates to specific studies reviewed in this chapter.

**Regional Dialectology**

As indicated above, the starting point for methodology in the study of class and ethnic dialects is in regional dialectology and the work of Hans Kurath (1939). His method provided the information contained in the linguistic atlases, and most of what is known about
regional dialects by the general public comes from data gathered by this approach. Three major characteristics typify the work of Kurath and his followers: One, the orientation toward non-urban areas: research was conducted only in rural and semi-rural sections eschewing the investigation of urban centers on the grounds that the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the city would make data gathered there atypical of regional speech. Two, selection of informants: within a specified area, a field worker selected informants which both he and the local residents considered to be typical of the area and representative of the appropriate age group and social class. Three, the interview technique: investigations by the dialect geographers can be classified as using elicitation procedures; i.e., they devised means of extracting responses from their informants. The method used was an extended interview intended to elicit local lexicon items and phonology. The interview lasted several hours, and the field worker frequently did more talking than the informant. In short, speech in these studies was elicited from a non-random population by an outsider through the interview technique.

Social Class Placement

Because early research on class dialects was incidental to other concerns, researchers paid little
attention to methods of classifying individuals on the basis of class. Investigators preceding Fries (1940) frequently used the explanation that anyone who spoke non-standard English was a member of the lower class. Fries, however, determined class membership on the basis of education and occupation. Kurath (1939) and other regional dialectologists used a combination of these approaches identifying informants' class membership by education and occupation unless their use of language suggested that their placement on these grounds was incorrect.

Researchers in the 1960's and 1970's, however, have used more scientific means of evaluating social class membership, commonly utilizing pre-existing sociological models. Sociologists took two main approaches to the evaluation of social stratification: the objective approach in which an outside researcher determined the criteria which would segment the community into the strata which would most significantly affect social behavior, and the subjective approach in which community members indicated their own and others class membership (Wolfram and Fasold, 1974).

Warner (1960) combined these two approaches. First, he established an Index of Status Characteristics ranking individuals in terms of their occupation, education, income, house type, and dwelling area. Within each of these categories, Warner distinguished seven classes.
Individual researchers may use one, some, or all of the categories in determining social class, and each category may be weighted according to the researcher's perception of the community's values. A typical combination is the use of occupation, source of income, house type, and dwelling area with occupation receiving a weighting of four, source of income a weighting of three, and dwelling area a weighting of two.

Warner's second step was a subjective evaluation referred to as Evaluated Participation. Researchers asked the participants how they rated each other in terms of the class categories recognized in the community. Comparing the results of the rating on the Index of Status Characteristics with the rating by Evaluated Participation Warner achieved a correlation coefficient of .975. Because of this high correlation and the difficulty in obtaining Evaluated Participation, researchers frequently employ only the Index of Status Characteristics. Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley (1968) are among the sociolinguists who have used Warner's Index.

In his studies on the social stratification of English in New York, Labov (1966) used a similar, though somewhat more complex status index. His data were drawn from a secondary survey conducted by the Mobilization for Youth research staff on a random population sample. In their Detroit Dialect Study Shuy et al. (1968) utilized
an adaptation of the procedure outlined in Appendix II of August Hollingshead's (1958) *Social Class and Mental Illness*. This index involved three factors: residence, education, and occupation. The divisions within those categories were similar to those employed by Warner.

Linguistic Deprivation Research

One group of researchers who made use of scientific means of social class placement were those investigating the theory of linguistic deprivation. However, some of the characteristics found in the research methodology of the area linguists can also be seen in the work done by researchers in this area despite the difference in their method of social class designation. For example, most of the investigators of linguistic deprivation approached language through elicitation by an outsider, frequently through the use of interviews. However, their methods differed from those of the area linguists in three major ways: In addition to using improved methods of social class placement, they used informants who were primarily children, and their population samples were random rather than selected. A variety of methods were utilized in collecting data relative to the theory of linguistic deprivation, and those discussed below are merely representative. Most of these studies could be classified as experiments.
In an attempt to relate reading readiness to the verbal environment of the child's home, Milner (1951) obtained information through the elicitation method by interviewing her subjects, asking them whether they ate breakfast and dinner with their parents and whether they engaged in meal-time conversations. Her population was a random sample of school children.

Thomas (1962) used a similar technique, eliciting speech from minority and middle-class children through the use of a structured oral interview. He asked each child a set of questions about a toy and recorded and analyzed the responses concluding that the lower-class children constructed sentences loosely, omitted verbs and auxiliaries, and failed to use up to 50% of the Dolch Basic sight words.

Hess and Shipman (1965) investigated the amount and quality of interaction between mothers and their children. The mothers were interviewed in their homes twice and brought to a testing center where they were taught three tasks and asked to teach them to their four-year-old children. Their interviews and their teaching sessions were recorded and subsequently analyzed.

Although still using an elicitation technique, M. Deutsch (1967) attempted to make the elicitation process more natural and enjoyable for their child subjects by devising the clown and rocket techniques. They installed
a tape recorder and an electronic nose in a clown's head. The child was informed that he was to play a game with the clown and that, if he played well, the clown's nose would light up, and he would receive a prize. This device was intended to reward the child for utterances since the nose lit up when the child spoke. A similar device involving a rocket going to the moon was used with older children.

All of the above were attempts at eliciting speech from minority and middle-class white children in order to evaluate and compare their verbal ability.

Sociolinguistic Approaches to Language Study

Labov's Contributions. As both a regional dialectologist and an investigator of class and ethnic dialects, Labov made a major methodological contribution to both areas of research. Unlike dialect researchers of the Kurath school, Labov used a previously existing sociological model for the classification of his informants and selected participants randomly rather than intentionally seeking out speakers deemed representative as regional dialectologists had previously done. He also moved dialect research into urban areas.

In "Some Principles of Linguistic Methodology," Labov (1972c) outlined the development of linguistic
methods historically and pointed out the need for the use of a variety of methods to supplement each other. The paper provides a history of the development of Labov's own ideas as well as an overview of the methods used throughout the field of linguistics.

Labov's (1972c:112-113) methodological innovations were based on four principles:

First is the PRINCIPLE OF STYLE SHIFTING: there are no single-style speakers. Whenever we first encounter a speaker in a face-to-face situation, we must assume that we are observing only a limited part of his entire linguistic repertoire. There may be some linguistic features that do not shift from one style to another, but every speaker will have a configuration of linguistic variables that shift from one context to another.

The PRINCIPLE OF ATTENTION asserts that Styles can be ordered along a single dimension, measured by the amount of attention paid to speech. Despite the varied nature of stylistic influences, and the multi-dimensional character of stylistic rules, all of the patterns can be projected on a single ordered dimension which has significance for our methodology. Casual and intimate styles can be stationed at one end of this continuum, and frozen, ritualistic styles at the other . . .

The third in this series is the VERNACULAR PRINCIPLE: that the style which is most regular in its structure and in its relation to the evolution of the language is the vernacular, in which the minimum attention is paid to speech. . . . It is the high frequency and practiced automaticity of everyday language which is responsible for its pervasive and well-formed character . . .

It can readily be seen that the fourth principle interferes with the third. The PRINCIPLE OF FORMALITY states that any systematic observation of a speaker defines a formal context in which more than the minimum attention is paid to speech.
Based on these principles, Labov and his associates isolated four contextual styles including spontaneous speech, speech elicited by interview, reading style in connected passages, and reading style in isolated word lists (Labov, 1966). Because of the principle of style-shifting and the principle of attention, Labov contended that elicitation procedures needed to be expanded to tap informants' use of the vernacular. Therefore, he and his associates developed the sociolinguistic interview (Labov, 1966; Labov et al., 1968). Working on the Lower East Side of New York City and in Harlem, the researchers located the social contexts in which the vernacular would most likely be used and identified the characteristics of such casual speech in terms of tempo, breathing, volume, pitch, laughter, and the like. They then attempted to devise questions which would bring about the kind of speech identified in casual contexts. According to Labov (1972c: 113):

A question that effectively triggers such responses may take six months to a year to develop--for the theme is not the only important feature. Placement, wording, timing and delivery all contribute to the likelihood of involving the speaker to the extent that formal constraints are over-ridden. One of the most successful questions of this type is on the Danger of Death: "Have you ever been in a situation where you were in serious danger of being killed, where you thought to yourself, this is it?"
Through the use of such questioning, these researchers were able to investigate more casual styles than had been observed in the past.

Another underlying principle of research asserted by Labov (1972c:111) is the Principle of Subordinate Shift:

When speakers of a subordinate dialect are asked direct questions about their language, their answers will shift in an irregular manner toward (or away from) the superordinate dialect.

In Labov's opinion, this principle functions whenever middle-class observers attempt to study working-class or black dialects as outsiders using formal elicitation techniques. He contended that the problem is compounded with child informants since the language of any children is itself a non-standard dialect and elicitation from children is subject to the Principle of Subordinate Shift regardless of class (Labov, 1972c:111).

Labov employed the sociolinguistic interview as one means of combating subordinate shift, but he also involved community members in the elicitation of data and recorded natural peer group interactions. The latter technique was originally employed by Gumperz (1964) in his Hemnes, Norway study. Through this method, the investigators provided the initial setting but receded from the interaction, leaving the groups alone to be recorded. Labov (1972c:115) contended, "The effect of recording is never wholly absent, as our principles would predict, but
it is large over-ridden by other factors." Labov (1972a) and Labov et al. (1968) further developed this technique in working with inner-city black adolescents.

Furthermore, whereas the traditional regional dialectologists and investigators of class differences in language had used outsiders as interviewers, Labov used both outsiders and community members to elicit different kinds of information. He contended (Labov, 1972c) that insiders could obtain in-depth information and that the quality of their interactions with members of their own groups could not be matched by outsiders. Nevertheless, he contended that they were limited in some respects:

Narratives told to insiders tend to be more fragmentary less well-formed than those told to outsiders. The outsider can be seen as a blunt instrument, a useful tool for all kinds of rough work, while the insider can penetrate more deeply in a narrower range (Labov, 1972c: 115).

An additional innovation of Labov's (1966:iii) was the "Rapid and Anonymous observation" such as that used in the survey of post vocalic \( r \) use among clerks in New York department stores. He first formulated the hypothesis that the social prestige of department stores would be reflected in the use of prestige norms of language by clerks. To test this hypothesis, he ranked the stores according to their relative status and attempted to elicit usages of post vocalic \( r \) from clerks by asking a question which would elicit the response "fourth floor."
Labov (1972c) has contended that no one method can be sufficient in collecting data for linguistic analysis, but that a combination of methods can eliminate most sources of error by complementing each other. Sociolinguistic Patterns and Language in the Inner City present data gathered by the variety of means suggested by Labov and demonstrate their combination into a comprehensive discussion of certain linguistic factors. Labov's contributions to the analysis of data have been as notable as his contributions to the methods of data gathering, but they will not be reviewed here.

According to Wolfram and Fasold (1974:31), "It was probably Labov's work in the middle 1960's that provided the major impetus for much of the current sociolinguistic inquiry into social dialects." Other researchers in fields converging with Labov's interests began to utilize similar research strategies either because of the direct influence of Labov's work or because of their independent arrival at similar insights into the nature of language. Other important studies on regional and class dialects based on sociolinguistic principles include work done by Wolfram (1971); Wolfram and Fasold (1974); Shuy et al. (1968); and Shuy, Griffin, and Cahir (1975).

The Ethnography of Communication. A methodological revolution equivalent to that initiated by Labov occurred
in the field of anthropology, generating research under the rubric the ethnography of communication. Primarily under the influence of Gumperz and Hymes, ethnographers of communication approached language research from a new perspective which brought about innovations in methodology. The basic unit of analysis for these investigators was the human group which composed the speech community as opposed to the language or dialect. Furthermore, ethnographers of communication were concerned with the rules of speaking rather than with the rules of grammar, and as Gumperz and Hymes (1972:36) noted, "Since one human group's theories of speaking can best be isolated by contrast with those of another, the comparative approach to fieldwork is probably the most useful at this stage." The two major collections of articles reflecting this orientation are Gumperz and Hymes (1964, 1972).

Sherzer and Darnell (1972) compiled an outline to be used as a guide in the ethnographic investigation of the use of speech in a community. The major questions included in that guide give a clear presentation of the orientation and objectives of ethnographers of communication. The major questions from that guide are listed below:

1. Analysis of the Use of Speech

   I. What are the components involved in the use of speech?
II. What relationships exist among the components just described?

2. Attitudes Toward the Use of Speech

I. What are the general attitudes toward speaking?
II. What are the general attitudes toward languages, dialects, varieties, etc.?

3. Acquisition of Speaking Competence

I. Is the notion infant (distinct from child) relevant to the society's conception of the life cycle with reference to the acquisition of speaking competence?
II. Is there an explicit native theory (or theories) with regard to the acquisition of speaking competence?
III. How are speaking skills transmitted?
IV. What is the general place of children in communication?

4. The Use of Speech in Education and Social Context

I. What is the relation of speech to the definition of stages, periods, or transitions in life?
II. What is the relationship between language and learning and teaching?
III. What role does language play in social control?

5. Typological Generalizations

I. What broad patterns in the use of speech emerge from analysis of a particular culture?
II. Are there patterns of speech use characteristic of cultural areas?
III. Are there patterns of speech use characteristic of particular kinds of speech community, e.g., societies with a particular level of sociocultural complexity or particular types of social organization? (Sherzer and Darnell, 1972: 548-554).
Approaching questions such as these requires extensive research, usually characterized by extended observation. Traditionally, ethnographers have lived among group members over a period of time in order to obtain an insider's view of the culture under investigation. Ethnographers of communication understandably have adopted a similar strategy. Philips (1973) lived on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation and observed the activities of the group for an extended period and in a variety of contexts. Similarly, Abrahams (1964) moved into a home in the center of the neighborhood in which he collected information about black speech acts. Mitchell-Kernan (1969), herself a black, also established residence in the community she was studying.

In the course of collecting data for an ethnographic study like that of Philips, Abrahams, or Mitchell-Kernan, a researcher may obtain information by a variety of methods. For example, Abrahams (1964) discussed collecting folk tales from people who came to his home. Mitchell-Kernan (1969) related an incident in which she collected examples of rapping by being approached by black males in a park. Therefore, the ethnographic model of research may consist of components of elicitation as well as observation of incidents occurring within the groups and of participant-observations.
A somewhat detailed examination of one study will illustrate some aspects of the ethnographic approach. Lein (1975) lived among the black migrants whom she studied, and she collected data in several settings. She observed the adolescents in school, either taping their interactions or writing them down in long hand. She also observed them as they interacted with peers and adults in their homes. Again, she recorded some exchanges and wrote others down. In some instances, she was a participant observer, conducting observations while taking part in the interactions. She did not record conversations conducted in her absence as discussed by Gumperz (1964) and Labov (1972b). Nevertheless, one of her findings was that the adolescents studied spoke more without adults present. She contended that her status in the community was such that her presence did not invoke the Principle of Subordinate Shift:

Over the months I lived in migrant camps, I spent a great deal of time with children while their parents were absent and, consistently, I was uncritical of children's verbal exchanges. Gradually, children began to relax in my presence. I do not think I heard all the kinds of talk children engage in when adults are absent, but I began to hear a close approximation (Lein, 1975:3).

Thus, Lein used elicitation, observation, and participant observation to collect her data; and she used memory, hand-written records, and tape recordings to store her corpus. The strengths of her method included her long-term involvement with her informants, the variety of
contexts in which speech was observed, and the tape recording of data for future analysis. The weaknesses included her definition of her population in terms of their identity as migrants rather than in terms of their identity on the basis of ethnicity or class membership; her reliance on memory and hand-written records of interactions; and her supposition without objective verification that her presence made little or no difference in the children's interactions. These weaknesses are not common to all ethnographic approaches.

Observation of Natural Occurrences. Utilizing an orientation similar to that of the ethnographers of communication, some of the researchers alluded to in this chapter observed natural interactions within their own cultures. An interesting use of observation to obtain data was Goffman's (1967:47-48) study in a mental institution; he explained:

Data for this paper are drawn chiefly from a brief observational study of mental patients in a modern research hospital. I use these data on the assumption that a logical place to learn about personal proprieties is among persons who have been locked up for spectacularly failing to maintain them.

Thus, he considered the mental institution inmates to constitute a contrast set for the study of "normal" social markings of deference. Again, he did not manipulate the behavior; he merely observed and interpreted it.
Also using observation, Brown and Levinson checked their own hypotheses concerning the performance of face threatening acts against observations of natural interactions among adults. Again, they did not discuss the use of any elicitation procedures or recording, and they did not specify the social context of their observations.

Ervin-Tripp (1972) began her investigation of American address terms with a hypothesis constructed from information in the existing literature. She then checked her hypothesis against her own experience with such sociolinguistic alternatives and observed the use of terms among her colleagues in a West Coast university. Similarly, in "Speech Acts and Social Learning" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976), she posited her own impressions of the manner in which directives were used and checked her impressions against their actual use in hospitals, the academic community, and a nursery school.

**Intuition.** Although intuition or using oneself as an informant is generally associated with transformational generative grammar, Lakoff (1975) used a similar technique in her analysis of language in its social context. In *Language and Woman's Place* she explained her approach:

> The data on which I am basing my claims have been gathered mainly by introspection: I have examined my own speech and that of my acquaintances, and have used my own intuitions in analyzing it. . . . The sociologist, anthropologist or ethnomethodologist familiar with
what seem to him more error-proof data-gathering techniques, such as the recording of random conversation, may object that these introspective methods may produce dubious results. But first, it should be noted that any procedure is at some point introspective: the gatherer must analyze his data, after all. Then one necessarily selects a subgroup of the population to work with: is the educated, white, middle-class group that the writer of the book identifies with less worthy of study than any other? And finally, there is the purely pragmatic issue: random conversation must go on for quite some time, and the recorder must be exceedingly lucky anyway, in order to produce evidence of any particular hypothesis, for example, that there is sexism in language, that there is not sexism in language. If we are to have a good sample of data to analyze, this will have to be elicited artificially from someone; I submit I am as good an artificial source of data as anyone (Lakoff, 1975:4-5).

She did not contend, however, that her findings were final or perfect, but presented them as one means of approaching the problem. Labov (1972c:98), in contrast, contended that perhaps the only thing worth trying for in linguistic research was "to be right on a matter of general principle."

A variety of goals and orientations to language study have resulted in a variety of methodologies, many building on the information provided by those which preceded them. Cross-class and cross-ethnic research among children in groups without pre-existing status ranks would, therefore, require a methodology which adequately considered: (1) social class and sociometric placement, (2) asymmetrical speech relations, (3) the phenomena of subordinate shift and the observer's paradox, and (4) the
balance of benefits between elicitation, observation, and intuition.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

The first section of this chapter describes the population and its selection, and the remaining four deal with the data collection, the instruments employed, and the limitations and assumptions of the study.

The Population and Its Selection

The population for the study consisted of fifteen females, ages ten to twelve, in grades five to seven. The total population was comprised of three homogeneous groups of five members each, representing different ethnic and/or class backgrounds. Five participants were middle-class white, five were working-class white, five were working-class black.

Class and Ethnic Categories

A primary aim of the study was to determine whether directives were used differently by members of different ethnic groups and/or by members of different socioeconomic groups, and further, to ascertain which, if any, of the differences in use of directives could be attributed to class membership and which, if any, could be attributed to ethnicity. Therefore, the contrasts of working- vs.
middle-class and black vs. white were devised. Ideally, the study would have included a fourth group consisting of middle-class black participants, but the middle-class black population in the community where the study was conducted was too limited to provide an adequate number of participants of the desired age and sex. The community in which the research was conducted is a small manufacturing center in east Tennessee. The population is 25,000 with approximately 48% of the labor force involved in manufacturing.

Limitation to Females

The study was limited to females for several reasons: First, much of the research already done with minority children has been conducted with males (Labov, 1972a; Abrahams, 1964), and the use of females promised to be a more valuable contribution to the field. Second, preliminary observations of possible participants indicated subjectively that females in the social classes and ethnic groups to be considered were verbally more active than their male counterparts. Females, for example, more frequently sat and talked together while the males were more frequently involved in physical activities such as ball games, arm wrestling, and the like. The higher verbal output of the females was considered to be valuable because of the limited scope of the study, i.e., four days of intensive observation and taping for each group. The more the children
talked, the more data would be available for analysis. Furthermore, the type of activities which appeared to hold the attention of the males would not be advantageous for taping with the equipment available. Third, sociolinguistic research attempts as much as possible to avoid observer biases; therefore, since two-thirds of the population would already be different from the researcher in class and ethnic group identity, the use of same-sex participants was seen as potentially valuable in keeping the researcher's alienation to a minimum.

Age of Participants

The desired age of the participants was determined on the basis of the findings of a preliminary study in which females between the ages of five and thirteen were included (Dirksen, 1975a). An analysis of the data from that study indicated that the girls by the age of ten had internalized a system of directives which demonstrated considerable flexibility, while the children younger than ten did not demonstrate the same facility in directive construction. The wider range of possible directives promised to make the study more complete, and therefore, more meaningful. Furthermore, participants between the ages of ten and twelve took the most active role in the interaction in terms of speaking turns and mean utterance length, again an important consideration in a limited study.
Group Size

The decision to limit the groups to five members each also grew out of the preliminary study which included larger groups. Groups of more than five tended to break up into a number of smaller groups, and the resulting simultaneous conversations were difficult to transcribe with the recording equipment available. However, while limiting the overall complexity, a five-member group still provided for several combinations of interactions including two simultaneous dyads with one person competing for membership.

Selection of Working-Class Black Participants

Participants for the working-class black group were selected from children attending a community center with which the researcher is affiliated. This group was chosen because of the researcher's acquaintance with the children involved in this program. Although the center has no specific religious affiliation, it does hold Sunday School as one of its functions, and some of the children refer to it as a church. However, only two of the children in the study attended religious services at the center. All the children in the study had some religious affiliation; lack of such affiliation among children, even in lower and working class families, is the exception rather than the rule. Many of the churches in the community operate bus ministries, picking children up from parts of town not generally
serviced by the churches, and others have missions in the area from which the working-class children were selected. Therefore, religious affiliation for this study was considered to be a factor which was representative of the practices of the community.

The center itself is located on the street which forms the *de facto* boundary between the black and white communities and is attended by children from both groups. Since participation in the activities at the center is unsolicited and totally voluntary on the part of the children, it might be argued that those who elect to participate might be unrepresentative of their class and ethnic groups as a whole. One might, for example, consider black children attending a white-directed center to be marginal to the black vernacular culture, and whites attending an integrated center to be alienated from their class and ethnic group which is generally characterized by active discrimination. However, extensive work within the community with children other than those affiliated with the center from both ethnic and class groups indicated to the satisfaction of the researcher that these children were not atypical.

As many studies have pointed out, it is difficult for a white investigator to elicit natural speech from black informants. Since ethnicity was an important variable in the study, it was necessary to collect speech samples from black children. Therefore, it seemed
advantageous to work with a group of minority children who were already familiar with the researcher and who had previously been engaged in social interaction with her. Within this limited population, best friends and sisters were eliminated because of the change that their communication would be significantly different on grounds not covered by the study; e.g., the increased familiarity of best friends, like that of sisters, might have affected the analyzability of the conversations because of in-group codes and might also have significantly affected the sociometric rankings.

From those girls remaining, five participants were selected with the following criteria: Those girls were given first preference who could clearly be demonstrated by house type, dwelling area, source of family income, and parents' occupations to be working-class children. Secondly, since parental consent and cooperation were necessary, children were selected whose parents were willing to allow them to participate. Finally, children who were personally acquainted with the researcher to some extent were given preference in an attempt to overcome the white adult researcher bias already alluded to.

The children's social class membership was computed according to the scale developed by W. Lloyd Warner for use in his Jonesville and Yankee City studies in 1949 and updated in 1960. (For a complete discussion of Warner's
scale see Chapter II, Social Class Placement). The results of the application of Warner's scale to the children in the study are contained in Table 1. Their ethnic identity was determined by their classification of themselves as black.

Selection of Working-Class White Participants

A first working-class white group was selected from the population at the center. However, the group was unable to function on the level necessary to complete the tasks without adult supervision, and after one session, they were replaced. The study group used also partially came from this center. However, after eliminating best friends and sisters, the remaining population was inadequate for the necessary sample. Two additional participants were randomly selected from an analogous club affiliated with a local church. The two additional girls lived in the same general area as the original three and were acquainted with the other group members to some degree. The social class of this group was also computed on the basis of Warner's scale (see Table 1).
Table 1. Social Class Designation of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>House Types</th>
<th>Dwelling Areas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mo. Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working-class Black:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working-class White:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-class White:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Girls whose housing type and area are starred live in government projects which are not accounted for on Warner's Scale.

Lower numbers indicate higher socioeconomic status.
Selection of Middle-Class White Participants

The middle class children were selected in a manner which was intended to simulate as nearly as possible the relationships found within the working-class population under consideration. The population from which the sample was drawn was limited to children attending one specific church. The children chosen for the working-class population were not necessarily friendship or neighborhood groups; they were affiliated with each other through the outside institution of the community center alluded to above. An institution which served an analogous function in the middle-class community was selected as a base population for the formation of a similar middle-class group. Girls from this total population who were best friends and sisters were eliminated. From the remaining group, an attempt was made to select participants on the basis of two criteria: One, their direct or indirect acquaintance with the researcher was considered. Since both working-class groups were made up, at least in part, of children acquainted with the researcher, an attempt was made to keep that variable constant in the middle-class group. Two, the participants' demonstrable membership in the middle-class was considered. Again, social class was determined by Warner's Scale (see Table 1).
Selection of Assistants

The study was originally designed to provide a contrast between the use of directives by children in all-child groups and in interactions with adults. However, because of the volume of material to be analyzed and interpreted, that concern was eliminated from the final study. Nevertheless, the study was partially managed by two research assistants, and in view of the original design, their selection was carefully considered. The assistants attended the sessions on alternate days, and their primary function was to assist the children in order to free the researcher to observe, rather than participate in, the speech behavior. Since their contact with the children was so immediate, they were selected on the basis of their familiarity with as many of the participants as possible. Both assistants were students at the college where the researcher is employed and had either direct or indirect contact with most of the children. One was black, Loretta, and one white, Terri. Terri had served as a softball coach for the girls team at the community center from which the working class girls were selected. Girls not on the team were acquainted with her from her other activities at the center. Loretta was also involved at the center as a tutor and knew several of the middle-class
girls through her work as a baby-sitter. Neither of the assistants had had any training in sociolinguistics or research, but both had had previous experience in working with children. Although the study did not include an analysis of conversations either with or in the presence of adults, the assistants served an important function in setting the casual tone of the sessions and in making the children comfortable and relaxed.

The Settings of the Language Elicitations

For the data collection the working-class children met in the library of the aforementioned community center, a setting they were quite accustomed to since it is frequently used as a meeting place for children and as a place to do crafts. It is not a library in the strict sense of the word although it does contain books and provide the usual services of a library. It also contains games and art supplies and is generally more noisy and less formal than might be expected. It is a setting the children themselves frequently choose in preference to other sections of the center, and it was selected for data collection because of its informal, unthreatening atmosphere.

Data collection among the middle class group took place on the campus of the college where the researcher is employed. Since the community center used for the
working-class children was unfamiliar to the middle-class group and in a neighborhood which they did not frequent, it was not considered suitable. The campus, however, is a familiar setting to these children since it is the denominational college of their church, and all of their parents are either faculty members, staff members, or administrators. The actual test environment was a recreation room very similar in structure and atmosphere to the library described above.

The Interaction Tasks

Each group was involved in four structured testing sessions lasting approximately three hours each. Six interaction tasks were accomplished during each session. The study was designed to reach a compromise between a totally controlled experiment and a natural interaction; therefore, each testing session followed a specified format which was repeated for each group. However, within that format, the conversations of the children were not manipulated in any way.

The interaction tasks set up for the children were divided into the following non-mutually exclusive sets:

1. Some tasks were completed while the children interacted with an adult while others were completed in all-child groups. The inclusion of adult-child interactions was intended to elicit
information which would indicate whether the coercion level of directives was decreased in the presence of an adult, presumably a higher status person than the child interactants, and whether directives addressed to adults were significantly less coercive. However, this concern was later eliminated. In the all-child interactions, it was hypothesized that the children would respond more naturally and with less inhibition than when adults were present. This lessening of inhibition would have two benefits: one, it was assumed that more speech would be forthcoming and, hence, more data; two, the speech would be more representative of the unobserved language of the children. Furthermore, it was anticipated that the vying for status and the assertion of children as group leaders would be facilitated in the absence of an adult figure.

2. Some of the tasks were primarily verbal, e.g., making up a story, telling about a personal experience, while others consisted of the verbal accompaniment to a non-verbal task such as tying macrame, making a collage, and the like. It was hypothesized that without a non-verbal frame, the verbal responses would be less deictic and that the sustaining of the on-going conversation would be
left to the initiative of the participants. It was further hypothesized that the amount of data elicited by the totally verbal contexts would be greater than that in the contexts which included a non-verbal activity, but that the formality of utterances might be lessened in the latter context. Formality of language increases in proportion to the amount of attention the speaker pays to what he is saying (see Labov, 1972c); therefore, it was hypothesized that the non-verbal activity would cause the speaker to pay less attention to the speech itself, thus making it less formal. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the speech accompanying the completion of the non-verbal activities would contain a large number of directives.

3. A few of the tasks involved the entire group working together toward a common goal such as making a trash can or making up a group story, and others involved the children working toward individual goals such as telling about a personal experience or doing embroidery. This contrast of tasks was based on the hypothesis that cooperation toward a common goal would elicit a large number of directives and that the directives would be oriented toward group benefit, whereas the
individual projects would elicit fewer directives and of a more personally directed nature. Also, it was hypothesized that intra-group leaders would emerge in the organization and accomplishment of group tasks.

4. Finally, some of the tasks were performed without an appointed group leader, and some were performed with one of the group members appointed as teacher. The appointment of peer teachers was intended to form a context in which each participant, regardless of intra-group status, would be expected to offer a large number of directives. It was intended, then, to capitalize on the leadership of some members and to draw out those who were less willing to assert themselves in other contexts. The tasks performed by all-child groups without appointed leaders were intended to make the assertion of group leadership by the members themselves necessary, and thus to bring some focus to the sociometric rankings. (For a complete listing of the tasks and the order in which they were completed see Table 2.)

The testing format provided more data than was ultimately analyzed. The following tasks, consisting only
Table 2. Schedule of Interaction Tasks

Day #1:
1. Adult teaches macrame to children.
2. Children plan with adult what craft each one will teach.
*3. Children make a collage without adults present.
4. Children look at TAT pictures and decide together on an interpretation without adults present.
5. Children explain their interpretation to adults.
6. Children and adults make fruit salad.

Day #2:
1. Adult teaches children to make an owl.
*2. Children make up a story to complete a paragraph which is supplied--no adults present.
*3. One child teaches the other a craft without adults.
4. Children make up a story from magazine pictures without adults.
5. Children explain their story to the adults.
6. Children and adults make fruit punch.

Day #3:
*1. One child teaches the others a craft without adults.
*2. The children describe their favorite person to each other.
*3. One child teaches the others a craft without adults.
*5. Children plan backyard cookout--no adults.
6. Children explain plan to adults.

Day #4:
*1. One child teaches a craft without adults.
*2. Each child tells a personal experience to all child group.
3. Children tell stories to adults.
*4. One child teaches the rest a craft.
5. Children and adults make doughnuts.
*6. One child teaches the others a craft.

*Tasks actually analyzed for the study.

While this schedule was generally adhered to, in some cases (e.g., one child's absence) it was applied flexibly. Because of illness, one group had to meet an extra day to make up some activities.
of all-child interactions, were selected for final inclusion in the data analysis:

1. Making a collage: group goal; no appointed leader; non-verbal frame.
2. Making up a group story: group goal; no appointed leader; totally verbal.
3. Child teaching a craft: group/individual goal; appointed leader; non-verbal frame.
4. Describing favorite person: individual goal; no appointed leader; totally verbal.
5. Planning cookout: group goal; no appointed leader; totally verbal.
6. Telling about a personal experience: individual goal; no appointed leader; totally verbal.

Number three was performed five times in each of the groups.

Selection of Tasks for Final Analysis

The above tasks were selected for a combination of pragmatic and theoretical reasons. During part of the taped sessions for two groups, one person was absent. Therefore, all conversations involving only four persons had to be eliminated. Furthermore, the quality of the taping was much better for some of the conversations than for others. Conversations eliminated for these reasons included the following: The examination of TAT pictures and the making up of a story from magazine pictures. In
the case of the working-class white group, one member was absent when the group made up its story from a provided first paragraph; to substitute for this task, the WCW participants made up a puppet show for the puppets they had made as a craft project.

Since the study was intended to deal with directives and since directives play a major role in giving instructions, the sessions were selected in which each of the fifteen girls was the appointed peer teacher. Because it was hypothesized that the group-goal tasks and the individual-goal tasks would produce different kinds of data, samples were selected from each of these categories. Initially, the study was designed to contrast primarily verbal tasks with those in which verbal behavior was an accompaniment to a non-verbal activity; therefore, a mix of these categories was also selected. Again, because of the overwhelming amount of data, the types of tasks were not analyzed separately. Nevertheless, the selection of identical or similar tasks across class and ethnic lines gave the study needed consistency and rigor, and the variety of tasks structured for the children made the elicitation of directives more fruitful by requiring different responses from the children.

While the overall sessions lasted approximately three hours each, different groups completed the same tasks at different rates. For example, the middle-class
group spent considerably longer discussing which crafts they might teach the group than did the other two groups. Also, some of the crafts the children elected to teach, e.g., embroidery, took considerably longer than others, such as drawing. A total of 17.28 hours of tape were analyzed, netting 883 directives.

Corroboration of Data Through Informal Observation

During the performance of the various tasks, the children were taped by three recorders placed in different positions around the room. In addition to the relatively formal testing sessions outlined above, the children were observed in less structured environments such as a hike and picnic, Sunday school classes, and at Youth Camp in craft and Bible classes and in small group discussions. Such observations, recorded on field notes, established to the satisfaction of the researcher that the performance of the children in the test group was consistent with their performance elsewhere. In addition, similar observations were made of children not involved in the research groups. Such observations included Sunday school classes similar in class and ethnic composition to those of the research group, and neighborhood play groups of middle-class white, working-class white, and working-class black children. These observations indicated to the satisfaction
of the researcher that the participants in the study were not atypical of their social class or ethnic group.

**Description of Instruments Employed**

Participants in the present study were classified in two ways for the purposes of data analysis. First, they were classified according to their social class and ethnic identity into three groups. Within each group, they were further ranked from one to five sociometrically. For their social class placement, they were ranked according to the Index of Status Characteristics (Warner, 1960). Their sociometric placement was determined by the responses of each of the group members to five questions asked to them during the course of the study.

**Social Class Placement of Participants**

Warner's (1960) Index of Status Characteristics was used in assigning participants to social classes. The index is based on the hypothesis that human behavior tends to vary somewhat according to status. The assumption in the present study was that the coercion level and selection of components in directive production would have a relationship to the socioeconomic class of the parent(s) of the children participating. The index contains four scales: Occupation, Source of Income, House Type, and Dwelling Area.
All four scales were utilized for the placement of the children in the study.

Occupations are ranked by the index on a scale from 1 to 7 with the lower score being the more prestigious; each member of the population in the present study was assigned a score based on the occupation of her mother or father. When both parents were employed, the assignment was made on the basis of the higher status occupation, and when neither parent was employed, the subject was assigned to the lowest status designation (7).

Source of income, house type, and dwelling area were also rated by the index on a scale ranging from 1 to 7, and each participant in the present study was so classified. In accordance with the index, occupation received a weighting of 4; source of income and house type a weighting of 3, and dwelling area a weighting of 2 for the determination of the final score for each individual. Warner's scale does not include a consideration of housing projects, but the four working-class participants living in housing projects were given a rating of 6 for house type. In the dwelling area category, the projects were assigned their rank on the basis of the classification of the individual groups of apartments by the Housing Authority of the community where the study was conducted. Table 1 indicates the total status ratings for each participant in the study and the group totals.
Sociometric Placement of Participants

The intention of the sociometric questioning was to determine which girl in each group the members themselves considered to be the leader, i.e., the person with the highest status and the greatest ability as a facilitator. Status, leadership ability, and power were equated because of their inter-relationship in the sociological literature (see Chapter II). The person who is the most powerful (i.e., brings about the most goal-oriented action within the group) possesses the highest status and is, therefore, the most leaderlike. In short, the three characteristics are too closely related to be separated sufficiently (see Table 3).

As suggested by Sargent (1958), five sociometric questions were framed, each attempting to elicit responses based on one of the characteristics of leadership discussed in Chapter II: (1) the ability to bring about the achievement of group goals (ability as a facilitator), and (2) the embodiment of group norms. Questions intended to ascertain the children's perception of each other as facilitators included: (1) If you were lost in the woods, which of these girls do you think would be most likely to find the way out? (2) If you were badly hurt and there was no adult around, which of these girls would you most want to have with you? For these two questions it was assumed that
Table 3. Sociometric Rank of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dani</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Robbi</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working-class White:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phillis</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Missy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working-class Black:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Henri</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
finding the way out of the woods and getting help for a serious injury would be shared goals. (3) If I could not be here, and this group was going to meet, which one of these girls do you think I should get to take my place? This question was intended to discover which person other participants thought would best bring about the group goals as they were officially presented.

Two questions were intended to discover which girl the others thought was the best embodiment of group norms:

1. Which of these girls do you think is the smartest? Although it may appear that being "smart" is a middle-class goal, the researcher attempted to make it clear to the children that this question was not limited to classroom intelligence. The responses of the children indicated that they interpreted "smart" in a broader context (e.g., "Gina, cause she go around everywhere and she know how ta do all kinda stuff").

2. Which of these girls would you most like to be like? In order to determine precisely which person most embodied group norms, it would be necessary to gather ethnographic data on each group over a period of time to determine what those norms were and to construct questions based on each norm. Also, in a cross-class and cross-ethnic study, it would be necessary to construct different questions
for each group reflecting different sets of norms. To avoid that complexity, the above question was framed on the assumption that participants would want to emulate the person who embodied the most group norms.

Coercion Level Analysis

This study also utilized the Coercion Level Index developed by the researcher for use in analyzing children's directives. It is based on the hypothesis that coerciveness has a direct relationship to: (1) the lack of ambiguity in possible interpretations of requests for action, (2) the lack of possibility for a show of voluntariness in compliance, and (3) an absence of solidarity cues. It, therefore, outlines the method of analyzing a directive in order to place it on a continuum from unambiguous to ambiguous, from involuntary to voluntary, and from being issued from a base of power to being issued from a base of solidarity to being issued from a base of supplication. The key concepts underlying the Coercion Level Index are defined as follows:

**Directive.** A directive is an utterance which calls for one of the following responses on the part of the addressee:

1a. To stop an on-going action: Quit hittin' me.

b. Not to perform an action: Don't make it red.
2. To perform an action: Hand me the paint.
3. To delay an action: Wait a minute.
4. To allow an action: Can I pass out the marbles?

There are four primary categories of directives determined by the grammatical form of the principal verb and listed below in the order of their relative coerciveness (see Ervin-Tripp, 1976).

1. Imperative: Give me that magazine.
2a. Let: Let me have those scissors.
   b. Let's: Let's make our puppets alike.
3. Question: Can I please be next?
4. Statement: You need to make that smaller.

The imperative and the let/let's offer no problems in identification as directives since they are always directives simply on the basis of their form. The question and the statement, however, require additional consideration since both forms are used for other purposes in conversation, and it is precisely this feature which makes them more ambiguous and less coercive when they are used as directives. Both of these forms must be interpreted partly by context, but the researcher has access to most of the material which the interactants themselves possess and is, therefore, in as good a position as the participants to determine whether an utterance in these categories is a directive.
Only yes/no questions, under most circumstances, can function as directives. Thus, "May I use your umbrella?" is a directive, but "Who is Harry?" is not. However, not all yes/no questions can be thus interpreted. "Is your house red?" for example, is a request for information but not a directive. (For a more complete discussion of the classification of questions, see Basso, 1975). Therefore, a question is a directive if it asks the addressee to do something besides simply answer the question. Question directives may be direct or indirect, however, and rely partially on context for interpretation. "Are you guys through?" in some contexts might be a request for information. However, in the context of the tape in which it appeared, it was a request for the use of the glue. Question directives in the children's data were usually much less context dependent as the following examples illustrate:

1. Will somebody cut this for me?
2. Can we have some more pipe cleaners?
3. Can I give everybody their marbles?
4. Will you make mine some eyes?

Most of the question directives in the children's data utilized a modal auxiliary and requested permission. (See Ervin-Tripp, 1976:131-132 for more discussion on request questions.)
Because the statement is not a directive form, it must always be interpreted by context. The point of using a statement rather than a more obvious form is so that it may be interpreted by the addressee as something besides a directive, thus allowing some voluntariness in compliance (Ervin-Tripp, 1976:132-133). "I want to write down mine," was recorded and analyzed as a directive, but that determination was made on the basis of context not form, and in other contexts, this statement might not have been a directive. In the context in which it appeared, Kay had been appointed to write the story down for the whole group, but Terry wanted to write her own part. Therefore, the statement was taken to have the underlying assertion, "Let me write my own." However, if the girls had been discussing whether they were individually going to write their stories as opposed to just telling them, the statement would not have been a directive.

Since all imperatives are directives, a conversation consists of directives, non-directive questions, and non-directive statements. The following brief exchange does not contain any directives, for example:

A: You know Henry Alexander, don't you?

B: Is he that guy with the white hair?

A: Yeah, the one that used to be friends with my brother.

B: Yeah, I know 'im, why?
A: Well, he just moved into the 6th Street Apartments and he's goin' to Oak Grove next year.

B: You don't sorta like 'im do you?

A: Who me? You kiddin'? He likes Pam Whitter—that real skinny girl.

B: Ugh!

This excerpt from a conversation contains requests for information, requests for utterance clarification, information statements, and expressions of opinion, but none of these utterances requests the addressee to do anything, to perform any action, only to respond, and hence, none are directives.

Coercion. The coercion of a directive is determined by the extent to which it is an obvious and unambiguous call for a response on the part of the addressee. Degree of coercion is ranked along three continua: power to solidarity to supplication, lack of ambiguity to ambiguity, and involuntariness of response to voluntariness of response. Power directives are coercive because they underscore the relationship of the speaker as superior to the addressee. For example, "Give me your paint brush," is a power directive because it implies the authority of the speaker over the addressee and his right to use and retain his own property. A power directive implies that the speaker is able to control the behavior of the addressee. In effect it asserts the speaker's right (whether real or
imagined) to regulate the activities of the addressee (see Brown and Gillman, 1960:255).

Solidarity directives are less coercive because they emphasize the mutuality of the relationship between speaker and addressee rather than stressing one's authority over the other (see Brown and Gillman, 1960:257). For example, "Let's make ours red," indicates a request for a joint activity which involves the speaker and the addressee equally. As such, the authority of the speaker is not asserted, and he does not imply his superiority over the addressee. A supplication directive, in direct contrast to a power directive, emphasizes the power of the addressee over the speaker and his activities. Supplication directives are, in short, requests for permission from an authority figure. "Can I pass the marbles out, please?" is a supplication directive because it requests a right from a person in authority. The power-solidarity-supplication continuum can be conceptualized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion of Speaker's Authority</th>
<th>Equality of Speaker and Addressee</th>
<th>Assertion of Addressee's Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X--------------------------------</td>
<td>X---------------------------------</td>
<td>X---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power | Solidarity | Supplication

Unambiguous directives are more coercive because they do not allow any other interpretations, and therefore,
require either compliance or an explanation of non-compliance. The presence of options or the degree to which something is at least made to seem optional is central to this culture's definition of politeness (i.e., non-coerciveness). Therefore, the more a directive allows the addressee real voluntariness of response or a show of voluntariness, the more polite and less coercive it is.

**Power.** The use of power in a directive asserts the speaker's authority over the addressee and his supposed right to request (or demand) services from the addressee (see Coercion).

**Solidarity.** Solidarity is the expression of the emphasis of the relationship of the speaker and the addressee as equal. It underscores the mutuality of the task and/or involvement. Where the power axis emphasizes the dominance of one interactant over the other, i.e., the social distance between them, the solidarity axis emphasizes their closeness (see Coercion).

**Supplication.** Supplication is the emphasis of the power of the addressee over the speaker. It is at the other extreme of the continuum from power (see Coercion).

Of the three continua underlying the placement of directives, the power-solidarity-supplication continuum is the most complex. On one extreme is the power of the
speaker over the addressee; on the other extreme is the power of the addressee over the speaker, and at the midpoint is the solidarity relationship between the two. A variety of additions and modulations are used to place directives along this continuum. The ambiguity-lack of ambiguity and voluntariness-involuntariness continua often vary together and are, to some extent, complementary, i.e., a directive which is ambiguous frequently offers a greater degree of voluntariness in compliance and vice versa. The power-solidarity-supplication continuum, however, may vary with the other two or may be used to offset them. For example, a speaker may balance an unambiguous directive which makes compliance involuntary with a solidarity cue in order to make it more acceptable to the addressee. The means of analyzing directives along these three continua are outlined below.

Method of Directive Coercion Analysis

Each directive was first classified in terms of its principal verb as either an imperative, a Let/Let's form, a question, or a statement. Next, it was classified in terms of the benefactor of the action requested, i.e., whether the recipient of the benefit of compliance would be the speaker, a third party, the speaker and the addressee jointly, or the addressee. Third, it was classified in terms of the type of action the directive
requested, i.e., whether the speaker was asking the addressee to stop performing an action, to perform an action, to delay an action or to allow an action. (Each of these three primary classifications is discussed in detail below.) An initial coercion level was then derived for each directive based on its placement in each of the above categories. Each component was given a numerical value designed to indicate the relative level of its coercion.

The grammatical form of the principal verb was considered to be more salient in determining the relative coercion of the directive than were the categories of Direction of Benefit or Action Requested. Therefore, the rank assignments were weighted so that the grammatical form category had double the value of any other category. Although the fact that the value was double was arbitrary, its being considered more important was not arbitrary. To a large degree, the form of the principal verb limits other possibilities for expressing voluntariness and ambiguity. The directive may be modified in significant ways which will increase its solidarity and, to some extent, make compliance appear more voluntary. However, no modulation can significantly alter the sense given to a directive by its principal verb. The ranking of the components is explained below:
Grammatical Form. Each directive is placed in one of four categories according to the grammatical form of the principal verb:

1. Imperative: (8 points)

   (1) Glue a picture on it.

   The imperative received 8 points as the most coercive verb form because it is unambiguous and does not provide for unexplained non-compliance. It is, therefore, the directive type which allows the addressee the least voluntariness in response.

2. Let or Let's: (6 points)

   (2) Let me taste the glue.

   (3) Let's clean it up.

   Although these are both grammatical imperatives, they do not have the coercive force of other imperatives. In (2) above the verb form increases voluntariness by moving along the power-solidarity-supplication continuum to the point where the addressee is seen as having power over the speaker. In (3) solidarity is invoked by the implication that the action will be shared.

   Although the let and let's have been included in the same category and are given the same rank as verb forms, let's is ultimately one point less coercive according to the index than is let because an additional point is deducted in the section of additions
and modifications for the use of the first person plural pronoun *us*. This is considered to be less coercive because of the solidarity invoked by the inclusive pronoun. This does not include the verb *let* used in the sense of *leave* as in "Let that thing alone."

3. Question: (4 points)

(4) Why don't you try green?

A question directive is more ambiguous than either grammatical form already presented because it is formally identical to the information question, and the addressee may choose to interpret it as such if other constraints such as feasibility are met. It is, however, so frequently used as a directive that it is generally interpreted as such.

4. Statement: (2 points)

(5) We could call the play "Romeo and Juliet."

The statement is the most ambiguous and, therefore, the least coercive directive form. The difficulty with analyzing this form, and hence its value in conversation, is that it cannot always be clearly interpreted as a directive.

The information presented under *Grammatical Form* above has dealt with the major grammatical forms utilized in directives. However, some semantic concepts must also be considered and have been included in the instrument.
For all practical purposes, any directive could be expressed in any of the forms thus far presented. The Grammatical Form category, therefore, represents possibilities for multiple realizations like the following:

statement: Oh dear, it's raining.

let/let's: Let's share your umbrella./Let me use your umbrella.

question: Could I borrow your umbrella?

imperative: Loan me your umbrella.

Each of the above directives has essentially the same meaning; only the grammatical form of its expression is different.

However, there are some differences in the coerciveness of directives which can only partially be accounted for by grammatical form and which do not represent multiple realizations. The Direction of Benefit category and the Action Requested category outlined below demonstrate some of those differences. Each of these categories receives only half the weight of the Grammatical Form category, and each can, in part but not entirely, be explained in terms of some grammatical component. For example the Direction of Benefit considers whether the speaker, the addressee, both interactants, or a third party will benefit from the requested action. For example:

Get me an umbrella.

Get yourself an umbrella.
Get her an umbrella.
Get us an umbrella (i.e., you and me).

In each of the examples above, a different benefactor is indicated and the indication of the benefactor is managed by the use of four different direct object pronouns. If pronouns were always used to indicate the recipient of the benefit, a semantic explanation for this category would not be necessary. However, pronouns do not always indicate the benefactor who is sometimes made evident only through context. For example, in the sentence "Move your head," there is no indication of who will benefit from the action. One child could be in the way of the speaker's vision; therefore, the speaker would benefit. On the other hand, a third child might be about to hit the addressee with a chair; in this case the addressee would be the benefactor. Another possibility is that the addressee's head is in the way of a third party who would benefit if it were moved. A final possibility could be that the barette of one child is tangled in the hair of the other, and if the addressee would "Move her head," they would both be unsnarled. This category, therefore, deviates from the first in that it contains some examples of polysemy rather than multiple realizations. A complete discussion of the two remaining categories will help to clarify this issue.
Direction of Benefit. The intended benefactor of the requested action is also considered in determining the degree of coercion of the directive. This category receives only half the weight of the Grammatical Form category since it is not as crucial in limiting power, ambiguity, and voluntariness.

1. Speaker: (4 points)

(6) Give me your scissors.

Requesting that an individual perform an action for the benefit of the speaker asserts the propriety of the addressee's service to the speaker, and, therefore, asserts her power. Other features of the directive may solicit a solidarity relationship, but if other cues are absent, a request from whose fulfillment only the speaker would benefit, is a relatively coercive form.

2. Neither the speaker nor the addressee: (3 points)

(7) Get Kay one.

If the benefactor is to be a third party, the directive is less coercive than if only the speaker benefits because such a request indicates a measure of solidarity with someone in the group. Nevertheless, it is still a relatively coercive form because it still asserts the speaker's right to direct the addressee to perform an action in which she has no
vested interest. The directive is, therefore, issued from a position of power relative to the addressee.

3. Both the speaker and the addressee: (2 points)

(8) Let's hurry and clean it up.

When there is mutual benefit to the speaker and addressee, the directive is being issued from a position of solidarity. The speaker is not asking the addressee to perform a service, but rather to participate in a shared activity.

4. Addressee: (1 point)

(9) Watch your head.

If the addressee is the sole benefactor, there is a greater degree of voluntariness in her compliance. If she does not choose to "watch her head," no one will suffer from that decision except her. Also, the speaker's apparent concern for the addressee indicates a measure of solidarity.

**Action Requested.** Directives were also classified in terms of what the addressee was being asked to do. Four possible actions were considered:

1. Stop performing: (4 points)

(10) Stop, girl.

This is classified as most coercive because it not only requests compliance on the part of the addressee, but it also indicates that the behavior she is now
engaged in is unacceptable. It is, therefore, both a directive and a value judgment. As such, it is issued from a position of power rather than of solidarity.

2. Perform: (3 points)

   (11) Somebody stir that black up.

   Perform directives are considered to be less coercive than stop directives because they do not evaluate the addressee's behavior. Nevertheless, they are more coercive than the remaining categories since they attempt to generate action which is not presently in progress.

3. Delay: (2 points)

   (12) Wait a minute 'n I'll show ya.

   Delay directives are ranked third because they condone the present behavior and ask only that it be delayed, not that it be terminated. Also, they do not attempt to generate an action as do the perform directives; they merely attempt briefly to interrupt an action. Therefore, they indicate solidarity rather than power.

4. Allow: (1 point)

   (13) Can I be next?

   Allow directives are ranked fourth because they indicate the addressee's power over the behavior of the speaker. They are, in a sense, requests for permission,
and as such, place the addressee in a power position relative to the speaker.

**Modification.** Certain features are important in raising or lowering the coercive level of a directive. Since the basic coerciveness of the directive has already been determined by the speaker's selection of the options outlined above, the modifications receive only +1 or -1 in determining the coercion level. They are not basic to the directive, but are added to modulate it. Such modifications are divided into two classes: those which increase the level of coercion and those which decrease it.

There is no simple way to determine exactly how much each modulation affects the coerciveness of the final directive; however, since the basic value of the directive in terms of the components already discussed is more central to the issue of coercion, the scale of modifiers must be coordinated with the scale of basic components. Therefore, the present system, while not as sensitive as might be desired, attempts to account for modifications primarily as they relate to the basic directive rather than in their relationship to each other. It would, of course, be possible to rank each modification in relation to each other modification in the same manner as the preceding components were ranked; however, in the opinion of the author, such a system would sacrifice elegance for detail,
a sacrifice which was not considered worthwhile in terms of the present study.

1. Those which increase the level of coercion:

(1 point)

gotta: (14) You gotta do the satin stitch.
hafta: (15) You hafta rub glue all around.
sposta: (16) You're sposta show us how.

Each of the above makes an otherwise non-coercive statement more coercive by eliminating the voluntary nature usually invoked by the statement form. Sposta is more voluntary than gotta or hafta which do not allow for alternatives, but it has the additional force of implying an external authority.

better: (17) You better watch whose arm yer gettin' paint on.

This form increases the coercion level of a directive by giving it the force of a threat. In form, it implies that the addressee will benefit from compliance; i.e., she may avoid some physical injury by performing as instructed. This does not leave the impression that compliance is voluntary.

intonation: (18) WAIT!

Intonation is the most difficult type of modification to deal with objectively. It can decrease the ambiguity inherent in otherwise ambiguous forms. For example, "Are you guys through?" is an ambiguous
directive because it can be interpreted as a request for information and because the addressee is not clearly specified. However, someone waiting to use the glue and growing impatient might ask the above question with an intonation pattern which would reduce the possibility of interpretation as an information question and more clearly specify the addressee. By the same token, a stern or threatening tone of voice reduces the addressee's opportunity to display any voluntariness in compliance. While the importance of tone in raising the level of coerciveness is obvious, classifying the tone in an objective fashion is quite difficult. The researcher must depend on her own interactional skills, and the outcome is obviously subjective. Kashinsky and Weiner (1969) did research on the response to tone of voice by subjects from different socioeconomic classes and referred to the varieties of tone simply as positive, negative, and neutral without further elaboration.

2. Those which decrease the level of coercion:

(-1 point)

intonation

Just as intonation can be used to decrease ambiguity and voluntariness, so can it be used to increase both. When an imperative is issued with question intonation, it loses some of its imperative
force since it seemingly calls for an answer as well as or rather than an action. Also, what is commonly described as "whining" decreases the level of coercion since it underscores the speaker's lack of control and power and, therefore, her low status relative to the addressee.

**tag question:** (18) Open this, will you?

The tag reduces the opening imperative almost to the level of the closing question by giving it the tentativeness and ambiguity of the request question.

**modal auxiliary:** (19) Would you help me?

Using a modal increases the voluntariness and the ambiguity of the request by modifying the tone of the central verb.

**address term:** (20) Henri, help me.

The address term, although it decreases the ambiguity, increases the solidarity to such a great extent that it lowers the overall coercion level.

**politeness marker:** (21) Somebody please help me.

Additions such as please are culturally designated as polite and, therefore, noncoercive.

**indefinite pronoun:** (22) Somebody pass me the glue.

Making the addressee indefinite clearly opens the door to unexplained non-compliance. One may simply choose to assume that the request was not intended for her. It is, therefore, both ambiguous and voluntary.
2nd person plural pronoun: (23) Ya'll come on.

This accomplishes approximately the same thing as the indefinite pronoun in that the directive is not specific and may, therefore, be ignored by any one individual.

well: (24) Well, you're gonna hafto.

Well indicates a sense of hesitancy on the part of the speaker which may be interpreted as lending an air of voluntariness to the directive.

all right: (25) All right, everybody pick one.

OK: (26) OK, yer gonna take it, and yer gonna cut it.

All right and OK are organizing devices which structure both the verbal and physical aspects of the interaction (Merritt, 1976). They receive a -1 on the coercion scale because they carry a sense of mutual involvement and cooperation, thereby invoking solidarity. They borrow at least the connotation of their other use as terms of acceptance and agreement.

Just: (27) Just put one cut in for me.

Although just has many uses, the only one considered here is the apparent lessening of the seriousness of the request being made. In a sense, it says, "That's all there is to it. I'm not asking too much."

The list of modifiers is flexible and can be expanded. Those listed above are from the data of the present study.
Additions. In a few cases, a phrase or clause is added to the directive to decrease or increase its coerciveness. Three additions seem to be salient in lowering the coerciveness, and one is relevant in increasing it.

1. Explanation: (-1 point)

(28) Let me. I can.

(29) Stop that. It hurts my nerves.

The "I can" in (28) explains the rationale for complying with the directive, "Let me." It is reasonable to let her do the task because she is capable of performing it. This lowers the coercion of the directive because it indicates that the speaker believes that the addressee merits an explanation. It also indicates that compliance with the directive is viewed as voluntary or the explanation would not be necessary.

"It hurts my nerves," in (29) explains why the request to "stop that" is being issued.

2. Disclaimer: (-1 point)

(39) I guess you just turn it over and press.

The disclaimer shifts some of the responsibility for the directive away from the speaker and makes it less coercive by letting the addressee know that the speaker herself is not totally committed to it. By doing so, she makes compliance more voluntary.
3. Condition: (-1 point)

(31) If Sarah wants it, give it to her.
(32) If you give me a red one, I'll give you a blue one.

A condition either states the circumstances under which the directive is to be performed as in (31), or it states the reward for complying as in (32). This lowers the coercion level because it decreases the scope of the request or specifies the reward for compliance. In either case, the condition makes the directive more voluntary: first, by leaving the decision for its actual performance in the hands of the addressee. She decides whether the condition has been met, and therefore, decides whether or not to comply with the directive. Second, the specification of the reward makes the directive clearly voluntary. The addressee has the option of claiming the reward by performing or not performing and forfeiting the reward.

4. First person plural: (-1 point)

(33) We could put this picture on it too.

The use of the first person plural increases the solidarity of the directive and, hence, lowers its coerciveness in the same way that the let's grammatical form operates. It attempts to draw the speaker and addressee(s) together in the proposed action.
5. Penalty: (+1 point)

(34) Stop flippin' that thing before I take it.

Again, the specification of a penalty decreases both the ambiguity of the directive and the voluntariness of compliance. In the case of penalties, it might be possible to weight the coerciveness of the addition by the seriousness of the penalty itself. For example, one might want to add more than one point for a penalty such as "Stop flippin' that thing or I'll kill you."

However, such a consideration would introduce two elements not dealt with in this study: First, one would have to assess the feasibility of the threat and determine whether it was serious or a sort of hyperbole or metaphor. Second, a middle class white observer would be placed in the position of ranking threats made by members of different social classes and ethnic groups. Both of these elements introduce a subjectivity and complexity which are beyond the scope of this investigation.

6. Expletive: (+1 point)

(35) Damn it. Get over here.

An expletive increases coercion both by diminishing solidarity and asserting power and by diminishing ambiguity. A directive introduced by an expletive leaves little to guess about on the part of the addressee.
**Deflection.** A deflected directive is one which is addressed to one person but intended for someone else within hearing range. It reduces the coerciveness by one point since it increases the ambiguity and disguises the fact that it is actually a directive. By increasing the ambiguity, it also increases the voluntariness of compliance since the intended addressee can simply opt to consider it to be addressed to someone else.

(36) She better go on around.

(37) She just say glue it; she don't tell you how.

It is essential that these be intended for someone who is within the immediate area whom the speaker knows can hear her.

**Repetitions.** After the preceding analysis has been performed a directive is assigned a coercion level total. If that directive is repeated, the total is altered to indicate the repetition. Three types of repetition are considered.

1. Repeat within a speaking turn: (+ half the original value)

(38) Give it to me. Give it to me.

The total already assigned to the directive is increased by fifty per cent. Again, this designation is somewhat arbitrary, but while it is more coercive to repeat a directive twice in one speaking turn, it
is not considered to be twice as coercive. With the first utterance, the speaker bids for the floor and attempts to get fellow interactants to attend to her. The second or third utterance of the same directive would not need the coercive force of the first. Further, it is modified by the law of diminishing returns.

2. Repeated in a later speaking turn: (-1 point)

If a directive is repeated in a different speaking turn, regardless of the addressee, it receives the total value of its first utterances minus one point. This rank is also arbitrary, but since the form of the directive is the same, and since it gets the floor for another turn, it does retain most of its force. However, the fact that it is repeated indicates that it was not successful and, therefore, decreases the speaker's power.

Multiple Directives. Some speakers utilize one speaking turn to issue more than one directive of substantively different content. Each directive issued after the first receives half the value it would receive if it were issued in a separate speaking turn.

(39) Turn your cup over. Cut the edges off. Put the pipe cleaner through.
Coding of Responses. A total of 883 directives was analyzed for the study. From that total 25% (200) were randomly selected for an analysis of their responses. Seven possible classifications were considered, and those responses analyzed were given a value ranging from +4 to -2 as indicated below. The value of the response is computed separately from the value of the directive.

1. Agreement: (4)
   
   (40) H: Let's paint 'em all blue.
   
   G: Yeah, let's.

   Agreement is a verbal assertion that the addressee accepts and approves of the directive.

2. Verbal compliance: (3)

   (41) G: Get me some glue.
   
   C: OK

   Verbal compliance is rated lower than agreement because, while it does indicate that the addressee is submitting to the will of the speaker, it does not overtly indicate approval of or agreement with the initial directive.

3. Question (2)

   (42) M: Give me some scissors.
   
   R: Where are they?

   A question indicates the intention to comply when the needed information has been provided,
4. Explained non-compliance: (1)

(43) R: Give me another stick.

S: I can't. We don't have anymore.

Explained non-compliance indicates that the addressee is not going to carry out the directive, but it still receives a value of 1 because it does not indicate any rebellion against the speaker or an assertion that the directive is incorrect, only that it is impossible.

5. No response: (0)

Since it is impossible to determine without video tapes whether no verbal response indicates that the speaker is complying with the directive non-verbally or ignoring it, this response has been given a value of zero.

6. Refusal: (-1)

(44) G: Herni, make yours a little fatter.

H: No.

A refusal is unexplained verbal non-compliance.

7. Contradiction: (-2)

(45) M: Put a circle right there.

T: That's dumb.

The contradiction not only indicates intentional non-compliance but also negatively evaluates the directive.
There are other possible responses to directives not accounted for in the scale above. For example, a question response such as the following, would not be a positive response:

M: Pass me the glue.
T: Whose gonna make me?

However, since no responses like the one above were found in the data, no attempt was made to place it on the scale of the instrument. The classification of responses in the study was more difficult than the classification of directives since the instrument for analyzing them is less precise and less complex.

**Determination of Addressee.** Because part of the study dealt with the receipt of directives, it was important to determine correctly who the addressee was. Three primary methods for making this determination were used:

1. Use of some type of address terms:

   Individual's name:
   
   (46) I need some help, Gina.

   Use of a nickname:
   
   (47) Come here, Hiwassee.

   Use of a title designated by the group itself:
   
   (48) Janitor, go get some paper towels.

   (49) OK, teacher, what do we do next?
In (48) Phyllis had appointed Barbara as janitor of the group earlier in the conversation, and in (49) "teacher" referred to the girl who was teaching the group a craft.

2. Linguistic context:

The directive as a response to a previous element:

(50) G: You don't have yours straight, Carla.
   C: Well, then, show me how I'm sposta get 'em straight.

Since Carla's directive was a response to Gina's remark, it seems reasonable to assume that it was addressed to Gina.

Addressee as next speaker:

(51) G: You write everything down.
   J: I don't want to write it. Get Hiawatha.

Directives frequently elicited verbal responses from the individual to whom they were addressed. Therefore, next speaker was often a clue to the addressee's identity. Furthermore, if the individual who responded to that directive was not the addressee, the interactants corrected the sequence.

(52) P: Watch whose arm you're gettin' paint on.
   B: I'm not touchin' your arm.
   P: Not you, Missy.

The directive was part of the inter-related flow of conversation. The question of the identity of the
addressee was a problem for the interactants as well as for the researcher, and the researcher could rely on many of the same clues which the participants themselves used. Also, when mistakes were made, the interactants themselves often corrected them.

3. Non-linguistic content:

(53) Yer sposta show us.

The addressee of this directive was made clear by something external to the linguistic situation, i.e., knowledge of who was supposed to show them. Again, if there was a mistaken identity, the girls themselves performed a repair.

(54) J: Sandi, yer sposta be teachin us, girl.
S: Not me, Carla is the one.
J: Teach us, then, if yer spos to.

Test of Validity of Categories in Coercion Level Index

In order to test the cognitive validity of the categories included in the portion of the Coercion Level Index which deals with the assignment of points to various components within a directive, a questionnaire was distributed to 100 respondents (see Appendix A for questionnaire and instructions). In each section, sentences representing each of the divisions within the three major categories outlined in the instrument were paired in six combinations. Other variables considered in the instrument
were held constant. Respondents were asked to indicate which sentence in each pair they would consider more polite and would use with a high status person. They were not given any further instructions. In Section I sentences representing each of the grammatical forms were paired with the following results:

(1) Statement more polite than imperative 85%
(2) Question more polite than imperative 98%
(3) Let more polite than imperative 69%
(4) Statement more polite than Let 83%
(5) Question more polite than Let 99%
(6) Statement more polite than question 71%

In Section II, the four possible benefactors of the action were paired in six combinations with the following results:

(1) Addressee as benefactor more polite than speaker as benefactor 68%
(2) Mutual benefit more polite than speaker as benefactor 80%
(3) Third party as benefactor more polite than speaker 87%
(4) Addressee as benefactor more polite than third party 51%
(5) Mutual benefit more polite than third party 54%
(6) Addressee as benefactor more polite than mutual 53%
This section proved to be the least valid in the last three comparisons. Respondents seemed to find little difference between the politeness implied by a directive intended to benefit the addressee rather than a third party. Nor did they note a significant difference in politeness between directives intended for mutual benefit as opposed to those intended for a third party. There was no statistically significant difference between directives with the addressee as benefactor as opposed to those providing mutual benefit. Numbers 4 and 6 above have only one point difference, and therefore, would not be expected to be widely divergent. However, number 5 has two points difference and is, therefore, the weakest point in the instrument.

In Section III, the four possible types of action requested were paired in six combinations with the following results:

1. Allow more polite than stop 75%
2. Delay more polite than stop 82%
3. Perform more polite than stop 89%
4. Allow more polite than perform 52%
5. Delay more polite than perform 80%
6. Allow more polite than delay 93%

The least significant difference was found in number 4, the difference between perform and stop directives. The
instrument allots only one point difference between these two, so they would not be expected to be widely divergent.

Although the responses did not correspond completely with the number of points assigned to each alternative, they did support the categories considered in the index because a majority of the respondents apparently judged coercion according to the same criteria as those used in the study. Therefore, for a majority of those responding to the questionnaire, the concerns of the index were cognitively salient.

In addition to testing the validity of the major categories, the questionnaire attempted to test the significance of the additions and modifications considered in the instrument. For this section, two sentences were paired, one containing the addition or modification and one without it. Respondents were again asked to indicate which sounded more polite. The following comparisons resulted:

Modifications:

Sentences without \textit{gotta} more polite than those with \textit{gotta} 97%
Sentences without \textit{hafta} more polite than those with \textit{hafta} 97%
Sentences with \textit{sposta} more polite than those with \textit{sposta} 74%
Sentences without \textit{better} more polite than those with \textit{better} 76%
Sentences with tag question more polite than without 82%
Sentence with model auxiliary more polite than without 96%
Sentences with address term more polite than without 90%
Sentence with politeness marker more polite than without 97%
Sentence with indefinite pronoun more polite than without 66%
Sentence with second person plural pronoun more polite 73%
Sentence with well more polite than without 68%
Sentence with OK more polite than without 78%
Additions:
Sentences with explanations more polite than without 88%
Sentences with disclaimers more polite than without 94%
Sentences with conditions more polite than without 94%
Sentences without penalties more polite than with 94%
Sentences with repeated directives in one turn less polite 96%
In every case the modification or addition was evaluated by a majority of the respondents in the same way it was evaluated by the instrument. (See Appendix B for examples of the application of the coercion level index to sample directives.)

Limitations of the Design

This study was limited by the following considerations:

1. The population of the study was not randomly selected.

2. The population consisted of only fifteen girls and, therefore, its predictive value for application to social class and ethnic groups in general was limited.

3. Ideally, the study would have consisted of four groups, the fourth consisting of children which could be classified as middle-class black. However, due to the limited size of the middle-class black population in the community where the research was conducted, no such group was available.

4. In both the selection of the groups and in the structured interactions, it was impossible to control such variables as the degree of familiarity of the girls within the groups and the familiarity
of the girls with the researcher and research assistants.

5. Two-thirds of the children came from a different socioeconomic class and/or ethnic group than the researcher. This class and ethnic difference may have introduced a bias in the data analysis.

6. Directives were marked for coercive intonation while being transcribed. This aspect of the analysis was highly subjective and offered several problems: Some kinds of intonation may elevate a directive far beyond one additional point which was all the system allowed.

7. Due to financial constraints, such technical devices as video tapes and multi-channel recorders were not utilized although they would have provided much valuable information.

8. Within the instrument used to analyze the coercion level of directives, some of the weightings were necessarily arbitrary because of the extreme complexity which would result from a less simplis- tic approach.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION
OF DATA

Since the intention of the present study was to determine how status was designated by the use of directives within each group studied and to determine whether there were any differences in the use of directives to designate status across class and ethnic lines, the following steps were undertaken in the analysis of the data. First, eleven conversations for each group were selected for analysis (see Table 2). The directives and responses from each conversation were then transcribed, and the speaker and addressee were noted. The total number of directives issued and received by each participant was established. Each directive was then analyzed in terms of the coercion level index (see Chapter III) and assigned a point value on the basis of its use of the major components, modifications, and additions. Responses were also analyzed in terms of the index, and a point value was assigned to each. A mean coercion level was then computed for each girl's directives as was a mean compliance level for her responses. The mean coercion level of the directives addressed to her was also computed as was the mean compliance level of the responses addressed to her.
Each participant's directives were also classified in terms of her selection of options within the major components in the index including Grammatical Form, Direction of Benefit, and Action Requested. There were four options within each of these three categories (see Chapter III), and the percentage of times each option was selected by each participant was calculated (see Appendix C). This operation provided a breakdown of the overall coercion level means into the consideration of the separate components selected in the formation of directives to indicate how the coercion level was achieved.

The final examination of the data was a non-statistical study of possible underlying strategies in directive formation. For this section of the analysis, repeated directives of the top, middle, and last ranked participants in each group were examined to determine what was reformulated in the repeat and what such reformulations might indicate about the strategy behind the formation of directives.

The information acquired through these processes will be presented under four major headings: (1) Uses of Directives, (2) Responses to Directives, (3) Selection of Directive Components, and (4) Directive Formation Strategy. This organization attempts to move from the largest unit, the whole directive, to the breakdown of the directive into
its component parts, and finally to a hypothetical discussion of the strategy underlying the foregoing data.

Because the study herein reported represents a methodological compromise between the strictly controlled experiment and the relatively uncontrolled observation, the presentation of the data will also represent something of a compromise between the format generally used in reporting experiments and that used in reporting observations of an ethnographic nature. While convention generally separates the subjective discussion from the findings in the report of an experiment, in an ethnography the discussion and the findings are inextricably intertwined. In this chapter the findings of the study will be presented under each of the four headings listed above, and a discussion of the findings will follow, separated only by a subhead. This structure is intended to allow adequate separation between objective and subjective analysis without their complete divorce.

**Uses of Directives**

**Method of Analysis**

In order to determine how status was indicated by the use of directives, each participant's sociometric rank was compared to her rank in each of the following areas: the relative coerciveness of the directives she issued, the number of directives she issued, the relative coerciveness of the directives addressed to her, and the number of
directives addressed to her. Ranks were compared using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. After these calculations had been performed for each of the three groups, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to ascertain existing similarities among the groups in the uses of directives outlined above (see Table 4, p. 175).

This section of analysis will include a comparison of sociometric rank and (1) the coerciveness of directives issued, (2) the number of directives issued, (3) the coerciveness of directives received, and (4) the number of directives received.

Adult Use of Directives as Described in the Literature

Although it was not a goal of the present study to compare the use of directives by children to that of adults, the adult model, because of its description in the literature, has been used as a frame of reference and merits a brief discussion to demonstrate its relevance to the analysis of the children's data. The findings of directive studies among adults have indicated that higher status persons issued more coercive directives than lower status persons, and that higher status persons also generally issued more directives than lower status persons (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Brown and Levinson, 1974; Lakoff, 1973; Dirksen, 1975b; Newmark, 1975; and Murray, 1975). They have also contended that more coercive directive forms
were issued to persons of lower status relative to the speaker, that less coercive forms were issued to higher status persons, and that lower status persons received more directives than high status persons.

Although Ervin-Tripp (1976) indicated that circumstances of stress or emergency altered the pattern of directives, Lakoff (1973:296-297) contended that, barring such emergencies, it is more important to adults to recognize status appropriately through the use of directives than to be effective in achieving compliance. Her observations indicated that ambiguity and possibility for non-compliance were essential in directives given upward by lower-status persons even if that ambiguity resulted in non-compliance or in the utterance not being interpreted as a directive.

Dirksen (1975b) and Murray (1975) noted in the Watergate Transcripts that directives issued to Nixon by his underlings were frequently so ambiguous and voluntary that they did not achieve compliance. Nevertheless, they were not repeated in less ambiguous terms. Again, it appeared that the marking of intra-group status was more critical than achieving effectiveness in communication. For adults, then, it has been demonstrated that, under normal circumstances, high intra-group status results in (1) high coerciveness in directives issued, (2) low
coerciveness in directives received, (3) high frequency in directives issued, and (4) low frequency in directives received.

The following charts illustrate hypothetical cases built on the adult model. The first column represents the ranking of status for each participant with the highest ranked person as 1. The second column contains the ranking by relative coerciveness of directives with the most coercive ranked as 1. The final column contains the ranking of the relative coerciveness of directives received with the most coercive ranked as 1. As the chart indicates, there is a direct one-to-one correspondence between high status and coerciveness of directives issued and an inverse one-to-one correspondence between status and coerciveness of directives received.

The same pattern emerges when one compares the number of directives issued and received to intra-group status. As a function of high status, the first ranked person issues the most and the most coercive directives and receives the least and the least coercive directives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intra-group Status</th>
<th>Number of Directives Issued</th>
<th>Number of Directives Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the descriptions presented in the literature, the two patterns above describe adults' use and receipt of directives to indicate status.

Differences Between Adult Model and Children's Model

In recognition of the information already compiled about the use of directives by adults to indicate status, the children's data were analyzed to compile similar information. However, even though the children's data were analyzed in reference to the adult model, several differences existed which affected the form taken by the children's models. First, as indicated earlier, the adult studies were conducted in groups where status was marked by office or role; it was not dynamic and was not in the process of being created. In the children's study, however, status was not pre-determined and was, in a sense, being negotiated throughout the study. Sociometric questions asked at different times netted different results, and the final sociometric rankings resulted from the combination of all the information taken throughout the study. Therefore, results from the children's data were not expected to be as
clear-cut as those taken from adult observations since status was more fluid than in comparable adult studies.

Secondly, the status ranks in adult studies have been considered to be reasonably equidistant; e.g., the status difference between a resident and an intern in a hospital setting has not been differentiated from the status difference between an intern and a nurse. In uncontrolled observations these status differences cannot be manipulated and other factors such as age, sex, and seniority might alter the distance between status positions. Nevertheless, little has been made in adult studies of the differences between status intervals. In the area of status interval differences, the adult model differed from the children's model in the present study in two major ways: First, the intervals in adult studies have generally been larger than those in the present study. For example, the status difference between Nixon and Haldeman in the Oval Office was probably greater than the status difference between the first and second ranked children in any of the three homogeneous groups under consideration. The fact that status was being negotiated during the study indicated that the differences between ranks, in most cases, were relatively small. Second, the status ranks among the children were not equidistant as reported by the sociometric questions (see Table 3). For example, in the middle-class white group, first ranked Kerry was named nine times in answer to
the questions, and second ranked Dani was named seven times, a difference of only two. In the working-class black group, however, first ranked Gina was named sixteen times and second ranked Henri was named five times, a difference of eleven. There was, therefore, a considerably greater status difference between Gina and Henry than between Kerry and Dani. In short, the status differences as represented by the sociometric rankings were ordinal, and the actual difference between any two participants may have had a significant effect on the data. The statistical methods used in this section of the analysis were designed for the analysis of ordinal data.

Third, because no quantitative examination of the coercion level of directives has been accomplished in adult studies, the amount of difference between directives of different types has not been considered. While modulations have been discussed, and some researchers (most notably Brown and Levinson, 1974) have described a complex directive hierarchy, the actual amount of difference between forms such as the imperative and the question and between the question and the statement has not been quantitatively described. Therefore, the difference between forms has been tacitly assumed to approximately equal. However, in the present study the ranks of directive coerciveness were ordinal as were the status ranks, and again, the amount of difference between given ranks may have affected the analysis.
Fourth, whereas lower status adults might risk not being understood rather than risk inappropriate social status marking, it was hypothesized that the children would deviate from the adult model in the following ways: Regardless of class or ethnicity, it was projected that the children would follow a strategy which indicated a preference for lack of ambiguity and, hence, coerciveness. The marking of social status would be less significant to the children when communicating their desires and achieving compliance with their requests.

Nevertheless, it was hypothesized that there would be differences between the children in their use of directives, which could be attributed to intra-group status. The following correspondence between sociometric rank and coerciveness of directives was projected. This

Projected correspondence between status and coerciveness for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric rank</th>
<th>Coercion of directives issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

distribution was projected because of the hypothesized tendency of lower ranked children to exert more coercion during the conversation than middle ranked children.

Whereas lower status adults generally risked not being
understood rather than risking inappropriate social status marking, it was hypothesized that low status children would prefer to use coercive forms upward, valuing lack of ambiguity over social status marking. In essence, it was projected that high and middle status children would follow the adult model, but that lower status children would have to try harder to be attended to and to achieve compliance, and thereby, would drive their coercion level above that of the middle status participants.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that the children's use of directives to indicate status would differ from the adult model in the following ways:

1. It would be less clear cut because of the constant negotiation of status, because of the variable size of status intervals, and because of the variable difference between coercion level averages.

2. Lower status children would be comparatively more coercive than middle status children and low status adults because of their value of lack of ambiguity over marking of social status. It was further hypothesized that the middle-class white group would most nearly resemble the adult model presented in the literature since the subjects for the adult description were primarily middle-class whites.
The statistical hypotheses for this section of analysis were: (1) There is no difference between the children's projected model and the children's use of directives; and (2) There is no difference between the adult model and the children's use of directives.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Coercion of Directives Issued

**Middle-Class White.** The actual data from the study revealed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Coercion Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compliance with projected child model $r = -.025$

°Compliance with adult model $r = -.1$

() Number of times mentioned in sociometric questions

The middle-class white group did not comply with the projected child model except in one instance, the case of third ranked Robbi whose coercion level was fifth. However, despite the limited concordance between the details of these results and the projected outcome, the rankings did correspond with the trends outlined above. The second ranked person, Dani, was the most coercive. Although it was anticipated that this position would be held by the first ranked person, Dani (2) received only two
fewer votes than Kerry (1), making the social distance between them a relatively small one, and therefore, making their reversed position more understandable. Furthermore, the second most coercive person was Sarah, who ranked fourth sociometrically, three points removed from Robbi (3). It was projected that the last ranked person sociometrically would be the most or second most coercive. For this group, therefore, both null hypotheses were rejected.

Discussion. Observations of this particular group indicated that the first three ranked participants, Kerry (1), Dani (2), and Robbi (3), were all contenders for group leadership. This was indicated by their sociometric placement which varied only three points and which, at some point during the study, placed each as number one. Sarah (4), in contrast, demonstrated by her behavior a strong desire to be part of this group and was marginally a member although she at no time either appeared to be the leader or emerged as leader in the sociometric questioning. Marci (5), on the other hand, was more isolated socially than Sarah (4). She was also only a marginal member but participated actively in the conversations. Marci (5) was the youngest participant in her group, and she did not compete for group status as actively as did Sarah (4); therefore, it was not surprising that Sarah (4) rather than Marci (5) was the second most coercive since Sarah (4) was more
competitive and more concerned about being attended to and about achieving compliance.

For the middle-class white group, the rankings indicated a more clear-cut description of what was happening than did an examination of the actual coercion level averages. Although there was little difference between the coerciveness of Kerry (1), Sarah (4), and Marci (5), there was considerable difference between that of Dani (2) and Robbi (3). Dani's (2) exceptionally high level (12.056), the highest of any of the fifteen participants, could be explained in part in either of two ways: One, Dani (2) perceived herself to be the leader of the group, meriting highest status, and acted accordingly; or two, she perceived the lack of clearly designated leadership in the group and became highly coercive in an attempt to be recognized as the leader. Neither of these explanations was wholly satisfactory, but the second would more fully account for Dani's (2) average being the highest in the study as well as in her group.

However, Robbi's (3) was the lowest coercion level average (8.376) among the fifteen participants. Since she was also a contender for the group leadership position and issued more directives than anyone else, her low average was unexplainable. The only insight provided by observations of the group which would help account for this difference was highly speculative and, since it was not backed
up by quantitative data, should be viewed as tentative; that is, Dani (2), throughout the study, did not appear to be oriented toward the completion of the assigned tasks. Her topic switches were generally away from the subject under discussion, and when the group broke up into pandemonium, it was usually under Dani's (2) guidance. (For example, on one occasion, she discovered a stack of song books, passed them out, and led the group in choruses for approximately half an hour.) Her leadership was away from the tasks presented. Therefore, a possible, tentative explanation for her unusually high coercion level was that in order to change a topic or an activity, one must be relatively more coercive than if the goal is to maintain or accomplish a task or topic.

Whereas Dani (2) was described by the research assistants as least cooperative, Robbi (3) was described as most cooperative. Her directives were generally oriented toward the completion of the assigned tasks, and seldom was she responsible for moving the group away from assigned topics or designated projects. Therefore, if Dani's (2) high coercion level was partially explained by her lack of orientation toward completing group goals, Robbi's (3) low coercivness could, in part, be explained by her orientation toward working within assigned limitations and not exerting the coerciveness necessary to lead the group to new activities.
Although in the middle-class white group the trends of the expected model were followed and deviance could partially be explained by observation data, the most surprising finding of this comparison was the complete lack of correspondence between the middle-class white children's performance and the model based on the behavior of middle-class white adults ($r_s = .1$). This lack of correspondence could have resulted from at least three sources: First, as mentioned above, the social status in this group was quite fluid and fluctuated considerably during the study. This lack of a firmly established social hierarchy might have affected the enactment of the adult model. For example, it was possible that Dani (2) (who ranked second sociometrically and first in coercion) perceived herself to be the leader and behaved accordingly. Second, the children might not have internalized the adult model by the age of twelve. Or, third, although they might have internalized the adult model, they might have been operating on the basis of their own sociolinguistic rules which were not brought to light by this study.

**Working-Class White.** The results from the working-class white group partially followed the projected pattern. For this group, the highest ranked person, Phyllis (1), was also the most coercive, following both the expected child model and the adult model. The third ranked person was, as
Sociometric Directives Issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No. Coercion Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis (8) 1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara (7) 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay (5) 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy (3) 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry (2) 5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compliance with projected child model \( r_S = -0.825 * 
°Compliance with adult model \( r_S = -0.6 
() Number of times mentions in sociometric questions anticipated, the lowest ranked in coercion. However, the fifth ranked was third in coercion rather than second as expected. For this group null hypothesis 2 was rejected, and null hypothesis 1 was accepted.

Discussion. The existing deviation from the projected pattern was partially explainable in terms of the sociometric fluidity of the group. Furthermore, the working-class white group complied with the projected child model with an \( r_S \) of .825 which is statistically significant at the .10 level but not at the .05 level. Although Phyllis (1) was clearly the established leader throughout the study, Barbara (2) was behind her by only one point. Therefore, it was not surprising that Barbara (2) exhibited the power behavior in directive construction characteristic of the top ranked individual. Terry (5), the fifth ranked party, was somewhat excluded from the group as was Marci (5) in the preceding group. Although Terry (5) was not an isolate, she did not appear to compete for group membership
or leadership and was, therefore, not as competitive in attempting to achieve compliance as was projected.

The most notable outcome of the rankings of this group was the compliance in three of the five cases with the adult model. Again, Barbara's (2) proximity to the leadership position may have elicited her second ranked coercive behavior. The status ranks in this group were more apparent to the participants early in the study as exhibited by the sociometric questioning and were, therefore, more stable. The clarity of the status of each individual probably contributed to this group's closer emulation of the adult model. They understood their status ranks earlier and marked them with relatively conventional directive formation. While this partial correspondence with the adult model was not conclusive, it did suggest that the working-class white children had some knowledge of how middle-class white adults indicate status through the use of directives.

**Working-Class Black.** The result of the comparison of social status and coerciveness was most like the projected profile among the working-class black group. For this group, there was complete concordance with the projected model for children, producing an $r_s$ of .875 which is significant at the .10 level. Gina (1), the first ranked sociometrically, was second most coercive. Janice (3), who
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued No.</th>
<th>Coercion Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11.545</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.345</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.983</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.488</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.875</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compliance with projected child model \( r_s .875*  
Compliance with adult model \( r_s .5  
() Number of times indicated in sociometric questions

ranked third sociometrically, ranked last on coercion, and Carla (5), who placed fifth sociometrically, was most coercive. Because of Gina's (1) very high status, accumulating 16 of 20 possible sociometric "votes," the hierarchy in this group was clearly established from the beginning of the study, and the ranking did not change with subsequent questioning. Furthermore, Gina's (1) placement was considerably higher than Henri's (2) who received only 5 votes. Therefore, the top rank category in this group was a wide interval, and the second ranked person was a considerable distance from the leadership of the group. The clearly established and stable status evidenced in this group undoubtedly contributed to the compliance with the projected model. This group did not comply with the adult model, producing an \( r_s \) of .5 which is not significant at the .05 level or at the .10 level. For the working-class black group null hypothesis 1 was rejected. Null hypothesis 2 was accepted.
Discussion. Initially, it might appear that Carla's (5) status as an isolate should have brought her coercion level down as it appeared to do for Marci (MCW-5) and Terry (VCW-5). However, the organization of this group was slightly more complex than was indicated by the sociometric information. It was divided into two segments, one consisting of Gina (1) and Henri (2), and one consisting of Janice (3), Sandy (4), and Carla (5). Although ranked last sociometrically, Carla (5) played a more active role in the conversations than did Sandy (4) as was indicated by the number of directives issued by each (40 for Carla and 14 for Sandy). Carla (5) was a member of the same neighborhood play group as Janice (3) and Sandy (4) and was generally considered to be "one of the gang," although perhaps somewhat marginal. Her position was more analogous to that of Sarah (MCW-4) in the middle-class group; i.e., she was marginal and, therefore, competed more actively to achieve compliance through lack of ambiguity and coerciveness. Furthermore, this group was well-acquainted before the research began and thus exhibited little formal politeness.

Considering the significant differences between the status ranks of the first and second persons, the minimal difference in coercion level means was of some interest. Although the sociometric placement of the second through the fifth ranked persons was orderly and their status
equidistant, it would follow from existing theories that a person ranked as high as Gina (1) would exhibit significantly more coercive behavior. Again, observation of the group speculatively suggested a possible explanation. Like Robbi (MCW-3) in the middle-class white group, Gina (1) was described by the research assistants as the most cooperative group member. As the oldest participant and the obvious leader of the group, Gina (1) frequently assisted younger group members in completing their projects. She was very goal-oriented throughout the study, and, like Robbi (MCW-3), she focused her directives on the successful completion of the tasks assigned. Therefore, Gina's (1) relatively low coercion level (i.e., low when considered in the context of her status) may have resulted, as did Robbi's (MCW-3), from the circumstance that it apparently did not require as much coercion to keep fellow participants "on task" as it did to lead them into other activities.

The complete compliance with the expected child model eliminated the possibility of compliance with the adult model. It cannot be assumed that this lack of compliance indicated a lack of knowledge of the adult model, however, since many other factors were influencing the use of directives among members of this group.

**Inter-Group Comparison.** None of the three groups exhibited any significant compliance with the adult model.
for the relationship between status and coerciveness presented in the literature. However, the two working class groups exhibited significant compliance with the projected child model in which the lowest status person demonstrated the most coerciveness or coerciveness equal to that of the highest status person. This tendency, therefore, may be a class-related phenomenon.

Inter-group comparisons on grosser measures indicated some suggestive differences. The working-class black group issued the most directives in the course of the conversations. However, too much cannot be made of this since the conversations were not controlled in terms of time, and since the activities differed somewhat from group to group; i.e., in the peer teacher situations, each child selected her own craft. These numbers could only be significant in the context of the total number of utterances issued during the conversations, and since this information was not relevant to the designation of status within the groups, it was not calculated.

The working-class black group was also the most coercive, rating almost a full point above the working-class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class/ Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number of Directives</th>
<th>Coercion Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>10.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>10.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>11.447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
white group and 1.1 above the middle-class white group. However, the distribution of coercion among the working-class black participants was considerably more democratic than among either of the other groups. There was only .9 difference between the most coercive person in the black group and the least coercive person. Furthermore, there was only .56 difference between the highest status person and the least coercive person despite the difference of 13 points in their sociometric rank. In the middle-class white group, there was a difference of 3.68 between the most and least coercive persons, and a difference of 1.88 between the highest status person and the least coercive person despite a minimal sociometric difference of 3. Therefore, even though the coercion level mean was higher in the working-class black group, coercive power was much more evenly distributed than in the middle-class white group. The working-class white group was intermediate with an overall coercion average of 10.491. The difference between the most and least coercive participants was 1.36. The most coercive person was also the highest status, separated from the least coercive person by 3 sociometric points.

Therefore, even though status was more clearly indicated and more stable in the working-class black group, coercive power was more evenly distributed among the participants in that group than among other groups. The
working-class white group demonstrated some distribution of coercion among various participants, and the middle-class white group contained both the most coercive and the least coercive participants in the study in spite of the group's fluid social status. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to compare the top, middle, and lowest persons sociometrically in each group on the basis of the coercion level of their directives. This produced no statistically significant results (see Table 4).

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Number of Directives Issued

Although some differences were projected between the use of directives by adults and by children in terms of the coercion of directives issued, the same differences were not projected in the number of directives issued. It was hypothesized that the number of directives issued by respective participants would roughly correspond with their sociometric rank in keeping with the adult model. As in the previous comparison, it appeared that the relevant factors affecting the relationship between sociometric rank and the number of directives issued would be the size and stability of status intervals. An additional factor was also considered significant, the amount of difference between participants in the total number of directives issued. In other words, the rankings according to number of directives issued were also ordinal, and the
Table 4. Inter-group Comparison of Ranked Order of Directives Issued and Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>WCB</th>
<th>WCW</th>
<th>MCW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Rank</td>
<td>highest</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issued:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issued: w = .086  
$s = 40$  
Received: w = .116  
$s = 54$  
Issued: w = .159  
$s = 74$  
Received: w = .60  
$s = 60$  
Issued: w = .0398  
$s = 18.5$  
Received: w = .0645  
$s = 30$

$s$ value @ .01 l.s. = 75.6.
difference between some ranks was much larger than the difference between others.

For this aspect of the analysis, each group member was ranked according to the total number of directives she issued, and this rank was again compared to her sociometric rank. A Spearman Rank Coefficient of Correlation was used to test for statistical significance between the rankings. The statistical hypothesis for this section of the data was that there is no difference between the adult model and the children's performance in the relationship between status and number of directives issued.

Middle-Class White. These rankings did not correspond with what was projected, and the correlation was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s .1$

The lack of concordance was again partially explained by the fluidity of the social status situation within this group. However, this would not account for Kerry's (1) combination of highest status and lowest number
of directives. Furthermore, Kerry (1) used significantly fewer directives than the person ranked fourth in directive use, Marci (5), so distance between ranks did not account for Kerry's (1) low rating. Again, the relationship between Kerry (1), Dani (2), and Robbi (3) was an interesting and problematic one, and the results of their rankings could only be approached through a discussion of the observations made during the study.

Discussion. As was indicated in the previous section, Dani (2) frequently moved the group away from the assigned activities, while Robbi (3) accepted a large portion of the responsibility for their completion. Kerry (1), on the other hand, was more of a loner than the other two, completing her tasks diligently but without accepting much responsibility for the group as a whole. Dani (2) was the most charismatic member of the group, the one who generated the most excitement and initiated the most action. She was frequently named as the person other participants would most like to be like. However, she was, in effect, a counter-leader.

Robbi (3), in contrast, may have alienated some group members by her concern over the successful completion of the tasks and her constant refutation of Dani's (2) leadership away from the assignments. Kerry (1) was efficient and detached. Although she did not spark the
kind of enthusiasm generated by Dani (2), she was well-liked and considered to be responsible and capable. She was not oriented toward getting the group to perform the assigned tasks although she performed them capably herself. Superficial observation of the group would lead to the conclusion that Robbi (3) and Dani (2) were the top competitors for group leadership with Kerry (1) a somewhat distant third. However, it appeared that in the actual sociometric tabulation, Robbi (3) and Dani (2) "split the vote" to some extent, leaving Kerry (1) in first place. While this analysis was far from conclusive, the relationship among the top three ranked persons in this group appeared to be affecting their use of directives to indicate status.

Sarah's (4) relatively high frequency of directive use might have been influenced by her marginal status and her desire to be included in the group. A similar explanation might be offered for Marci's (5) rank as third in frequency of directives. Their desire to be included in group activities and to be considered group members may have encouraged them to issue more directives.

*Working-Class White.* The working-class white group produced the following ratings. Two of the five participants followed the expected pattern: the first ranked girls issued the most directives, and the fourth ranked person
sociometrically also ranked fourth in number of directives issued. An important factor in the ranking of this group was the wide differentiation in number of directives issued by the various participants, ranging from Phyllis' (1) 143 to Kay's (3) 8. The size of the intervals was, therefore, quite different, and this difference probably affected the analysis. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

Discussion. The difference between Phyllis' (1) and Kay's (3) number of directives was probably a function of their individual styles, a concern outside the scope of this examination. Phyllis (1) was known as a "loud mouth" and was frequently accused of monopolizing conversations. Kay (3), in contrast, was quite reserved in conversation, and several of the directives addressed to her were commands such as "Talk," or "Say something."

Her very small number of directives indicated that she was not playing an active role in managing the activities of the group. Therefore, a relevant question in terms
of this group's sociometric organization was why she was ranked third by her fellow participants. Although age and intra-group status did not correlate for all group members, it was, perhaps, a factor in Kay's (3) sociometric ranking since she was the oldest participant in her group. Furthermore, Kay (3) was a basketball star on her school team and was well-known in her neighborhood for her skill at the sport. These two points were considered significant because they came up repeatedly in the taped conversations. These two assets may have elevated her sociometric position in spite of the fact that she did not exhibit a leadership role in the group.

Terry (5), on the other hand, the other person whose rank in number of directives issued did not correspond with her sociometric rank, was a marginal group member, and she may have perceived her status to be higher than it actually was. She did play an active role in directing group activities.

Therefore, this group demonstrated adherence to the projected model to a considerable degree even though the rank comparisons were not statistically significant. The group was, again, responding to its own unique dynamics as well as to the expected sociolinguistic design.

Working-Class Black. There was significant correspondence between social status and frequency of directives
in the working-class black group. For this group, the first ranked person through the third ranked person demonstrated a direct relationship between the number of

directives issued and sociometric rank; and the fourth and fifth ranked persons reversed the expected frequency. In this group, therefore, there was a statistically significant correspondence between status and the number of directives issued as was demonstrated by the $r_s$ value of .90 which is significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was confirmed.

This positive correspondence with the expected model was predictable in terms of the size and stability of the status ranks in this group. Sandy (4) and Carla (5), the two participants who did not follow the expected model, were very close sociometrically, deviating only by one point. Carla's (5) larger number of directives was at least partially the result of the fact simply that she talked more than Sandy (4) and, therefore, was likely to issue more directives.
**Inter-Group Comparison.** The sociometric rank, the mean coercion level, and the frequency rank of directives issued were compared across group boundaries by Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. This analysis indicated no statistical significance in the way in which participants in each group were ranked. This lack of statistical significance indicated two things: one, there was no significant difference among the groups which could be accounted for as a function of class and/or ethnicity; and two, the rankings of the children were not the simple result of the one-to-one correlation between social status and coercion or frequency of directives issued as described by the adult model.

Nevertheless, in spite of the lack of statistical significance in the comparison of the three groups, there were some interesting differences. The middle-class white group demonstrated no correspondence between the adult model and their own performance in the number of directives issued. This group appeared to be responding to more subtle considerations relating to the flexibility of the social status and the competition for group membership and leadership. The working-class white group exhibited some correspondence to the projections, and their deviation was partially explainable in terms of the individual characteristics of group members, the difference in number of directives issued by participants, and the possible
underlying factors in the sociometric ranking. The working-class black group exhibited significant concordance with the projected model, partly because of the stability of the status ranks within that group. Since the issuing of directives in terms of status depended in part on the individual's perception of herself and her relationship to other group members in terms of her status, this close approximation of the adult model, in which participants' statuses are clear to each other and to themselves, suggested that the status designation within the group was clear to the participants. The girls may have understood what their status was during the study with the possible exception of Carla (5) and Sandy (4) who were, in fact, very close sociometrically. This possible awareness of their social position could have resulted, in part, from Gina's (1) overwhelming position of leadership which was recognized by all the participants. It might also be attributable to ethnic factors.

Abrahams (1964) described the role of the female in the black community, and Mitchell-Kernan (1969) pointed out the importance of older siblings and older children in teaching younger children and in regulating their behavior. Therefore, Gina (1), the oldest member of her group may have been assuming a leadership role which was commonly accepted among the group members. She may have become the adult substitute described by Abrahams and Mitchell-Kernan,
and her status within her group might, therefore, have taken on added significance and elicited more pronounced marking than was evident in the white groups.

Similar stability or clarity of position did not exist in the other two groups although it was more evident in the working-class white group than in the middle-class group. Again, it appeared, however, that the differences in performance among the three groups were the result of responses to the group's unique dynamics rather than to either class or ethnicity.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Coercion of Directives Received

A consideration of the directives issued by participants provided only half the picture of how directives were used to indicate status. Perhaps even more revealing than who used coercive directives was the consideration of to whom those directives were addressed. (For a discussion of how the addressee was determined see Section 10 of Coercion Level Index, Chapter III.) In the adult model, more coercive directives were addressed downward and to peers. Ervin-Tripp (1972) also indicated that such factors as the unaddressed receiver, the territory in which the request was made, the volume of the request, and the degree of familiarity between interactants influenced the coerciveness of directives among adults. Factors which may have influenced the children's use which were not
considered in the adult model were the same as those mentioned in previous sections: (1) the ordinal nature of the status rankings and the coercion level mean rankings, and (2) the fluidity of the status ranks. However, despite these differences, it was hypothesized that the profile of adults and children would be similar.

Because it was projected that the highest status person sociometrically would receive the least coercive directives, the ranking of coerciveness was reversed with the least coercive mean ranked as 1. A Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was computed for each of the three comparisons in each of the three groups. Because some of the directives issued by individuals were addressed to the group as a whole and to addressees whose identity could not be determined, the total number of directives considered in this section of the analysis was smaller than in the previous sections. The statistical hypothesis for this section of analysis was that there is no difference between the adult model and the children's actual performance in the receipt of directives.

Middle-Class White. The middle-class white group produced the following configuration. For status ranked persons 1-4, there was a direct relationship between the coercion of directives received and social status. This
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Received No.</th>
<th>Mean Coercion Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s .00 \]

A high degree of concordance with the expected model was somewhat surprising given the dynamic nature of the status rankings in this group. However, the last ranked person received less coercive directives than anyone else. Despite the deviance of the last case, however, the decrease of coercion corresponding to the increase of status was meaningful. If the last case were deleted from consideration, the Spearman Rho would produce an \( r_s \) value of 1, complete correlation, but its presence negated any statistical significance. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

**Discussion.** Again, observations of the group helped to explain why Marci's (5) case was deviant. As mentioned earlier, Marci (5) was to some extent an isolate. Not only the youngest member of the group, she was the only one from her school. Although she attended church with the other participants and sang in the same choir, she was not considered to be an in-group member to the extent that Dani (2), Kerry (1), and Robbi (3) were, and she did not
compete for membership to the extent that Sarah (4) did. Therefore, it appeared that Marci (5) was being afforded the formal politeness due a stranger or an outsider. As indicated by Ervin-Tripp's analysis, more coercive forms are used with peers and close associates, whereas less coercive forms are used with strangers. From the functioning of the group during the testing sessions, it appeared to the researcher that Marci was, to some extent, considered by the others to belong to the "stranger" category. If this explanation were accepted, the middle-class group would demonstrate complete adherence to the adult model.

**Working-Class White.** The hypothesized correlation was not found in the working-class white group. A Spearman Rank Coefficient of Correlation was computed for these comparisons with a resulting $r_s = -.60$ which is not significant at the .10 level; therefore, no correspondence between social status and the mean coercion level of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Received</th>
<th>Coercion Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = -.6$
directives received was found for the working-class white group, and the null hypothesis was rejected. In fact, the comparisons indicated a trend in the opposite direction of the projection in that the two girls ranked first and second sociometrically received the most coercive directives. However, there was no great difference among the mean coercion levels of the directives received by any of the participants. Nevertheless, this group's use of directives tended to indicate a definite absence of concern over making directives less coercive when they were addressed to a high status person.

**Working-Class Black.** There was also no correspondence between social status and coercion of directives received in the working-class black group. In this group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Received Rank</th>
<th>Coercion Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = -0.7 \]

the most coercive directives were issued to the third ranked person rather than to the fifth ranked person who received the lowest level of coercive directives. No meaningful pattern emerged from this comparison, the \( r_s \) was not significant at the .10 level, and the null hypothesis
was rejected. Since Carla (5) was not an outsider in the same sense as Marci (MCW-5) was in the middle-class group, the low coerciveness issued to her could not be explained in terms of formal politeness used with a relative stranger. The use of the most coercive forms with Janice (3) was somewhat surprising since the coercion of the directives she issued was the lowest in her group and since she was the sociometric leader of the three younger girls. As with the working-class white group, the trend was in the opposite direction of the adult model.

Discussion. Observations of the group did not indicate any explanation based on the group's unique dynamics which might explain the pattern which emerged in the use of coerciveness. It appeared, rather, that this group was not marking status linguistically through variation in coerciveness in any manner which resembled the adult model described in the literature.

Inter-Group Comparison. In each previous section of analysis, the middle-class white group deviated more than either other group from both the expected child model of directive use and the established adult model. Their deviance was partially attributed to the inner dynamics of the group itself because of the fluidity of its status ranks. However, in spite of the lack of clarity concerning group leadership and the competition for leadership and
members, the middle-class white children perceived the status ranks within the group clearly enough, and considered them important enough, to mark status linguistically in precisely the same manner as adults. Although lower ranked members (e.g. Sarah [4]) exhibited power behavior by using coercive directives generally, they addressed less coercive directives to those they considered to be higher ranked or outsiders. This clear emulation of the adult model at least implied that the middle-class children had had some training in marking status linguistically in directive formation.

It also appeared that such training was absent in the working-class groups. In the working-class white group, status ranks in the previous sections of analysis appeared to be more stable and more clearly designated than in the middle-class group. However, the use of non-coerciveness in addressing higher status individuals was completely absent. The case in the black group was even more remarkable. The status in this group was clearly marked and comparatively inflexible. All the participants perceived from the beginning that Gina (1) was clearly the leader. However, in spite of that knowledge, they did not afford her any special linguistic marking for status through lack of coerciveness. In fact, she ranked fourth in being addressed with polite forms, and only Janice (3), the leader of the sub-group, was addressed in more coercive
terms. If a pattern exists within the working-class groups, it is responding to different characteristics than those presently considered in sociolinguistic rules concerning status and directive use. At any rate, the linguistic training and experience of the working-class children in the area of lessening coerciveness to mark the status of the addressee was decidedly different from that of the middle-class group. Of all the findings presented thus far, this difference appeared to be the most clearly a function of class rather than of the unique dynamics of the individual groups.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Number of Directives Received

The adult model of directive use to indicate status also demonstrated that higher status interlocutors received a smaller number of directives than lower status persons. Again, the flexibility and size of the status ranks in the present study and the size of the ranks of number of directives issued were factors in the children's data not considered in adult studies. However, it was hypothesized that the children would approximate the adult model in spite of the differences. Because it was projected that higher status persons would have fewer directives addressed to them than lower status persons, the rankings were reversed with the lowest number of directives ranked as 1.

The statistical hypothesis for this section of analysis was
that there is no difference between the adult model and the children's performance in the relationship between social status and number of directives received.

Middle-Class White. For the middle-class white participants there was some correspondence between the adult model and the children's performance. Although there was no statistically significant relationship between the sociometric rank and the frequency of directives received at the .05 level, the compliance was significant at the .10 level and the trend was toward compliance with the model. The first, second, and fourth ranked participants sociometrically received the expected rankings in terms of number of directives received. Only the third and fifth participants were reversed. The null hypothesis was confirmed.

Discussion. Since Robbi (3) issued more directives than anyone else in her group, it was perhaps not surprising that she also received the most. Furthermore, if
the idea that Marci (5) was receiving formal politeness as an isolate were accepted for the previous section, it would also apply in this case, perhaps even more forcefully since low receipt of directives could be an indication of limited inclusion in the conversations in general; i.e., Marci (5) was infrequently addressed by other participants in any fashion, not merely with directives. Her participation in conversation was primarily self-initiated in that she appeared to address others more often than they addressed her. In view of Marci's (5) special position in the group, the configuration of the middle-class white participants appeared to be fairly close to the adult model.

Working-Class White. There was no significant relationship between the number of directives received and the social status of members of the working-class white group, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Received No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = -.4$

$r_s$, although not significant at the .10 level indicates a trend toward an inverse relationship between social status
and the number of directives received. In fact, the two highest ranked participants, Phyllis (1) and Barbara (2), received more directives than anyone else. Close behind them was Terry (5), the last ranked participant, and the individual receiving the fewest directives, Missy (4), the fourth ranked participant. The pattern of number of directives received did not appear to be meaningful either in terms of the sociometric data or observations of the group dynamics. It appeared, therefore, that the working-class white group did not use the number of directives issued to individuals as a means of marking status.

**Working-Class Black.** The black group did not exhibit any correspondence with the hypothesized rankings, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Again, the negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Received No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = -0.4 \]

\(r_s\), although not significant, indicated a trend in the opposite direction of the adult model. As in the middle-class white group the first and second ranked participants received the most directives, contrary to the theory that they would use the least. For unexplained reasons, Sandy
(4), the fourth ranked participant who issued only 14 directives, received 41 to place her in third position. Again, this group did not appear to be marking status in any discernable fashion in terms of the number of directives received. Members also did not appear to be issuing directives to specific persons on the basis of group dynamics, and the outcome was not affected in explainable ways in terms of the differences in status ranks or other factors considered in this analysis. Judging from the rankings presented above, the working-class black group did not appear to consider the issuing of directives to persons in specific status ranks to be a function of status.

**Inter-Group Comparison.** Although the findings in this section were not as clear-cut as those in the preceding section, they did indicate that the middle-class group was attending to status within the group in addressing directives to specific individuals to a greater extent than were the other two groups. Again, this could have resulted from the middle-class children's internalization of the middle-class white adult model. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance revealed no statistical significance in a comparison of the three groups' use of received directives (see Table 4).
Summary of Findings

The statistical procedures performed on the data in this section produced four significant findings which can be discussed in terms of the class membership and ethnicity of the groups. The working-class groups differed from the middle-class group in three ways. First, the working-class groups complied with the projected child model in which the highest and lowest status participants were more coercive than the middle-status participants. The middle-class group did not comply with this configuration. Second, the working-class groups did not respond to intra-group status in issuing less coercive directives to high status persons whereas the middle-class group did. Third, the working class groups did not respond to intra-group status by issuing fewer directives to persons with high status whereas the middle-class group did.

The black group differed from the white groups in one way: black participants demonstrated a high correlation between intra-group status and the number of directives issued. The two white groups demonstrated no such correlation.

Implications of Data on the Use of Directives

First, since none of the groups corresponded significantly with the adult model in the relationship of status to coerciveness of directives issued, adults
interacting with children using a system comparable to that of the children in the study could misconstrue the children's intention and/or perception of their roles in the group if the adults interpreted the children's behavior in terms of the adult model. Although adult status is usually predetermined in interactions with children, the reverse misunderstanding is also possible; i.e., children, using their own rules, could misinterpret the adults' intention and/or perception of their roles. The foregoing implication is hypothetical based on an extrapolation of the findings of the study since adult-child interaction was not analyzed.

Second, more directly related to the findings of the study, an adult (e.g., a teacher, scout leader, etc.) observing the interaction of a group of working-class children could misinterpret which individuals were actually group leaders. Basing judgment on the number and coerciveness of directives as used in the adult mode, the observing adult could select the individual with the least actual leadership potential.

Third, because of the correspondence of the working-class groups with the projected child model, working-class children potentially face the considerable danger in being misunderstood by adults in terms of the adult use of the factors under consideration. When persons utilize coercion beyond the level deemed appropriate for their status, they
are interpreted as rude in adult society. Therefore, the highly coercive low status working-class child faces misunderstanding in interactions with adults and possibly with middle-class children.

Fourth, the middle-class group's response to status in issuing directives implies that the middle-class children were implicitly or explicitly instructed in the use of the politeness system of the middle-class which allows high status persons more voluntariness in compliance, and it conversely implies that working-class children did not receive this same instruction. When working-class children are interacting with peers or with adults from their own social class, presumably, there is no conflict in sociolinguistic rules, but a lower status working-class child's lack of response linguistically to high status in a mixed class group could lead to his social peril.

Again, adult-child interactions would reveal additional information on this subject as would mixed group interactions in which children from different socioeconomic groups interacted with each other. Even without this additional evidence, however, the trend indicated by the data in this study could help to explain the perception many middle-class adults have of working-class children as rude.
Responses to Directives

Method of Analysis

A total of 883 directives were examined for the study. From that total a random selection of 25% (200) were analyzed in terms of the responses they elicited. The responses were coded according to the index (see Chapter III) to determine their relative compliance. The compliance mean of the responses issued by each of the fifteen participants was then calculated, and each girl was ranked according to the relative compliance of the responses she issued. Her compliance level rank was then compared to her sociometric rank. It was further determined to whom each of the analyzed responses was addressed, and a mean compliance level of responses received by each girl was also calculated. The participants were then ranked according to the relative compliance of the responses addressed to them, and that ranking was compared first to each girl's sociometric rank and second to her mean coercion level rank. All the ranks were compared by the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient.

Although there have been several studies conducted on the uses of directives to indicate status, and although those studies have demonstrated how coerciveness and number of directives are used as functions of status, none of them has given systematic consideration to the other half of the
directive unit, the response. The present study, however, attempted to extend the examination of the designation of status through the use of directives to include a quantitative analysis of responses. A response was not considered to affect the coercion level of a directive issued for the first time since the directive has already been formulated and issued before the response is uttered. However, the response may be affected by the coerciveness of the directive, either toward or away from compliance, and the coerciveness of a repeated directive may be affected by the relative compliance of the first response. These two considerations will be taken up in some detail in later sections. Nevertheless, the response was considered to be significant in designating status as the following examples illustrate:

(1) Close the door.  
   Yes ma'am.

(2) Close the door.  
   Why don't you?

   While one could no doubt conceive of circumstances in which either of the two responses above could be offered to a person in a high status position, a common sense evaluation of the examples indicates that (1) is more likely to be addressed to a peer or a lower status person. The directive is unchanged, but the response indicates something about the status of the speaker in relation to the addressee.
The adult model of directive use, discussed in detail in the previous section, contended that high social status results in a larger number of more coercive directives. The model of expectations concerning responses was extrapolated from the model for directive formation based primarily on a consideration of the relative power of the interlocutors. One would assume that higher status persons would elicit more compliant responses and issue less compliant responses as a function of the power vested in their status, and conversely that lower status persons, functioning within the limitations inherent in their position, would elicit less compliant responses and issue more compliant responses. A change in the power relationship of the interlocutors should, therefore, result in a change in the types of responses issued and received. An excellent example of a power shift in progress can be found in Newmark's (1975) discussion of the Watergate Transcripts in which he compared two conversations between John Dean and President Nixon. In the first conversation, Dean was the lowest status person on the Nixon "team" and was very compliant. However, in the second conversation, Dean had announced that he was to testify before the Senate committee and expose the involvement of the White House in the Watergate cover-up. In the second conversation he was far less compliant than in the first. The power of the two individuals over each other had, in effect, reversed.
Because the children's social status ranks were not pre-determined and because the power relationships were not crucial, a clear-cut adherence to the model described above was not projected. However, it was hypothesized that the children would tend toward the indication of higher status through compliance simply because they had selected their own leaders, and it was hypothesized that they would, therefore, be willing to submit to them.

For this analysis, twenty-five per cent of the directives in the study were chosen at random, and their responses were coded on a compliance scale ranging from +4 to -2. Responses were coded as follows:

Agreement: (+4) a verbal assertion that the addressee accepted and approved of the directive.

Verbal compliance: (+3) an indication that the addressee submitted to the will of the speaker without overtly indicating approval or agreement with the directive.

Question: (+2) an indication of the intention to comply when the needed information was supplied.

Explained non-compliance: (+1) an indication that the addressee was not going to carry out the directive because of the facts stated in the explanation.

No response: (0)

Refusal: (-1) unexplained verbal non-compliance.
Contradiction: (-2) an indication of non-compliance coupled with a negative evaluation of the directive and/or the individual's right to issue it.

The data were analyzed in three ways for this section of the study: (1) each girl's sociometric rank was compared to the mean compliance level of the responses she issued, (2) her sociometric rank was compared to the mean compliance level of the responses she received, and (3) the mean compliance level of the responses she received was compared to the mean coercion level of the directives she issued to determine whether compliance was more likely to result from the status of the speaker or from the coerciveness of the directive. Ranks were again compared by using a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Compliance of Responses Issued

Because a negative, or non-compliant, response issued was expected to correlate with high status, the person issuing the most negative responses was ranked 1. The statistical hypothesis for this section of analysis was that there is no difference between sociometric rank and the rank of the compliance of responses issued.

Middle-Class White. The comparisons of ranks for this group did not indicate a statistical significance at the .10 level, so the null hypothesis was rejected. In
this configuration, negative responses should have indicated high status since a high status person's power base should have given her the authority to respond negatively. For the second, third, and fourth ranked persons, the expected correspondence was exact. However, the first and fifth individuals were reversed. In short, the most powerful person in sociometric terms issued the most compliant responses, and the least powerful person issued the most negative responses.

Discussion. There were several possible explanations for the reversal of the first and fifth ranked children in this group. Kerry (1), who ranked first sociometrically, may have been a basically submissive person who did not use her high status as a means of responding counter to her usual pattern; and Marci (5) may have been a naturally negative individual who characteristically did not comply regardless of her status. However, observations of these two did not indicate that this was entirely the case. A second possibility was that the sociometric
questions, as they were interpreted by the middle-class group, were slanted in favor of compliant, cooperative individuals; or that the middle-class children valued compliance and, therefore, selected the most compliant participant as the highest ranked sociometrically and the least compliant as the lowest ranked. On the other hand, the highest status person might have considered that she had the most to lose by being negative to her fellow interactants. She was held in high esteem and perhaps wanted to retain that position, tacitly assuming that by complying with the directives of her fellows, she would attain or keep her favorable status. The lowest ranked person, in contrast, had the least to lose. She was already a social isolate and was perhaps unwilling to comply since she had little hope of raising her status. Conversely, Kerry (1) may have assumed that her status was much lower than it was, and Marci (5) may have assumed that her was higher. Or finally, recognizing Kerry's (1) high status, fellow interactants may not have directed her to do anything she did not want to do anyway, while they felt less restricted in the kinds of requests made of Marci (5). None of these explanations was completely acceptable, and the reversal of these two participants probably resulted from a combination of these and other factors.
Working-Class White. The comparison for this group also exhibited no statistically significant relationships,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Responses Issued</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = .5 \]

Missy (4) and Terry (5) were predictably compliant in their responses, and their reversal in terms of their sociometric rank was understandable since they were only separated by one point. However, Phyllis (1) and Kay (3) did not use compliance in any predictable fashion. Barbara (2) was the only group member who fully adhered to the expected model.

Discussion. While the reversal of Phyllis (1) and Kay (3) in terms of the expected model could not be explained by any observation of the group, Kay's (3) position as most negative was predictable in terms of the group's dynamics. Throughout the study, perhaps because of Kay's reserved and limited participation, other members of the group persisted in attempting to persuade her to do things against her will. For example, the group composed a puppet show, and Phyllis (1), in particular, was determined that Kay (3) should play the part of the father. Kay (3) repeatedly refused, and several minutes of dialogue were
devoted to the discussion. At another point, other group members decided that Kay (3) should sing as part of their presentation. The idea was not accepted by Kay (3) either. If Kay (3) perceived her response behavior as being inappropriate to her status, she obviously did not value status marking enough to comply with the directives given her by her group. Overall, then, the working-class white group was not using relative compliance to designate status.

**Working-Class Black.** There was no statistical significance at the .10 level in the relationship between sociometric rank and response compliance for the working-class black group and the null hypothesis was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Responses Issued Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = .4 \]

In spite of the lack of statistical significance, four of the five participants were in the relationship to each other that was hypothesized in the model. Gina (1), Henry (2), Janice (3), and Carla (5) were ranked relative to each other in the same way sociometrically as they were in terms of their compliance. Of the four, Gina (1) was highest ranked and least compliant, and Carla (5) was
lowest ranked and most compliant. However, Sandy (4) was out of the expected order as fourth sociometrically and least compliant. Her deviance threw the remaining rankings off.

Discussion. Sandy (4), in her lack of compliance and low status ranking, was very similar to Marci (MCW-5) in the middle-class white group. Therefore, the same explanations offered for Marci's (MCW-5) deviance could be put forward to explain Sandy's (4). However, the most plausible explanation would be that Sandy's (4) status was low enough that she felt she had nothing to gain by complying. Sandy (4), more than fifth ranked Carla, was a loner, taking a limited part in the conversations and a limited role in group activities. Even during her own peer teaching session, she offered very few directives. However, she received considerably more than she issued (41 compared to 14), and she may have felt threatened by that imbalance and responded defensively with lack of compliance.

In spite of Sandy's (4) deviance, whatever its cause, the working-class black group did exhibit a strong tendency to correspond to the expected pattern, utilizing higher status as a base for non-compliant responses.

Inter-Group Comparison. The Spearman Rho calculations did not indicate any significant relationships, and observational data did not supply any insights which could
account for the relative compliance of directives in relation to sociometric status as a function of either class or ethnicity. However, broader kinds of comparisons among the three groups were interesting and suggestive. The chart below illustrates the cross-group comparison of compliance level means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class/ Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Compliance Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The working-class black group, which was highest in overall coercion, was most compliant in directive responses. The middle-class white group was second, and the working-class white group was considerably below the other two groups, a probable indication of less cooperation among the group members. This could be a result of their lack of familiarity with each other prior to the research sessions.

Members of the middle-class white group had the widest divergence in their relative compliance. The most compliant person rated a mean score of 1.8, and the least compliant person rated a mean score of -0.25, a difference of 1.55. The working-class white group exhibited the least difference among participants in their tendencies to comply. The most compliant had a mean of 0.833, and the least compliant had a mean of 0.16, a difference of 0.67. Again, the
working-class black group was similar to the middle-class white group. The most compliant person achieved a mean of 1.75 and the least compliant had a mean of .7, a difference of 1.05. Because the middle-class white and working-class black groups were more similar, neither class nor ethnicity was considered to be a factor in overall group compliance.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank, Coercion Level Rank, and Compliance of Directives Received

While a consideration of the kinds of responses issued by each participant was relevant in a discussion of how status was designated through the use of directives, it was even more pertinent and revealing to investigate the types of responses issued to each participant. The responses issued suggested the perception each individual had of her status rank, but the responses received by each individual suggested the other four participants' evaluation of that individual's status. It was hypothesized that high status persons would receive more compliant responses, and low status persons would receive more negative, less compliant responses. Because high status was projected to correlate with compliance in this part of the analysis, the most compliant responses were ranked 1. The ranks were again compared by Spearman Correlation Coefficients. In addition to an investigation of the correspondence between sociometric rank and relative compliance, this section
also includes a comparison of the relative compliance of the responses issued to each individual and her coercion level mean rank in an attempt to ascertain whether the message form or the status of the speaker had more bearing on the response pattern. The statistical hypotheses for this section of the analysis were: (1) there is no difference between sociometric rank and the rank of compliance of directives received; (2) there is no difference between the rank of the mean coercion level of directives issued and the rank of the compliance of responses received.

Middle-Class White. There was no statistically significant relationship at the .10 level between the sociometric status of the participants and the compliance of responses addressed to them; therefore, null hypothesis 1 was rejected. None of the relationships corresponded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s .5 \]

with the hypothesized model except Kerry's (1). She successfully combined her highest social status with the highest rank in achieving compliant responses. No pattern emerged which could be efficiently explained in terms of
observation data or insight into the group's dynamics. Since the relative compliance of directives was not related in any systematic fashion to intra-group status, the compliance rankings were compared to the rankings of coercion level means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Compliance</th>
<th>Coercion Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses Received</td>
<td>Directives Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = -0.8^* \]

The \( r_s \) of \(-0.8\) is statistically significant at the .10 level and indicates a negative relationship between compliance and coerciveness. Robbi (3) and Kerry (1), the two least coercive participants were most successful in achieving compliance, and Dani (2) and Sarah (4), the most coercive participants, received the most negative responses. Marci (5) ranked third on both scales. The comparison did indicate that the middle-class white group was more likely to respond favorably if the directive were given in non-coercive terms. Null hypothesis 2 was rejected.

**Working-Class White.** Again, there was no statistically significant correspondence between sociometric rank and relative compliance of responses, and null
hypothesis 1 was rejected. Counter to the expectation, the two persons ranked last sociometrically were most successful in achieving compliance with their directives, and no meaningful pattern emerged to relate status to relative compliance for any of the group members. Again, the mean coercion levels of each individual were compared to the compliance of responses.

\[ r_s .1 \]

This comparison did not reveal any statistically significant correspondence at the .10 level although there was somewhat more correspondence. Again, no meaningful pattern of relationships emerged, and null hypothesis 2 was rejected.
Working-Class Black. The comparison of sociometric rank and compliance of responses received indicated a statistically significant relationship at the .10 although not at the .05 level in the working-class black group. Null hypothesis 1 was therefore accepted. Although the correspondence was not complete, the deviation could be explained in terms of close sociometric proximity. This correspondence between status and compliance may have been the result of the clear and stable status ranks within the group.

No statistical significance was found in a comparison of the coercion level means of this group and the relative compliance of responses at the .10 level. Null hypothesis 2 was, therefore, rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Responses Received No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s .8^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Compliance Responses Received</th>
<th>Mean Coercion Directives Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s -.2$
The most coercive person, Carla (5), ranked fourth in the ability to achieve compliance; and the least coercive person, Janice (3), ranked second in achieving compliance.

It was hypothesized that high coercion would result in high compliance. However, the lack of statistical significance indicated that the black group did not respond to directives on the basis of their coerciveness. The black group, unlike the middle-class white group, responded significantly more favorably to the status of the speaker than to the form in which the directive was issued.

Inter-Group Comparison. A comparison of the three groups in terms of received responses revealed some interesting contrasts which may be attributable to ethnicity. The middle-class white group responded with greater compliance to non-coercive directives. The directive form was more significant in eliciting compliance from middle-class children than was the status of the speaker. In direct contrast, the form of the directive was only minimally significant to the working-class black group whose members responded most compliantly to high socio-metric status without regard to relative coerciveness. The working-class white group demonstrated no meaningful pattern, and neither status nor coercion was statistically
significant in eliciting compliance from members of this group.

The message form importance to the middle-class white children may have resulted from their linguistic training which valued verbal politeness. Response to non-coerciveness may, in fact, be a middle-class value which was consciously taught to the middle-class children. It was surprising that they responded more to message form than to status of speaker in view of their careful designation of status through the non-coerciveness of the directives they issued.

It was also interesting that the black children responded significantly to the status of the speaker. In interaction with non-working-class non-black children and adults, the black children's compliant responses to an authority figure may be more important in presenting a favorable impression than designating status through non-coercive directives, a technique this group did not practice.

However, the working-class white children demonstrated neither a facility for marking status through non-coerciveness nor through compliance with authority figures. Their interaction with adults and children outside their own class and ethnic group, therefore, leaves them in the greatest social jeopardy. Their response patterns in the study appeared to be individualistic, based on
idiosyncrasies and unique intra-group considerations rather than on the larger issues of status marking and response to coerciveness or non-coerciveness.

Summary of Findings

The statistical analysis performed on the response to directives indicated four findings. First, no correlation was demonstrated for any of the three groups between sociometric rank and compliance of responses issued. In other words, unlike what is usually assumed to occur among adults, the children did not use high status as a reason to comply with directives issued to them, nor did they consider low status to be reason enough for complying.

Second, the middle-class white group demonstrated a negative correspondence between high coerciveness and favorable compliance, indicating that members of this group tended to comply with non-coercive directives more favorably than with coercive directives.

Third, the working-class black group exhibited a positive correlation between the status of the person issuing the directive and the relative compliance of the response. Finally, the working-class white group exhibited no statistically significant pattern of response, indicating no preference for either the status of the speaker or the relative coerciveness of the directive. Because of the lack of significance in the responses of the
working-class white group to either message form or status of sender, the above findings could not be attributed to either class or ethnicity with any certainty.

Implications of the Analysis of Responses to Directives

There were apparently no "yes men" in the children's groups since the status of the speaker was not related in any group to the compliance of the response. Perhaps the association between status and the need to comply or the lack of need to comply which is evident in adult groups is acquired later than the age of the children in this study, or perhaps the status differences in these three groups were not great enough to elicit status-related responses. To further probe this question, it would be useful to investigate interactions between children and adults and among children whose status ranks were more clear-cut.

The favorable response of the middle-class white children to non-coercive directive form suggested their acquisition of the middle-class value of conventional politeness. It is part of the training of many of the middle-class children in the researcher's acquaintance to modify their directive form toward politeness before their directives achieve compliance. One frequently hears exchanges such as the following between middle-class children and their parents. Child: "Give me a cookie." Parent:
"Say, 'please'." In some cases the parent may respond with "Are you asking me or telling me?" a response which explicitly focuses on the form in which the directive was issued by the child. Further study of the form of a directive in relation to its response across class and ethnic lines appears to be a fruitful field of investigation.

The working-class black group's correlation between status of speaker and compliance of response offered additional evidence that the older children in this group may have been functioning as adult-substitutes in the fashion suggested by Abrahams (1964) and Mitchell-Kernan (1969).

The lack of any statistically significant pattern of responses among the working-class white group also indicated an area in need of further investigation, specifically designed to probe the relationship between the form of a directive and the response it receives.

**Selection of Directive Components**

**Method of Analysis**

Underlying the coercion level of each directive analyzed in this study was each speaker's selection of components from the range of possibilities for directive formation; i.e., two directives with the same coercion level could be composed of radically different elements.
Every directive, as the coercion level index, explained in Chapter II, possessed three basic elements which comprised the basis of its coerciveness: (1) the grammatical form of the principal verb, (2) the recipient of the benefit of the action, and (3) the type of action requested by the directive. Although these three elements were not always part of the linguistic makeup of the sentence (e.g., in some cases the recipient of the benefit had to be determined by non-linguist context), together they formed the basic level of coerciveness of the directives studied.

Each of these three basic components was, in turn, composed of four options varying in their degree of coerciveness. Within each of the three major components, the selection of one of the four options was obligatory. The three major components and their options, in decreasing order of coerciveness, included:

1. Grammatical Form (i.e., the grammatical form of the principal verb).
   a. Imperative
   b. Let/Let's
   c. Question
   d. Statement

2. Direction of Benefit (i.e., who will profit from compliance).
   a. Speaker
   b. Uncertain or third party
c. Both speaker and addressee
d. Addressee

3. Action Requested
   a. Stop or don't perform
   b. Perform
   c. Delay
   d. Allow

The selection of an option within each category resulted from the interaction of three continua. Depending upon the selection of the options, a directive might range from ambiguous (allowing the addressee to interpret the utterance as something beside a directive) to unambiguous (leaving no options as to message, addressee, or interpretation as a directive); from voluntary (allowing at least a show of voluntariness in compliance) to involuntary (making compliance appear to be required); and from being issued from a base of power (speaker over addressee) to a base of solidarity (speaker and addressee equal) to a base of supplication (addressee over speaker). The placement along these three continua determined the coerciveness of the directive, and that placement was accomplished primarily through the selection of the options outlined above.

In addition to the three major components directives were modified by a variety of modifications and additions
which were used either to raise or lower the coercion level. They served to emphasize or modify the placement of the directive along the three continua.

Differential selection of the elements comprising the directive was investigated for this section of the analysis, and the presentation has two parts. The first section compares the top, middle, and last ranked individual within each group on the basis of her selection from among the basic directive components. It then presents a comparison of the selection of options across class and ethnic lines. The second section of the analysis deals with a comparison of the selection of additions and modifications including first an intra-group comparison and then an inter-group comparison. The intra-group analysis will base the comparison on the sociometric status of the participants discussed.

The relationship between intra-group social status and the selection of directive components was examined first. For this analysis, each participant's directives were classified in terms of her selection of options within the three major components by determining the percentage and number of times each option was selected. For example, the following charts contain information concerning the selection of options within the three categories by Kerry (MWC-1), the first ranked person sociometrically in the middle-class white group.
The chart indicates that of the 32 verbs analyzed, Kerry used 18 imperatives, 2 of the Let or Let's type, 4 which had undergone question transformation, and 8 which were declarative. In other words, 56% of her directives were imperatives; i.e., forms which were highly coercive, unambiguous, involuntary, and based on speaker's power over addressee. Only 6.25% were either Let directives or Let's directives. Let directives imply the power of the addressee over the speaker; however, they are unambiguous, and somewhat involuntary. Let's directives imply a solidarity relationship between speaker and addressee, and are unambiguous and also somewhat involuntary. Some 12.5% of Kerry's directives were questions and, hence, ambiguous, fairly voluntary, and flexible in their power base. Also, 25% of her directives were the least coercive type, statements, which were ambiguous, voluntary, and not necessarily offered from the speaker's power base. The following sentences illustrate each type of option from this category.

1. Imperative: Get me an umbrella.
2. Let: Let me borrow your umbrella.
3. Let's: Let's share your umbrella.
4. Question: Can I borrow your umbrella?
5. Statement: Oh no! It's raining, and I don't have an umbrella.

The chart below illustrates Kerry's (MCW-1) selection among the options in the Action Requested category. Of Kerry's 31 action requests, three or 9.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=31</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

requested that the addressee stop performing an action. The majority of the directives, 26 or 83.87%, requested that the addressee perform an action. None of them requested a delay, and only 2 or 6.45% requested permission. The sentences below illustrate each of the above possible selections.

1. Stop: Stop stealing my pointed scissors.
2. Perform: Give me another stick.
3. Delay: Wait a minute.
4. Allow: Let me be next.

The examples are in order of descending coercion as explained in the index. A stop directives as in 1 above indicates the power of the speaker over the addressee and
implies a negative evaluation of the addressee's behavior. A perform directive (2) again expresses the power of the speaker over the addressee but not to the same extent as a stop directive since it does not evaluate the individual's behavior. A delay (3) moves toward greater power on the part of the addressee, and an allow directive (4) places the power balance on the side of the addressee with the speaker as supplicant requesting permission. Therefore, an analysis of selections among these options should indicate the characteristic power relationship between the speaker and the addressee.

The following chart illustrates Kerry's (MCW-1) selection of options in the Direction of Benefit category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p=31

Of her total of 31, 10 or 32.26% of Kerry's directives were issued for her own benefit, a strategy which places the speaker in a power position over the addressee. Only 9.68 of her directives were issued for the benefit of someone other than herself or her addressee. This was again considered to be a power directive because the speaker was requesting the addressee to do something from which she would not personally benefit, but it was not
considered as powerful (therefore as coercive) as a speaker-benefit directive. Some 22.58% of Kerry's directives were for the mutual benefit of herself and her addressee. This type was considered to be a solidarity directive since it indicated group involvement. Also 35.48% of Kerry's directives were intended to benefit the addressee. While this is a non-coercive form since it places the addressee in the power position, it does tend to indicate a leadership role on the part of the speaker because of her involvement with the addressee and her advice-giving position. The sentences below illustrate these component selections.

1. Speaker benefits: Get me some paint.
2. Third party benefits: Get Marci some paint.
3. Mutual benefit: Get us (you and me) some paint.
4. Addressee benefit: Get yourself some paint.

Every directive fit into one of the four categories, and the selection of one of the four options helped to establish the coercion level of the directive by placing it on the three continua discussed above (see Appendix A). The purpose of this section of the analysis was to determine whether the selection of options within the three major components was related to sociometric rank on the intra-group level or to social class or ethnic group membership on the inter-group level.

In an attempt to acquire this information, chi squares were derived comparing each participant with every
other participant in her group on the basis of her selection of the options within the components. To simplify the presentation, only a three way comparison between top, middle, and last ranked persons will be discussed. (Table 8, p. 254 contains the complete comparison of all group members.) Because of the existence of some empty cells (e.g., Kerry's (MCW-1) delay category above), and because of the small number of cases in some cells, the chi squares for this portion of the study were merely an indication of trends and cannot be considered definitive.

Comparison of Sociometric Rank and Component Selection

Middle-Class White #1-#3. Table 5 shows the middle-class white group's chi square values for Grammatical Form, Direction of Benefit, and Action Requested. The first comparison to be discussed was between first ranked Kerry and third ranked Robbi. Kerry's mean coercion level was 10.258, and Robbi's was 8.376. Therefore, it was hypothesized that Kerry would make selections which were more coercive than those made by Robbi. The statistical comparison produced the following results. (Statistically significant chi squares at the .05 level are starred.)
Table 5. Relationships Between Intra-group Social Status and Selection of Directive Components for Middle-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Being Compared Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Grammatical Category $x^2$</th>
<th>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</th>
<th>Action Requested $x^2$</th>
<th>Modification $x^2$</th>
<th>Addition $x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1-2) K-D</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-3) K-R</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>9.98*</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>9.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-5) K-M</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3) D-R</td>
<td>8.74*</td>
<td>11.55*</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-4) D-S</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>9.54*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>9.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-5) D-M</td>
<td>10.26*</td>
<td>15.48*</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-4) R-S</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>21.21*</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-5) R-M</td>
<td>8.26*</td>
<td>14.52*</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Being Compared</th>
<th>Sociometric Rank Initial</th>
<th>Grammatical Category $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Direction of Benefit $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Action Requested $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Modification $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Addition $\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4-5) S-M</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.62*</td>
<td>20.44*</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 3$  
$\chi^2$ value @ .05 l.x. = 7.82  
*indicates significance

$df = 1$  
$\chi^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 3.84  
*indicates significance
1. Grammatical Form: .64.
2. Direction of Benefit: 6.13
3. Action Requested: 9.98*

The only significant difference between the options selected by these two participants was in the Action Requested category. The two girls were very similar in the grammatical forms selected for their directives and only slightly more different in the Direction of Benefit. Since a significant difference appeared in the Action Requested category, the percentages of each girl's selections were compared (see Appendix B for complete comparison of all participants in every category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since these categories are ranked according to their relative coerciveness with stop as most coercive, and allow as least coercive, it was evident from this comparison that Kerry (1), the higher status person, was using a higher percentage of coercive action requests than Robbi (3), while Robbi was using a higher percentage of relatively non-coercive forms than Kerry (1). More than 20% of Robbi's (3) directives requested either that the
addressee postpone her present action or that she allow Robbi to do something. Neither of these requests is as coercive as directing the addressee to stop performing an action or to begin performing. Therefore, Kerry's (1) higher social status (and higher coercion level) were reflected in her coercive use of the Action Requested category.

The second comparison was performed between Kerry (1) and the last ranked middle-class white participant, Marci (5). Kerry's (1) coercion level mean of 10.258 was very similar to Marci's (5) mean of 10.269. Therefore, few differences were projected. The following chi squares resulted from this comparison.

1. Grammatical Form: 4.40
2. Direction of Benefit: 7.24
3. Action Requested: 2.34

At the .05 level, none of these comparisons was significant, but the Direction of Benefit category comparison was significant at the .10 level. Although selections from this category were not closely related to coerciveness, they did indicate the amount of group involvement of each participant and, therefore, suggested their degree of leadership and function as a facilitator. Within this category, Marci's (5) low social status was reflected by her lack of appeals to group solidarity. She issued
only 3.85% of her directives for mutual benefit, whereas Kerry (1) issued 27% for mutual benefit. From this evidence it appeared that Kerry (1) was more involved in solidarity relationships with other group members and that an appreciable number of her directives were not issued for herself, but for the benefit of combined efforts shared with other group members. Marci (5), in contrast, issued very few directives indicating solidarity between herself and her addressees. This implied that she was not working together with other group members in the same way as was Kerry (1), and was, therefore, not as involved in facilitating group action. Again, this could have been a result of her relative social isolation from the rest of the group which caused her low sociometric ranking.

#3-#5. A final comparison was made in this group between third ranked Robbi and fifth ranked Marci. Because of the disparity in their coercion levels (8.376 and 10.269 respectively), a considerable difference in their component selection was projected. The comparison produced the following chi square values:

1. Grammatical Form: 8.26*
2. Direction of Benefit: 14.52*
3. Action Requested: 9.98*

Predictably, every comparison was significant at the .05 level and merited closer investigation. The two girls'
differential use of the Grammatical Form category produced some interesting results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Stmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (1)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (5)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marci's (5) lowest social status was reflected in her ambivalent use of grammatical forms as compared to Robbi (3). In the preceding section of analysis the hypothesis was discussed which contended that lower status children emulated the power strategies of higher status children, thus increasing their coercion to the point that it surpassed that of the middle-status child in each group. This profile comparing Marci (5) to Robbi (3) partially revealed this phenomenon, but it also indicated that Marci (5) was using a considerable number of relatively non-coercive forms. This might indicate that the bottom status position, at least for this group, was an ambivalent position which called for a mixture of coercive and non-coercive forms. Marci (5) used both more of the most coercive imperative form and the least coercive statement than did Robbi (3). She did not, however, use as many questions or Let forms. The Let category could have revealed either of two things: the speaker's submission to the superiority of the addressee (a non-coercive choice) or the appeal to
solidarity when coupled with the first person plural pronoun (also non-coercive but indicative of group involvement). While 10% of Robbi's (3) directives made use of either of these alternatives, none of Marci's (5) did, another indication of Marci's isolation from the group. The differential use of the imperative form in particular accounted for much of the difference between Marci's (5) mean coercion level (10.269) and Robbi's (3) (8.376).

The Direction of Benefit selection also revealed differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>3rd Per.</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, Marci's (5) social status as last was reflected in her varied selection of alternatives within the direction of benefit category. She again used more of the most coercive forms than did Robbi (3), and she used more of the least coercive forms than did Robbi. Her very low use of the Mutual Benefit category, although not closely related to relative coerciveness, was additional indication of her lack of appeals to group solidarity which, coupled with her very limited use of the Let/Let's Grammatical Form, indicated an absence of group membership which paralleled her social status. Her surprisingly high use
of the benefit to addressee option may have indicated an attempt on her part to gain acceptance from the other group members, but it was a selection which indicated low coercion and limited power on the part of the speaker.

The Action Requested category was also revealing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbi (3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci (5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, Marci (5) issued more coercive forms selected from this category than did Robbi (3), and she issued fewer of the less coercive forms than did Robbi. As has been discussed, this high coerciveness indicated her bottom position socially.

Summary. The comparison of the selection of options within the major components of directive formation indicated more similarity between the highest ranking person and the lowest ranking person than between either of these and the person in the middle. These data support the hypothesis that the lowest status person in the group was emulating successful power-oriented behavior in an attempt to be successful herself. Marci's use of more of the extreme forms of highly coercive or highly non-coercive selections indicated the ambivalence of her status.
Table 5). In addition, the selection of components, especially in the Direction of Benefit category, also suggested the degree to which each participant was involved in facilitating group activities. Kerry (1) issued the most mutual benefit directives; Robbi (3) was second in this category; and Marci (5), the social isolate was a distant third.

Working-Class White. A comparison of the top, middle, and last ranked participants in the working-class white group indicated similar relationships between status and selection of component options. Top ranked Phyllis issued 143 directives and had a coercion level mean of 11.12; middle-ranked Kay issued only 12 directives and had a coercion mean of 9.75; and last ranked Terry issued 61 directives with a coercion level mean of 10.623. The differences in coercion means indicated considerable differences in selection of options as the following comparisons indicate. Table 6 shows the working-class white group's chi square values for each comparison.

#1-#3. The first comparison was between top ranked Phyllis and middle ranked Kay. Kay's (3) small number of directives issued (12) affected the statistical outcome of her comparison with Phyllis (1), and these findings were merely indicative of the trends of selection on the part of the two girls.
Table 6. Relationships Between Intra-group Social Status and Selection of Directive Components for Working-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Being Compared Sociometric Rank and Initial</th>
<th>Grammatical Category $x^2$</th>
<th>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</th>
<th>Action Requested $x^2$</th>
<th>Modification $x^2$</th>
<th>Addition $x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1-2) P-B</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00*</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>38.19*</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-3) P-K</td>
<td>22.60*</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>19.30*</td>
<td>8.86*</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-4) P-M</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>10.63*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>24.88*</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-5) P-T</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>10.58*</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>23.66*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3) B-K</td>
<td>7.92*</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>9.82*</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-4) B-M</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>10.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-5) B-T</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>17.28*</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-4) K-M</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-5) K-T</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>21.36*</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Being Compared</td>
<td>Sociometric Rank and Initial</td>
<td>Grammatical Category $x^2$</td>
<td>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</td>
<td>Action Requested $x^2$</td>
<td>Modification $x^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-5)</td>
<td>M-T</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>13.30*</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df = 3</td>
<td>x$^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 7.82</td>
<td>df = 1</td>
<td>x$^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates significance
1. Grammatical category: 22.60*
2. Direction of Benefit: 3.06
3. Action Requested: 19.30*

Both the Grammatical Form and the Action Requested categories were significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the percentages in each category were compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imper.</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Stmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis (1)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phyllis (1) used 64.34% imperative verbs, a power based selection, in keeping with her high social status. Kay (3) used 25% imperatives. In the Let/Let's category, Kay (3) used 50% while Phyllis (1) used only 5%. This indicated that Phyllis did not ask for permission to any considerable extent, also a function of her high status perhaps, and that she did not offer a substantial number of group goal, solidarity directives of the Let's type. Phyllis' (1) use of this category was comparable to that of Kerry (MCW-1) top ranked participant in the previous group, who used it only 6.25% of the time. Kay's (3) 50% use of this option indicated only four directives. Two of these requested permission (Just let me be the director), and two were solidarity directives (Let's start off where we're gonna be./Let's have somebody play two parts). The
differential use of imperatives partially accounted for the difference between Phyllis' (1) and Kay's (3) coercion level means.

Different selections within the Action Requested category were also evident. Phyllis (1) used perform type directives 82.52% of the time indicating her active role in at least attempting to direct the activities of the other participants. Kay (3) made use of the option 38% of the time, but this only represented 3 directives compared to Phyllis' 118. This use of the perform option appeared to be a function of Phyllis' (1) status.

In summary, Phyllis (1) combined frequent use of the most coercive and power-based verb form, the imperative, and frequent use of perform directives as a function of her high social status. In contrast, Kay (3) offered only 12 directives in the course of the conversations, and those were evenly distributed among the various categories producing her mean coercion level of 9.75, the lowest in her group. Kay's middle social status did not correspond with the selection of highly coercive forms. Quite the contrary, she seemed almost totally uninvolved in directing
the activities of her fellow participants through the use of directives.

#1-#5. The second comparison within the working-class white group was between Phyllis (1) and Terry (5), the last ranked participant. Terry's (5) mean coercion level was 10.623 compared to Phyllis' (1) 11.112. The following chi square values were produced:

1. Grammatical Form: 4.69
2. Direction of Benefit: 10.58*
3. Action Requested: 2.37

Only the Direction of Benefit category was significant at the .05 level. The significant difference in this category was that Phyllis (1) issued more directives intended to benefit herself (30.9%) whereas Terry (5) issued more directives intended to benefit her addressee (47.5%). This propensity toward directives to benefit the addressee was also found in the lowest ranked member of the middle-class white group and might have indicated a desire to be a part of the group. While Phyllis' (1) choice to issue directives for her own benefit did indicate a coercive power-based
strategy, it also indicated a somewhat weak leadership position. Phyllis offered only 20.8% of her directives for mutual benefit and 19% for the benefit of the addressee.

#3-#5. The third comparison was between third ranked Kay (3) and last ranked Terry (5).

1. Grammatical Form: 6.54
2. Direction of Benefit: 6.54
3. Action Requested: 21.36*

Only the Action Requested category was significant at the .05 level. Again the primary difference between these two participants was in the selection of more coercive forms by Terry (5). More than 93% of Terry's directives requested the two most coercive actions, whereas only 35.5% of Kay's (3) came from these two categories, and none of them were requests to stop. This difference accounted for the difference between their mean coercion levels which were Kay 9.75 and Terry 10.623. Again, the bottom ranked person was more coercive in component selection than the middle ranked person.
Summary. In the working-class white group, Phyllis' (1) directives were characterized by frequent selection of imperative verb forms, perform action requests, and speaker benefit requests. These selections account for her relatively high coercion level and indicate that she was following the adult model in using power forms as a function of her high status. Kay, the middle-ranked participant, almost totally abstained from issuing directives, but those she did issue were characteristically from the Let/Let's option of the grammatical form category, requesting that the addressee either perform or delay, and they were either oriented toward group goals or benefit of speaker. Last ranked Terry, like last ranked Marci (MCW-5) in the middle-class white group, issued directives which were characteristically for the benefit of the addressee and requested performance. Terry (5) was not statistically dissimilar to either Kay (3) or Phyllis (1) in her selection of grammatical forms.

Working-Class Black. The final group to be compared was the working-class black group. Top ranked Gina had a coercion mean of 11.545; middle ranked Janice had a coercion mean of 10.983; and last ranked Carla had a coercion mean of 11.875. These means ranked second, fifth, and first, respectively, in relative coerciveness. Because of the distribution of coerciveness among the
three, Carla (5) and Gina (1) were projected to be most similar, possibly because Carla (5) was either emulating Gina's successful strategies or competing to be attended to (see Table 7).

#1-#3. The first comparison was between first-ranked Gina and third-ranked Janice.

1. Grammatical Form: 8.06*
2. Direction of Benefit: 4.09
3. Action Requested: 8.46*

Both Grammatical Form and Action Requested were significant at the .05 level. Grammatical Form will be considered first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imper.</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Stmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (1)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary difference between selection of grammatical forms by these two participants was in the first two categories. Gina (1) used imperatives, the most coercive form, whereas Janice (3) used significantly more Let/Let's forms. Again this category indicated either a request for permission or a solidarity request. Since 20.7% of Janice's Action Requested selections were from the allow category, it is safe to assume that a significant
Table 7. Relationships Between Intra-group Social Status and Selection of Directive Components for Working-Class Black Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Being Compared Sociometric Rank and Initial</th>
<th>Grammatical Category $x^2$</th>
<th>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</th>
<th>Action Requested $x^2$</th>
<th>Modification $x^2$</th>
<th>Addition $x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-H</td>
<td>10.77*</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>14.16*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-J</td>
<td>8.06*</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>8.46*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-S</td>
<td>8.86*</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-C</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>20.07*</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.65*</td>
<td>3.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-J</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>10.73*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-S</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>8.25*</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-C</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>16.75*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>5.45*</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-S</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-C</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>13.33*</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.78*</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Being Compared</td>
<td>Sociometric Rank</td>
<td>Grammatical Category $x^2$</td>
<td>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</td>
<td>Action Requested $x^2$</td>
<td>Modification $x^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-5) S-C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>13.99*</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 3$

$x^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 7.82

*indicates significance

$df = 1$

$x^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 3.84

*indicates significance
number of her *let* forms were requests for permission since that co-occurs with the *allow*. This places her in a non-coercive power position as supplicant.

The differential selection from the Action Requested category also demonstrated difference which could be correlated with status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina (1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice (3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Janice (3) did use more of the most coercive stop directives than Gina (1), the major differences between her use and that of Gina (1) was in the *perform* and *allow* categories. Gina (1) offered significantly more perform directives indicating her involvement in directing other participants' activities. Janice (3) offered significantly more *allow* directives which function as requests for permission. Whereas the *perform* directives place the speaker in a power position over the addressee, *allow* directives place the addressee's power over that of the speaker. These selections, therefore, reflected the relative status of the two girls.
#1-#5. The second comparison was between Gina (1) and Carla (5), the first and last ranked participants sociometrically.

1. Grammatical Forms: 7.6
2. Direction of Benefit: 20.07*
3. Action Requested: 6.40

The only significant category was the Direction of Benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>3rd Party</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gina (1)</td>
<td>26 23</td>
<td>26 23</td>
<td>22 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla (5)</td>
<td>25 61</td>
<td>5 12</td>
<td>2 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary differences within this category were found in the first two columns, the speaker and the unknown or third party as benefactor. Whereas Gina (1) issued directives for her own benefit only 23.21% of the time, Carla (5) requested for her own benefit 61%. Furthermore, Gina (1) requested actions for a third party or an unknown recipient almost twice as much as did Carla (5). While requests for personal benefit are more coercive, they also exhibit less involvement in the group, less potential leadership ability, and more dependence. Again, the first and fifth ranked persons were more similar than either of them was to the third ranked person.
The third and final comparison was between Janice (3) and Carla (5), the third and fifth ranked participants respectively.

1. Grammatical Form: 4.92
2. Direction of Benefit: 13.33*
3. Action Requested: 5.26

Only the Direction of Benefit category proved to be significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice  (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not highly significant in terms of coerciveness, the primary differences here reflected Janice's (3) solidarity appeals as contrasted with Carla's (5) power appeals. Janice made 28% of the directives for the benefit of the group or herself and her addressee. Carla (5), on the other hand, made only 5% mutual benefactor requests. However, Carla issued 61% of her directives for her own benefit, an appeal to power, whereas only 30% of Janice's were for her sole benefit. This again demonstrated the attempt by the lowest status person to emulate power as opposed to striving for or reflecting group membership.
Summary. Gina's directives demonstrated the power strategy of the person ranked highest sociometrically. They were predominantly imperatives which requested that the addressee perform some action. However, her selections were distributed almost evenly in the Direction of Benefit category with 38% going to the addressee. This indicated that Gina was involved in regulating the activities of her fellow participants and that her directives were functioning to achieve group as well as individual goals.

Janice, the third ranked black participant, also issued more imperatives than any other form (31%); however, she used a considerable number of directives from the Let/Let's category, and her selection from the options within the Direction of Benefit category was also evenly distributed. She issued a surprisingly high percentage of stop directives (16%), which were influential in placing her coercion mean at 10.983. Carla's (5) directives were characterized by imperative verbs, requesting performances for her own benefit resulting in her high coercion mean of 11.875.

Inter-Group Comparison of Component Selection

Profiles of Status Positions. From the preceding data, a profile emerged of each of the three positions in the groups. The highest status person characteristically had a relatively high coercion level, reached in part
through frequent use of imperatives. The use of the imperative was seen as a power strategy, and the first ranked individual made more use of it than the third or fifth ranked persons except in the MCW group in which the last ranked person used the most imperatives with the first ranked person second. Furthermore, the top ranked person made least use of the Let/Let's category which implied that she did not frequently ask others for permission. Top ranked participants also made the least use of the allow category, indicating that they did not ask others for permission.

The third ranked participant in each group had the lowest coercion level, and in each case made the least use of the imperative and the greatest use of the Let/Let's category in direct contrast to the first ranked party. The middle-status person also used the least coercive statement form considerably more than did the other participants. With the exception of WCB-3 she also issued fewer directives for mutual benefit; and with the exception of MCW-3, she issued fewer for addressee benefit than did the top ranked person. She issued more directives for personal benefit (except MCW-3), demonstrating her limited role in structuring group activities. In every case, the middle-status person made the greatest use of the allow category, asking permission more often than either other participant analyzed, and she made the greatest use of the
delay category. Therefore, the third ranked participant used a more limited power strategy in selecting grammatical forms, was somewhat more self-oriented than group-oriented, and exhibited supplicant behavior by requesting permission and asking others to wait for her.

The last ranked person was also characteristically coercive and, like the first ranked party, make frequent use of the imperative and little use of the Let/Let's option. She also made the least use of the statement. The lowest ranked speaker, except for WCW-5, issued the most directives for self benefit, but also issued the most directives for addressee benefit, except in the case of WCB-5, and made mutual benefit requests only half as often as first and middle ranked speakers, demonstrating a limited role in ordering group activities. Last ranked speakers made the least use of the delay request and used allow with approximately the same frequency as top ranked speakers. Low status, therefore, appeared to result in a somewhat ambivalent use of power behavior which made the last ranked participant more similar to the first ranked than to the third in coerciveness. She was coercive and used the same power strategy as her top ranked counterpart, but she was not as involved in the on-going activities of the group. However, she was involved in assisting other group members on a one-to-one basis as is evidenced by her frequent use of directives to benefit the addressee.
Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Comparisons. The relationship between the selection of components and the class and/or ethnic composition of the groups was also investigated. For this part of the analysis, the number of uses of each selection within each component was totaled for the group as a whole, and chi square values were computed to compare each group to every other group with the following results (see Table 8).

Middle-Class White and Working-Class White. The comparison of the two white groups was intended to indicate differences in component selection which could be attributed to class membership. These groups were significantly different in two areas, Direction of Benefit and Action Requested. An examination of the data underlying those differences indicated the following:

Direction of Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>3rd Party</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major differences in the Direction of Benefit category were in the speaker benefit and the mutual benefit selection. The middle-class group exhibited a strategy based on the power of the speaker by using 13% more speaker benefit forms than were used by the working-class group.
Table 8. Inter-group Correlation of Component Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Being Compared</th>
<th>Grammatical Category $x^2$</th>
<th>Direction of Benefit $x^2$</th>
<th>Action Requested $x^2$</th>
<th>Modification $x^2$</th>
<th>Addition $x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCB, MCW</td>
<td>14.88*</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB, WCW</td>
<td>8.20*</td>
<td>8.89*</td>
<td>22.34*</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW, MCW</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>17.10*</td>
<td>10.25*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 3$  
$x^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 7.82  
*indicates significance

$df = 1$  
$x^2$ value @ .05 l.s. = 3.84
They also used 7% fewer mutual benefit directives than their working-class counterparts. These two differences suggest basic differences in the orientation of the groups. Whereas the MCW group was more oriented toward personal goals, the WCW member were more oriented toward group goals with mutual benefit. This analysis, therefore, suggested better cooperation among WCW members than among MCW participants. This difference contrasts with the MCW's preference for non-coercive directives discussed in the previous section and also contrasts with the fact that MCW participants were more successful in achieving compliance than were the WCW participants since it would seem reasonable to expect greater compliance with directives intended to benefit the addressee to some extent.

However, the Action Requested category demonstrated the power strategy of the WCW group. WCW participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

selected 11% more perform options than did MCW members who used each of the other three options slightly more than the WCW group. The WCW participants, therefore, made fewer attempts to terminate or delay others' actions and made
fewer requests for permission. Coupled with their high percentage of mutual benefit selections, this preference for perform verbs would also suggest an orientation toward the completion of group goals.

Working-Class White and Working-Class Black. This comparison was intended to indicate differences which could be attributed to ethnic group membership rather than to class, and there were significant differences in each of the three major areas in chi square values:

1. Grammatical Form: 8.2*
2. Direction of Benefit: 8.89*
3. Action Requested: 22.34*

The data underlying these differences revealed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imper.</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Stmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary difference in the Grammatical Form category was the working-class white group's more extensive use of the statement, the least coercive of the selections, balanced by the black group's more extensive use of the Let/Let's option. The imperative and question categories were used with approximately the same frequency by both groups. The WCW's greater use of the statement demonstrated
a choice for ambiguity since the statement is the most ambiguous directive form. The WCB's greater use of the Let/Let's category suggested either that these group members requested permission or issued mutual goal directives more often than did the WCW group members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>3rd Party</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>68 21</td>
<td>72 22</td>
<td>94 28</td>
<td>92 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>96 31</td>
<td>65 20</td>
<td>71 23</td>
<td>80 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the MCW group, the WCB participants used the speaker benefit category significantly more than the WCW did. This again indicated that the self-orientation on the part of the black group was greater than that of the WCW group. The WCW participants again demonstrated slightly greater use of the mutual benefit category, suggesting an orientation toward group goals or shared action. This was a surprising finding considering the fact that the WCB group was most successful in achieving compliance, and the WCW group was least successful.

The most significant difference between these two groups was in the area of Action Requested. The primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>Allow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
<td>#  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>25 8</td>
<td>263 86</td>
<td>15 5</td>
<td>24 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>30 10</td>
<td>227 73</td>
<td>15 5</td>
<td>41 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference in this category was the use of perform directives. Although the working class white group was less coercive overall with a mean coercion level of 10.346 compared to the black group's level of 11.42, they made 13% greater use of this category which is the second most coercive (see Table 8). The working-class black group's greater use of the allow category may be a reflection of their apparent respect for Gina's (1) status as their adult-substitute as discussed in the previous section since allow forms are requests for permission. Therefore, even though the mean coercion levels of the WCW and WCB groups were comparable, the groups made differential selections of the components which were statistically significant.

**Working-Class Black and Middle-Class White.** A final comparison was made between the working-class black group and the middle-class white group. This comparison revealed only one statistically significant difference, a chi square of 14.88 in the Grammatical Form category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imper.</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Stmt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two primary areas of difference in this category were the use of the second most coercive category, the Let/Let's
and the least coercive category, the statement. The middle-class group used the Let/Let's form 8% less than did the black group, whereas they used the non-coercive statement form 10% more. The coupling of these two factors explained the difference in coercion between the black group (11.42), and the middle-class white group (10.05) (see Table 8). Again, the Let/Let's choices by the WCB group indicated a greater frequency of requesting permission, probably due to the more clearly established leadership roles in the black group.

Summary of Comparisons. A summary comparison of the three groups revealed the following characteristics as illustrated by the charts below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Form</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Let/Let's</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Benefit</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>3rd Party</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCW</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The middle-class white group was the least coercive, selecting the highest percentage of options from the statement category. The value of this selection pattern was discussed in the previous section of analysis relating to the responses to directives. The MCW group formulated the most self-benefitting directives and indicated the least mutuality of concern both in a minimal use of the Let/Let's category and the mutual selection in the Direction of Benefit section.

The WCW group rated between the MCW and the WCB in almost every area. Although the WCW was less coercive than the WCB group and more coercive than the WCW group, they issued the most 3rd party benefit directives and the most addressee benefit directives, an interesting configuration in terms of the self-benefit orientation of the MCW group. Members of the WCW group also issued more perform directives than the other two groups. This combination of factors indicated that the WCW group was more involved in the direction of activities by the group and less personally and individually oriented than was the MCW group.
However, the WCB group, although more coercive than the other two, was also appreciably more cooperative as was indicated by their highest use of the Let/Let's form in the Grammatical Form section and their high percentage of mutual benefit selections.

**Class and Ethnic Comparison.** One usage difference may be associated with the ethnicity of the participants: The two white groups made somewhat greater use of the statement form than did the black group. Four differences could be attributed to class membership: (1) working-class participants made slightly greater use of the imperative than did the middle-class group members; (2) working-class participants issued significantly more directives intended to bring about mutual benefit than did the more self-oriented middle-class group; (3) working-class children made slightly less use of the stop directive; and (4) they made slightly greater use of the perform directive.

**Discussion.** The one ethnic-associated difference (greater use of the statement by the white groups) may indicate something very basic about differences in directive formation by members of different ethnic groups. Although the data presented in this study are inconclusive and the difference between ethnic groups was small, this finding suggests possibilities for further investigation. If the black children do not select the statement option as
frequently as white children, their directives consequently may be more coercive than anticipated by the white model since the grammatical form option is the basis for directive formation. The statement is a very subtle form which is ambiguous and voluntary. It allows options considered significant in conventional politeness. Limited use of this form could handicap a black child attempting to communicate appropriately with whites. If, indeed, black children do not make frequent use of this form, they may also not recognize statement directives addressed to them by teachers or other whites with whom they communicate.

The most significant difference which can be attributed to class was the working-class children's greater use of directives oriented toward mutual benefit. While the MCW children issued only 18% of their directives for mutual benefit of speaker and addressee, the WCW group used the mutual benefit option for 29% of their directives, and the WCB group used it for 23% of theirs. The middle-class white group was better acquainted before the testing sessions began than were the members of the working-class white group. However, the working-class black participants were also quite familiar with each other prior to the study. Therefore, the mutuality of benefit cannot be explained either in terms of previously existing camaraderie or in terms of formal politeness afforded to strangers. Again, this area of shared goal significance as a function of
working-class background as opposed to individual-goal significance as a goal of middle-class background merits further investigation.

Although the Grammatical Form category was a salient indication of the coerciveness of the various groups, the Direction of Benefit category proved to be more useful in discovering how the directives were functioning to bring about individual or shared goals. For example, a high percentage of speaker benefits suggested high coerciveness but limited group involvement, whereas selection from the mutual benefit option indicated group involvement. Examination of directives on other than grammatical grounds, therefore, appears to be a useful concern.

Comparison of the Uses of Additions and Modifications

Because chi squares cannot be considered definitive in dealing with data in which there is a significant number of empty cells, the statistical comparisons of the selections among the additions and modifications of basic directive components was even more tentative than the preceding data. Nevertheless, an analysis was attempted based on the chi square results. The first section of the analysis will compare the use of additions and modifications in terms of sociometric rank as in the previous section, comparing the top, middle, and last ranked child in each group. The second section will compare selection
of additions and modifications across class and ethnic lines.

**Middle-Class White.** Table 5 contains all the chi square values for comparisons among middle-class white participants. The first comparison analyzed for this section was between Kerry, the first ranked MCW participant, and Robbi, ranked third in the MCW group. There was a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2 = 9.98$) in their use of additions, so the underlying data were investigated. Table 9 contains information concerning the use of the additions by each member of the MCW group. This table indicated that Kerry (1) used only two explanations for her directives, whereas Robbi (3) used sixteen. This was further indication of the concept discussed in the previous section that Robbi (3), despite her rank as third, was more involved than either Kerry (1) or Marci (5) in keeping the group "on task" and in helping participants complete the assignments. Robbi (3) and Kerry (1) were comparable in their use of all the other options within the additions.

Kerry (1) and Robbi (3) exhibited no statistically significant difference in their use of modifications. Nevertheless, their selection from the modification options were examined. Kerry (1) used modification thirteen times; i.e., she modified 42% of her directives. Her most frequently used modification was **OK** which was also used twelve
times by Robbi (3). Marci, the last ranked MCW participant, did not use OK. This comparison was particularly interesting since OK has been demonstrated to be a term which is used to manage conversations and regulate the beginnings and endings of sequences (Merritt, 1976). When the adults were present in the interactions, they used OK considerably more than did the children. It appeared, therefore, that the use of OK indicated the leadership role of the person using it. This theory would coincide with the distribution of that modification among these three participants. Robbi (3) and Kerry (1) both used OK with 13% of their directives. Marci (5) did not use it at all.

Table 9. Use of Additions by Middle-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Deflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Repeat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robbi (3) used modifications 86 times for 93% of her directives. This might have been an indication of Robbi's verbal superiority since she was one of the older members of the group and modifications make directives more verbally complex. However, it could also have been brought about, at least in part, by the fact that Robbi (3) was involved in directing the group and in keeping members working successfully. Nevertheless, she was doing this from a limited power base as the third ranked person. Therefore, she needed to maneuver linguistically to bring about compliance to her 112 directives. She may have been at least tacitly aware that her group responded more favorably to lack of coerciveness, and her -1 modifications no doubt contributed to her low coercion level (8.376), the lowest of any participant in the study. Her non-coercive modifications also probably contributed to her high rank in achieving compliance.

Kerry (1) was also compared with Marci (5), but there was no statistical significance in their use of either modifications or additions (see Tables 9, 10). However, Marci (5) did use nine explanations, explaining 25% of her directives. She also stipulated conditions for the performance of her directives three times (10%). This was considered to be a solidarity addition since it made the directive more voluntary in that it did not need to be complied with unless certain conditions occurred. For
Table 10. Use of Modifications by Middle-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1 Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sposta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal auxiliary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness marker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. pronoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd per. pl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st per. pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example, "If that paint's too thick, add some water to it," is a directive which does not require compliance unless the conditional clause proves to be true. As discussed in the following section, Directive Formation Strategy, Marci (5) also repeated a considerable number of her directives.

The final comparison was between Marci (5) and Robbi (3). Again, neither the comparison of additions nor of modifications was statistically significant (see Tables 9, 10). Marci's (5) use of the explanations and other relevant additions was, therefore, more similar to Robbi's (3) use than to Kerry's (1). Marci (5) used modifications on 54% of her directives, considerably more than were used by Kerry (1). Again, this may have been a result of her need to maneuver linguistically to compensate for low social status.

Working-Class White. The first comparison in this group was in the use of additions between Phyllis (1) and Kay (3). There was no statistically significant difference between these two in their use of additions (Table 11). However, a statistical significance was found in their use of modifications (see Table 6). Table 12 contains information concerning the uses of modifications for all members of the working-class white group. Phyllis (1) used 79 modifications for 55% of her directives. Again, Kay's small total affected the findings. Kay (3) used hafta
Table 11. Use of Additions by Working-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Deflection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Repeat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Use of Modifications by Working-Class White Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modifications +1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sposta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications -1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal auxiliary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address term</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness marker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. pronoun</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd per. pl.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st per. pl.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
twice, as did Phyllis (1), but Kay's use constituted a far
greater share of her total directives than of Phyllis'.
This was a highly coercive addition. Kay (3) also used an
indefinite pronoun once, a first person plural pronoun
once, and "just" twice. These uses did not form any
specific pattern.

The second comparison in the working-class white
group was between Phyllis (1) and Terry (5). These two
demonstrated no statistically significant difference in the
use of additions, but a significant difference was found
in the use of modifications (see Table 6). Terry (5) used
21 modifications; therefore, a total of 34% of her direc­
tives were modified in some way. She used 5 modifications
to increase her coercion level, adding one point to 8% of
her directives. Phyllis (1) used 12 coercive modifications,
also 8% of her total. Last ranked Terry was, therefore,
using a power strategy similar to that of first ranked
Phyllis in this area. Phyllis used 11 address terms, how­
ever, while Terry did not use any. This could indicate
Phyllis' greater familiarity with the group members or her
greater involvement in directing their activities.
Phyllis (1) also made greater use of the first person
plural pronoun than did Terry (5). Again this use pointed
to a group orientation rather than an individual orienta­tion. Like Robbi (MCW-3), Phyllis (1) also made greater
use of OK, another indication of her involvement in directing the group's activities.

The third comparison in the WCW group was between third ranked Kay and fifth ranked Terry. There was no statistical significance in their use of either additions or modifications. However, Terry (5) did make use of several forms not utilized by Kay: better, expletive, non-coercive intonation, modal auxiliary, politeness marker, second person plural pronoun, well, and all right.

In the working-class white group, Phyllis (1) made the most frequent use of additions and modifications, adding them to 55% of her directives. Her selection among the options indicated her group leadership to some extent; however, no meaningful pattern in the selection of options could be detected in the differential selection among the three working-class white participants analyzed.

Working-Class Black. The first comparison in this group was between top ranked Gina and third ranked Janice. The chi square values indicated that they made very similar use of the additions and modifications (see Table 7). This similarity might have resulted from the fact that Gina (1) was the apparent leader of the whole group, but Janice (3) was the apparent leader of the sub-group consisting of the three younger participants, Janice, Sandy, and Carla. A
complete listing of the selections of modifications and additions for this group can be found in Tables 13 and 14.

The second comparison in this group was between Gina (1) and last ranked Carla (5). Both the addition and the modification categories were statistically significant in indicating differences between these two participants. Gina (1) used additions 34 times for 30% of her directives. Carla (5) used eight additions for 20% of her directives. Gina offered 12 explanations to accompany directives, and Carla offered 3. Gina repeated 11 of her directives whereas Carla repeated 6. None of the other categories were utilized by Carla; however, several were used by Gina (1): She offered two disclaimers, stated one conditions, issued three deflected directives, and repeated directives within the same speaking turn eight times.

The final WCB comparison was between middle ranked Janice and last ranked Carla. The chi square calculations indicated a statistical significance in their differential selection of modifications. Janice (3) used modifications with 59% of her directives, whereas Carla (5) used them with 68% of hers. Janice (3) added coercive modification to eight (14%) of her directives while Carla (5) added only one (2.5%). This was an interesting difference since Janice was the least coercive person in her group (10.98), and Carla was the most coercive (11.875). Therefore, Janice's selection from the alternatives within the three
Table 13. Use of Additions by Working-Class Black Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-1 Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+1 Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Deflection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Repeat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14. Use of Modifications by Working-Class Black Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>+Modifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotta</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sposta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Modifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal auxiliary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address term</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness marker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. pronoun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd per. pl.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st per. pl.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major categories must have been considerably less coercive than Carla's. Janice (3) also used twenty-three non-coercive modifications (43%) and Carla (5) used twenty-six (65%). Neither of these participants used the OK or all right, and they made minimal use of the first person plural and second person plural pronouns. This could have indicated a limited participation in directing group activities.

The selection of additions was also statistically significant. Janice used ten (19%) non-coercive additions compared to Carla's use of eight (20%). Because of the similarity of these two girls' use of additions, no meaningful pattern of difference could be discerned.

**Inter-Group Comparison.** Because of the lack of validity in the use of chi squares to determine relationships with a considerable number of empty cells, this section of analysis dispensed with that aspect of the statistical approach. (See Table 8 for the chi square values.) Instead, the percentage of times each modification and addition was used was calculated and compared (see Tables 15 and 16). The following differences emerged:

None of the additions were significantly different on the basis of either class or ethnicity. It was interesting, however, that the working-class groups utilized explanations only slightly less than the
Table 15. Inter-Group Comparison of the Use of Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class White</th>
<th>Working-Class White</th>
<th>Working-Class Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Time</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Deflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Repeat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Inter-Group Comparison of the Use of Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class White</th>
<th>Working-Class White</th>
<th>Working-Class Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sposta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal auxiliary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address term</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness mrkr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. pronoun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd per. pl.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st per. pl.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all right</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
middle-class group. One of the primary contentions of some educational psychologists in the last decade (M. Deutsch, 1967; Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Hess and Shipman, 1965) was that working-class speakers did not offer explanations for their directives. The evidence from this study would not substantiate that contention.

The inter-group examination revealed four uses of modifications which appeared to be associated with ethnicity:

1. The white groups evidenced significantly fewer uses of better to increase coercion. Better (e.g., "You better watch whose arm yer gettin' paint on") implies the threat "or else" and is a coercive modification since it diminishes solidarity, ambiguity, and voluntariness. Frequent use of this form could significantly elevate coercion level.

2. The white groups used somewhat less non-coercive intonation. That is, black group members more often stated directives with question intonation than did the white groups.

3. The white groups used significantly more modal auxiliaries than did the black group. This finding could be related to overall differences in the verb system of black English and may offer additional evidence that verb forms in black English
have different meanings and different uses than the same forms in standard English.

4. The black group used address terms on 22% of their directives compared to 9% for the white groups. This difference was significant enough to warrant further investigation. Nothing in the researcher's knowledge about the black community or about this specific group of children accounted for this difference. Again, the black group, like the middle-class group, was previously acquainted, so the use of address terms cannot be attributed to formality or camaraderie. This finding suggests an ethnic-based difference in the way interlocutors disambiguate address. Perhaps a study of non-verbal means of indicating who is being addressed would indicate additional ethnic differences.

Two uses of modifications were more closely related to class:

1. The middle-class participants used coercive intonation twice as often as did the working-class participants. This was, perhaps, partially attributable to the competition for status within the MCW group. Competitive sequences in this group were usually resolved by increased volume and
increasingly coercive intonation. This was not the case in the other groups.

2. The middle-class group made use of OK twice as much as the working class groups. This may indicate that the organizational function of OK is a middle-class phenomenon. Interestingly, none of the groups made any use of the tag question which Lakoff (1975) specifically associates with females.

**Directive Formation Strategy**

**Method of Analysis**

Thus far the study has examined the relationship between the overall coerciveness of directives and the sociometric rank of the participants; the relationship between sociometric rank, coerciveness, and the relative compliance of responses to directives; and the relationship between sociometric status and the selection of various components to formulate directives. The following section draws from each of these analyses and attempts to discover the nature of the strategies underlying directive formation. As has been pointed out repeatedly in the literature and this study, directives are highly social speech forms in that they indicate the status of the speaker, the status of the addressee and their relationship. The appropriate formation of a directive is a complex linguistic task, the mismanagement of which has potentially severe social
consequences. Exactly how the process of directive formation is managed is not clear since the primary source of data is the finished product. However, something can be learned about the process of directive formation by examining directives which, because they did not achieve the desired response, were reformulated and issued again.

The conversations analyzed in this study provided data for an examination of the possible underlying strategies of directives repeated in separate speaking turns. Repeats were made necessary by non-compliance, and the variation in their forms indicated how the speaker was evaluating the reasons for her lack of success and effecting necessary corrections. The formation of a directive was considered in the instrument presented in Chapter III to result from placement along three continua: power-solidarity-supplication, lack of ambiguity-ambiguity, and involuntariness-voluntariness. The placement along the three continua resulted from the selection of options within the major components of the directive (see preceding analysis) and was based on assessment of the social situation. By examining the changes which repeated or reformulated directives underwent, it was possible to focus on what the speaker saw as relevant in the complex social situation, the factor which demanded a change in directive form. Thus, repeats and reformulations provided a key to
the indication and determination of status through the use of directives.

The repeated directives of three members of each group were examined: the first, third, and fifth ranked person according to the sociometric data. A directive was considered to be a repeat if the speaker had made the same request at some previous point in the conversation without having it fulfilled. Since the semantic content was held constant, the examination of the varying grammatical structures was indicative of alterations in strategy.

The most common reason for repeating a directive was the assumption that the intended addressee had not heard or understood it. In this case, the speaker usually repeated the first form verbatim, occasionally adding a floor bid device. Although this type of repetition was common, it was not as relevant to the issue of indicating social status as some of the other types, and therefore, will not be dealt with as completely. The following series illustrates this type of repeat:

(1) What do we do now?
   
   OK, what do we do now?¹

¹. Three spaced dots between lines of dialogue indicate that there was intervening conversation, but that none of it could be interpreted as a response to the directive. Responses are included. In a few cases, there
In this repeat, none of the social cues were altered, and the second form was placed at the same point on the three continua as was the first form. The only difference between the two utterances was the addition of OK to the second. OK is a common conversation management device which signals the beginning of a new segment of the action or interaction. In this case, the speaker was using it to obtain the floor and to initiate a new phase of activity. Because of the similarity of these series and their lack of contribution to the central questions of the study, additional examples will be considered only as they relate to other concerns.

When a person repeated a directive, it indicated at least two things about her use of directives: one, that the directive just issued was unsuccessful, and two, that she possessed a dynamic directive formation strategy which allowed her to make instantaneous evaluations of the situation and reformulate the unsuccessful directive in an attempt to make it more effective. Therefore, an individual could have a small percentage of repeated directives either because she was ordinarily successful the first time the directive was issued or because she did not have or did not use a dynamic strategy and, therefore, did not

was no intervening talk, but the utterances were separated by significant pauses, terminal juncture, and a configuration of the "turn signals" outlined by Duncan (1974).
reformulate ineffective directives. High social status and/or high rank in achieving favorable compliance coupled with a low percentage of repeats would indicate a high degree of success on the first issue. Conversely, low social status and/or low rank in achieving favorable compliance would indicate a lack of dynamic strategy when coupled with a low percentage of repeats. In the following section, each participant discussed will be introduced in terms of the above factors in an attempt to delineate the existing profiles.

Middle-Class White

**Highest Ranked Participant.** Kerry was the highest ranked middle-class white participant, and the following chart summarizes her profile in terms of the data discussed thus far:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/Coercion</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She ranked fifth in number of directives issued, fourth in her coercion level mean, and first in her group for success in achieving compliance. Of the three girls examined for this portion of the study, she ranked second in number of directives repeated with 11%. Her high
sociometric status corresponded with her high degree of achieving compliance; however, she did demonstrate a dynamic strategy by re-issuing 11% of her initially unsuccessful directives.

Discussion. Because of her high status and success, Kerry's (1) repeat strategies were particularly interesting and are examined below:

(2) Sing that song.

Come on, Dani.

The first form of this series was an unambiguous imperative which indicated the speaker's power over the addressee. However, the second form changed the power relationship by placing Dani (2) over Kerry (1) and indicating that compliance was, therefore, voluntary. Although come on is a grammatical imperative, it is a standard pleading or coaxing phrase and has no more imperative force than please which is itself grammatically an imperative. Come on is, perhaps, more imploring than please because of the formal nature of the latter, but this is precisely the quality which places it on the addresssee end of the power-solidarity-supplication continuum. Kerry (1), therefore, moved herself from the power end of the continuum to the supplicant end; however, she
also added an address term which, in this case, served as a solidarity cue. Therefore, the first form was issued from Kerry's power base as number one socially, but when that strategy failed, she retreated to a combined appeal including both an indication of her inferior position relative to the addressee and a solidarity tag. Whether Kerry (1) was aware of it or not, this was an effective strategy for her group which responded significantly more often to lack of coercion than to either coercion or high status.

The strategy behind Kerry's second series was similar, but not identical, to that of the first.

(3) I get two more, Marci.

I need two more, please.

Although the first form is this series was a statement with an address term, it was still relatively unambiguous and, therefore, involuntary. The sole benefit was to the speaker, placing the directive on the speaker's side of the power continuum, and the address term gave the directive less ambiguity. The second form, however, replaced the unambiguous get with a statement of need. The direction of benefit did not change with this alteration, but the power relationship did. Get implied the speaker's right to the items requested; need implied the addressee's
power over them, and hence over the speaker. The address term was replaced by a politeness marker which brought about a kind of social distance and was reminiscent of the training strategy of middle class parents who withhold an item until the child says please.

Although the repeat employed the same basic strategy as (2), i.e., it moved from the speaker's social power base to her position of the powerless supplicant, there were still some basic differences: (2) was issued to the person ranked second sociometrically, whereas (3) was issued to the lowest ranked person, Marci. Because of the social status difference, (3) sounded like an anonymous service encounter. Therefore, even though the basic strategy was similar, the outcome of (3) underscored the speaker's status by its formality. The please, then, became a kind of metaphor which switched the code of the second directive. If the lowest status person would not respond favorably to the directive of the highest status person, the speaker would paraphrase the request in less powerful terms, but the price for that paraphrase was formal social distance. This reformulation adds credence to the previously discussed notion that Marci's first rank in lack of coerciveness in received directives was attributable to formal politeness.

Kerry's (1) strategy in her two repeated directives indicated the following: (1) her recognition of her social
power which to some degree was demonstrated by the coerciveness of the first form of each directive and the difference in the modifications made based on the addressee, and (2) her tacit understanding that this group responded more favorably to less coercive directive forms than to high status. However, since there were only two examples of repeats in which the form of the second utterance was changed in Kerry's data, no firm conclusions could be drawn.

**Middle-Ranked Participant.** Robbi was the third ranked participant sociometrically in the middle-class white group.

**MCW-3 Summary of Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued Number</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Responses Received Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She ranked second in successful compliance with her directives even though she ranked lowest in relative coercion. She used more directives than anyone else in her group, and 8.7% of them were repeated.

**Discussion.** One of Robbi's (3) series was similar to (1) above in that its purpose was primarily to clarify her intention:
(4) Just pick up one. You don't have to--just pick one out.

Pick one out you've smoothed out.

These two directives were issued during Robbi's period of teaching a craft and were addressed to the group as a whole. The first utterance in the series consisted of three parts: the first, *Just pick up one*, was intended as an instruction, but Robbi apparently perceived that it was inadequate and attempted to reformulate it. The second part, *You don't have to*, was an aborted reformulation which was an attempt to lessen the severity of the directive by decreasing the addressees' perception of what they were being asked to do. When this was aborted, Robbi went back to her original form *Just pick one out*. While this was essentially the same as the first part of this directive, it implied a little more careful selection; picking one out requires more thought than picking one up. The second directive in the series continued the idea of part three of section one. In the second utterance Robbi specified the criterion for picking one out, "one . . . you've smoothed out." This repeat was not based on power-solidarity strategy, but on the speaker's desire to communicate with the group. The repeat indicated, not that the group was not complying but that they were attempting to comply but doing so incorrectly.
Robbi's (3) second directive series was based on a very different strategy than (4):

(5) R: Well, yer gonna hafto or we won't have enough.

M: Mine didn't cut.

R: Well TRY or we won't have enough.

In (5) Robbi was responding to Marci, a sociometric isolate ranked fifth in her group. The first form of (5) was already fairly coercive in that the hafto made it unambiguous and called for involuntary compliance. Nevertheless, it was modified by the non-coercive well and the explanation, or we won't have enough. The second form was even more coercive, however, because of the following changes: it added coercive intonation which stressed the principal verb try. The verb was also changed from the future tense declarative gonna hafto to the present tense imperative try. This removed any possible idea the addressee might have had about postponing the indicated action and, therefore, made the directive more imminent and less ambiguous. The second form retained the explanation as an appeal to the rational side of the addressee. Both (4) and (5) were issued during Robbi's (3) period of teaching a craft to the group. The difference in strategies can be explained, in part, by the difference in addressee of the two series: one was issued to the group as a whole,
and one was issued to Marci (5). However, another series addressed to Marci (5) adds further information about Robbi's (3) directive selection.

(6) Can I take it apart and give each one five, Marci?

Can I give everybody their marbles?

Can I?

For this series, the roles of Marci (5) and Robbi (3) were reversed: Marci was the teacher, and Robbi was the learner. This role reversal was reflected in the first form in (6) which emphasized the addressee's role as superior to the speaker by using the can I form which requests permission, an act based on the underlying assumption that the addressee possesses the power to grant permission. That premise was not rejected in formulation of the second directive in the series. The primary difference between the first and second forms was that the address term was deleted; the request itself was simplified syntactically from take it apart and give each one five to give everybody their marbles. This repeat indicated that Marci (5) had not attended to the first utterance. The second form did not indicate an alteration which moved the directive along any of the three continua underlying
directive strategy. The third form, however, indicated Robbi's (3) assumption that Marci (5) had heard, attended to, and understood at least one of her previous requests since it deleted all the necessary information and only asked for permission. Again, it did not alter the power relationships existing between the two interactants, and it did not alter the ambiguity or voluntariness of the original form. If the second form was an attempt to make sure Marci (5) had heard her, the third was an attempt to get her to respond. The maintained politeness of the three-part series was surprising in terms of (5) in which Robbi (3) became quite coercive with the same addressee. The appointment of Marci as teacher, despite her social isolation, appeared to have affected Robbi's (3) perception of her social status. The series in (6) could have been addressed to an adult without modification.

However, a third series with the same speaker and addressee introduced another dimension:

(7) Marci, you're just gonna haf to wait. Mine just fell apart.

. .

Wait, please, wait. (-intonation)

. .

WAIT. (+intonation)
The situation in which this series was uttered was the same as for (6) in that Marci (5) was still the teacher. The first form in this series was very much like the first form in (5), the declarative statement with gonna hafto as the principal verb and an explanation. The directive was placed on the speaker's side of the power continuum by the hafto, and it indicated the control of the speaker over the situation. When this tactic was unsuccessful, Robbi (31 switched to the approach used in (61. She moved from a statement to an imperative; however, she modified the imperative in two ways: she added a politeness marker, please, and used pleading intonation. Through the use of these two devices, she clearly moved the directive toward Marci's (5) end of the power continuum although she retained its lack of ambiguity. When this form was also unsuccessful, Robbi (31 removed the two devices used in the second form and issued a straightforward imperative with coercive intonation. The third form, then, asserted the speaker's power over the addressee and was placed at the coercive end of each of the three continua. Although (6) and (7) were similar in that they had the same addressee and were issued in the same situation, WAIT! was much more coercive than Can I? The primary difference between the two was the urgency of the speaker's need for the directive to achieve compliance. Although Robbi (3) wanted to distribute the marbles in (6) it was an optional
activity. However, in (7) it was much more necessary that Marci (5) stop giving instructions until Robbi (3) had a chance to repair her craft which "just fell apart." The sense of urgency, then, was a salient feature in the construction of this directive series.

One additional series by Robbi (3) demonstrated another aspect of her strategy:

(8) I think it would be good to have it the 25th.

Let's have it the 25th of August.

This series was addressed to the group as a whole as part of a session to plan an outing. The first formulation was rated six on the coercion level index, a comparatively low rating. It was a statement issued for mutual benefit reduced by the presence of a disclaimer. As such it was relatively ambiguous, highly voluntary, and not issued from a position of speaker's power. The second form, however, rated a ten on the coercion level index because of the following changes: the disclaimer I think was deleted making the directive more straightforward, and the statement form was altered to the less ambiguous let's. The first person plural pronoun placed the directive at the solidarity point of the power continuum. In dealing with the group as a whole, therefore, it appeared that Robbi (3) was aware of her sociometric position as number
three and, therefore, did not assert herself strongly from a power position. Instead, she invoked solidarity and minimal coercion in the formulation of her unsuccessful statement.

In summary, of the five series used by Robbi (3), one retained the same coercion level, one became less coercive, and three became more coercive. The factors which seemed to be affecting the direction of the changes included the role relationship between the speaker and the addressee (i.e., which was teacher and which was student), the importance of achieving compliance, and whether the directive was addressed to a group or to an individual. Unfortunately, none of Robbi's (3) repeated directives was addressed to anyone above her in sociometric rank. However, it was interesting that Robbi (3) was considerably less coercive with Marci (5) when Marci was in her role as teacher. Overly simplified, Robbi's (3) general strategy was to become increasingly coercive, a relatively unsuccessful tactic considering her group's propensity to respond more favorably to lower coercion levels.

Lowest-Ranked Participant. The lowest ranked person sociometrically in the middle-class white group was Marci.
Despite her low social status, Marci (5) ranked third in success at achieving compliance, partially because of her persistence in repeating 27% of her directives. She ranked fourth in frequency of directives issued and second in average coercion level.

Discussion. Marci's (5) first directive series was particularly interesting because it was the longest one found in any of the conversations, consisting of the original directive followed by ten reformulations all of which were unsuccessful:

(9) M: I can't cut it. (-intonation)

R: Well, you're just gonna hafto or we won't have enough.

M: Will somebody cut this for me?

R: You can cut it.
M: Would you cut mine?

D: You're not totally helpless, Marci.

M: Cut mine.

M: PLEASE (+intonation)

M: Oh, somebody, cut mine. (-intonation)

M: Oh, somebody cut mine. (-intonation

M: OH! Somebody CUT mine! (+intonation)

In its original form, this directive was a statement with non-coercive intonation. Therefore, it was ambiguous and voluntary and underscored the addressee's power over the speaker. It was a hint, but no one took it, so Marci (5) reduced the ambiguity to some degree by moving from a statement to a question. However, she retained an element of ambiguity by formulating an unspecified subject, somebody. The second form still emphasized the power of the
addressee over the speaker. The third form was a retreat to the ambiguity and voluntariness of the first form and offered an explanation for the question. The third form was somewhat different from the first in that it shifted the blame from the speaker's inability to the item itself. When the first three tries were all unsuccessful, the speaker determined to formulate a directive which would be effective. Therefore, she reduced the ambiguity to some extent by specifying the addressee and making it clear that some assistance was desired. In the same way she reduced the possibility for unexplained non-compliance. In order to balance this coerciveness, however, she used the question form, the modal auxiliary and the politeness marker, please. The outcome of this strategy was the very polite, "Would you cut mine, please, Robbi?" Nevertheless, even this attempt was unsuccessful, so Marci (5) turned to a different addressee, Dani (2), and rephrased her request. The fourth form was very much like the third except that the politeness marker and the address term were deleted. This placed the directive slightly more toward the speaker's end of the power continuum, but still on the addressee's side.

The response to this fourth formulation was "You're not totally helpless, Marci." This feedback indicated to Marci (5) that she had been placing her directives too far toward the addressee's end of the power continuum, so in
the fifth formulation, she moved to the other extreme with *Cut Mine*, an unambiguous power directive which emphasized the control of the speaker. However, this too was unsuccessful, and the sixth form indicated Marci's (5) confusion about how to proceed. The supplicant directives which placed her in an inferior power relationship to the addressee had not only failed but drawn negative comment, and her clearly unambiguous power directives had been equally unsuccessful. Therefore, in the sixth try she used the politeness marker, *please*, but issued it with the coercive intonation usually reserved for imperatives. This abbreviated form of the directive assumed that the addressee had heard and understood the preceding utterances. While the use of the politeness marker symbolized politeness, the coercive intonation negated any real sense of submission.

The eighth attempt changed the addressee from a specific person to the group as a whole and shifted back to indication of addressee power over speaker. Although the addressee was ambiguous, the request form was not. The ninth and tenth forms were identical in form and intonation and reflected the same strategy as the eighth without the explanation *I can't*, which by this time was shared knowledge. Eight through ten all had non-coercive or pleading intonation which helped place them on the supplicant end of the power continuum. However, the
eleventh form reverted to coercive intonation asserting the speaker's power by demanding that her request be fulfilled. Every available strategy had failed, and the coercive intonation of the eleventh form resulted as much from frustration as from the belief that the power base actually existed.

Marci's (5) remaining repeats were of the type exemplified by (1) and, therefore, will not be discussed. Marci's (5) overall strategy in the preceding series was to begin with low coercion and retain it as long as possible. She, in fact, issued her directive five times before she resorted to an imperative. This was generally the best approach to use with this group, but coupled with Marci's (5) low status, it proved unsuccessful in this case. Marci's (5) strategy seemed to be less affected by the sociometric status of her addressees than was Kerry's (1) and, as in one of Robbi's (3) series, her persistence appeared to result from the urgency of her need to achieve compliance. Marci's (5) willingness to repeat 27% of her directives may account for her rank as third in achieving compliance.

The three members of the middle-class group discussed above indicated the following principles underlying directive strategy in this group: (1) decreases in coercion appeared to be more successful than increases in coercion, (2) the status rankings of the speaker and
addressee were considered in adjusting the form of the directives, (3) the urgency of the situation was more significant than status in determining an appropriate coercion level, and (4) role relationships were more important than status relationships in determining coerciveness. From the very limited data consulted in this section, the above principles are merely suggestive of the orientation of the strategies discussed.

Working-Class White

The strategies among the working-class white group did not prove to be substantially different from those employed by the middle-class group. Again, three participants were considered, the first, middle, and lowest ranked participants sociometrically.

**Highest Ranked Participant.** The highest ranked girl in the working-class white group was Phyllis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCW-1 Summary of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phyllis (1) ranked first in the number of directives she issued and in her overall coercion level and third in achieving compliance with her directives. In short, she issued more directives and more coercive directives than
anyone else in her group but, in spite of her high sociometric rank, two other group members were more successful at achieving compliance. Phyllis (1) repeated 14% of her directives.

Discussion. The similarity between her strategy and that of previously discussed participants may be seen in the following series:

(10) P: Hand me that little paint brush.
  B: I'm using it.
  P: I want my little paint brush.
  B: Well, just wait till I'm through.
  
  P: I NEED it. (+intonation)

Like her first ranked counterpart in the middle-class group, Phyllis (1) began her series with a power directive based on her social position. It was an unambiguous imperative which was not modified in any way and did not have a verbally specified addressee. Again, like first ranked Kerry (MCW), when this power directive was unsuccessful, Phyllis (1) retreated from the power position by making a statement which was both more ambiguous and more voluntary. At the same time, however, she also changed the that to my which increased her claim on the object. Her third form was very much like Kerry's (MCW-1)
"I need two more, please." However, where Kerry (MCW-1) moved to social distance in a metaphorical lessening of her social power, Phyllis (1) combined power of speaker and power of addressee in a different way, more like Marci's (MCW-5) PLEASE in (9). Phyllis (1) used a statement of need, usually a non-coercive directive, but she modified it with coercive intonation. The shortened form of the third segment of the series indicated her understanding that Barbara (2) had heard and understood her previous utterances. The third form was an explanation of the first two as well as a restated directive. This series was addressed to second ranked Barbara (2), and the strategy involved moving first toward less coerciveness and then toward a middle ground between the first two forms.

Although most of Phyllis' (1) series were simple repeats, one additional complex series helped to further illustrate her strategy. Since different sections of this series were addressed to different people and requested different acts, not every directive was counted as a repeat. Nonetheless, the overall goal of the entire series was to get Kay (3) to play the part of the father in the puppet show the group had planned.

(11) P: Kay's the daddy.

K: No, I'm not either.
P: Yes, you are.
K: No, I'm not.

P: Raise yer hand for Kay for a daddy.


P: Yeah! Kay's the daddy.
K: I'm not gonna be the daddy either.
P: Come on, be it.
K: I'm not gonna be.
B: Don't make her if she don't want to.
P: You have to be.

Even though the first formulation of the directive was a deflected statement, it was unambiguous and offered no voluntary and unexplained non-compliance. It was a fiat sent down from the top-ranked person socially to the person ranked third. However, the real addressee of this utterance responded unfavorably to directives more often than any other group member, and her response to this fiat was characteristic. This negative response brought about the second directive in the series which was merely a restatement of the first in a more abbreviated form and
addressed directly to the intended receiver rather than deflected as the first formulation had been. When this direct approach failed, Phyllis (1) attempted to take her case to the people in a vote, trying to rally her social support behind her cause. Therefore, her third directive in the series was directed to the group as a whole and not merely to those who actually wanted Kay (3) to play the part, i.e., Phyllis (1) did not say, "Raise your hands if you want Kay for a daddy." The form of the directive indicated that the vote was a show of Phyllis' (1) social force rather than democracy in action. Because of her top ranked social position, her directive was intended not only to elicit the Kay (3) for a daddy vote but to create it. The fourth directive in the series indicated that the third was not entirely successful although it must have been attended to because of the abbreviated form of the repeat. The fact that it was repeated after it was obvious to Phyllis (1) that the intended receivers had heard it indicated further that Phyllis (1) was creating rather than counting the vote. Both forms of vote soliciting were unambiguous and involuntary. Whatever ambiguity existed in the first form as to the voters' freedom of choice was cleared up by the second form.

The fifth form indicated that the vote taking was successful, and Phyllis (1) reverted to her original fiat, expecting her show of social power to have convinced
Kay (3). However, when this was not the case, Phyllis (1) changed her strategy entirely. Like Kerry (MCW-1) in (2), Phyllis placed her next directive on the supplicant end of the power continuum, indicating Kay's (3) superiority for the first time. However, where Kerry (MCW-1) used the solidarity cue of an address term, Phyllis (1) reverted to another imperative be it. The supplication, however, was short-lived, and Phyllis' (1) next directive was another command statement made coercive by the addition of *hafto*. Although all the interactants attempted at some point to use social power as a force behind their directives, Phyllis (1) was the only one who did so overtly, and even her attempted show of force was unsuccessful.

The working-class white group did not respond characteristically to either high coercion, low coercion, or status, but mixed their responses to each factor. Therefore, it was difficult for participants in this group to formulate a successful strategy. In the two series above, the strategy of the directive series may not have made a significant difference in achieving compliance, however, because of the nature of what Phyllis (1) was asking. In (10) she asked Barbara (2) to give her the paint brush that Barbara (2) was actually using, and she was not satisfied with that explanation of non-compliance. It is difficult to imagine how Phyllis (1) might have phrased a directive in terms effective enough to entice
Barbara (2) to give her brush before she had finished with it. In (11), Phyllis (1) asked Kay (3) to play a role in a puppet show which she did not want to play. No strategy Phyllis (1) used was effective in getting Kay (3) to do something so sincerely against her wishes. Therefore, although Phyllis' (1) strategy appeared to take into account the relevant factors of the interrelationship of social status and variation of coerciveness, her success at achieving compliance may have been comparatively low because of the kinds of things she expected, or at least requested, other people to do. She may have over-estimated her own status; even though she was first, she was not considerably above the other participants.

Middle-Ranked Participant. The third ranked participant in the working-class white group was Kay.

**WCW-3 Summary of Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Kay (3) ranked fifth in the number of directives she issued and in coerciveness, she ranked second in success in achieving compliance.

Discussion. Kay repeated only one directive, and the whole conversation surrounding the repeat was essential
to its meaningful examination:

(12) K: Let me just be the director 'n tell what the play's gonna be about.

P: OK, Kay, you write everything down.

K: You have to tell me.

T: I wanta write mine down.

P: Cross out than 'n write it over.

B: Let's just--Act like--Hey, let's act like botha them are goin' on a date.

P: All right. Kay, you write down the words.

M: Just say--

P: Here yall write something.

K: Let me just be the director.

Kay's (3) initial directive was a relatively non-coercive one which placed the addressee(s) at the power end of the scale assuming that they had power over her. This conversation followed (11), however, in which Kay (3) had asserted herself against both Phyllis (1) and Phyllis' social support. Perhaps because of her earlier defeat, Phyllis (1) appeared to go along with Kay (3) in her response, OK. However, Phyllis (1) had a different perception of what a director was supposed to do as is indicated by her return directive, "You write everything down." Although Kay (3) agreed initially, the conversation gained momentum, and the writing task became more than
Kay (3) wanted to handle. This brought about her repeated directive, "Let me just be the director." In a sense this was a simple repeat, i.e., Kay (3) was clarifying what she had requested initially since it became apparent that her fellow interactants had not understood what she intended. Her second formulation of the directive deleted the "'n tell what the play's gonna be about." In later conversations, it became obvious that Kay (3) had included the task of introducing the play to the audience as part of the director's responsibilities, but Phyllis (1) had interpreted her to mean that she wanted to write the play itself. Therefore, the second formulation of the directive was not a shift in power, voluntariness, or ambiguity, but a repeat for clarification. Since this was Kay's (3) only repeat, nothing could clearly be determined about her underlying strategy.

**Lowest-Ranked Participant.** Terry was the fifth sociometrically ranked person in the working-class white group.

**WCW-5 Summary of Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terry ranked third in total number of directives issued and coerciveness and last in success in achieving compliance. Terry repeated only .7% of her directives, and all her repeats were for clarification or to gain the floor. Her lack of repeats based on strategy may have been a factor in her lack of success in achieving compliance. She had Marci's (MCW-5) low social status, but without her persistence, she did not achieve her level of compliance with directives issued.

Because of the limited data on reformulation coming from the working-class white group, it was difficult to determine what principles were considered salient by these children. Phyllis (1) appeared to recognize the inter-relationships of status and the significance of coerciveness; however, her requests were for performances beyond the scope of most directives. Kay (3) offered only one clarification repeat, and Terry (5) had no directives series based on strategy.

Working-Class Black

The strategy of the black interactants tended to prefer increased coerciveness in repeats; however, as indicated above, success in achieving compliance was more a matter of status than of message form as the following comparisons indicate.
Highest-Ranked Participant. In the working-class black group, Gina was ranked first sociometrically.

WCB-1 Summary of Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She also ranked first in achieving favorable compliance to her directives, first in frequency of directives issued, and second in average coercion. In spite of her high success in eliciting compliance, Gina (1) repeated only 6.5% of her directives, a clear indication that her high status made frequent repeats unnecessary. Several of Gina's (1) directives series were simple repeats, and two of them merely added explanations:

(13) Y'all better start hurryin' up'n finishin' up.

. . .

You better start finishin up cause we still got four things to do.

(14) You gotta put'em on bof sides.

. . .

You gotta put 'em on bof sides or they'll come apart.

However, a few of Gina's series did indicate her directive strategy in more complex ways:
Give me the piece of paper. I can do it.

Give me the piece of paper. (+intonation)

Discussion. The first relatively coercive form was modified by an explanation. It was already unambiguous and involuntary and issued from the speaker's power position. The second formulation was even more coercive due to the deletion of the explanation and the addition of coercive intonation. Gina (1) was not accustomed to having to give her directives more than once before they achieved compliance. In her next series, however, she reversed her strategy:

(16) All y'all help me. (+intonation)

Y'all help me.

The first form of the series was made more coercive in two ways: the seemingly redundant all was added as a preface to y'all to make the addressee unambiguous since y'all could have meant any two or more of the four addressees. In addition, she used coercive intonation. Both these extra features were deleted in her second formulation which, by comparison, was a plea. A series demonstrating Gina's (1) role as disciplinarian also revealed something about her directive formation strategy:
(17) Be quiet y'all. (+intonation)

Y'all get off that thing. (+intonation)

Let that thing alone, Sandy.

Y'all don't even 'posed to be messin' widdat.

In its first form, the imperative was relatively coercive because of the form of its principal verb and the added coercive intonation. However, the addressee was the ambiguous y'all. This ambiguity was deleted in the second formulation which more clearly specified what action was being directed. The coercive intonation was still present in the second form. The address term in the third form further decreased the ambiguity, but the coercive intonation was not used. The fourth formulation was much less coercive and served as an explanation for the first three; however, it also made a negative evaluation of the addressee's behavior, a powerful comment coming from Gina (1) since she was ranked so high on every scale. The difference between the strategies in (16) and (17) may be explained by the fact that (16) was addressed to the group as a whole, whereas (17) was addressed to the lowest ranking members of
the group who were, at the time of the series, not participating in the group activities but rather detracting from them. Gina (1) combined high social status, frequency of directives, high coercion level average and high success at obtaining compliance to make repeats unnecessary; therefore, her repeat strategy was not as clearly demonstrated in the data. However, her tendency, especially in addressing low ranking interactants, was to increase coercion. Nevertheless, Gina's (1) lack of repeats and her success at achieving compliance without them indicated the propensity on the part of the black group to respond to status more than to message form.

Middle-Ranked Participant. The third ranked person in the working-class black group was Janice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued Number</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Responses Received Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Janice (3) ranked second to Gina (1) in achieving compliance with her directives even though she was fifth in coerciveness and only repeated 3.5%, or two directives, both of which were repeated for clarification. The reason for Janice's (3) low percentage clearly appeared to be that she had a high degree of success in obtaining compliance with first forms. However, her claim to that success was more
difficult to explain. It was interesting to note that the third ranked person sociometrically in each of the three groups was both lowest in coerciveness and second in success in achieving compliance.

Lowest-Ranked Participant. The lowest ranked person in the working-class black group was Carla.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociometric Rank</th>
<th>Directives Issued</th>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Responses Received</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carla (5) ranked fourth in achieving compliance in spite of the fact that she was highest in coerciveness in her group. She also repeated 19.5% of her directives.

Discussion. She could, therefore, be considered to be the least successful speaker examined thus far. She offered only a few highly coercive directives, but despite her persistence in repeating 19.5%, she was least successful in obtaining compliance. Terry (WCW-5), who was fifth sociometrically and fifth in obtaining compliance did not use the repeat as a resource, and hence, maintained her low rank, unlike Marci (MCW-5), who despite her fifth position sociometrically drove her favorable compliance rank up to three by her 27% repeats. Carla (5), however, availed herself of the resource of repeats but was unable
to improve her compliance ratio by doing so. Her low status was reflected in her first directive series.

(18) C: You only put a hole right there, right there.

G: You gotta put 'em on bof sides.

G: You gotta put 'em on bof sides or they'll come apart.

C: Y'all just go on put holes in all of 'em.

S: Well look, like this.

G: You bose ta put holes in all of 'em.

G: Let me see that.

C: Go on 'n put holes in all of 'em.

During this conversation, Carla (5) was the instructor, demonstrating how to make a trash can out of egg cartons. She believed that holes were required only in two places, hence her first directive. However, Gina (1), the top ranked person socially, differed with Carla (5) and repeated a gotta statement twice. Either Gina's (1) logic (or they'll come apart) or her superior status convinced Carla (5) who, in the next directive, changed her instructions: "Y'all just go on put holes in all of 'em."

Sandy (4), however, was not convinced, and explaining to her elicited Carla's (5) repeat, "Go on 'n put holes in all of 'em." The repeat was more coercive than the original because the ambiguous y'all was deleted as was the just indicating a lessening of the requirement. However, the
increased coercion was directed at the next lowest ranked member, Sandy (4), and was a show of support for the top ranked member, Gina (1). Therefore, it was not a power move in any real sense, but rather an attempt to indicate as clearly as possible that Carla (5) had gone over to Gina's (1) side.

In a later series, however, Carla (5) demonstrated a different strategy with Gina (1) as addressee.

(19) Let me see some a that thread.


Let me see some a that thread, Gina. (-intonation)


Gimme some.

The form was first a relatively coercive let with an undesignated subject. This form rated a ten on the coercion level index. The second form dropped to an eight by adding an address term and a non-coercive intonation. However, the final form rated a fifteen and reflected Carla's (5) strategy of compensating for lack of success with high level coercion.

A similar series addressed to Sandy (4), the fourth ranking person in the working-class black group, indicated the use of the same strategy:
(20) Sandy, will you please pass me the crayons. (-intonation)

Gimme a brown one, Sandy.

Put the crayon right there. (+intonation)

This series began with a very formally polite directive and one of the few uses of a politeness marker by members of this group. The address term, the verb pass and the politeness marker, combined to give the directive the flavor of a metaphor, not of the type used by Kerry (MCW-1) in (3) to create social distance, but one used for humorous effect. This type of humor was common for Carla (5) who liked to talk "in voice" and had a routine in which she imitated the speech of whites. Therefore, the non-coercive intonation attached to this directive could have been a mimicking intonation contour effected to imitate the white version of polite conversation. However, when Carla (5) did not receive the desired response either to her request or to her humor, she reverted to a more direct strategy, an unambiguous power imperative with an address term. The third form was even more coercive because the address term was deleted, and the directive itself took on the impact of a threat with the
"or else" deleted. Although the semantic content varied somewhat during the three directives, moving from the crayons to a brown one to the crayon, the context indicated that these three were all the same basic directive in three forms. The remainder of Carla's (5) series were simple repeats which did not reveal strategy.

Carla's (5) repeat strategy revealed two possible sources of her lack of success in achieving compliance. One, she repeatedly resorted to higher coercion without regard to the status of the addressee. She addressed Gina (1), top ranked group member, in the same fashion that she addressed Sandy (4), fourth ranked member. She did not appear to be considering all the social information available to her in formulating or reformulating her directives. Two, Carla's (5) group responded more to status than to directive form; therefore, all her attempts, including humor, may have been to no avail since her status was so low.

The three members of the working-class black group indicated the following principles underlying their directive formation strategy: (1) increases in coercion appeared to be more common, if not more successful, than decreases in coercion; (2) although the status rankings of the participants were not always considered in reformulating the directives, this lack of consideration resulted in unsuccessful directives; and (3) the status of the speaker
appeared to have more effect on the tendency toward compliance than did the strategy of the reformulated directives.

Inter-Group Comparison

Although little could be ascertained from the limited data available in the interactions of the working-class white participants, a comparison could be made between the middle-class white and working-class black groups. The most obvious difference was the orientation of the white group toward decreased coercion and the black group's orientation toward increased coercion. While this trend may indicate a real linguistic difference between the groups which was a function of class and/or ethnicity, it may have also resulted from an interaction of other factors. For example, lowest ranked and most coercive Carla (WCB-5) issued many of the repeats analyzed in the working-class black section, and her coerciveness may have distorted the picture. Also, if Gina's (WCB-1) repeats with explanations were included, there may appear to be a greater propensity for decreases in coerciveness. At any rate, this difference, while interesting and suggestive, was tentative. The relative status of the interactants again appeared to be more important to the participants in the working-class black group. Because each of the participants discussed repeated directives with varying
degrees of success, it was difficult to delineate a pattern which could be said to be shared by all group members.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine: (1) how the status of an individual in a group was indicated by that individual's use and receipt of directives and (2) whether the indication of an individual's status within such a group varied as a function of class and/or ethnicity.

The population of the study consisted of fifteen females between the ages of ten and twelve, divided into homogeneous groups of five members each on the basis of their class and ethnicity; one group consisted of middle-class white participants, one of working-class white participants, and one of working-class black participants.

Summary

Activities Included in the Investigation

Investigation of the use of the directive system by the participants involved: (1) structuring twenty-four interaction tasks to be completed by the participants over a period of four days per group; (2) taping the interactions; (3) transcribing the directives and their responses from selected tapes; (4) developing an instrument to evaluate the coercion level of the directives and the
relative compliance of the responses; (5) collecting sociometric data for each child from other members of the group; (6) comparing the individual's sociometric rank with the mean coercion level of the directives she issued, the frequency of directives issued, the mean coercion level of directives received, the frequency of directives, her selection of various components within the possibilities for directive formation, the relative compliance of the responses she issued, and the relative compliance of the responses she received; (7) selecting the statistical techniques which were Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance, chi squares, and the Spearman Rank Coefficient of Correlation; (8) interpreting the results of the treatment of the data in terms of the purpose of the study.

Population of the Study

The population was selected from among the working class black and white participants in a neighborhood community center and from an analogous middle-class institution. The social class of the participants was determined by Warner's Index of Social Status Characteristics including the indices of occupation, source of income, dwelling type, and dwelling area.

Major Findings

The major findings of the study are presented below under the titles of their respective sections of analysis.
Uses of Directives. The analysis of the use of directives produced five findings:

1. There was no significant correlation between any of the groups in the study and the adult model of directive use described in the literature.

2. Both working-class groups complied with the projected child model of directive use in which the first and last ranked participants were more coercive than the middle ranked participant. The middle-class group did not correspond with this model, but the middle ranked person in the middle-class group was also the least coercive person.

3. The middle-class group issued less coercive directives to persons with higher status. The working-class groups did not distinguish status in addressing directives.

4. The middle-class group issued fewer directives to persons with higher status. Again, the working-class groups did not make a status designation.

5. The black group demonstrated a positive correlation between status and the number of directives issued. Neither of the white groups made this designation.

Responses to Directives. The examination of the responses to directives produced five major findings:
1. There was no correlation in any group between the status of the person receiving the directive and the relative compliance of the response.

2. The middle-class white group responded more favorably to low coercion than to high coercion.

3. The working-class black group exhibited a positive correlation between the status of the person issuing the directive and the relative compliance of the response.

4. The working-class white group did not indicate any discernable pattern of responses.

5. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance indicated no statistical significance in a comparison of the three groups in their uses of and responses to directives.

Component Selection. Individual differences among group members in the selection of components can be found in Tables 5, 6, and 7. The following findings relate to the characteristic selection of directive components by persons in specific status ranks:

1. The highest status person in each group was characterized by the use of the most imperatives and the fewest Let/Let's forms. She also selected the fewest speaker benefit directives and the most mutual benefit directives. Finally, she asked
for permission by selecting the allow option less than anyone else in her group.

2. The middle status person in each group was characterized by using the fewest imperatives and the most Let/Let's forms. She also characteristically used the most statements, made almost as many mutual benefit requests as the first ranked person, and made the fewest addressee benefit requests. Finally, she issued the fewest perform directives, the most delay directives, and the most allow directives in her group.

3. The last ranked person in each group was more similar to the first ranked person than to the middle ranked person in that she characteristically used a large percentage of imperatives and few Let/Let's forms. She issued fewer statements than either the first or third ranked participants. She issued the most speaker benefit directives, the fewest mutual benefit directives, and the most addressee benefit directives. She issued more perform directives than any other participant, and she issued almost no delay directives.

In cross-class and cross-ethnic comparisons of components selections, the following findings emerged which could be associated with class:
1. Working-class participants made greater use of imperatives than did middle-class participants.

2. Working-class participants issued more directives intended to bring about mutual benefit than did middle-class participants.

3. Middle-class interactants more frequently used coercive intonation.

4. Middle-class participants used OK twice as often as working-class participants.

The following findings were associated with the ethnicity of the participants:

1. White participants used the statement form significantly more often than did the black participants.

2. The white groups used significantly more modal auxiliaries than the black group did.

3. Black participants used better as a coercive modifier more frequently than did white speakers.

4. Black participants more frequently used non-coercive intonation than white speakers.

5. Black participants used address terms considerably more than did white participants. One finding was considered important because it indicated no difference among the groups: all three groups used
approximately the same number of explanations to clarify their directives.

**Directive Formation Strategy.** An examination of repeated and reformulated directives revealed the characteristic strategies underlying directive formation for the three groups. The middle-class white group adhered to the following principles:

1. Decreases in coercion appeared to be more successful than increases in coercion.
2. The status rankings of the speaker and addressee were considered in adjusting the form of the directives.
3. The urgency of the situation was more significant than status in determining an appropriate coercion level.
4. Role relationships were more important than status relationships in determining coerciveness.

No conclusive findings could be derived from the repeated directives of the working-class white group. However, the three members of the working-class black group indicated the following principles underlying their directive formation strategy:

1. Increases in coercion appeared to be more common, if not more successful, than decreases in coercion.
2. Although the status rankings of the participants were not always considered in reformulations, a lack of such consideration resulted in unsuccessful directives.

3. The status of the speaker appeared to have more effect on the tendency toward compliance than did the strategy of the reformulated directive.

Conclusions

The conclusions will be presented below in terms of their contribution to fulfilling the stated purposes of the study. Therefore, they will appear under two headings:

1) Intra-Group Uses of Directives to Indicate Status, and
2) Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Differences in the Use of Directives to Indicate Status.

Intra-Group Uses of Directives to Indicate Status

*Middle-Class White.* The adolescent females in the middle-class white group did not indicate status by demonstrating any statistically significant relationship between status and either the number or the coerciveness of directives issued. However, they did mark the status of the receiver of directives by demonstrating a significant correlation between both the number and the coerciveness of directives issued to persons in high status positions. They issued fewer and less coercive directives to higher
status participants and correspondingly a greater number and more coercive directives to lower status participants. High status was not a factor in determining whether or not they responded compliantly to directives. Instead, middle-class participants characteristically responded more favorably to directives which were not highly coercive.

In selecting directive components, highest status resulted in fourth highest coerciveness, selections which indicated a concern over group goals as opposed to personal goals, and authority over others as opposed to supplication. Middle status resulted in lowest coercion, more concern for group-goals than for personal goals, and extensive use of supplication as opposed to authority. Lowest status resulted in third highest coerciveness and selections which were ambivalent in terms of authority including a significant number from both ends of the power-solidarity-supplication continuum but few choices from the middle. It also resulted in choices which indicated isolation from the group.

Working-Class White. Members of this group did not indicate status by the number of directives issued. Both high status and low status resulted in relatively high coercion, and middle-status resulted in lowest coercion. Low status in the working-class white group did not result in greater compliance with directives nor did high status
result in less compliance. Furthermore, the status of the speaker was not significant in eliciting favorable responses to directives.

In component selection, high status resulted in highest coercion, group-goal orientation, and selections which indicated authority rather than supplication. Middle-status resulted in lowest coercion, less group orientation, more personal orientation, and a greater tendency to ask permission. Lowest status resulted in relatively coercive directives and ambivalent choices from both ends of the power-solidarity-suppllication continuum.

**Working-Class Black.** The participants in the working-class black group demonstrated a relationship between status and the relative coerciveness of directives issued in that highest and lowest status participants both issued highly coercive directives, and the middle status participant exhibited lowest coerciveness. The number of directives issued was directly correlated with status; i.e., the highest status person issued the most directives, and lower status persons issued correspondingly fewer. The black participants did not indicate status by issuing either fewer or less coercive directives to high status participants. However, they did respond to the status of the speaker by complying more favorably with directives given by higher status participants.
In the selection of directive components, high status resulted in high coerciveness, group-goal orientation, and an expression of authority over other interactants. Middle-status resulted in lowest coercion, slightly less group-goal involvement, frequent use of supplicant selections, and limited selections from the power end of the continuum. Lowest status resulted in highest coercion, individual goal orientation, and ambivalent selections from both ends of the power-solidarity-supplication continuum. It also resulted in selections indicating a general isolation from the group.

Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Differences in the Use of Directives to Indicate Status

The preceding descriptions of the use of directives to indicate status by the homogeneous groups of females who participated in the study have certain elements in common. However, some differences in the use of directives to indicate status can be attributed to the ethnicity of the participants, and some can be attributed to their class membership.

Similarities. None of the three groups used the directive system to designate status in the same way in which it was used by the adults described in the literature. Furthermore, none of the groups demonstrated any correlation between the status of the addressee and compliance
with directives. Highest, middle, and lowest status participants made directive component selections which were similar to the selections made by persons of the same status rank in other groups. That is, certain characteristic selections appeared to be a function of intra-group status rather than class or ethnicity. Also, the mean coercion levels of all of the groups were very similar.

**Ethnic Differences.** Status in the black group was marked by directive use in two ways not shared by either white group. Only blacks used status as a power base for issuing a larger number of directives. Also, only black participants responded significantly more compliantly to higher status speakers. Therefore, status for this group was significant to the speaker in determining the appropriate number of directives to be issued and to the addressee in determining the appropriate responses.

Although the overall coercion level means were comparable across group lines, there were some significant differences in component selections which could be attributed to ethnicity. Black participants used more imperatives and made more frequent use of *better* as a coercive addition. However, they also made more frequent use of non-coercive intonation and used significantly more address terms, also a non-coercive device. In contrast, white speakers made significantly more frequent use of the
non-coercive statement form and the modal auxiliary. The directive formation strategies, while interesting and suggestive, were too tentative a basis from which to draw conclusions. However, the strategy differences along ethnic lines appeared to parallel other evidence about directives. For example, the status of the speaker in the black group appeared to be more influential in achieving compliance for a repeated directive than was the strategy underlying the reformulation. This did not appear to be true for the other groups.

Class Differences. Both working-class groups demonstrated one characteristic not shared by the middle-class group: They used both highest and lowest status as a basis for issuing highly coercive directives and middle status as a basis for issuing the least coercive directives. Therefore, the lowest status person in both working-class groups exhibited behavior which was more similar to the highest status person than to anyone else in the group. This configuration was divergent from both the adult model and the profile of the middle-class group.

Middle-class participants marked status in two ways not shared by either working-class group: (1) they indicated their recognition of the intra-group status of fellow participants by addressing fewer directives to higher ranking persons and correspondingly more directives
to lower ranking persons; (2) they also indicated the status of their addressees by issuing less coercive directives to persons in higher status positions and correspondingly more coercive directives to lower ranking addressees. However, for this group status was not significant in determining compliance. Instead, middle-class participants responded more compliantly to non-coercive message form than to status of speaker. Middle-class children, in contrast to working-class children, recognized the status of their fellow interactants and considered that status in determining the number and coerciveness of the directives they would address to certain parties. However, the individual's status in the middle-class group did not play a role in determining how many directives she would issue, or in how coercive her directives might be. It also did not play a role in regulating responses to directives.

Some component selection variations also appeared to be functions of class. The working-class groups both made greater use of imperatives than did the middle-class group, and they were more oriented toward mutual benefit. The middle-class group used coercive intonation twice as much as the working-class groups and made twice as much use of OK as a conversational device.
Implications

The implications of the data from this study will be presented below under the headings of the sections in which each type of analysis was presented: (1) Use of Directives, (2) Responses to Directives, (3) Directive Component Selection, and (4) Directive Formation Strategy.

Implications of the Data on the Use of Directives

Interaction with Adults. Children may be subject to misinterpretation by adults of their indication of social status through their use of directives since the child model, as investigated in this study, and the adult model, as presently described in the literature are not co-terminous. Whereas the lower status adults use less coercive directive forms when addressing higher status adults, only the middle-class children in the study followed this pattern. The working-class children with low status used more coercive forms upward in an attempt to make their requests powerful and unambiguous. It was assumed by this difference in models that, whereas adults value social marking over efficiency in attaining directive compliance, children value efficiency over social marking. Since data involving children interacting with adults were not analyzed, no evidence was presented concerning children's use of directives to adults, but the area of the
mismatch between children's and adults' use of directives appears to be a valuable research concern.

Furthermore, an adult observing the interactions of children from the working-class could misinterpret which children were actually performing group leadership roles. Basing judgment on the number and coerciveness of directives as they are used in the adult model, the observing adult could select the individual with the least actual leadership potential.

Cross-Class Interactions. Since the white middle-class is still the most powerful reference group in the institutions where classes and ethnic groups are most frequently integrated, working-class children are subject to misinterpretation of their use of the directive system since it does not fully coincide with the middle-class model. Because directives, like address terms, carry a heavy load of social meaning, misinterpretation of the children's sociolinguistic rules for directive information can be crucial to one in a minority power position such as a child in school. In the study, middle-class children issued less coercive directives to children with higher intra-group social status, and they issued fewer directives to higher ranking participants. However, this was not the case with the working-class children. This difference indicates a different utilization of social status
information in the creation of directives, a difference which has serious implications.

Within her own context, the working-class child forms directives according to a system which does not differentiate high status from low status in terms of coerciveness. As long as her fellow interacts are utilizing the same system, there is no confusion. However, when that child interacts with representatives from the middle-class who do mark social status with lack of coerciveness, she is in danger of misinterpretation. Because social situations are created as well as reflected by the use of language, a child using a highly coercive form with a fellow interactant of high status is perceived as attempting to create a social hierarchy in which the high status person is brought down to a level below the speaker because this is the way the rule functions in the middle-class system. Therefore, the working-class child is viewed as abrupt and rude, even though she is merely processing social information according to her own rules which work sufficiently well in her own context.

Because minority ethnic and class children must interact with middle-class white children and adults at school, it is important that their directive system be understood so that their intentions in interaction will not be misconstrued. Research conducted on interaction of
children from different social classes would help to illuminate this concern.

Cross-Ethnic Interactions. Only the black group indicated a correlation between intra-group status and the number of directives issued by the participants. Although this does not imply any difficulties in inter-group interactions, it does imply a difference in the functioning of the sociolinguistic rule for directive formation. The black children responded to their own status in a different fashion than did the white participants. This difference might have resulted from the role of the adolescent female in the black community, and again, this is suggestive of a need for further investigation.

Implications of the Data of Responses to Directives

Interaction with Adults. The status of the directive receiver was not a factor in any of the groups in determining whether or not the receiver would comply. Although the question of responses has not been directly dealt with in adult studies, there is the implication in adult data that lower status results in more favorable compliance, and higher status is a factor in non-compliance. Because the status intervals of the participants in the present study were relatively small, it is not to be assumed that children will not recognize their own status
as a factor in responding to directives issued by adults. Nevertheless, these data imply a difference in the use of directives to indicate status between children and adults and suggest an area for further investigation.

**Cross-Class Interaction.** The favorable response of the middle-class white children to non-coercive directive form also implies an interesting cross-class difference in the use of directives. The investigation of directive formation strategy, although quite tentative, indicated that working-class black children generally make directives more coercive if they do not achieve compliance the first time they are issued. Since the middle-class white children responded more favorably to lower coerciveness, a potential cross-class/cross-ethnic communication problem is suggested. First, the working-class black children had a higher overall coercion level and used more imperative forms than the middle-class children to begin with. This might initially result in non-compliance on the white child's part in an interaction with a working-class black child. If the black child's first directive did not receive compliance, she would typically increase the level of coercion, a strategy which, however successful in her own group, would lessen her chances of achieving compliance from a middle-class child who valued non-coerciveness. While such a
conversation is merely hypothetical, its possibility is suggested by the data of the present study.

**Cross-Ethnic Interaction.** In the working-class black group, the status of the directive sender was a significant factor in determining whether or not it received compliance. This difference between the black and white systems studied introduces an additional complication to the interaction of the hypothetical middle-class white and working-class black children discussed above. This correlation between status of speaker and compliance of response offers additional evidence that the older children in the working-class black group may be responding to the unique role of adolescent females in the black community.

**Implications of the Data on Directive Component Selection**

**Cross-Ethnic Interaction.** The one ethnic-associated difference in the selection of components (i.e., the greater use of the statement by white participants) may indicate something very basic about differences in directive formation by members of different ethnic groups. Although the data presented in this study are inconclusive, this finding suggests possibilities for further investigation. If the black children do not select the statement option, their directives may frequently be more coercive than anticipated by the white model since the grammatical
form option is the basis for directive formation. The statement is a very subtle form which is ambiguous and voluntary. It allows options considered significant in conventional politeness. Limited use of this form could handicap a black child attempting to communicate appropriately with whites. If black children do not make frequent use of this form, they may also not recognize statement directives issued to them by teachers or other whites with whom they communicate.

Differences across ethnic lines in the use of the additions and modifications also have implications for cross-ethnic communication. Black participants appeared to be designating addressees in a substantially different manner than were the white participants. White speakers made very limited use of the address term. This would suggest that they were indicating which participant was being addressed in some non-verbal fashion such as eye-contact, body orientation, or proximity. If the black group members were making use of non-verbal means of indicating addressees, they apparently did not feel that such indication was adequate. This difference in addressee designation is an additional source of cross-ethnic communication mismatch. Unless there is a great deal of redundancy in the black system which provides both verbal and non-verbal means of designating addressee, the data of the present study imply that blacks use verbal means and may not
recognize non-verbal means. Closer examination of the non-verbal aspects of addressee designation by both groups is suggested.

The use of intonation by blacks and whites was also significantly different. The white groups used more coercive intonation whereas the black group used more non-coercive intonation. This does not imply communication difficulties, but it does suggest further non-verbal and paralinguistic differences in the use of directives which need further investigation.

Cross-Class Communication. The most significant difference which could be attributed to class in the selection of directive components was the working-class children's greater orientation toward mutual benefit in directive construction. The middle-class white group was better acquainted before the testing sessions began than were the members of the working-class white group. However, the working-class black participants were also quite familiar with each other prior to the study. Therefore, the mutuality of benefit cannot be explained in terms of previously existing camaraderie or in terms of formal politeness afforded to strangers. Again, this area of group goal significance as a function of working-class background as opposed to individual-goal significance as a
goal of middle-class background merits further investiga-
tion.

Implications of the Data on Directive Formation Strategy

Cross-Class and Cross-Ethnic Implications. Although the data in this area were highly tentative, one obvious difference in repeat strategy emerged: the middle-class white group was oriented toward decreased coercion, whereas the working-class black group was oriented toward increased coercion. The difficulties involved in the divergence of these strategies when used in mixed class and ethnic groups, especially when coupled with the middle-class white group's tendency toward greater compliance with non-coercive forms, are apparent.

Suggestions for Further Investigation

Studies including interactions between adults and children would help to clarify several of the preceding implications. It would also be useful to conduct further investigations among all-child groups in which the status intervals were greater and status was more clearly marked. Studies of interactions of children in non-homogeneous groups would also indicate whether the implied difficulties in communication across class and ethnic lines occurred and to what extent children from the various groups were able
to adjust their own systems to deal with the systems of their interlocutors. Because of the interesting differences which emerged from the study of responses, additional study of the relationship between the form of the directive and the response it receives as well as the relationship between the status of the sender, the status of the receiver, and the relative compliance appears to be promising. Finally, a study which focused on some of the non-verbal aspects of the interaction of homogeneous and non-homogeneous groups of children would provide additional, valuable information.
APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE CALCULATIONS OF DIRECTIVE COERCION

Summary of Instrument:

A. Grammatical Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let/Let's</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Direction of Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Action Requested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Don't</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Modifications and Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coercive</th>
<th>Non-Coercive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>penalty</td>
<td>deflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotta</td>
<td>tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafto</td>
<td>modal auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sposta</td>
<td>address term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>politeness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>indefinite pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>2nd person pl. pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st person pl. pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explanation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Application of Instrument:

1. Kay, give me that paint.
   A. grammatical form: imperative = 8
   B. direction of benefit: speaker = 4
   C. action requested: perform = 3
   D. modifications: address term = -1
   Coercion level = 14

2. Let Henri finish what she was sayin.
   A. grammatical form: Let = 6
   B. direction of benefit: 3rd party = 3
   C. action requested: allow = 1
   D. modifications: none
   Coercion level = 10

3. Let's call our play "Romeo and Juliet."
   A. grammatical form: Let = 6
   B. direction of benefit: mutual = 2
   C. action requested: perform = 3
   D. modifications: 1st person pl. = -1
   Coercion level = 10

4. Marci, can I give everybody their marbles?
   A. grammatical form: question = 4
   B. direction of benefit: speaker = 4
   C. action requested: allow = 1
   D. modifications: address term = -1
       modal auxiliary = -1
   Coercion level = 7

5. You're sposta make a round circle first.
   A. grammatical form: statement = 2
   B. direction of benefit: addressee = 1
   C. action requested: perform = 3
   D. modifications: sposta = +1
   Coercion level = 7
6. You all better wait for me.
   A. grammatical form: statement = 2
   B. direction of benefit: speaker = 4
   C. action requested: delay = 2
   D. modifications: better = +1
      2nd person plural pronoun = -1
   Coercion level = 8

7. Stop stealin' my pointed scissors.
   A. grammatical form: imperative = 8
   B. direction of benefit: speaker = 4
   C. action requested: stop = 4
   D. modifications: non-coercive
      intonation = -1
   Coercion level = 15

8. You'uns can just make yer puppets any way you want to.
   A. grammatical form: statement = 2
   B. direction of benefit: addressee. = 1
   C. action requested: perform = 3
   D. modifications: 2nd person plural = -1
      modal auxiliary = -1
      just = -1
   Coercion level = 3

9. OK, let's put the paint where we can all reach it so we can get started.
   A. grammatical form: Let's = 6
   B. direction of benefit: mutual = 2
   C. action requested: perform = 3
   D. modifications: 1st person plural = -1
      OK = -1
      explanation = -1
   Coercion level = 8
10. Will somebody please get me a paper towel?

A. grammatical form: question = 4
B. direction of benefit: speaker = 4
C. action requested: perform = 3
D. modifications: modal auxiliary = -1
   indefinite pronoun = -1
   politeness marker = -1

Coercion level 8
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT VALIDATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Look at each pair of sentences below and decide which one in each pair is more polite in your opinion. For example, which of the two would you be more likely to say to Dr. Conn? Put a check in the blank next to the more polite sentence.

1. _____ Loan me your umbrella.
   _____ Oh no. It's raining.

2. _____ Could I borrow your umbrella?
   _____ Loan me your umbrella.

3. _____ Oh no. It's raining.
   _____ Let me borrow your umbrella.

4. _____ Loan me your umbrella.
   _____ Let me borrow your umbrella.

5. _____ Could I borrow your umbrella?
   _____ Let me borrow your umbrella.

6. _____ Could I borrow your umbrella?
   _____ Oh no. It's raining.

Put a check next to the sentence in each pair below which you think sounds more polite.

1. _____ Get me some paper.
   _____ Get you some paper.

2. _____ Get you and me some paper.
   _____ Get me some paper.

3. _____ Get me some paper.
   _____ Get Kim some paper.

4. _____ Get you some paper.
   _____ Get Kim some paper.

1. The supportive questionnaire was administered to 100 college students from freshman to senior level from mixed geographic areas and incomes.
5. _____ Get Kim some paper.
      _____ Get you and me some paper.
6. _____ Get you and me some paper.
      _____ Get you some paper.

Put a check next to the sentence in each pair below which you think sounds more polite:

1. _____ Get some glue.
      _____ Stop that.
2. _____ Stop that.
      _____ Wait a minute.
3. _____ Wait a minute.
      _____ Let me be next.
4. _____ Let me be next.
      _____ Stop that.
5. _____ Wait a minute.
      _____ Get some glue.
6. _____ Get some glue.
      _____ Let me be next.

Put a check next to the more polite sentence in each pair below.

1. _____ Stop hitting me.
      _____ You better stop hitting me.
2. _____ You have to paint it blue.
      _____ You can paint it blue.
3. _____ You're supposed to paint it blue,
      _____ You can paint it blue.
4. _____ You could glue it here.
      _____ You glue it here.
5. _____ Put a picture on it.
      _____ Put a picture on it, please.
6. _____ Let's eat.
      _____ Let's eat, OK?
7. _____ Let's eat.
      _____ OK, Let's eat.
Give it to her.
  Give it to her because she needs it next.

Anne, you're supposed to show us how to do it.
  Anne is supposed to show us how to do it.

Give it to me. Give it to me.
  Give it to me.

You're supposed to cut it.
  Well, you're supposed to cut it.

Somebody hand me the scissors.
  Hand me the scissors.

Anne, give me the red, please.
  Give me the red, please.

I think you're supposed to glue it down.
  You're supposed to glue it down.

Stop hitting me.
  Stop hitting me before I break your arm.

Give me a red one.
  Give me a red one, and I'll give you a blue one.

Come on.
  You guys (You all) come on.
APPENDIX C

COMPONENT SELECTION TOTALS AND PERCENTAGES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.F.</th>
<th>D.B.</th>
<th>A.R.</th>
<th>Mod.</th>
<th>Add.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle-Class White**

**Kerry; Total: 31; Coercion Mean: 10.258**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dani; Total: 54; Coercion Mean: 12.056**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Robbi; Total: 95; Coercion Mean: 8.376**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sarah; Total: 54; Coercion Mean: 10.611**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.F.</td>
<td>D.B.</td>
<td>A.R.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>Add.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marci; Total: 52; Coercion Mean: 10.269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working-Class White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis; Total: 143; Coercion Mean: 11.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brenda; Total: 84; Coercion Mean: 10.702

| I       | 49   | 56.98| S       | 26   | 30.95| S       | 6    | 7.10 |
| L       | 11   | 12.79| ?       | 17   | 20.24| P       | 66   | 77.75|
| Q       | 5    | 5.81 | M       | 25   | 29.76| D       | 5    | 5.88 |
| S       | 21   | 24.42| A       | 16   | 19.10| A       | 8    | 9.41 |

Kim; Total: 84; Coercion Mean: 9.75

<p>| I       | 2    | 0.25 | S       | 3    | 31.50| S       | 0    | 0.00 |
| L       | 4    | 5.00 | ?       | 1    | 12.50| P       | 3    | 38.00|
| Q       | 0    | 0.00 | M       | 2    | 5.00 | D       | 3    | 38.00|
| S       | 2    | 2.50 | A       | 2    | 5.00 | A       | 2    | 25.00|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.F.</th>
<th>D.B.</th>
<th>A.R.</th>
<th>Mod.</th>
<th>Add.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy; Total: 30; Coercion Mean: 10.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>S 10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>S 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>? 1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>P 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>M 10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>D 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>A 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry; Total: 61; Coercion Mean: 10.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 35</td>
<td>57.38</td>
<td>S 7</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>S 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 9</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>? 14</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>P 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>D 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 14</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>A 29</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>A 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina; Total: 112; Coercion Mean: 11.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 79</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>S 26</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>S 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 9</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>? 26</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>P 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>M 22</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>D 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 23</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>A 38</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>A 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri; Total: 87; Coercion Mean: 11.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 47</td>
<td>53.41</td>
<td>S 25</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>S 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 21</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>? 15</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>P 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>M 28</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>D 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>A 20</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>A 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.F.</td>
<td>D.B.</td>
<td>A.R.</td>
<td>Mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#   %</td>
<td>#   %</td>
<td>#   %</td>
<td>#   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice; Total: 57; Coercion Mean: 10.983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>31 53.45</td>
<td>S 17 29.82</td>
<td>S 9 15.52</td>
<td>+1 9 15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>13 22.40</td>
<td>? 12 21.00</td>
<td>P 34 58.60</td>
<td>-1 24 42.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2  3.45</td>
<td>M 16 28.10</td>
<td>D 3 5.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>12 20.69</td>
<td>A 12 21.00</td>
<td>A 12 20.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy; Total: 14; Coercion Mean: 11.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7  4.67</td>
<td>S 3 21.43</td>
<td>S 2 14.30</td>
<td>+1 1 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3  20.00</td>
<td>? 7 50.00</td>
<td>P 11 78.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3  20.00</td>
<td>M 3 21.43</td>
<td>D 0 0.00</td>
<td>-1 5 35.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2  13.33</td>
<td>A 1 7.14</td>
<td>A 1 7.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla; Total: 40; Coercion Mean: 11.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25 60.98</td>
<td>S 25 61.00</td>
<td>S 3 7.32</td>
<td>+1 1 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7  17.10</td>
<td>? 5 12.20</td>
<td>P 32 78.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>5  12.20</td>
<td>M 2 4.88</td>
<td>D 0 0.00</td>
<td>-1 29 70.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4  9.76</td>
<td>A 9 21.95</td>
<td>A 6 14.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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