THE EFFECTS OF STATUS AND GENDER ON

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN PARENTS AND

THEIR CHILDREN

By

CATHLEEN SKINNER

Bachelor of Arts
Oral Roberts University
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1981

Master of Arts
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1990

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 2005

THE EFFECTS OF STATUS AND GENDER ON

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN PARENTS AND

THEIR CHILDREN

Dissertation Defense:

Carol Moder
Dissertation Advisor

Gene Halleck

Susan Garzon

Nadine Olson

A. Gordon Emslie
Dean of the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to so many people who have given me help and support throughout the dissertation process. I wish to acknowledge them, and to express my deepest appreciation.

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Carol Lynn Moder who has served as an inspiring role model as a teacher, and for her help and guidance from the inception of the project to its completion. This sincere appreciation extends to the members of my committee, Dr. Gene Halleck, Dr. Susan Garzon and Dr. Nadine Olson, each of whom has been an additional sources of inspiration to me in so many ways over the course of my doctoral program. I would also like to thank the English Department for their support throughout my program.

My gratitude extends to my family and friends: first to those who were willing to participate in my research, as well as to those who have listened as I discussed my theories and ideas, asked insightful questions, encouraged me and prayed for me throughout the process. I am especially grateful to Amy Hann who cared for my sons and often prepared enough dinner for both our families while I did research and wrote in her office, as well as to Christa and Roy Van Tassell for everything they have done from discussing my ideas when I needed an ear, to sustaining our family through their incomparable friendship. I am also deeply grateful to Ellen Neufeld who was a great source of encouragement and wisdom.

I am thankful to my sons, Ian and Jonathan, for helping me keep in perspective what is truly important in life. They kept a smile in my heart, if not on my face, by their often times unknowing support. Thank you also to my dear parents who have always encouraged me to continue growing, and to become all that I can be.

Words alone cannot express the depths of my gratitude and appreciation for my amazing husband Matthew, who more than anyone, gave me the courage to start this journey, and throughout it has been a source of help, wisdom, encouragement, and love. I love you.

And finally, my deepest gratitude is given to my Lord Jesus Christ, without whose grace and presence in my life I would truly never have made it to this point. This has been an awesome spiritual journey. I am able to say in the Psalmist's words: "Yet always I am with you; you hold me by the right hand, you guide me with your counsel…my flesh and my heart may fail, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever." Psalm 73:23-24a & 26.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Interaction is an important aspect of human behavior. It is through interaction that we communicate with each other, forming relationships and accomplishing goals. It is something we both are taught and intuit. It is also an important medium of teaching and learning. The way interactions are formed depends on a wide range of variables, including context, topic, conversation partners, and goals of the interaction (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle and Fivush, 1995; Carli, 1990; and Tannen 1990). These and other variables have a complex relationship with linguistic choices.   As Boxer (2002) points out,

> Linguistic choices have to do with underlying and shifting identities. Our identity as speakers of a particular language, our identity as a member of any number of speech communities, our identity as an individual in a particular setting, our identity as it relates to others in our social group, our identity as it forms in the process of moment-to-moment group relationship display and development, are all relevant…
> (p. 3)

Who holds the power in the interaction is related to these variables of identity.

Gender and Power

One of the main features of identity, and with which power is often interrelated, is gender. One of the first things we notice when interacting with someone is gender. In fact, men and women and their many differences are often the source of hours of entertainment through stories and anecdotes, from the stereotype of the silent husband who refuses to ask for directions to the unsubstantiated image of gossiping neighborhood women who nag their families and never shut up. Popular culture has capitalized on the differences with books such as *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1992). In the last four decades, gender based studies have become the basis for volumes of research in medicine, education, psychology, sociology, and linguistics. Men's and women's different approaches to problem solving, interpersonal relations, and veritably every aspect of life has given rise to dozens of theories regarding what makes each gender behave as it does and the impact on society their differences cause.

The status of each gender has come under scrutiny, leading to intense, emotional arguments. In general, men's interactional styles have been characterized as competitive and status oriented (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle, & Fivush, 1995; Carli, 1990; Tannen, 1990). Television sit-coms and commercials are based on these premises. In the winter of 2003-2004, Dr. Scholl's company unveiled a commercial showing a car accident involving two men. Instead of denying responsibility, which viewers would typically expect in this situation, the man who has rear-ended the other's car affably assumes responsibility and apologizes, avoiding confrontation. The offended party says, "You must be 'gellin'," referring to the latest shoe insert product in the Dr. Scholl's line. It implies the gel sole inserts will make the wearer so comfortable that it will dissolve the need to exert power,

and instead the offending party will assume responsibility for his actions. Without the stereotype in our cultural schema of men challenging one another as well as their limited willingness to accept personal responsibility, let alone apologize, the commercial would lose much of its impact.

While the aforementioned commercial plays off the stereotype of men's seemingly independent, detached ways of interacting, in contrast women, it has been observed, often use an overlapping interactional style that supports other conversational participants (Schiffrin, 1994; Tannen, 1990). Women also use cooperative or inclusive language more than men, such as "Let's…" (Sachs, 1987; Tannen, 1990). They use the phrase, "I'm sorry" not solely for apologizing, but also to commiserate (Tannen, 1990).

In considering interactions between men and women, men are believed to control conversations more through offering information and opinions, giving directives, or remaining silent (Aries, 1976; Gleason, 1987; Leet-Pellegrini, 1980; Tannen, 1990), behaviors that some view as carrying more control. Gilligan emphasizes this point: "[F]emale identity revolves around interconnectedness and relationship," on the other hand male identity "stresses separation and independence" (1982, p. 34).

In addition, some researchers hold the perspective that men are automatically afforded higher status or more power than women in our society (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977). However, in one particular study on interactions between genders, Pillon, Degauquier, and Duquesne's results suggest that there are more similarities in conversational style among men and women than differences. They raise the question of whether measures used in past studies to determine dominance and power by men, and submissive, subordinate behavior by

women in interactions as a reflection of their status in society, have been accurately interpreted. They point out that past investigations have measured power and dominance by amount of speech and frequency of interruption, which may actually reflect other kinds of social relationships than dominance (1992, p. 152). One of these studies seemed to find evidence that women, like children, are restricted in how they are allowed to participate in male-female conversations. The researchers claim that cross-sex conversations have the qualities of child/adult conversations (West & Zimmerman, 1975). However, Pillon, Degauquier, and Duquesne (1992) point out a significant element found in child-adult conversations that was not addressed by the previous studies: children seldom submit willingly to restrictions in conversation, but in the interactions reported, women seem to. The examples above demonstrate that the interpretations regarding the results of the body of research findings on the different ways gender is manifested in interactions have differed significantly. This has lead to an array of theories attempting to explain how these two different groups relate to the world and the reasons behind their differences. Research on the underlying reasons for the linguistic differences of men and women are roughly divided into two controversial philosophies: power and dominance, and nature versus nurture.

Power and Dominance

Wood (1994) takes the stance that men and women have differing world views. "Women see talk as the essence of a relationship while men use talk to exert control, preserve independence, and enhance status" (Mulvaney, 1994, p. 5). Women favor rapport and consensus building and use language as the means to achieve these goals.

They are more likely to find a way to reach a compromise than men who usually go about a game of one-upmanship in an attempt to establish a hierarchy (Goodwin, 1990; Sachs, 1987).

Past research has indicated that men are automatically afforded higher status than women (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977). In a now controversial work, Lakoff (1975) was among the first to attempt to define the linguistic differences of women from men. She contended that women are discriminated against by the expectations society has of the way language is used by men and women as well as by the way men and women are socialized in language use. Lakoff found women used more polite forms, tag questions, intensifiers, hedges, and personal presence markers, which she concluded created the impression of hesitancy and ineffective speech. As Mulvaney (1994) says, "[W]omen reflect their role in the social order by adopting linguistic practices…what we are taught about gender, then, is reflected in our language usage" (p. 2). In the past two decades, however, progress has been made in western culture regarding the perceptions of both men's and women's qualities and abilities.

Yet equality is elusive. Significant competition between men and women continues in many avenues of life to see who can gain more power and achieve the higher status: "Anything you can do, I can do better!" Since Lakoff's early work on the subject, additional research has been done in an attempt to examine speech features and compare their occurrences among women's and men's speech (Annas, 1987; Belenky, et al., 1986; Kramarae & Treichler, 1990; McCracken & Appleby, 1992; Sommers & Lawrence, 1992). Many of these researchers strongly believe that women have been intentionally subjugated, and continue to be purposefully kept less powerful by relegating them to

lower status positions. For example, Gannett (1992) has labeled men as dominant and women as muted. Sommers and Lawrence (1992) further this concept, "As members of the muted group, women remain largely silenced, recognizing that their voices and contributions are devalued because of their lesser power and status" (p. 6). The underlying premise of this theory is that men have most of, if not all the power. Therefore male attributes, including their style of language use, are preferred in the powerful arenas of society where status counts most, that is in authoritative, controlling positions of business, government, education and economics (Kramarae & Treichler, 1985; Miles, 1989; Osborne, 1979; Tarvis & Wade, 1984; Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley,1983). Annas states:

> The conclusion much of this research leads to is that the sexism encoded into the structure of the language and acted out in speech situations finally has less to do with gender per se than it does with who has the power to name, to speak, and to expect that one's words will be heard and valued. (1987, p. 6)

Through feminist efforts we have seen changes occur across society in how labels and titles referring to jobs and positions are used. Many titles and career labels have been changed. For example, "chairman" has become "chairperson," "mailman" has become "mail carrier."

Nature Versus Nurture

The second general group of philosophical attitudes regarding how men and women behave differently is a question of nature versus nurture. One group believes that there are inherent differences in the cognitive and neurological make up of men and

women that at the very least cause them to be predisposed to the general kinds of behavior that have come to be characterized as male and female.

On the other hand, the opposing group believes that these differences do not contribute to the behavior patterns found among gender groups. Instead, they believe that behavior and attitudes, including language use and function, result solely from the ways children are socialized and allowed to develop.

Nature

In the area of psychological sciences, it has become accepted as common knowledge that neurological and cognitive differences between males and females exist (Christen, 1991; Halpern, 1992; Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1979; Shaywitz, B.A., Shaywitz, S.E., Pugh, K.R., Constable, R.T., Skudlarski, P., Bronen, R.T., Fulbright, R.K., Fletcher, J.M., Shankweiler, D.P., Katz, L., & Gore, J.C. 1995; Springer and Deutsch, 1989). Kimura presents the results of years of research on cognitive functioning:

Men, on average, excel on spatial tasks (particularly…imaginally rotat[ing] a figure), perception of the vertical and horizontal, mathematical reasoning, and spatio-motor targetting ability. Women, on average, excel on tasks of verbal fluency (where words must be generated with constraints on the letters they contain), perceptual speed,…verbal and item memory, and some fine motor skills. (1996, p. 1)

She also notes that women have been found to perform better than men on tests of location memory (1996, p. 2). Shaywitz et al. (1995) gathered data on the functional organization of the brain for language using a functional magnetic resonance imaging

study. Results showed females are predisposed to greater verbal abilities, including acquiring language earlier and having longer attention spans than males for conversation. Other studies reveal related results of women and language-memory abilities including greater abilities to generate synonyms, color names, and list items beginning with a specific letter (Halpern, 2000; Kimura, 1992).

One of the factors that influences cognitive functioning that Kimura discusses is sex-hormones. The body of data includes results of studies of both prenatal and perinatal influences of androgen, testosterone and estrogen on brain organization and development and cognitive functioning in babies, accounting for some of the ways in which males and females differ. Weiman (2002) discusses additional research in which it has been found that genes are key to sex differentiation. For example, in the sixth or seventh week of pregnancy, hormone levels in the fetus' body rise and maintain a relatively high level even following delivery, contributing to differences in male and female brains. These hormone levels are controlled by a person's genetic makeup, and differ between people.

Other studies have tried to determine the differences in the make up of the brain between men and women. Gur, Turetsky, Matsui, Yan, Bilker, Hughett, and Gur (1999) discovered through magnetic imaging that the male brain has more white matter and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) than the female brain, while the female brain contains more gray matter. These researchers propose that more white matter could allow men to transfer information more deeply into the brain, hypothesizing that this explains their greater ability in spatial reasoning. On the other hand, the increased gray matter may create the capacity for better, more efficient processing in women. Research in animals has revealed that in male brains, the right hemisphere is denser and larger, and before

birth, develops more rapidly. The left hemisphere, which is the center of language in

most humans, is therefore presumed to be more vulnerable to damage at critical periods

of development. Scientists in this field also speculate that the female corpus callosum is

different from the male's and enables the female brain's left and right hemispheres to

communicate more efficiently.

Yet, there are those who warn of over-generalizing the results of these findings

regarding behavior. Monitor magazine interviewed Diane Halpern, PhD, professor of

psychology at Claremont McKenna College. They report that according to Halpern:

> Cognitive differences between males and females is a dangerous topic because of
>
> the pitfalls of taking any one research study and applying it to the relative
>
> intelligence of one sex over the other. Talk about differences can obscure the fact
>
> that women and men are similar in many more ways than different…in fact the size
>
> and nature of sex differences vary across time spans and environments. (Kersting,
>
> 2003, p. 1)

Nurture

The second major theory is that the differences in men and women's interactional

styles is due to differences in boys' and girls' socialization. These scholars believe that

nurture is the fundamental force behind gender differences in behaviors, regardless of any

cognitive differences that exist between genders due to genetic and neurological makeup.

Their theory is summed up by Meunier (1996), who contends that "the socialization

process undergone by males and females sets various types of preferential cognitive

networks, and that gender-specific psyches ultimately stem from nurture rather than

nature" (p. 1). She continues, "the socialization process undergone by males and females, whether at home or at school, past or present, play a much stronger role on the shaping of the cognitive styles than previously admitted" (p. 1). She concludes that the differences in cognitive styles by males and females are "imposed by society." Meunier (1996) points to work by Lever (1978) who observed playground games of boys and girls. The boys organized into teams and competed against each other in games that had specific rules and goals. The girls played in smaller groups with ritualistic activities and seemed to display more cooperative kinds of play.

Furthering these observations, Cameron (1992) also looks at the kinds of play in which boys and girls engage. She draws her conclusions concerning differences among gender in language development from gender differences in playgroups. Observations of children at play reveal boys form large groups organized hierarchically, while girls play in small, intimate groups, which could account for the different styles of speech which men and women develop: masculine as direct and confrontational and feminine as intimate and nurturing. In Mulvaney's (1994) words, "Gender is both an influence on and a product of communication" (p. 2).

Cross-Cultural Communication Between Genders

Whether the differences in the ways men and women interact is due to neurological and cognitive differences, or socialization as children, the result is two different cultures living side by side. Language is one of the primary ways that a culture expresses its world rather than the world being the starting point for language. Nevertheless, it is also a phenomenon that culture influences language use.

According to Tannen (1990), "communication between men and women can be like cross cultural communication, prey to a clash of conversational styles" (p. 42). Although these theorists might agree that men have enjoyed superior status in many areas of life, supporters of this theory disagree with the "power and dominance" argument that women are intentionally subjugated by men.

So it is not the language itself that creates the conflict, but the clash of cultures. The approach this theory takes is to stress that interaction between genders is intercultural, one masculine, the other feminine, both having equal validity. Language is a tool of society that by itself does not have inherent bias, but the ways cultures use the language cause it to develop meanings. Mulvaney (1994) points out that the way language is used and the worldview of a group are not easy to tease apart (p. 5). However, men and women need to try to understand and acknowledge the differences in the goals and values each has and ways each one expresses himself or herself, and accept each other's differences as being of equal value (Maltz & Borker, 1998; Mulvaney, 1994; Tannen, 1990). Mulvaney (1994) offers, "This is not the only, the right or the best way of examining gender and communication, but it does offer an alternative framework for analysis, one that perhaps defuses the potential for offensive and/or posturing when discussing gender" (p. 1).

These studies subtly point out the importance of situating language use and examining utterances in context in order to fully understand what is said, what is meant, and how it is understood. As Blakemore (1992) points out, a hearer can only assume that he or she has arrived at the correct conclusion of what is meant. In another context, the very same utterance may be interpreted very differently depending on the many variables

that make up the situation. Given that someone who is involved in a conversation with nearly full access to context can only "assume" they are arriving at the correct interpretation, context and situating the utterances are critical for the researcher attempting to analyze discourse from outside the given discourse.

Adult-Child Interactions

The studies cited above, among the vast body on the subject, show that there are differences in the ways adult males and females interact with one another. Yet, gender is not the only factor involved in interactions that cause speakers to make the choices they do. The ages of the participants is another factor that influences linguistic choices. Adults interact differently when speaking to children than when they are speaking to one another. This leads to important questions regarding how adults and children behave in conversations, particularly how mothers and fathers and their own children interact. When men and women assume the role of parent, and their conversational partners are their children, are the linguistic features commonly associated with their gender affected, and does the gender of the child affect the interactional style and linguistic choices of the parent? When parents are together, do they influence each other's interactions with the child? Does the position of power a parent holds change the interactional styles of men or women?

Research into the relationships of parents and children and the working of the family unit has included the examination of interactions between parents and children and has provided a basis for an answer to some of these questions. Early studies concentrated on adults, usually mothers, in their role as caretakers of babies and young children

drawing attention to the unique features of language found in this context. Major studies have looked at measures of prosody, grammatical complexity, and redundancy in mother-infant/young child interactions (Broen, 1972; Drach, 1969; Phillips, 1970, 1973; Remick, 1976; Sachs, Brown, & Salerno, 1976; Snow, 1972). Specific types of interactional elements have also been examined for these subjects including directives (Bellinger, 1979) and interrogatives (Buium, 1976; Holzman, 1972), pragmatic features and ellipsis (Holzman, 1974), repetition (Kobashigawa, 1969), discourse features and teaching devices (Moerk, 1972), teaching strategies (Pellegrini, McGillicuddy-Delisi, Sigel, & Brody, 1986) and syntactic complexity (Pfuderer, 1969). Studies have also considered the affects of gender by examining father-infant-young child interactions, the affects of the triadic unit of mother-father-child, and to some extent, the affects of interactions of the family unit (Belsky, 1979; Clarke-Stewart, 1978; Lamb; 1977; Liddell, Henzi, & Drew, 1987; Siegal, 1987). Much of this research has focused on very young children.

Two studies have attempted to examine whether mothers and fathers interact differently with their sons and daughters, focusing on middle-childhood aged subjects. The first, Bronstein (1984), conducted quantitative research concentrating on these variables among a sample of nineteen Mexican families in the low to middle income bracket from a small provincial city. Data was collected using brief, direct observation conducted in their homes. She reported significant differences in the interactions between fathers and their sons and daughters, and mothers and their sons and daughters. Fathers spend more time in play with their children and gave more information and explanations, while mothers spend more time in caregiving. Mothers did not differ in the ways they treated their sons and daughters, while fathers tended to pay more "interested

attention" to their sons and involve them in more cognitive/achievement oriented activities. They behaved less dominantly, were not as restrictive, and engaged in less punitive behavior with their daughters.

The second study, Russell and Russell (1987; 1988), used Bronstein's quantitative methods on a sample of thirty-two middle-class Australian families, but added a parental self-reporting interview. This study provided additional support for findings that there are differences between mothers and fathers in the ways they interact with their children, especially noting that gender of child had a strong impact on interactions. However, their findings on the mother/child interactions dispute those of Bronstein, and instead find that mothers were more directive, dominant assertive, and provided more information to their children than fathers. The behaviors of both parents tended to be contextually bound. For example, directiveness on the part of the mothers increased in family management situations.

It is to be expected that in these studies differences in the cultures would have an influence on the ways parents interact with their children, resulting in differences between the outcomes of the studies. It is also important to note that the interactional differences occur situationally, further underscoring the importance of situating language in context when examining sociolinguistic features, including gender, age, and power differentials. It is impossible to make sense of the meaning behind the language and how it is understood without context.

Purpose of the Current Study

While considerable study has been devoted to the areas of gender and language, as well as investigations into ways adults interact with children, additional research continues to be warranted. In the four decades since research began to be done on gender issues and adult-child interactions, societal shifts in family norms and what used to be thought of as gender-related domains in family life have changed. Roles of parents are blurred. For example, men are no longer the sole breadwinners in a family. Instead in many cases, both parents have careers, or at least work outside the home. In some cases, mothers or fathers are the primary caregiver, but most commonly both parents are responsible for caring for their children's needs.

Although studies have been conducted which analyze various aspects of parent-child interactions, and ways that fathers and mothers differ in their interactions with their sons and daughters, and gender differences in linguistic and pragmatic realms, there remain gaps in the research regarding how and why parents choose the strategies they do in their interactions with their sons and daughters in middle-childhood; that is, identifying more clearly the situation and context in which certain kinds of interactions take place. In light of the changes that have occurred since the earlier days of research into gender and language issues, and adults' interactions with children, this study investigates the ways that context and situation influence how mothers and fathers use directives with their sons and daughters in middle childhood in the various situations that family life presents, using a case study approach involving four families with similar backgrounds. Interactions involving children in middle childhood are the focus of the study, because there is little work that has been done exploring the language parents use in interacting

with this age group. These children are more self-sufficient and cognitively mature than the young children upon which most of the earlier studies have focused, and it is expected that the parents' interactions with the older children will reflect their children's greater cognitive abilities. This study is also intended to shed further light on the differences and similarities between fathers and mothers in their interactions with their sons and daughters, in order to better understand both the differences and similarities and how they might influence the socialization process of the children. As Tannen (1994) so clearly expresses,

> There are gender differences in ways of speaking, and we need to identify and understand them. Without such understanding, we are doomed to blame others or ourselves – or the relationship-for the otherwise mystifying and damaging effects of our contrasting conversational styles. (p. 17)

Following the discourse analysis methods of Hobbs (2002), Holzman (1972), Schiffrin (1994), and Tannen (1990, 1994, and the self-reporting interview by parents used by Russell and Russell (1987), as well as interviews with the children, the analysis examines interactions of fathers and mothers with their sons and daughters; considering how gender, power, goals and type of activities all interrelate, while focusing on parental directives. Family members' perceptions of their interactions are compared with the data gathered to establish triangulation.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Situating Language Use

Language out of context is impossible to interpret. Not only is it difficult, if not impossible, for participants in a conversation to understand one another if they do not share the same knowledge base, or experience the situation the same as much as it is possible for two or more people to do so, but it is absolutely impossible for a researcher to make any kind of accurate analysis of an interaction without sharing in the knowledge base of the participants and situating the interaction in its context as fully as possible. Blakemore (1992) defines context as: "…the beliefs and assumptions the hearer constructs for the interpretation of an utterance either on the basis of the assumptions she has stored in memory or on the basis of her interpretation of previous utterances" (p. 87). She also notes that sharing membership in a linguistic community can provide evidence for mutual knowledge, so that if a speaker and hearer can establish that they both belong to the same community, they can also assume they have mutual knowledge of all the propositions known by its members (1992, p. 20).

Researchers can also share in the knowledge of a given speech community either by being a member, or by doing sufficient research into the community in order to be able to provide accurate interpretations of data they gather. Yet it is absolutely essential to consider the situational factors of an interaction before attempting to make an

interpretation on what the language means. In this study, the analysis will include how

the situation and context influence the linguistic choices made. In order to analyze and

understand the meaning of the language of directives, and more fully, the interactions in

the data presented, the ways that certain situational factors work together to influence

them will receive primary attention. These factors include power, gender, the kinds of

situations taking place and the goals of the interaction, and to a lesser extent, the

conversational style and personality of the participants.

   Johnson and Roen (1992) and Ochs (1992) argue that the nature of the activity,

along with the socioliguistic factors associated with it, are more influential in linguistic

choices than gender. Ochs (1992) points out that among members of a culture, certain

linguistic forms may be labeled masculine or feminine, however these forms do not

appear exclusively to be used by one particular sex. Instead these forms carry

information regarding the activity as well as the stance (pp. 340-341). "Knowledge of

how language relates to gender is not a catalogue of correlations between particular

linguistic forms and sets of speakers" (p. 342). Mulvaney (1994) provides this example:

"…although there may be cultural differences between the sexes, it is not productive to

assume that all men love sports anymore than it is constructive to assume that all Irish

consume extraordinary amounts of alcohol" (p. 6). Freed (1991) suggests that if there are

language differences, they are due to socialization and power differences. She contends

that only some men and some women use these features and only in certain situations. In

further examining men and women's interactions, Sheldon (1991) expresses the

importance of making a clear distinction between sex and gender. She believes not doing

so creates the potential for data regarding male and female behaviors to be

misinterpreted, giving rise to a deterministic perspective. "'Sex' refers to physical, biological characteristics. 'Gender' refers to socially constructed and historically changing interpretations of what the physical differences between the sexes MEAN and how they should be reflected in behaviors" (Shelton, 1991, p. 2). While she does not give examples, she concludes that among both genders, interactions that can be identified as solidarity-based or dominance-based can be found. Further regarding the question of gender and sex, and linguistic style, Arliss (1991) states: "communication is thought to be, at once, the process by which we learn to be male or female, and the product of our attempts to behave sex-appropriately." (p. 10).

Defining the concept of gender still further, Butler (1990) has developed what she calls the Performative Theory of Gender. She draws on Nietzshe's claim that there is no 'being' behind the doing, neither effecting, nor becoming; 'the doer' is an agent of the deed, but the deed is everything. She describes gender as "a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to preexist the deed." She further proposes that "there is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results" (Butler, 1990, p. 25).

Social Structure, Power and Language

While it is assumed that parents are the ones with implicit power in relationships with their children, in other relationships and interactions, who has the power is not always immediately clear. One of the main themes that runs through many of the theories of language and gender and over which arguments continue whether explicitly stated or not, is that of power, status and influence: who has it and who does not. Power

is one of the most important features that emerges in situating language use and understanding interactions. As Searle (1995) proposes, language is a "basic social institution" (p. 60), and it is through language that power is primarily exerted. Leezenberg (2002) makes the case that "power relations are at least in part constitutive of linguistic communication itself" (p. 894). Eric Wolf maintains that among all human relations power is an ever-present aspect at work at differing levels. Wolf has identified four types of power:

> Power as an individual attribute or capability; the capacity of an actor to impose his will on other actors in social relations; control of the settings within which people may act (organizational power)…; [and] the structuring and organization of these settings themselves, thus making some kinds of social action possible (structural power). (Leezenberg, 2002, p. 904)

In comparing the relationship of parents and children, Wolf's definitions of power stated above are close to a definition of what a parent's role in the life of his or her child is. Additionally, gender and kinship according to Wolf (1999) are socially organized categories that are controlled by organizational power. Leezenberg (2002) expounds that "[t]his implies that such cultural categories are not simply given, but are produced and reproduced by the continuous exercise of tactical power: the exercise of such power, however, is constrained by structural power relations" (p. 904). While this tends to support the main argument of those who maintain that men have the power and women are dominated, there are many relationships in which women do have power, and some interesting analyses that reveal how women exert control and power in interactions. One of these many relationships is as a mother. However, Miller (1991) makes the

observation that the issues of status, power and gender in interactions is multi-faceted and difficult to separate because women in general often seem not to care about power.

Studies following the premise that power and language are linked and are primary elements in social reality, have looked at how power affects language use. In studies which have looked at gender, role, relationship and power, it has been found that although gender can be identified as a sociolinguistic feature among many others, the roles of the speakers and the balance of power, as well as the genders of the participants, affect interactional and language choices. In order to accurately assess the factors that determine language choices, the language must be situated considering the social networks of the participants, since it is their relationships that provide the motivation behind linguistic choices (Brown, 1998, p. 83). Language use must be looked at in context with consideration of the roles, relationships and goals of the participants (Tannen, 1994). Who has power in the relationship during a specific interaction has a significant affect on how and what kind of language is used in the interaction, even with regard to the effect of gender.

Differences in Gender Found Among Adult Interactions

In order to discuss the differences between mothers' and fathers' directives to their sons and daughters and the surrounding situation, it is important to identify the pertinent ways in which men and women have been found to use similar linguistic strategies differently based on gender among adults. Following are some of the key areas that have been examined in previous research.

Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) forged new ground in their study of politeness in communication. They describe polite speech as the use of verbal strategies that take into account the addressee's feelings, showing respect for his or her 'face' (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 61; Brown, 1998, p. 84). "Some acts are intrinsically threatening to face and thus require softening" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 24). "Face" is the term developed by Goffman (1967) that refers to one's self concept of personal needs. On one hand is the need or desire to be accepted and appreciated, corresponding to "positive face." On the other hand is the need or desire not to be used or imposed upon, corresponding to "negative face." According to Brown and Levinson, polite speech considers both aspects of face and expands on the concept by differentiating between positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies.

Positive politeness strategies are "approach based," so-called because they approach the listener with compliments, attempts at seeking agreement, jokes, claims of mutual or reflexive goals and reciprocity, expressions of sympathy, understanding and cooperation (Brown, 1998, p. 85). These strategies address the listeners positive face needs.

Negative politeness strategies are "avoidance-based" in that they use linguistic means by which the listener will understand the speaker does not wish to impose. Formality, hedges, using questions rather than assertions, and the use of passive constructions to create distance and a sense of impersonalization are all ways in which negative politeness is expressed (Brown, 1998, p. 85).

Other concepts that are included in Brown and Levinson's theory are power, distance and size. "Power" refers to which of the participants in the interaction has higher status, or holds control in the situation. "Distance" is a continuum which describes the degree of social intimacy participants have. For example, the most socially intimate people are family and close friends, followed by one's social group and colleagues, acquaintances, and strangers. "Size" refers to the amount of effort required on the addressee's part or degree of imposition that is placed on him or her by a request.

An interrelationship exists between distance, size and power, and the strategies chosen. According to Brown and Levinson, positive face "reproduces the characteristics of conversational interaction among intimates, where expressions of interest and approval, shared knowledge and desires, and reciprocity of obligations are routinely exchanged" (1987, p. 101). When positive politeness is used among non-intimates, the purpose is "as a kind of metaphorical extension of intimacy," "a kind of social accelerator" by which the requester makes clear his/her desire to alter the distance between himself/herself and the hearer (1987, p. 103).

When focusing on gender, analysis of interactions seems to indicate that women are more polite in their speech than men. Herbert (1990), Holmes (1988, 1998), and Johnson and Roen (1992) all report women compliment more than men. Pilkington (1998) reported that in same-sex interactions, women used a greater number of positive-politeness strategies than men in similar situations. Holtgrave and Yang (1991) report differences in perception of power, distance, and ranking of request between genders.

Hobbs (2003) studied the effects of gender in her research on the politeness strategies of men and women in voice mail messages using Brown and Levinson's (1987)

theory of politeness. In her findings she reports that men and women were equally polite, however they often chose different strategies to show politeness. She looked at requests for information from her in her position as a lawyer from eleven subjects: seven men and four women. Among the subjects, nine could be considered to have equal status with the researcher. The other two subjects, women, were secretaries. Six of the male subjects were attorneys. They chose positive politeness strategies in making their requests of her more often, including compliments, joking and claiming reciprocity. Both males and females regularly used negative politeness strategies, that is thanking, taking blame and apologizing, softening the force of requests, and formality (Hobbs, 2003, p. 248). In other words, Hobbs did not find that women used more negative politeness strategies than men in the context of the relationships she examined. However, it is possible that given other circumstances, women's use of negative politeness strategies would be more pronounced.

Another area in which analysis for differences in gender and power has been done is the language and interactional style in negotiation in business settings. Hoffman (2002) used simulation games to explore the impact of gender and power on the feelings, behavior, and outcomes of in-house conflicts negotiated by male and female managers. Managers were arranged in same-sex and cross-sex dyads and assigned differential power positions. Women and men did not differ in the way they behaved or in the outcomes they achieved. However, women reported a lack of confidence and feelings of dissatisfaction in comparison to their male counterparts. There were effects of power in the negotiation strategies chosen. High-power managers of both genders worked toward cooperative negotiation and mutually beneficial ends, of which they reported they felt

satisfied they had achieved. Low-power managers on the other hand, used more competitive strategies, and reported feeling they had achieved the desired goal at the expense of the other party.

In other research examining this area Walters, Stuhlmacher, and Meyer (1998) report that in a meta-analytic review of 62 research reports on the relationship between gender and competitive behavior in bargaining, they found women seemed to favor a more cooperative approach in negotiating strategies than men. However, the difference was only slight. In addition, results suggest that "constraints on the negotiators (imposed by abstract bargaining paradigms and restrictions on communication) lessen gender differences in negotiation behavior" (p. 1). They also noted that in the condition where an opponent matched one deal with another in the bargaining process, women became significantly more competitive.

Similar findings that gender has less of an effect in constrained conditions was noted by Sommers and Lawrence (1992) in their research on gender and interactional styles within peer-response groups in college composition classrooms. They report that when peer-groups were teacher-directed, that is when members of the groups were provided with guidelines to follow, including the directive that every member of the group had to participate, both males and females participated fairly equally. However, in student-directed peer-groups in which the teacher allowed students to have significant freedom in how the group conducted itself, males in general were found to dominate the discussions by holding the floor more, interrupting female classmates, and promoting female classmates' ideas as their own (pp. 20-22).

Other important findings in the research by Sommers and Lawrence (1992) are differences in the kind of feedback males and females provide. There were three main ways in which they differed. First, males' responses were "more definitive and certain…than females." Second, females asked more questions, made more suggestions and gave more advice than males, while in comparison males pointed out weaknesses in classmates' writing without offering advice or asking questions. Third, females used more speech typically associated with feminine speech styles, including hedges, inserting "presence-of-self" and personalizing suggestions (pp. 27-30). That is, women behaved in ways that draw on politeness strategies, while men disregarded them.

Apologizing

Among the issues surrounding gender and politeness strategies is the apology. Considerable investigation has taken place between genders and cultures on the structure of an apology, and on speech acts that at first glance may appear to be apologies because some form of the words "apology," or "sorry" appear in the discourse. Goffman describes an apology as a "remedial interchange" that serves to alter the meaning that might otherwise be assigned to an act, "transforming what might be seen as offensive into what can be seen as acceptable" (Al-Zumor, 2003). Its purpose is to restore balance and harmony to social relations following a threat, real, virtual or perceived (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983, p. 20). Owen (1983) finds that the apology is one kind of remedial interchange meant to repair face damage to another party, where restoration of face or its preservation become the focus of the interchange. What acts or events call for remediation, such as an apology, vary between cultures as do the choices of strategies.

What is necessary and/or preferred in one context in one culture can vary in another (Olshtain, 1989).

Thomas (1995) found similarities between apologizing and thanking, and incorporated Searle's description of conditions of thanking as a framework to begin analyzing the speech act of apologizing. According to Speech Act Theory, the conditions appear as:

Propositional act: S expresses regret for a past act A of S.

Preparatory condition: S believes that A was not in H's best interest.

Sincerity condition: Speaker regrets A

Essential condition: Counts as an apology for act A (Searle, 1969, p. 99).

Thomas deviates from Searle's basic premise in her analysis, however, because she finds real-life applications that challenge it. The above conditions are not universal. For example, people sometimes apologize for occurrences outside their control such as the weather, or for someone else's actions. There are apologetic acts that occur in which none of the usual words are present, such as "I apologize," or "I regret." Thomas says the phrase, "I apologize," is "a 'metalinguistic performative', it is self-referential, self-verifying and non-falsifiable" (1985, p. 33). Glinert adds, "The upshot is that speaker and hearer may collude to overlook the sincerity condition or not, depending possibly on some definable circumstances" (1998, p. 1). In other words, the attitude between the speaker and hearer affects the sincerity condition.

Because the act of apologizing places the one performing the act in a one down position, apologizing is believed to reduce the power of the one apologizing. However, Glinert (1998) suggests that this is not always the case. He cites the news conference in

which then President Clinton spoke to the nation regarding a questionable relationship he had with a White House intern, Monica Lewinsky. In his analysis, he points out that Clinton's statement is missing many of the conditions necessary for a true apology, and it is therefore rendered a non-apology. Many of the statements made are cloaked in ambiguity. For example, "'I must take complete responsibility" can denote a moral ought or an external coercion" (Glinert, 1998). Another example is, "I deeply regret that…" which can simply mean, "I wish the events had not occurred, or that I had not been found out" (1998, p. 2). He finds strong similarities between this apology and someone saying "I'm sorry, but you can't come in" (1998, p.2). The speaker is not apologizing, but addressing the hearer's negative face needs, and in the process loses none of his or her power.

Not only do the standards and requirements of apologizing change from culture to culture, but from person to person. Tannen (1994) discusses the act of saying "I'm sorry," including when one is not, and how it might be received depending on the relationships between the parties and other contextual factors. She says that apologizing, or seeming to apologize by the tone of voice, even when the specific words "I'm sorry," or "I apologize," are not present are used by many women as "conversational smoothers." They can be misperceived as putting oneself in a one-down position, contributing to a loss of power. However, as Tannen (1994) reports, "But for many women, and a fair number of men, saying 'I'm sorry' isn't literally an apology; it is a ritual way of restoring balance to a conversation" (p. 45), and according to Holmes (1989) and Wolfson (1984), women tend to apologize more than men. Further, Tannen (1994) found evidence not

only that women apologize more, but also express appreciation more and soften criticism whereas men perform these speech acts less.

n other words, "I'm sorry" does not always carry the same meaning as "I apologize," which would be to accept blame. Rather, it is expressing regret, an expression of understanding, perhaps even caring about another person's feelings. (Tannen, 1994, p. 46). Tannen describes the expectations often involved in the act of apologizing. According to her theory, an act on the part of each participant is required usually required in order to make the interchange successful and restore balance to the relationship. Accepting blame for an event puts that person in a one-down position. In what she identifies as "ritual apologizing," (1990) both parties share the blame, mutually saving face. "It is a courteous way of not leaving the apologizer in a one-down position" (Tannen 1990, p. 234). Those members of a culture who understand and share this ritual do not take the admission of fault literally. Those whose culture, or personality type do not use apologies in this way often take the apology literally, which keeps the one apologizing in a one-down position. The person apologizing thinks the other person is putting him/her down, while the one to whom the apology was given believes the one apologizing is putting himself/herself in a one-down position, thus causing cross-cultural conflict.

Questions

Asking questions is a multi-faceted aspect of interaction. Coates (1996) noted that:

Questions can be used to seek information, to encourage another speaker to

participate in talk, to hedge, to introduce a new topic, to avoid the role of expert,

to check the views of other participants, to invite someone to tell a story. (p. 176)

In addition, they can be used to direct someone to do something. In her study on

directives, Ervin-Tripp (1976) identified what she called "non-explicit question

"directives" (p. 38). Situating the question is essential in determining meaning of the

utterance.

There is evidence that men and women use questions, as well as other

interactional, features differently. For example, Maltz and Borker (1982) take the stance

that men question to get information while women use questions to maintain the

conversation. Coates (1996) supports this from her research on women relating to other

women: "There are few examples of information-seeking questions in women's friendly

talk where information is the only goal of the question" (p. 177). Teen-age girls alone

were found to use these kinds of questions in discussing boys or common problems.

Some might debate the idea that men ever use questions. Fishman (1990) noted

in her research that in "…370 questions asked in twelve and a half hours of conversation,

the women asked 263" (p. 36). In early research on gender related speech, Lakeoff

(1973) proposed that women used tag questions more often than men, as well as more

compound requests. These features which have continued to be associated with a

feminine style of interaction are believed by theorists to cause female speech patterns to

seem more polite than what is noted as a masculine style. Similar in function are what

Ervin-Tripp (1976) identified as post-posed questions. These kinds of questions are not

attached to a statement directly, but immediately follow. Examples of these questions

include, "Okay?" or saying the addressee's name in a question intonation.

However, research has since been performed that demonstrates questions have

features that lead them to be used differently based on the situation and differences of

power. In fact, Blum-Kulka (1983) and Harris (1984) assert that questions are a way of

controlling people and situations.

In one study of differences in use of questions between men and women,

Macauley analyzed the differences in linguistic and interactional styles between two male

and two female broadcast interviewers as they performed topical and political interviews

on broadcast media. She points out that most studies which hypothesize about gender

have been based on the premise that women are powerless or different (2001, p. 4). She

points out that in an interview setting, asking questions places the interviewer in the seat

of power regardless of gender. "Although Fishman hypothesizes that questions in female

speech signify social status inferior to males, little attention has been given to female

interviewers for whom asking questions reflects status equal to that of males" (Macauley,

2001, p. 295).

She uses Davies and Harre's (1990) concept of "positioning" to examine how the

interviewers whom she analyzed positioned themselves as powerful speakers during the

interviews. In the setting of a formal interview, Macauley (2001) was able to thoroughly

examine how interviewers used questions to position themselves as well as the types of

questions each gender used. Results seemed to counter previous interpretations of data

concerning how males and females use questions. The purpose of an interview is to

gather information, but in order to be successful at that, the interviewer must also be

successful at keeping the conversation going. In other words, the interviewer must also

facilitate the conversation. The two female interviewers used disputable assertions as

indirect requests for information in their questioning strategies toward getting at sensitive

issues and maintaining their status. Macauley (2001) states:

D-event [disputable] assertions as indirect requests for information carry the

implicature 'what do you have to say about that' and it is the getting of a salient response

that makes the interview successful and so maintains the status of the interviewer. (p.

311)

These acts were perceived as more challenging than the questioning techniques

employed by the male interviewers. The male interviewers initial questioning strategies

built rapport. They used indirect questions that drew on the interviewee's personal

knowledge, experience and emotion, revealing them as a complete human being in

relation to others. Out of this relationship they could then expect their requests for

information to be fulfilled. The female interviewers never attempted to build a

cooperative relationship with the interviewees. Macauley (2001) sums up, "While the

male interviewers specialize in attunement, the female interviewers specialize in analytic

engagement" (p. 314).

Backing up Maccauley's (2001) research on ways men and women differ in

interviewing techniques, Holmes (1995) uses research by one of her graduate students,

Margaret Franken, which distinguishes how men and women go about and accomplish

interviews. The male interviewer who was analyzed held the floor longer, while the two

female interviewers made only brief contributions between questions as means of

facilitating the interviews.

Looking at gender differences in interviewing from a slightly different perspective, Winter (1993) analyzed political interviews conducted by a male and a female and found the male took turns more often and held turns longer than the female interviewer. The male also interrupted more often, all of which contributed a confrontational edge to the interview. Both interviewers were found to use declarative statements, functioning as indirect questions, as a means of drawing the interviewee out, and also challenging the participant.

In a similar vein, question use among men and women in a professional setting following a small meeting was conducted by Dubois and Crouch (1979). In examining the data, they found men were the only ones to use tag questions. Holmes (1995) also conducted a study on the question and answer period following a seminar and found that males asked more questions than females, especially ones she termed "antagonistic." These took the form of assertions that seemed challenging. She concluded that although men and women had approximately the same number of elicitations that showed support and agreement, when comparing negative elicitations, men used more antagonistic forms and females chose more critical, yet face-saving forms.

Opinion polls covering a wide variety of topics from political issues to cultural topics were undertaken to investigate whether women talk differently to other women than to men; and secondly, whether men respond differently than woman to being questioned. Researchers used data collected by the Texas Poll. Results revealed that female interviewers are challenged in their position of power by male interviewees through various uncooperative responses, requiring the women to act as "handlers" more than facilitators. The men were found to tease, avoid the subject or gave uncodeable

answers when asked to respond, while women interviewees were more cooperative and even looked for reassurance that they were answering correctly (Johnstone, Ferrara, & Bean, 1992). Johnstone, et al. (2002) reported, "Female respondents elicit more sympathy and understanding, while male respondents elicit more attention to their wants and needs and more joking" (p. 1).

Directives

Another area of language that has been investigated is the giving of directives. Ervin-Tripp (1976) examined the different syntactic forms which directives take and kinds of situations in which these different forms are used. Her study used data collected in a variety of situations; including family and living situations, offices, a hospital and lab, service situations, requests for goods, a student dining hall, adult education classes, and a Marine Corp recruiting station. From the data collected, she examined the distribution of directives both across and within settings, looking at social features, including rank, age, sex, intimacy, and role. She was able to identify six different kinds of directives: need statements, imperatives, imbedded imperatives, permission directives, question directives, and hints (p. 29). Her results reveal that there is a variance among situations depending on sociolinguistic features and goals. In addition, forms of directives are predictable depending upon those features and goals.

In further research, West (1990) examined the use of directives and their forms in the context of encounters between doctors and their patients, focusing specifically on kinds of directives used by male doctors and those used by female doctors. She adapted Labov and Fanshel's (1977) concepts of aggravated and mitigated language and applied it

to categorizing directives as aggravated and mitigated. Aggravated directives emphasize the status differences between the speaker and listener, while mitigated directives reduce status between conversational partners. An example of aggravated directives is the command or imperative form, while suggestions are classified among mitigated forms. Her results show that male doctors use aggravated directives more than female doctors, and female doctors use more mitigated directives than male doctors. However, both categories of directives are found in the interactions of both genders.

Characteristics of Adult-Child Interactions

Prior to the research on the ways women and men use language and the impact that has on interactions, studies in the 1960's established that adults, particularly women, speak differently when interacting with babies and small children than they do when interacting with other groups, including older children, other women, or men. Some of this research included investigations into measures of prosody, grammatical complexity, and redundancy in female-infant/young child interactions (Broen, 1972; Buium, 1976; Drach, 1969; Phillips, 1970, 1973; Remick, 1976; Sach, Brown, & Salerno, 1976; Snow, 1972). In addition, interactional features including pragmatic meanings and ellipses, (Holzman, 1974), discourse features and teaching devices (Moerk, 1972), as well as syntactic complexity (Pfuderer, 1969), directives (Bellinger, 1979), and interrogatives (Holtzman, 1972).

Directives and Interrogatives

Of particular interest in relation to the current study are those of Bellinger (1979) which looked at the linguistic forms of mothers' directives of their children's behaviors, and Holtzman (1972), who examined the variety in kinds of interrogatives used by three mothers with their children.

Bellinger (1979) investigated what linguistic forms directives took when mothers gave directives to their children. His findings indicate that mothers rely on cognitive variables based on their children's ability to understand language rather than the usual social variables that effect linguistic choices. He identified five forms mothers used to speak to their one to five-year-old-children. The first he labeled the "conventional imperative," which has the syntax of the imperative form, and explicitly includes the child as agent. The second he identifies as an "intermediate interrogative," which has the syntax of a command, but rising intonation at the end as in a question. The third is an "interrogative," with the content directed at the act the mother wishes the child to perform. This form requires a more sophisticated cognitive awareness on the part of the child as the mother is asking the child to perform and act, not supply information. The fourth is the "declarative," implying that the child is the agent, but not explicitly stating it. The fifth is a "statement," from which the child must make an implied meaning through adjacency of the statement to his or her action. As children develop their language and cognitive abilities, mothers' directives require more implication. These cognitive variables are later replaced completely by the social variables found in adult – adult interactions.

Holtzman (1972) investigated the use of interrogatives in mothers' speech to young children. She conducted a longitudinal case study that examined the variety in the kinds of interrogatives used by three mothers with their children using the concepts underlying Speech Act Theory. She identified five classifications of interrogatives including 1) requests for information, 2) requests for behavior, 3) questions that set the hearer up to display knowledge, 4) interrogatives in which the question is not verbalized, and 5) uses of interrogatives for purposes other than questioning (1972, p. 313). The initial phase of the study analyzed mothers' interactions with their children who were in the two-morpheme phase. Next, she analyzed the mothers' use of interrogatives again as their children were in the four-morpheme phase of language acquisition. Her findings show that mothers seem to be aware of children's cognitive abilities to make inferences based on the child's language development. During the two-morpheme stage, the mothers used questions that fell in the first three categories. During the four-morpheme stage, the mothers expanded their repetoire to include questions from all five categories.

Gender-Based Studies of Parent/Child Interactions

With increased research and theorizing concerning gender and power in adult interactions, studies have also taken into consideration the effects of gender in parent-child interactions (Bronstein, 1984; Cherry & Lewis, 1978; Esterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984; Liddell, Henzi & Drew, 1987; Pederson, Yarrow, & Cain, 1980). These studies began to consider that a father might have a significant role in the developing identity of a child (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle & Fivush, 1995; DeFrancisco, 1992; Girolametto & Tannock, 1994; Lamb, 1975, 1977; Siegal, 1987). They also began to examine how

families interact, leading to observations that men and women not only have differences in the ways they interact with children, but also similarities (Belsky, 1979; Clarke-Stewart, 1978; Russell & Russell, 1987, 1988).

Mothers' and Fathers' Interactions with Their Children

Adams, Kuebli, Boyle and Fivush (1995) conducted a longitudinal investigation on the differences in the ways mothers and fathers talked about past emotions with their sons and daughters. They found that the main thrust of emotion terms were positive. However, parents mentioned sadness with children between ages three and four, and this more often with girls than boys. By the time the children reached between ages five and six, they discussed negative evaluation of situations, again more often with girls than boys. Parents also used more variety in emotional expression with girls than boys. Each of their findings was reflected in how the children spoke of emotion as they developed language skills. The relevance of the study is based on the important concept that "adults implicitly teach children how often and in what kind of situations to talk about emotions" (p. 310). However, adults not only implicitly teach children about talking about emotion, but about talking and many of the aspects of interaction.

Studies by Pederson, Yarrow, Anderson, and Cain (1980), and Esterbrooks and Goldberg (1984) found that among college-educated fathers, only one to two hours a day was spent alone with their children. Theorizing that interactions between fathers and their children would conform to interactions when both parents were with their child, Liddell, Henzi, and Drew (1987) set out to look for differences in interactions between mothers and fathers interacting with their young sons and daughters while playing a in

public park. They discovered that, indeed, mother-child interactions were different than

father-child and mother-father-child interactions, which were remarkably similar.

Further, they found that mothers and fathers had an equitable amount of talk with their

daughters, but with sons, fathers talked much more than mothers, also suggesting they

talk more to sons than daughters (p. 264), supporting research findings by Lamb (1977).

Clarke-Stewart (1978) examined fathers' and mothers' interactions with very

young children and found that mothers interacted more with their children at this age than

did fathers. However, when fathers were present, mothers' interactions with their

children lessened. "This finding illustrates the more general phenomenon that, as the

number of adults in a situation increases, the amount of adult-child interaction decreases,

since adults concentrate more on each other" (p. 476). On the other hand, she noted that

the wives did not seem to be paying more attention to their husbands (1978, p. 473). She

also found that mothers and fathers engaged equally in social-play with their children,

reporting it is one area "where the father's effort was not 'overwhelmed' by the amount

of maternal behavior emitted" (1978, p. 472). The differences in playful interactions are

that fathers usually chose physically active games, while mothers used objects. When

choosing activities in which to engage their children, mothers showed a preference for

intellectually stimulating activities, while fathers chose social or physical play activities.

Children in the study responded more readily and were willing to cooperate more when

their father was their playmate as opposed to their mother. Of note are her findings that

fathers who played most were also most negative toward their children. She notes that as

the children grew older, fathers played with their children more frequently, while mothers

needed to provide less caregiving. She concludes that children continue to interact more with their mothers, but that parents were alike in quality of interaction, except for play.

Following Clarke-Stewart's (1978) study, Belsky (1979) conducted a study using natural observation in an unrestricted, unstructured home environment of mother-child, father-child, and mother-father-child interactions, which "maintained the ecological integrity of parents' experiences" (p. 606). He found more similarities than differences between mothers' and fathers' behaviors. The differences he did find indicated a preference of parent in interactions with a child of the same sex. Additional findings supported those of Clarke-Stewart (1978) and Lamb (1977) that parents interacted more with their child when alone than in the presence of the other parent. In regard to fathers' and mothers' language use in teaching strategies, Pellegrini, McGillicuddy-DeLisi, Sigel, and Brody 's (1986) conclusions follow Holzman's (1972) that children's cognitive level affects the linguistic choices of not only mothers but both parents in their interactions with their children.

Fathers' and Mothers' Interactions with Children in Middle Childhood

Two studies have attempted to examine gender of both parents and children among middle-childhood-aged subjects. In the first, Bronstein (1984) conducted quantitative research to investigate ways in which mothers and fathers differ in their interactions with their sons and daughters in a sample of nineteen lower and middle-income Mexican families using brief, direct observation. She reports there are significant differences in the interactions between fathers and their sons and daughters, and mothers and their sons and daughters. In examining types of interactions, she found mothers

spend more time in taking care of the children, while fathers engage in more play and participatory activities with their children. Fathers also did more explaining and information-giving than mothers. In analyzing parent-child interaction styles, Bronstein (1984) reports, "fathers paid more interested attention to sons than to daughters…" (p. 1000). In addition, they seem to engage in more cognitive/achievement interaction with boys, while they are more sociable with girls. She concludes that a child's gender affects fathers' attitudes toward their children. However, she did not find evidence of a difference in attitudes based on a child's gender among mothers.

Russell and Russell (1987; 1988) conducted the second study. They used the same quantitative methods as Bronstein, but added a parental self-reporting interview regarding time, frequency, and content of interactions which mothers and fathers had with their sons and daughters. The experimental sample in their study consisted of 57 middle-class Australian families. This study provides additional support for findings that there are significant differences between mothers and fathers in the ways they interact with their children. These researchers also found that the gender of the child had a strong impact on interactions.

In comparing these two studies, Russell and Russell's (1987) findings both support and contradict those of Bronstein (1984). In support, they found that mothers spend more time in caregiving. In contrast, however, they found that mothers were more directive and dominant-assertive in family management matters, and that they provide more information for their children than do fathers. The fathers in this study did not engage in more cognitive/achievement-oriented interaction, but they did play more with their children, as well as engage in more affectionate behavior than mothers. Play often

took the form of verbal interaction rather than physical activity. Parents did not differ

significantly in their response to misbehavior. Both parents reacted more negatively to

misbehavior by boys than girls. Considering the differing cultural norms and expectations

of men's and women's roles in these two different environments, it is to be expected that

the results of the studies would not be the same, even while using the same methodology.

Gender and Directive Use Among Children

One other aspect of gender-related language differences which contributes to the

understanding of the ways directives are used by males and females comes from a study

done by Goodwin (1990) of boys and girls playgroups made up of children in late

childhood and early adolescence. She observed that as the boys organized their play, the

individuals who emerged with higher status were the ones that gave the most aggravated

directives to other boys, particularly using the imperative form. The boys established the

hierarchy of their group by giving and denying permission, evaluating members positions

and establishing competition between individuals and groups.

The girls in the study participated together in deciding what they were going to

play and who was going to play what role. The girls used suggestions and proposals for

action as a group. Leaders in the group also gave commands, but rather than using the

commands as a way to improve their status, commands were given to protect a member

who might be in danger, or when expressing the requirements of the communal activity.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Design

The design of this study is a case study approach, which provides an opportunity for in-depth analysis of the subject. The present study utilizes methods of discourse analysis found in other cross-gender studies which have examined either adult relationships or parent-child relationships (Hobbs, 2003; Holzman, 1972; Schiffrin, 1994; Tannen (1990, 1994) to examine the interactions between the parents and their children who participated in this study. It is the purpose of this study to contribute to the understanding of how linguistic features, specifically directives by mothers and fathers with their sons and daughters are used in the different situations that arise in family life, and how they contribute to their children's identity and socialization. In addition, this analysis can contribute a new level of understanding to the field of gender and interactions, especially concerning both the influence of gender of either the parent or the child in parent-child interactions and the situation on linguistic choices.

Data

The data for this study consist of directives within different situations found in the naturally occurring interactions of four families. The interactions collected and analyzed

for this study took place during events that were tape recorded by the families at random over several months, capturing whatever interactions might occur. Audio tape was selected as the medium of recording the data because of the ease with which it could be managed and the ability to make it less obtrusive, creating less of a chance of influencing the interactions. In addition, the families expressed a preference for collecting data using audiotape as opposed to videotape. This method of data collection finds precedence in studies by Goodwin (1998), Hobbs (2003), Holzman (1972), Schiffrin, (1994), and Tannen (1990, 1994).

Participants

The families who participated in this study were chosen because of their similarities and their relationship with the experimenter. The mother in one family is a close relative, the mothers in two of the other families are former colleagues with whom the experimenter had developed close ties, and both parents in the fourth family are long-time family friends. The families are all middle-class, married couples. The parents are employed at least part time as professionals. All have had some graduate school experience. The ages of the parents at the time of the study ranged from mid-thirties to mid-forties. Each family included one child in middle childhood, aged seven to nine. This investigation focuses on the interactions of each parent with his or her middle childhood-aged son or daughter in various contexts, and with various family members present.

TABLE I

SUBJECT FAMILIES

	Age	Education	Profession
Family 1 - Harre			
Father – Adam	37	B.A.	Marketing Assistant
Mother – Laura	44	B.A.	Freelance Writer/Editor
Daughter - Rachel	7 years, 4 months	2nd Grade	
Son - Michael	33 months		
Family 2 - Sands			
Father – Sam	45	B.A.	City Planner
Mother – Betty	46	M.A.	ESL/FL Specialist
Daughter – Cathy	7 years, 8 months	2nd Grade	
Family 3 - Danson			
Father – Strom	44	Ph.D.	Professor
Mother – Patrina	34	Ph.D.	Professor
Son – Karl	7 years, 7 months	2nd Grade	
Daughter – Brianna	5 years, 4 months		
Family 4 - Vietch			
Father – Rick	40	M.A.	Licensed Professional Counselor
Mother – Lisa	38	M.A.	Licensed Social Worker
Son – William	8 years, 7 months	2nd Grade	
Daughter – Joy	5 years, 10 months	Kindergarten	
Daughter – Marion	20 months		

Family #1 is the Harre family, which has four members: father, mother, daughter and son. The father was thirty-seven years old at the time of the study, and a native of a suburb outside Vancouver, British Columbia. He has a Bachelor of Arts degree and holds a Graduate Diploma from a private Canadian university. He is employed as a marketing assistant for a manufacturing company in a mid-sized city in the Midwest. The mother was forty-four years old at the time of the study, and is a native of a mid-sized city with a university in a western mountain state. She has a Bachelor of Arts degree and had begun a Master of Arts degree, but not finished. She is a free-lance writer/editor, working from home. They were recent transplants to the Midwest from British Columbia. At the time the study began, their daughter Rachel was seven years

and four months old and in second grade. Their son Michael was thirty-three months old at the time of the study. They began collecting data in September 1997 and continued until November of 1998. They provided eight-and-a-half hours of family interactions of which one and a half were chosen for transcription for analysis.

Family #2 is the Sands. There are six members in this family: father, mother, three daughters and a son. The father in this family was forty-five years old at the time of the study, and is from a mid-sized city in the southwest. He holds a Bachelor's Degree with additional hours in advanced studies, and works for a medium-sized university town as a city planner. He also serves as an officer in the National Guard. The mother was forty-six at the time of the study, and is from the same southwestern city. She has a Master of Arts degree, and is in a Doctoral degree program. She is an ESL/EFL Specialist and runs her own private language school as well as teaches at a university. Their daughter Cathy was seven years and eight months at the start of the study, and in second grade. The three older children, who are significantly older than Cathy, are no longer at home but live in different cities. They did not participate in any way in the study.

The Sands began collecting data in June of 1997. However within the year, the father was called into active service in the United Nations security forces in Bosnia. He was out of the country for most of the year of the study. The family provided one-and-a-half hours of interactions that occurred prior to his call to active duty. All of the interactions were transcribed for analysis.

Family #3 is the Dansons. There are four members in this family: father, mother, son, and daughter. The father was forty-four years old when the study began, and is from

a rural background in a southern state. He has a Ph.D. and teaches at a major university in the southwest. The mother was thirty-four years old at the time of the study, and grew up near a major city with a university in Wisconsin. She has a Ph.D. in English and teaches at a private university. Their son, Karl was seven years and seven months at the start of the study, and in second grade. Their daughter, Brianna, was five years and four months, and in Kindergarten.

This family provided five-and-a-half hours of tape, two hours and seven minutes that were chosen for transcription and analysis. They began taping in June of 1997 and turned in all tapes to the experimenter by December of 1998.

Family #4 is the Vietchs. There are five members in this family: father, mother, son and two daughters. They live in a large southwestern city. The father was forty years old at the time of the study, and has a Master of Arts Degree. He grew up in a mid-sized city in the Northeast. He is a Licensed Professional Counselor and is employed by several private counseling services. The mother was thirty-eight years old at the time of the study and has a Master of Arts degree. She grew up in a small town/rural setting in the Midwest. She is a Licensed Social Worker and works as a state social worker in a small town/rural environment. Their son William was eight years and seven months at the start of the study, and is in the second grade. Their daughter Joy was five years and ten months, and in Kindergarten. Their youngest daughter, Marion, was twenty months.

This family provided six-and-a-half hours of tapes of which two hours and thirty-eight minutes were chosen for transcription and analysis. They began taping interactions in September of 1997 and turned in all tapes by December of 1998.

TABLE II

INTERACTIONS – ALL FAMILIES

	Interactional Setting	Length of Interactional Setting	Participants	Place
Family #1 Harre	#1 Family Meal	36:55	Father, Mother, Daughter, Son and Participant Observer	Family Kitchen
	#2 Cleaning Basement	16:45	Father, Daughter, Son	Basement
	#3 Dinner	5:25	Mother, Daughter, Son	Family Kitchen
	#4 Bedtime	34:38	Mother, Daughter, Son	Son's Bedroom
	#5 Bedtime, Reading 1	2:25	Mother, Daughter, Son	Son's Bedroom
Family #2 Sands	#1 Daughter's Room Re-do	23:10	Father, Mother, Daughter	Daughter's Bedroom
	#2 Homework and Household tasks	42:00	Father, Mother, Daughter	Dining room, Family room
Family #3 Danson	#1 Son's Room Re-do	7:00	Father, Son, Daughter	Son's Bedroom
	#2 Painting Son's Room	16:00	Father, Son, Daughter	Son's Bedroom
	#3 Dinner	11:30	Father, Son, Daughter	Dining Room
	#4 Meal Preparation	15:00	Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Guest, Observer	Kitchen
	#5 Outdoor Meal	6:15	Father, Mother, Son and Daughter	Patio
	#6 Family Meal and preparing to ' go out	25:00	Father, Mother, Son and Daughter	Dining Room
	#7 Casual Interaction	6:45	Mother, Daughter, Son	Living Room
Family #4 Vietch	#1 Making Valentines	12:00	Father, Son, Daughter, Baby	Dining Room
	#2 Meal in front of television	58:00	Father, Son, Daughter, Baby	Family Room
	#3 Son doing homework	11:00	Father and Son	Kitchen
	#4 Family Restaurant	9:00	Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Baby	Kitchen
	#5 Preparation to go out	9:00	Father, Mother, Son, Daughter	Family Room
	#6 Family Meal	11:38	Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Baby	Dining Room
	#7 Xmas Prep.	3:00	Father, Mother, Son Daughter, Baby	Family Room
	#8 Game	18:00	Mother, Son, Daughter Baby	Kitchen

Procedure

After the families agreed to participate in the study, a time was set up for the experimenter to observe each family first-hand during an evening of activities, including dinner. Through the course of the evening, the participants were also interviewed, and provided with tapes and instructions. The instructions were given verbally, explaining the project and requirements for taping, and each family was provided with a set of written instructions as well, to which they could refer.

Because of the closeness of the relationships between the experimenter and participants prior to being asked to participate in the study, the participants were aware of the experimenter's research interests before the project was begun and had been involved in conversations with the experimenter revolving around the research topic. Therefore the parents were provided with significant background on the study in order to solicit cooperation, and to guide them in collecting data that would be maximally useful. It was also intended to put them at ease regarding how the data would be used since all of them had experience in research themselves, and were already aware to a large extent of the general focus of the research project. Thus they were provided with significantly more information regarding the purpose of the study than under most experimental conditions. The written instructions were provided to which participants could refer due to the length of time over which data collection was expected to take place, and the spontaneity the experimenter hoped would occur in the data collection. The instructions were casually worded since they were being provided to close friends and relatives, and as a means to lessen the intimidation factor which the participants might feel regarding the obligation they were undertaking. The written instructions appear in Appendix A.

Data collection began at different times for each family as arrangements could be made for the experimenter to visit and observe them. Two families were observed and provided with tapes in early June, and two families were visited and provided with tapes in September. It was expected the data collection would conclude by the end of the year, however due to the extenuating circumstances in the lives of Family #2, the Sands, as mentioned earlier, data collection was extended to the following summer, allowing each family one year to complete their part of the project. Each family contributed varying amounts and kinds of data, and lengths of interactions, as well as varying participants in the interactions or those present in the setting, which is to be expected in natural occurring data.

In order to be able to draw comparisons, interactions from the different families chosen for analysis share similarities in settings and participants. These interactions include mealtimes with the whole family present, an interaction between each or both parents with one or more of their children during a goal directed project, and preparations in advance of a family outing. In addition, other types of interactions that occurred among some, but not all, of the families have been included in the analysis because the data shed additional light on the family interactions under analysis.

To transcribe the selected body of interactions, conventions previously used by Hobbs (2003), Schiffrin (1994), and Tannen (1990, 1994) were incorporated. These conventions use conventional spelling, mark pauses with periods and commas, include hesitations such as disfluency, and emphasize placement of stress that might otherwise be interpreted differently. These transcription conventions do not incorporate phonetic representation of sounds or emphasis that follows normal stress-timing.

For example:

Pauses

Half-second pauses are marked with a single period spaced between words, and do not come at the end of an utterance. One-second pauses are marked with two periods spaced between words in an utterance. A pause that is two to three seconds long is marked with three periods spaced between words. Pauses longer than three seconds are labeled as a pause and the length of time it lasts before the next utterance.

> Father: And then it only comes out this far…in the floor..
>   It's twenty inches.

Hesitations and Disfluency

Hesitations are spelled conventionally, and include the appropriate pause marks that show the length of the pause. Commas are used to mark where the voice of the speaker drops, but is not a true pause:

> M: So anyway what they do, Rachel, is they take your . your .. you,
>   you answer questions. They'll give you all of thi, this third, fourth,
>   and fifth grade . tes, questions.

Emphasis Outside Normal Stress-Timing and Differences in Pitch

The stress is not marked in every utterance. It is only marked if it falls outside the regular rhythm of speech, where the speaker is placing special emphasis on a word or idea. Pitch is also marked using backward or forward slash marks where the pitch effects the meaning of the utterance or the manner in which it is delivered:

> Will: I **am** sitting on my bottom!

> M: Not like /that\.

Question marks also show a rising intonation in delivery of an utterance:

F: Remember what happened before? With the chair? Will?

Commas denote a falling intonation in mid-sentence, while periods next to the

final word of an utterance show sentence final intonation:

F: Will, how many, uh . uh, let me, I'm sorry to interrupt you.
     How many sandwiches can you eat?

A dash at the end of an utterance denotes that the speaker broke off the utterance

before raising or lowering their voice:

F: But I don't know –
     That wouldn't, there wouldn't be any way for you to get into your desk.

In addition, these conventions note dynamic features of the interaction, such as

when speakers interrupt one another, overlap one another through false starts and

mistimings, latch on to one another, and use back channels. Types of interruptions,

however, are not distinguished in this analysis. Interruptions are marked with straight

brackets where the utterances overlap:

M: Honey, I don't understand why-

Cathy: -Because it doesn't look pretty there.

M: (very quietly) Oh, it does. It [looks .]

Cathy: [Not to **me**!]

False Start

False starts occur when more than one person begins talking at the same time.

Straight brackets indicate what utterances overlap each other:

F: [That wall] is just,

Karl: [That would be -]

Mistiming

Mistiming occurs when one speaker perceives another has finished speaking and attempts to take the floor. They are coded using straight brackets where pauses and utterances overlap:

Karl: I would have [.. s-all] this space to go up –

F: [Then,]

Overlaps

Overlaps occur when more than one speaker talks at the same time. The purpose may be to establish dominance:

M: Cath, so you do [not put your fingers,]

Cathy: [I'm not going to play in it.]

M: (raised pitch & volume) You [don't even . .]

Cathy;   [I'm not gonna **play** in it.]

Or it may be a phenomenon of intimacy when people are so well acquainted that they respond at the same time:

Cathy: Uh-uhn.

M: Oh, [okay.]

F: [Oh, okay.]

M: [Alright, its okay.]

F: [I figured it would] just give you a little more room if it were out.

Latching

Latching occurs when a speaker begins an utterance on the heels of someone else's utterance. The first utterance is marked with a dash at the end and the following utterance is preceded by a dash:

Will: Where that yellow is –

M: -You stuff it. Stuff a gumdrop hat. Gooey gumdrops.

Back Channeling

Back channeling includes utterances that support and encourage another speaker to continue the interaction:

Karl: Now, anyway, the chair can be my reading chair.
        That chair right there, you know that chair I really like, the blue one/.

F: Umhmm

K: Then put a desk chair right there/ . .
    And put my desk chair . . .

Once the transcriptions were complete, individual interactions were identified and timed, noting participants. An interaction was identified as one or more individuals engaging another individual (including himself or herself) verbally in a single setting. Interactions include multiple topics, and may include overlapping conversations among parties who are engaged in the same interaction. For example the Vietchs are in their family room a few days before Christmas. The father has been reading to their daughter Joy, while the mother is working on decorating the room, and is in the middle of untangling garland. Their son Will has been helping, but is now sitting in a rocking chair.

M: I hate this time of year. Please don't rock like that.

F: Remember what happened before? With the chair? Will?
        [When Joy was-]
W: [Yeah, but I'm] not rockin' rockin' that way.

F: [Well/]

M: [Hmm. (inaudible)]

W: I'm rockin' [forward.]

M: [We asked] [you not to do it.]

F: [You can still tip that way.]

M: The only way you can do that chair is to sit on your bottom and rock it.

W: I **am** sitting on my bottom!

M: Not like [/that\].

F: [You were] on your knees, Buddy.

W: One foot barely under my other.

The interaction with Will ends as the parents turn their attention to baby Marion.

Next, turns were identified. A turn is considered everything that is uttered while one person holds the floor. Within the turns, an utterance is a set of words that form a thought. More than one utterance can form a turn. The next step was to analyze the interactions for directives, following Goodwin's (1980) criteria that directives are "speech acts that try to get another to do something" (p. 157). Ervin-Tripp (1976) and West (1990) distinguish types of directives that I have incorporated in analyzing the directives found in the data of this study.

Need Statements

According to Ervin-Tripp (1976), need statements are a highly aggravated form of directive focusing on the requirements of the speaker and emphasizing the distance between the superior and the subordinate. Need statements include the use of "need to," "ought to," "had to" or "had got to" to express a directive (West, 1990, p. 332):

     M: Rick, I really need for William to go and pu-start putting on his white shirt.

Imperatives

Also known as commands, these forms are bald demands that make a strong distinction between the speaker and addressee, and are considered highly aggravated (West, 1990, p. 332).

     F: Come stand with your finger right here, Karl.

Imbedded Imperatives

This type of directive is less aggravated than bald-faced commands are, which downgrade the directive to a "request," although the distinction between the speaker and addressee is still emphasized. Agent, action, object, and often the beneficiary are as explicit as in direct imperatives, although they are embedded in a frame with other syntactic and semantic properties:

     M: Will, could you turn that down please.

Elliptical and Implied Imperatives

These kinds of directives rely on context and for the hearer to make accurate implications as to the meaning of the directive. Most of these directives do not express the agent or object:

F: (Directing position) Well/ **\here.**

The exception to the lack of agent being expressed in this kind of directive occurs when the hearer's name is used as a directive. The hearer must still make implications based on the context as to the meaning of the directive and the course of action to be taken:

     Rachel: Um-um!
     F: (admonishing tone) /Rachel\.

Inverse Imperatives

These directives can minimize status differences, and provide the addressee with the ability to direct the speaker. As Goodwin (1990) notes, it makes the participants co-partners (pp. 74-75). In the situation below, the addressee is presented with the ability to make a choice, but is clearly not of equal status with the speaker:

F: You want more time for that attitude?

Permission Directives

These bring about the condition stated that requires an action by the hearer other than merely granting permission:

F: Karl, would you hand me my cup and I'll refill it while I make her one.

Permission Provisions

These directives use the syntax of granting permission, yet assert authority (West, 1990, p. 337):

F: You can hold it under the **bottom**, bubby.

Question Directives and Quasi-Questions

These are directives in question format that do not simply expect a reply, but imply an action as well, yet do not necessarily specify the desired act:

F: Do you know where the rest of the bowls are?
Karl: Bowls? No problem (????). No bananas (????).
        (Opens cupboard doors, dishes moving around).

Tag and Post-Posed Questions

These directives follow a statement, and demonstrate that the speaker is making the hearer aware that the speaker believes the hearer has knowledge of his or her own actions or intentions and the speaker is also aware of the hearer's knowledge. The speaker is forcing the hearer to acknowledge this, and to agree with the speaker, which places an obligation on the hearer to take an implied course of action.

M: If you don't understand that, then I'll [explain it again.]
Will: [I sort of .]
F: You understand it, but you just don't want to do it. **Am I right?**
      (very quietly) **Am I right?**

   (No response from Will)

Pseudo-Mutual Requirements

These directives use "we" as the subject when only one of the participants, either the speaker or the addressee will take action or be affected:

M: Okay, we're not gonna probably get to watch this whole thing, guys.

Proposals for Joint Action

A symmetrical relationship is created through this type of directive. The speaker includes himself or herself in the directive:

F: We have to leave here in less than thirty minutes.

M: Let's turn this off 'cause we can't see it in the kitchen.

False Collaboratives

Proposes a joint action that will actually be taken by the addressee only:

M: Probably ought to wash our hands since we've been playing on this floor.

This form of directive can exaggerate the difference in the status of the speaker and addressee, however in the above example, it mitigates the directive.

Pronouncements

This type of directive is used to accomplish such things as expressing standards of behavior or initiating family rituals. It is sometimes used as a transition to end one activity and initiate another:

Karl: So like . . . can I move my finger?
F: (laughing) You –move your fingers?

Karl: I'm about to say, "Whoo-whoo," and it's the –feel man.
F: (laughs) Okay- **It's bedtime Beanie Bobs.**

Explanations as Directives and Hints

Although statements and explanations occur throughout the discourse that support

other types of directives, these particular statements imply that a course of action be

taken or avoided.

F: Now-now, buddy, you're going to spill all over if you do that.

Similarly, explanations that are used as hints to obligate the hearer to take a course of

action also occur. They require the hearer to make an implication about what course of

action needs to be taken. Ervin-Tripp (1976) included these among her examples of

"hints."

Karl: (shouting) Brianna!
F: (quietly) She can't hear you in here, buddy.

(Karl leaves the room and calls out again.)

Directive by Example

In this type of directive, the speaker expresses what he or she would do to provide

an example of how or what to do:

F: Okay, here's what I'd do.

Indirect Passive Directives

In this type of directive, the speaker is stating a rule that the hearer is expected to

adhere to, but does not name the hearer as agent. The speaker is, in a sense, appealing to

a higher authority, one outside himself or herself. The impact of this kind of directive is to obligate the hearer to obey the rule rather than the speaker.

M: Uh, the ball is never thrown in the house.

Suggestion Directive

In this type of directive, the speaker is making a suggestion to the hearer about something in which the hearer has a certain amount of choice. This directive does not place strong as strong an obligation on the hearer, but is intended to assist him or her.

F: You might have to dig for it in the bottom, there's a lot of paper there.

Each of the above examples were identified in the data that was analyzed. Findings from the analysis of the interactions regarding directives in this current study will be discussed in the following chapter on Analysis of Data.

Research Instruments

As discussed earlier, subjects were approached and asked to participate in a linguistic study that would examine the interactions of fathers and mothers with their sons and daughters. All the subjects agreed to participate and provided written and verbal (audio taped) permission. Subjects were advised of the time frame of the data collection, which was planned to take place from the time of the experimenter's observation to the end of the year. As mentioned before, due to circumstances that arose in the lives of one family, data collection was extended to the summer of the following year for all families. Each family was supplied with audio-tapes, as well as a set of

written and oral instructions regarding the random taping of interactions among family members. The families used their own recorders.

In addition as previously mentioned, written instructions briefly outlined the details regarding the purpose, design and proposed analysis of the experiment. Each family was asked to randomly turn on their tape recorders to capture the mother interacting with her son and daughter individually, the father interacting with his son and daughter individually, as well as times capturing whole family interactions. It was requested that the interactions be as diverse as possible to include but not be limited to task-oriented interaction, structured and unstructured play, routine activities, mealtimes, relating events, and discipline. They were also requested to write down the setting and situation, participants in the interaction and age of children involved to include with the tape. In reality, the families provided this written information only on a very limited basis. However, I was able to determine most of this information from references in the interactions.

Before data gathering was begun by the families, I observed each of the families for an evening, including dinner, and after-dinner activities. These observations were also audio taped. In keeping with methods used by Russell and Russell (1987, 1988) parents and children were interviewed separately on tape concerning types, times, frequency and content of interactions providing their perception of the kinds of interactions that occur and how they are manifested. Combining these methods of gathering data allows the participants' perceptions of interactions to be compared to the actual data gathered and reveals how close perception and reality are through these select interactions.

Each was asked the same questions framed from his or her own perspective regarding their interactions between father and son and daughter, and mother and son and daughter. The questions were developed to solicit each family member's perception of the kinds of interactions that take place in their family. The questions were intended to discover the kinds of interactions that occur between each parent and child, as well as the status and responsibilities of each parent, and how successful parents and children perceive the strategies used in their interactions to influence the behavior desired. The questions could be considered leading. Whether the parents had ever formally discussed these aspects of their family life before as a couple cannot be assessed from the answers they gave. While the questions might be considered leading in some cases, I felt it was important to try to get at the information the questions solicited in order to better analyze and understand the dynamics of the interactions and elucidate the findings. The questions used in the interview can be found in Appendix B.

Research Design

Interactions between fathers and mothers and their sons and daughters were audio taped at random from the summer of 1997 through December of 1998. The interactions selected for analysis include situations of similar nature from each family. The data generated include four comparable settings and situations. One is of the fathers working on a project with their sons and daughters. In tapes from one family, the mother is also helping. A second grouping of interactions involves a father or mother assisting their son or daughter with homework, and discussing school related issues. A third is bedtime routine, including a parent reading a story to one or more children, a setting which was

found in common among three of the families. The fourth is a dinnertime experience from each of the families. These interactions are the basis for comparison and analysis.

Using video to gather data on interactions was considered because it provides visual context and clues for a more accurate analysis. However, the families involved were not willing to be video taped. Therefore using a tape recorder, it was decided, would be the least intrusive, most effective method for gathering data. In addition, I observed and recorded each family's interactions over several hours during an evening of dinner and activities. Because I had a relationship with many of the family members as discussed earlier, I was familiar with their mannerisms and could recognize the meanings of their vocal qualities and characteristics. I was able to determine the content of the interactions through previous experience and additionally, through the observation experience.

Familiarity with the families also posed a challenge. Remaining objective and not bringing background knowledge unavailable to an outside researcher to bear on the analysis of the interactions posed a difficult task. While my intimacy with the families brought valuable knowledge to the research, it also had the potential to color the analysis.

In analyzing the data, I first considered that from past research, we know that mothers and fathers do treat their children differently. While this might at first seem to have a negative connotation, Siegal (1987) discusses the importance of this phenomenon for developing gender identity in children. However, the major gap appeared throughout the studies was a lack of investigation into the actual linguistic forms that mothers and fathers use when interacting with their children. In keeping with the initial investigation regarding gender influences on linguistic choices and how power is realized in

relationships between mothers and fathers and their sons and daughters in the various

situations that occur in family life, as well as the influences mothers and fathers have on

each other's interactions with their children, more specific questions emerged: 1) Do

mother's use more mitigated directives as seen in West's study regarding female doctors?

2) Do father's use more aggravated directives as seen in West's study regarding male

doctors? 3) Which directives appear most often within specific situations? 4) Do mothers

vary their use in type of directives more than fathers?

The following analysis investigates family interactions within varying contexts

that occur in family life, focusing on directives and attempting to answer the research

questions above.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis

This analysis examines each of the four participating family's interactions, looking first at the two families with a daughter in middle-childhood, Families #1 and #2, followed by the two families with sons in middle-childhood, Families #3 and #4. The analysis of each family begins first with data obtained by the researcher during interviews with the family, followed by the analysis of family interactions obtained through the families' random audio taping.

In the initial analysis stage of identifying and classifying directives, it became apparent that the linguistic expressions used between each parent and his or her son or daughter in various interactional settings and situations goes beyond the categories used by West (1990) in her research. In attempting to answer the research questions, "Do mother's use more mitigated directives as seen in West's (1990) study of female doctors?" and "Do father's use more aggravated directives as seen in West's (1990) study of male doctors?" it was discovered that simply organizing the directives into the categories of aggravated and mitigated directives and tracking their use by gender as West (1990) did in her study of doctor/patient relationships appear to be inadequate in answering the research questions based on the relationships between parents and children, and understanding the dynamics that occur in given situations. After identifying utterances as directives, there were almost equal amounts of use by mothers and fathers

in each of these categories, yet in the interactions, other mitigating language and factors took place. Therefore, to discuss the directives only as aggravated and mitigated does not provide a complete picture of how directives are realized in relationships between these mothers and their daughter or son, and these fathers and their daughter or son. The parent/child relationship, while sharing certain features with the doctor/patient relationship has very distinct differences. Although doctors are considered to be authorities on medical issues, and carry a certain amount of prestige, which translates into a kind of power in their position, they do not, however, have the kind of authority over their patients that a parent has or is expected to have over a child. Parents are endowed with more authority and power in the relationship with their children than doctors do with patients. Parents are expected to not only care for their children's needs, but to socialize them and prepare them for the multitude of responsibilities they will be expected to assume as adults in our society. This includes passing down cultural knowledge, social skills, communication skills, thinking skills, behaviors and attitudes that will help children grow to become productive members in our society who can function appropriately. Directive types and their uses found in the interactions are discussed where it provides insight into ways parents interact with their children. Analysis of other types of linguistic features found in the interactions where mothers and fathers direct their son or daughter will be more fully analyzed in order to answer the research questions.

Presentation of data from the interviews of each family begins with the parents' responses to interview questions regarding their perception of each parent's interactions with their son or daughter, and is followed by responses to the same interview questions

given to the focus son or daughter, the child in middle-childhood. The questions used in the interviews are the same for both parents and children, and can be found in Appendix B. In the cases of the two families with boys, their younger sisters also participated in the interviews with their brothers because as research was being gathered, it had not yet been determined exactly what the research would include in the investigation. However, because this study focuses on the mother's and father's interactions specifically with the child in middle-childhood, the information from the interviews pertaining to the parent/son relationships will receive primary focus.

Each interview was conducted as a conversation, which the interview questions served to guide. In reporting the data of the interviews, the information is organized in a way that the researcher feels serves to provide the clearest, most accurate picture that characterizes the relationships among family members and their interactional styles, especially the relationships between the mother and father and their son or daughter in middle-childhood. Therefore references to their children are included, as the focus child is part of that group. However, references only to a sibling or siblings are not.

Following the presentation and discussion of the interview data, a description of the audio-taped data collected will be presented, including the settings, participants, length of time, number of interactions between each father and mother and his or her son or daughter, and kinds of directives used in the situation. Further analysis of each father and mother, and a comparison between them regarding their interactional style and use of directives follows the analysis of directives. Situations within the interactions, including topics of conversation, interactional styles, relational elements of parents and children and ways that they use directives and other linguistic features that shed further light on

the formation and use of directives in relation to the research questions will be discussed where relevant.

Families with the daughter in middle-childhood will be presented first, followed by a comparison between these two families. These analyses will be followed by the families with sons in middle-childhood, and a comparison between these two families. Comparisons made among all the families will be discussed in the following chapter.

Family # 1 - The Harre Family

The Harre family includes the father, Adam, the mother, Laura, the focus child in middle-childhood, a daughter, Rachel, and a much younger son, Matthew. The analysis of the data provided by this family will begin with the researcher's interview of the parents, followed by the researcher's interview of their daughter, Rachel, and finally by the analysis of the interactions the family provided.

Family Interactional Patterns

The Harre family was observed by the researcher as a participant observer during a weekend visit. Following the first meal of the visit, which was recorded and is among the interactional settings that are analyzed in this research, the mother and father were interviewed together. The focus child, their daughter Rachel, was interviewed alone following the parent's interview.

The questions asked in the interview were designed to provide background information about the relationships among the family members, especially the relationship between the focus child, the child in middle-childhood, and each parent. In

addition, they were designed to discern how these family members perceive their

relationships and compare each of their descriptions about their interactions with the data

that they collected for the researcher.

In the data provided by the Harre family, there are four separate interactions

analyzed. Only one includes both parents and both children. One includes the father and

both children, while two include the mother and both children. The total amount of time

of all the interactions is ninety-five minutes. Each interaction will be described more

completely as it is analyzed, including setting, participants, length of time, number of

interactions, and kinds of directives. Situations within interactions, including topics of

conversation that involve directing the child will also be included. Interactional styles

and relational elements of parents and children will also be discussed where relevant.

Interview with Laura and Adam Harre

The first set of interview questions asks the parents about the amount of time each

spends with their child, when they spend time alone, where they are when they spend

time alone, what sorts of things they do together, and what they talk about when they are

alone. According to their reports, Laura spends five hours a day with Rachel during the

school year, and about thirteen hours a day on weekends, while Adam spends about three

and a half hours with Rachel each day during the week and thirteen hours a day on

weekends. Laura said she and Rachel are alone together a half-hour at the end of the day

and another one half to one hour a week when they go shopping. Adam reported they

spend about forty-five minutes a week alone while he is doing things around the house

and yard and Rachel is watching or helping him. In addition, he takes her on an

occasional outing. One or the other parent also spends time doing homework with Rachel, as well as other activities such as reading and writing, doing arts and crafts, and watching her play computer games.

When they are together, Laura said she talks to Rachel about her day: what happened in school, homework she has to do, and if there were any problems on the bus ride home. They also discuss Rachel and her friends, and how to handle different aspects of relationships. Another point of common interest is mysteries.

Adam defines Rachel's personality as "highly curious." She wants to know "why" about everything, constantly asking questions about how things work, and why things are as they are. She is especially interested in science topics. She also wants to know how to change things she does not like. The things he discusses with her often revolve around these kinds of issues. One topic Adam mentioned they talk about as a family is issues of safety, since they live in a small rural community where many parents have a quite different perspective than the Harres on what children are capable of doing safely at the ages of Rachel and Matthew. He mentions gun safety and vehicle safety in particular as issues he is concerned about with his children. Both parents said that Rachel chatters constantly, asking questions or telling them things she has learned, and she, therefore, initiates many of their conversations together. The differences in reported topics seem to conform to some gender research findings on male and female differences. Laura and Adam report the family is together for every meal on weekends, and nearly every evening meal during the week. Adam occasionally has to work late in the evening or go out of town on business trips. They spend most of their time on weekends together doing household chores and projects, but find time to play in the yard, go for walks, go to

the park to play, and read to their children. They also like to go to garage sales, and sometimes take day trips to do whatever the family is interested in doing.

The responsibilities that Laura and Adam report they each have fits into fairly stereotypical gender roles, while there is some overlap and blending of roles when they are together. According to their report, Laura is in charge of planning the family schedule, which she plans around Adam's work schedule. She characterizes her scheduling of family life as very basic and flexible. Since Laura works from home and is therefore home more often, she handles the basic household operations. When Laura and Adam are home, they try to work together on everything, including caring for their children. When they are both home in the evenings they share caring for their children, such as putting them to bed. They divide the responsibility of helping Rachel with her homework by subject. Laura helps her with reading, language arts and most of her math before Adam comes home. After dinner he helps Rachel with science and any kinds of projects that require use of the Internet.

Regarding things that they have taught Rachel, or want to teach her, Laura says it is very hard to teach Rachel anything because she already thinks she knows how to do it all. When she gets into the middle of something and discovers she does not, she then wants to be shown how. It is at this point that Rachel comes to her parents to be taught, or shown how to do things. Adam says one thing he has been overtly teaching her is to be observant about the world around her, particularly in regards to nature. Again he talks about Rachel's intense curiosity and need for information. Laura has shared her own interests, working with Rachel on writing, arts and crafts, and sewing. She mentions that

she tries to answer Rachel's questions, and that this often leads to impromptu teaching sessions.

Regarding discipline the Harres said that because Laura is around Rachel more often, she is the one who must play the role of disciplinarian and deliver immediate consequences. However in many cases, Rachel must tell her father about what she did when he gets home, and he discusses the situation with her. He says he tries to help her see what she did wrong and what she can do in order to make better choices. Adam comments that Rachel is a very difficult child to discipline. She is extremely sensitive and afraid she will "mess up."

Their discipline strategies focus on specific behaviors such as hitting or calling names, or extinguishing undesirable habits. They employ the "time out" system, remove privileges such as riding her bicycle, or take away television viewing time for each offense. Laura and Adam try to balance each other out and support each other, even when they disagree about the issue. Adam feels he is firmer with Rachel than Laura. He reveals that Rachel often is in conflict with Laura, but in his words: "I can do no wrong." Laura is silent on this topic, except to agree that Rachel is "Daddy's girl."

In questioning how they get Rachel to do what they want her to do, they agree that they make a request. They report they sometimes use rewards for positive behavior and are trying to increase the amount of "positive reinforcement" techniques they use. Adam feels they don't do this enough. Their approach to chores is to do them together as a family. Laura or Adam gives each child a specific job within the global task and tells them, "Your part in this job is X." Adam says he uses questions to remind Rachel what needs to be done. Finally, they use positive reinforcement to get chores accomplished.

The interview is concluded with the discussion of chores. During the interview, the Harres openly discuss their differences, difficulties, even some of the shortcomings they perceive in their relationships with Rachel, as well discuss what they perceive are the positive aspects of their relationships. Their characterization of their relationship as one of sharing everything is only partially borne out in the analyses of their interactions. As mentioned previously, Laura is responsible primarily for the children and taking care managing their home, and having a home based business, while Adam goes away to work, often works late, and goes away on business trips. While Adam and Laura may work cooperatively when he is at home, their roles remain divided into fairly stereotypical roles of males and females in the traditional family model. Following is the researcher's interview with Rachel.

Interview with Rachel Harre

Rachel corroborates what her parents have reported regarding the amount of time they spend together. Rachel says she spends six hours per day on weekdays, and eleven to twelve hours on weekends with her mother. She estimates she is alone with her one half hour to two hours every day, times when her younger brother is asleep. Her mother sometimes takes her to the library alone, or to the park, and they also go grocery shopping.

She is with her father about four hours a day after he comes home from work, and eleven or twelve hours on weekends. She is alone with one of both parents for a half hour to an hour after her brother is put to bed at night. During this time, they may watch television or play games. Her parents also read to her frequently. Her father occasionally takes her out alone to do something such as go to the movies.

They are always together in the evenings and may be working on different activities side by side. For example, Rachel may be working on her homework while her parents help her and do other tasks. They make dinner together in the kitchen, and then eat their meal together. Later they go into the living room to watch television or play board games. In addition they always attend church together.

When Rachel talks to her mother, she says she wants her mother's complete attention and wants to be alone with her and not to have to share the time with her younger brother. She talks to her mother about her frustrations at school and shares the positive things that happened as well. She talks to her about how to do homework assignments. They also discuss their common interests such as crafts, drawing and writing.

With her father Rachel says she asks him to explain how things work to her, such as cars and tractors, and how to fix things. She also talks to him about new inventions they might find out about. She goes to him to explain math problems to her, help her with three dimensional drawing, and using the computer. She is also quick to say she talks to him about his day and how it was, as well.

Rachel believes her parents plan their family life together. She says they share all the responsibilities of taking care of their home and children. When it comes to helping her with her homework, she says it depends on what the subject is and which parent has a stronger background in that subject. Her mother helps her with language arts, while her father helps her with science. Both her parents teach her things. Her mother has taught her how to set the table and fold the laundry, although her father taught her specifically how to fold underwear the way he likes it done. Her mother has also worked with her to

increase her vocabulary and English fluency. Her father has taught her things about fixing cars, and taking care of their pets. He, too, has helped her improve her language skills and taught her some unusual words. She says each of her parents has taught her about the things each of them is interested in.

When asked about her parents' discipline strategies, she says first they tell her what to do or what not to do. If that fails, they yell at her and use tougher language, which is followed by "time out," or a spanking if the offense is really serious. Other ways her mother deals with misbehavior is to take away special toys or privileges. If they are trying to help her change a specific behavior that has become a negative habit, they give her a reward after a specific length of time of not doing it. She says she hates getting into trouble, and cannot stand to have her parents angry with her. When she thinks she is going to be in trouble, she will go to her father and tell him, because she thinks he is less likely to yell at her or become angry. Instead, he talks to her about what she did, and tries to help her figure out how to make better choices, although he also gives her consequences.

Summary of Interview

The strongest impression that Laura and Adam, as well as Rachel create is a family that is deeply involved with one another. They make it clear they spend all their time possible working and playing together, and share most of their interests with each other, even if that interest is not the forte of the other family member or members. This display of depth of bonding and intimacy is further revealed in the interactions provided in the data they supplied and will be discussed in the following analysis.

TABLE III

HARRE – INTERACTIONS

	Interactional Setting	Length of Interactional Setting	# of Interactions	Aggravated Directives		Mitigated Directives		Total Directives	
				#	/ ratio of Interactions	#	/ ratio of Interactions	#	/ ratio of Interactions
FATHER	#1 Family Meal	36:55	72	20	.28	7	.10	27	.38
	#2 Cleaning Basement	16:45	84	30	.36	5	.06	35	.42
MOTHER	#1 Family Meal	36:35	79	26	.33	4	.05	30	.38
	#2 Dinner - Mother and Children	5:25	15	5	.33	1	.06	6	.40
	#3 Reading and Bedtime 1	34:38	9	12	1.33	6	.66	8	2.00
	#4 Reading and Bedtime 2	2:25	4	2	.50	5	1.25	7	1.75

Father

In the data of the Harre family, father Adam and daughter Rachel are together in two settings: a meal preparation, followed by a more relaxed family time of eating in which Adam, Laura, Rachel, Matthew, and the guest observer were all present; and cleaning out their basement, which included only Adam, Rachel, and Matthew. The total time Adam and Rachel were involved in the same activities was a little more than fifty-three minutes.

In the interactions between father and daughter, the data revealed Adam Harre delivered sixty-three directives out of the one hundred and fifty-six turns he had with Rachel. That is, forty percent of all interactions between father and daughter included some kind of directive. In examining the directives, the majority were in the form of an aggravated directive. Only twelve of all the directives, or eight per cent, given in either

setting fit in a category of mitigated forms as described by Ervin-Tripp (1976) and West (1990). Additional types of directives were identified that were not found in West's description of directives given by doctors to patients. However among the aggravated forms, mitigating language was included or vocal tones that softened the force and displayed care for the child while continuing to establish a distinction in status between parent and child. Adam's repertoire of directive types is among the richest of all the parents as noted in Table III above.

Mother

The Harre family provided data of the mother, Laura, and their daughter Rachel during four interactions, which totaled seventy-nine minutes. The first interaction is the meal preparation, followed by eating described in the previous segment, which includes the entire family and the participant observer as a guest. The second is Laura alone with her children having dinner. The third is a brief five minute segment of Laura helping the children get ready for bed, while the fourth is Laura reading a bedtime story followed by the children getting into bed.

Her turns to Rachel total one hundred and seven times. Among their interactions, Laura delivers sixty-one directives. The directives account for fifty-seven per cent of her interactions with Rachel. In fact, some of the turns include more than one directive. The majority of directives are aggravated, accounting for seventy-three per cent of the directives as compared to twenty-six per cent of the directives falling into a mitigated category. The types of directives included in Laura's interactions and their distribution is located in Table III.

It is of interest that the number of directives increases dramatically in Interactions #3 and #4. The factor that seems to influence this increase is the interactions between siblings. Laura spends a great deal of time, as revealed by the utterances in these interactions, trying to stop her two children from annoying each other. While there are other sibling relationships and interactions revealing sibling rivalry in the body of data collected for this research, the challenge of dealing with the antagonism that emerges in interactions between these two siblings is something no other parent among the participants faces.

Interactional Settings

Following is a description of the location, participants, activities, and where relevant, topics of conversation for each of the Interactional Settings provided by the Harre family and used in the analysis of this research project.

Interaction #1

The first interaction involves the entire Harre family as they prepare a meal followed by the meal itself. Both aspects of this interaction lasted thirty-six and a half minutes. The participant observer was also present. She did not actively engage in helping prepare the meal, but was solicited to converse at various times throughout the interaction.

Adam and Laura worked side by side in preparing the meal while Rachel and Matthew played in the kitchen and the participant observer watched. Rachel was expected to be available to help whenever one of her parents deemed it necessary. When

not engaged in tasks assigned by a parent, she could go about her own activities. Her

parents expectations of Rachel involved supportive acts to the preparation of the meal

and the meal itself, such as moving her toys, choosing a place to sit, staying out of the

way, handing things to a parent, setting the table, using good manners, and having a

positive, compliant attitude. Occasionally, Rachel is called upon by one of her parents to

do a small job. She is much more receptive to directives by her father than her mother.

In fact, several of his directives are based on Rachel's attitudes and responses to her

mother's directives.

Interaction #2

The second setting is another goal-oriented activity. The father and children are

cleaning the basement in preparation for painting it. The mother is not present. Unlike

the meal preparation setting of Interaction #1, the children are very active in the process.

Father and children work together in a cooperative venture. Adam Harre acts as director,

with a plan in mind, which he shares with his children on a "need to know" basis. The

interactions between father and children primarily revolve around each child performing

duties one at a time as their father issues them. In addition to encapsulated acts

accomplished through the directives, questions, comments, and stories relating to items

found or looked for, arise as the clean-up process occurs. Adam has eighty-four turns

with Rachel, and issues thirty-five directives to her, which accounts for forty-two per cent

of the interactions.

Adam employs a wide variety of directive types in this interaction. The primary

form was the imperative, which follows with the situation of Adam acting as director of

the cleanup. Proposals for Joint Action and Permission Provisions were used close to

half as often as the imperative. Adam used the Proposals for Joint Action to initiate and

organize specific activities within the greater situation. Permission Provisions were used

in response to Rachel's questions about performing specific tasks.

Interaction #3

Interaction #3 occurs between Laura and her children at the conclusion of an

evening meal in the Harre's kitchen. Adam is still at work. The length of the interaction

is five minutes and twenty-five seconds. Laura is attempting to explain to Rachel what to

expect regarding an important standardized test that she will be taking in school soon.

Matthew is sitting with his plate in front of him, balking at his mother's efforts to get him

to finish eating. Periodically, Rachel interferes with Matthew frustrating both him and

their mother.

During this interaction, Laura has fifteen turns with Rachel. In that time six

directives occur in Laura's interactions with her daughter. Aggravated directives make

up a third of the interactions, or thirty-three per cent, and a mitigated directive accounts

for six per cent of the interactions.

Interaction #4

The fourth interaction takes place later that same evening. It is bedtime and Laura

and the children gather in Matthew's room to hear a story and say their prayers before

going to bed. Laura and the children interact before and after the story, with an

occasional interruption to the story occurring. The total time in this setting is thirty-four

and a half minutes. Laura interacts with Rachel a total of only nine times in this setting.

In this setting, which is quite structured and goal-oriented, there are multiple directives in

some of the interactions. In the nine interactions, eight aggravated and one mitigated

directives occur.

Interaction #5

The final interaction in the data of the mother, Laura, with her children is another

bedtime ritual. This interaction lasts four and a half minutes, including the bedtime story.

The interaction begins with the reading of the story, and concludes with Laura directing

the children through the remaining rituals of bedtime.

Types of Directives

Explicit in a directive is the speaker's perspective of his or her relationship with

the hearer (Goodwin, 1990). In addition, an imperative carries in its force a claim by the

speaker about his or her right to make such a directive (Goodwin, 1980).

TABLE IV

HARRE – DIRECTIVES

INTERACTIONAL SETTINGS

Directive Type	Meal Prep and Meal		Basement	Meal	Bedtime
Aggravated Directives	F	M	F	M	M
Imperative	7	5	19		
Imbedded Imperative		2	2		
Permission Provisions	7	1	5	1	
Hearer's Need					
Speaker'sNeed					
Pseudo-Mutual Requirements		7			
False Collab.		1			
Question Dir.	1	3	1		
Tag Question		2	1		
Pronouncement	1				2
Directive by Example					
Suggestions					
Mitigated Directives					
Proposal for Joint Action	1	2	5		
Permission Directives		1			
Hints	1				
Explanation Directives	2	1			
Singular Suggestions					

Imperatives and Need Statements

Imperatives are among the most frequently used types of directives used by the Harres. West (1990) identifies imperatives as one of the most aggravated forms of directives because of its emphasis on the speaker's status over that of the hearer's.

Laura and Adam use a similar amount of imperatives when together during Interaction #1, five and seven imperatives among their turns, respectively. When alone with their children, imperatives occur more frequently. In fact in both cases, their use of imperatives with Rachel more than doubled when each was alone with their children. This can be accounted for both because of an effect of the setting and activities, as well as eliminating the effects of accommodation when in the presence of another adult.

The primary occurrence behind the use of the imperative is when Rachel challenges her parents' standards for her behavior or attitudes, and especially when she challenges her parents' authority. A prime example is Adam's use of the imperative to direct Rachel's attitude while intervening in a misunderstanding between Rachel and her mother Laura over a perceived infringement on Rachel's status that occurs in Interactions #1. Although the child has complied with her mother's request, she acts as though her mother has overstepped her right of authority. The situation begins with Laura directing Rachel to put something with the recyclable materials; a directive Rachel challenges because taking out the recycle is the responsibility of her much younger brother, which threatens Rachel's face.

4.1)   Laura**:   Rachel, would you put this in recycle.**
                   There's that one. I think the iced-tea is done.
                           (Rachel takes item outside and returns to kitchen.)

Rachel: But that's Matthew's job! Not mine! [Inaudible]
Laura: [What's Matthew's job?]
Rachel: (crying) Putting the recycle [out !]
Laura: [Uh ..Oh\.]
            I'm .. I just meant to lay it down by the door, honey.
            I didn't - I'm sorry.
            [I didn't mean that.]
Adam: **[You don't need to get mad at anybody.]**
            (In response to R's expression) Oh yeah!
            Is that attitude totally necessary.
Rachel: (quietly) No.
Adam: OK. Then **don't have one.**
Rachel: (stomps foot, uses silly voice) OK.
Adam: (lighter tone) Or **have a good one**.

        In this situation, Adam exerts his authority as the father to require Rachel to

change her attitude. He clearly delineates the status between parent and child,

establishing parental power of authority to require Rachel to comply cheerfully with

whatever directives she might receive. The underlying meaning he conveys is that her

attitude should be one of a willingness to comply even if the directive seems to threaten

her face. He uses the "Hearer's Need Statement," followed by imperatives to accomplish

this.

        He uses the aggravated directive, the "Hearer's Need Statement," which is on par

with imperatives in their strength of clearly separating superiors and subordinates. Adam

uses these directives in the same context as the imperatives; times when Rachel is

struggling to dominate the interaction. Adam's initial step into intervening in Rachel's

challenge of authority is with the type of "need statement" that places requirements on

the hearer. In this example, he is not directing her actions, but going beyond to her

attitude and removing Rachel's right to express a negative one. This pattern of "hearer's

need statement" preceding an imperative occurs again in this setting in order to counter an attempt by his daughter to usurp control.

Adam's power and status is emphasized even more in the situation because he is stepping into the mother and daughter's disagreement when Laura herself does not seem to be emphasizing her status, rather she is more concerned with addressing Rachel's face needs. On behalf of his wife, Adam addresses Laura's positive face needs to be treated with respect. He perceives Rachel's actions as a threat to her status, which is how he would interpret Rachel's actions if they were aimed at him. However, Laura is mitigating her status and attempting to re-establish her relationship with Rachel.

Laura's response to Rachel's challenge clearly follows patterns found in female adult interactions described in the studies of Schiffrin (1994) and Tannen (1990). Women have been found to be more interested in cooperation and consensus building in their relationships while men emphasize status. Laura honestly apologizes to Rachel for this misunderstanding, therefore accepting blame for the problem that has arisen between them. She includes other strategies too, such as endearments to re-establish harmony.

While Laura is interested in maintaining a positive relationship with her daughter, she still takes a role in guiding Rachel's behavior. She delivers six imperatives to Rachel during the first setting. These all appear during the meal. Her use of imperatives are reminders, directly related to the standards and expectations regarding the manner of behavior which Rachel is being taught, and expected to adhere to during meals. For example:

4.2)   Laura: **Just have one piece**, Rachel.

4.3)   Laura: Now **remember**, it pours out really easy out of that one.

4.4)   Laura: **Here** Rachel. Can I have it please?

In example 4.3, Laura provides an explanation along with the imperative "remember"

that both provides context for the command as well as softens the command, acting as a

means of helping Rachel avoid an accident. In example 4.4, Laura uses a permission

directive to prompt Rachel to use good manners and pass the food until everyone is

served.

The only imperative that extends beyond the parameters of the actual meal is

when Laura issues a polite request to Rachel to get a serving spoon that has been

forgotten. As she did when her mother asked her to take out the recycle, Rachel obeys,

but challenges the request. After apologizing, Laura issues a command regarding

Rachel's attitude, using a light-hearted manner.

4.5)   Laura: Oh I for - **Rachel would you get a big spoon for these**?
        Rachel: (growling) I just got sat down!
        Laura: I'm sorry. I'm really sorry.
        Rachel: (sighing heavily) Uhhh. (Spoon falls on table.)
                Why do I always have to [(?????).]
        Laura**:   [Cheer up!] Cheer up!**

Laura uses an imbedded imperative, a directive found to be highly aggravated, to

make a request. While this initial directive is somewhat softened, being downgraded to a

request, Rachel cannot refuse. However, she makes it plain that she feels Laura has

overstepped the boundaries of what she should be expected to do once again. Laura

issues an honest apology. However, when Rachel continues to display an attitude of

displeasure, her mother directs her to change her attitude, light-heartedly commanding

"Cheer up! Cheer up!" This time Adam does not become involved.

87

Another prime example of the use of imperatives in Interaction #1 occurs when Rachel challenges her parents established expectations of mealtime behavior. As in many North American, middle-class, white families, mealtime is structured with specific expectations and standards. The Harre household is no exception. There are rules regarding the appropriate use of tableware and napkins, food service, expectations that all foods be tried, serving sizes, and use of language to accomplish the acts that take place throughout the meal, from beginning, to furthering its progress and taking leave from the meal. In this setting, Rachel does not always adhere to her family's expectation and standards.

In addition to situations when Rachel specifically challenges her parents' authority or status in Interaction #1, such as in the situation described above, Adam uses the imperative when, as previously noted, her behavior does not follow family standards. An example of this occurs as the food is being served. In this example, it becomes clear that another expectation in the Harre family is that children are not expected to eat more than their parents do.

4.6)   Rachel: Daddy? Is that enough meat for you?
             Adam: Oh yes.
             Rachel: Okay.
             Adam: One piece is enough for me, there/
             Rachel: (????????)
             Adam: **Whoa!** You're eatin' more than I am.
             Laura: Just have one piece, Rachel.
             Rachel: (disagreeing tone) [Mmmmm!]
             Adam: **[Start with] one**, and if you need
                   more we'll get you more.

The conversation implies, and later corroborates a corollary of the rule concerning the amount of food a child eats, that children are expected to eat some of every food

presented during the meal. However, Rachel would rather have meat than the other

foods. She challenges her parents throughout this setting where there are strict standards

of behavior to which she is expected to adhere.

A different way that Adam Harre uses the imperative in this setting is in the case

of a simple reminder to Rachel. In the following example he directs Rachel regarding a

future course of action.

4.7)   Adam: Ummm, what else do we want for (??????),
        Laura: Uhhh
        Adam: Rachel, **don't forget** I have some/ <u>no</u> I don't want your
                dogs in here!

Adam uses a negative imperative, **"don't forget,"** to remind his daughter of some action

she will have to take either immediately or in the future. His vocal qualities are relaxed,

but the form of a negative imperative emphasizes the directive's significance although we

are unable to discern what it is due to the intervening circumstances. This kind of

imperative is common among intimates when they are engaged in activities together, and

because the thought is interrupted there is not enough information to discern if he means

to distinguish between their status.

A third use of the imperative found in Adam's interactions with Rachel is the

"Inverse Imperative" in which the subject is explicated in the directive. The example

below occurs when Rachel asks about the participant observer's purpose in being there:

4.8)   Rachel: Does she have to interview me?
        Cathleen: Umhmmm
        Rachel: [Augh -]
        Laura: [So you'll have to] answer her questions.
        Rachel: What if I don't know the answers?
        Laura: (Laughs)

Adam: You can say that.
        Rachel: Oh?
        Adam: **And you say that honestly.**

The effects of this imperative form are softened by explicitly stating the subject, "you."

Adam uses this type of imperative to advise Rachel, and once again express expectations

regarding her behavior and attitude, more than to delineate status. The tone is similar to

Example 4.7 when Adam uses the imperative in reminding Rachel of something, and

addresses her positive face needs to be seen as competent. However, it does not alter the

status of parent as authority saying, "This is how it's done" to the child as subordinate

learner.

        An imperative emphasizes the difference in status between the speaker and hearer,

and Adam and Laura use them effectively when each wants to clearly distinguish the

difference in status between parent and child. They occur at instances when each wants

to clarify who is in charge, as Adam does when Rachel challenges her mother's authority.

In different contexts, each uses them more casually, as when Adam reminds Rachel "not

to forget." Finally inverse imperative is used as a means of advising and preparing

Rachel for a new experience.

        Because of the nature of the activity in Interaction #2, one that is goal-oriented,

with a single person in charge (in this case the father) while others carry out tasks as

assigned by him as the "director," one would intuitively expect that more imperatives are

likely to occur, and such is the case. There are nineteen imperatives in Adam's directives

to his daughter as compared to eight in the previous encounter. In other words, fifty-four

per cent of his directives in Interaction #2 are an imperative compared to thirty per cent in

Interaction #1. Some of the imperatives occur as simple commands, for example in

answer to her question for direction:

> 4.9)　　Rachel: Where should I put this?
> 　　　　Adam: **Put it over here** by the Pachinko machine.
> 　　　　　　or in simply issuing directions:

> 4.10)　Adam: **Come here.**

Other imperatives are encased in language that softens the impact:

> 4.11)　Adam: **Drop it over, be careful with the saw**, **babe**, parked over by
> 　　　　　the water trap.

Whereas imperatives in the first setting were used most often when Rachel challenged

her parents' in some way, they are now used in guiding her to accomplish tasks in a

cooperative environment. In fact, in contrast to the interactions that occurred in

Interaction #1, Rachel does not challenge her father during Interaction #2. She quickly

complies with his directives. If she finds a directive unclear, she asks for clarification or

states her need, and if she has ideas regarding how to do a job, she presents them through

a request.

Adam also employs "hints" with explanations, as well as elliptical imperatives.

These directives have the same pragmatic meaning as a direct command, for example:

> 4.12)　Adam: **Here's some more**, Rachel.

> 4.13)　Rachel: I don't see the thing where you put it right here.
> 　　　　Adam: **Back in there somewhere**.

In example 4.12, when he says, "Here's some more," he is implying an

imperative, "take this to the recycle bin with the other recyclables." In example 4.13, he

is issuing a directive to Rachel to "**Put** it back in there somewhere." In both examples 4.12 and 4.13, he relies on the surrounding context for Rachel to understand what to do.

In Interaction #3, Laura is alone with the children. Her use of the imperative indicates exertion of parental control. It occurs as an elliptical form: calling Rachel's name. It is unclear the exact impetus for this imperative, but there is a scuffle between Rachel and Matthew at the table. Laura calls out Rachel's name with a rising intonation, followed by "OK" with a dropping intonation at the end, signifying a transition.

4.14)   Laura: **Rachel/!** (Scuffle resulting in something being knocked over).
            OK\.

Laura's indicates she is directing Rachel to stop what she's doing by calling out her daughter's name in this manner. She says it again, and sighs as the confrontation between the siblings continues, retaining the same meaning, but with less force.

4.15   Laura: **Rachel/!**
            Matthew: (angrily) No, I'm not!
            Laura: Matthew! Now don't, this –
            Matthew: Ahhng!
            Rachel: (gently) Matthew, don't push.
            Laura: **Rachel\.** [(Sigh)]
            Rachel: [Did you say] [sorry?]
            Laura: [OK.]

By changing her tone of voice and sighing, she downgrades the command. She indicates she is more interested in having her daughter cooperate and "get along" with her brother, and her, than in status.

Later in the interaction Laura attempts to maintain control over dinner and bring it to a peaceful conclusion. She issues a bald command to Rachel.

4.16)   Laura: No, I'll go get it Rachel, I'll go get it –
                (Forcefully) <u>Matthew!</u> Stay here and (calmly) sit down please.
                Rachel, **sit down**.

Unlike the previous example where Laura mitigates her command to Rachel, in this instance, she is exerting her authority and status in the same way that it has been found to be used among males. This situation occurs at the end of dinner after Rachel and Matthew have tried their mother's patience. She is alone with them, without the usual support of Adam. Her response to Rachel is one that no longer displays any softening or mitigation, but demands compliance based on her authority.

.

Imbedded Imperatives

Each parent uses this type of directive with Rachel twice. Adam employs this directive while in the basement with their children as polite requests to direct Rachel to take on a task, which might be perceived as face threatening. Laura uses them in the same way. While Adam received a positive response from Rachel, on both occasions, Laura is challenged. Both situations have been presented earlier in this analysis in Examples 4.1 and 4.5. The first one occurs when Laura uses an imbedded imperative as a polite request to take care of some recyclable materials. Rachel is playing and Laura softens her directive, aware that she is imposing on Rachel, yet with the rights of her status as "the mother." Although Rachel performs the task, she perceives this as an imposition not because she is playing, but because she believes anything having to do with recycling is relegated to her younger brother. She challenges her mother after the fact. Laura further softens her face-threatening act to Rachel by apologizing, and explaining her intentions.

The second situation, also described in example 4.5, occurs when the family has sat down to eat and Laura discovers that a serving spoon is needed before they can begin. She uses the same directive type, an imbedded imperative as a request, to direct Rachel to retrieve a serving spoon because she is closest to where the silverware is kept. Rachel responds in the same way as she did in Example 4.1. After getting the spoon, she grumbles and challenges her mother's right to impose on her. Laura acknowledges the request as an imposition and once again, sincerely apologizes.

Hearer's Need Statements

Laura uses the "hearer's need statement" to express an obligation, rather than establish her own status of authority as Adam does when he incorporates this type of directive as shown in Example 4.1. She uses this form to bring an activity to a conclusion that Rachel and she are engaged in just as the family is about to sit down to dinner. Although it is similar in form to a Singular Suggestion, and includes "I think" and "just" which softens the impact, it nevertheless carries greater weight than a suggestion.

4.17)   Laura: I think **you'll have to just cut out what you want**, Rachel.
                   Let's eat now.

She uses it again to place an obligation on Rachel when Rachel asks about answering the guest observer's interview questions.

4.18)   Laura: **So you'll have to answer her questions**.

Laura is expressing expectations of behavior according to the implied conditions of an interview situation. In neither of the above cases is Laura establishing her authority over the situation or over Rachel, although she is expressing an obligation that Rachel must meet.

In one instance that occurs in the final setting, Laura does use it to establish her authority. Following the bedtime story, Laura directs Rachel to go to her own room using this type of directive.

4.19)   Laura: Rachel, **you need to get in your room.** I'll be there in a minute.

The "hearer's need statement" directive is among the least frequently occurring directive in the data of the Harre family. Adam uses this type to address Rachel's attitude toward her mother's directives; and to place an obligation. Laura uses it just once to obligate Rachel to obey her.

Permission Provisions

The next most commonly observed directive in Adam's speech is the Permission Provision, that is, giving and withholding permission. Each time occurs when Rachel initiates a problem. At times, he issues a negative permission provision, simply stating "No" to an action initiated by Rachel, and follows is by another type of aggravated directive. In the example below, Rachel has again been challenging her mother's authority, this time more subtly, over food portions. Rachel and Laura have recently carried on a subdued confrontation over healthy eating. Rachel prefers meat to vegetables, but her mother insists that she limit her meat intake. As the meal is concluding, Rachel begins to complain.

4.20) Rachel: My tummy's hungry for <u>meat</u>!
                  (Sound of utensils on plate) Thank you.
          Adam: **We let you have a little smaller meat** and that's a big
                  portion of it with that. gristle **so we'll let you have a
                  bit more.**

Clearly in his position of parental authority according to the family structure the Harres

have established, and by the standards of many middle-class white families in North

American culture, Adam has the right to give and withhold permission. He includes an

explanation within the "permission provision" that maintains Laura's authority, and

provides parental solidarity while managing to successfully negotiate with Rachel and

permit her need to be satisfied. He has acted as a benevolent authority figure.

    Adam grants permission in response to questions from Rachel about the manner

she is doing a task. He responds with "yes" and a brief explanation.

4.21)   Adam: **It's okay.** Bring is here.

    The two times in which Adam says "No," they are direct answers to statements

from Rachel about what she thinks needs to be done. However as noted earlier, Rachel is

not challenging Adam. Her action can be seen as a move to gain face by displaying her

knowledge and abilities and have a greater stake in taking charge. She is seeking his

approval.   He responds in disagreement and withholding permission and assumes the

role of a teacher explaining, in contrast, how to go about the task.

4.22)   Rachel: Dad, we need to pick up (??????????????).
        Adam: No**.** All we need to do is pick up and move things around and
                **make them neater .. and make them so we can reach . the wall
                easier, we're working on the wall.**

A different use of the permission provision occurs once in Laura's interactions with Rachel during the meal. Laura notices that Rachel is having some problems with her food and she drops some on the floor. Without waiting for Rachel to request permission to pick it up, Laura issues a permission provision for her to get down from the table and pick it up off the floor. Rather than granting permission, this act is in fact a command for Rachel to clean up after herself.

4.23)   Laura: **You can get down and get it to you -**

The "Permission Provision" is also the most frequently used directive in Interaction #4, the final setting in the Harre family analysis. Laura uses this form primarily in response to Rachel's questions about the test, or action she takes that interferes with the flow of the interaction. Two of the permission provisions are affirmative. In the case of the single negative one, Laura stops Rachel from leaving the table to get something her brother has asked for, found in example 4.15 above. These uses of the permission provision are in contrast to the way Laura uses it in Interaction #1, as an indirect way of prompting Rachel to do something. Her use of this directive type in Interaction #4 is very similar to the pattern of Adam's use of this type of directive.

Laura's and Adam's uses of permission provisions differ significantly. Adam uses "yes" and "no," usually in conjunction with another type of directive to give or withdraw permission. Laura does not use either "yes" or "no" in relation to a permissive. When withdrawing permission, such as not allowing Rachel to take too much meat, she uses a positive statement ("Just take one piece."). While Adam maintains his authority by granting or rescinding permission as a child is in the act of doing something, or requesting guidance, Laura uses the permissive provision to establish her authority in a

different way. She requires Rachel to act by giving her permission to act and therefore

obligating her to do so before the child shows any intent to act.

Speaker's Need Statement

Another example of how Laura and Adam perceive their relationships with

Rachel differently and how this influences their interactions, involves an attempt by

Rachel to gain control of the conversation, and influence events that are to come. She

tells her parents she wants to do something special and they have to guess what she wants

to do. She negotiates with them to play along for a little while. Laura is amenable to

playing the game. Once again Laura's actions follow the findings of interactions among

adult women to support each other's interactions. However, Adam quickly counters with

his own requirements. He expresses his removal from the game and demonstrates the

masculine bend toward independence by using a "Speaker's Need Statement."

> 4.24)   Adam: What was your best plan?
> Rachel: Mmmm, have to guess.
> Adam: **No, you have to tell me.**
> Rachel: (laughs, then wheedling tone) I say yes or no and you guess.
> Laura: **The Amana Colonies?**
> Rachel: unh-unh-unh-unh\
> Adam: Up to – at your birthday party?
> Rachel: um-unh\
> Adam: Where.
> Rachel: (laughs, sing-song tone) Still have to [guess].
> Adam: (losing patience)   [No!]
>   I'm all out of ideas, Rachel.
> Rachel: (giggles)
> Adam: (recovering humor, joking tone) **I don't have to guess either**.
> Adam: Just let you keep it to yourself and we don't care.

Adam does not intend to take part in this game. He starts to squelch it by issuing

the "Hearer's Need" statement, "You have to tell me." However, Laura joins in Rachel's

game by guessing. Adam concedes, and accommodates Laura's initial participation, but quickly loses patience and ends the game with the use of a negative " speaker's want statement." This is in direct opposition to Rachel's demand that he and her mother "have to guess," making clear their asymmetrical relationship. In addition, Laura guesses only once, Adam guesses once then seizes the interaction to force Rachel to stop playing the game. As with the use of the imperatives in examples 4.1 and 4.2, Adam is emphasizing his status and authority as Rachel tries to manipulate the situation to gain more control.

Pseudo-Mutual Requirements

While Adam never used this form, pseudo-mutual requirements appear seven times in Laura's directives to Rachel. Five of these occur in reference to eating a healthy diet during Interaction #1. Rachel attempts to take a larger serving of meat than her mother feels is appropriate, and the issue of the amounts of foods that should be eaten becomes a topic of conversation later in the meal. Laura refers to "we" as a family in setting up standards of expectations for what her daughter will eat, but the directive is, in fact, emphasizing that to which Rachel is expected to conform as part of the Harre family. Rachel is part of the family and the family, including Rachel, behaves according to standards established by the parents. Her mother uses "we" to explain amounts and types of foods that Rachel is expected to eat in order to practice healthy eating habits in conforming to family standards.

4.25) Laura: Well, **we need to eat -** you need to eat the noodles with our meat
honey, . to fill up on them. Like [I said, we don't/]
Rachel: [I <u>ate</u> most of them].
Laura: OK. (Louder) **We don't want to eat the meat as the, center of
our, meal.**

In this situation Laura's strategy can be equated to the strategy identified by

Tannen (1990) as "rapport talk." Women engage in rapport talk to build unity and

consensus. Laura is engaging in this type of interaction on one level, but this type of

directive is highly aggravated on another level. She is telling Rachel what "we" do, and

including her even when Rachel is obviously not in agreement. She starts the initial

directive using "we," but changes it to then say "you," sending a mixed message.

Question Directives

Another type of directive that has been linked with a specific function is the

Question Directive. It is a teaching device that assists the hearer in negotiating a situation

in figuring out what to do or how to act. Both Adam and Laura employ this type of

directive throughout the meal in order to remind Rachel of the correct thing to do as

exemplified by the following:

> 4.26) Rachel: I need mayo/
> Adam: You need <u>what</u>, Rachel?
> Rachel: Mayo. (Knife rattles in empty jar)
> Laura: **What's the magic word?**
> Rachel: Pleeeeeeese.

Laura is using this opportunity to jog Rachel's schema of appropriate behavior and

linguistic phrases when having a meal. She has taught Rachel that there are "magic

phrases" that accomplish acts at the table, and when you want something you cannot

reach, there is an appropriate phrase to accomplish this act. Rachel obviously recognizes

what her mother is saying because she delivers the word back, saying "Please."

Tag Questions

Not only does Laura use relational strategies associated with adult women's interactions as she interacts with her daughter, she also includes strategies that show she can delineate status between her daughter and herself, and take charge as well. One of these strategies includes the use of tag questions. When used as directives, they stand on their own to require agreement by the hearer, as well as reinforcing directives that have already been issued. Rather than affect a behavior, they are meant to affect an attitude. Adam and Laura Harre each apply them in this way. Laura uses the tag question twice during the meal preparation and eating setting, and Adam only once, while cleaning the basement.

Laura reinforces a question directive with the tag question, "Okay?" in the example below:

4.27)   Rachel: Mommy it (?????) bad.
        Adam: Yes we're going to Rachel but I couldn't get in to it.
        Rachel: Sorry.
        Adam: Too many people try to make one pot of soup.
        Laura: Rachel, why don't you let Daddy and I try to make it,
             and you sit down. **Okay?**

She uses the tag question to strengthen what seems like a suggestion, and turn it into a directive. The tone is edged with sarcasm, which also emphasizes the directive status of the tag question. On another occasion when Rachel has presented a problem, Laura uses a tag question as a directive to bring about Rachel's agreement and resolve the situation. This example occurs when Rachel describes her perspective of her mother's balanced diet program for the family to the guest observer.

4.28)   Laura: We're trying to be, how do I put it – trying to just have a little
                 bit of meat – to accent the rest of the meal\ sort of thing, rather
                 than make it the center point of our – meal.
        Rachel: So we only have a tiny bit of meat on the side, and\, eat the rest.
        Laura: (firm voice) Well, I don't deny you your food, Rachel. Cause
                 you, **do I\?**
        Rachel: (sulkily) I don't want the rest of my noodles.

Laura's tag question, "Do I?" is said with indignation. It is a demand that Rachel rethink

what she has just said, agree with her mother and perhaps even apologize. From the

frequency of this topic, the force of Laura's statement followed by a tag question that

drops in intonation at the end, and the resulting dodge of the situation by Rachel, it is

clear this is an ongoing area of contention between Rachel and her mother. Rachel comes

as close as she can to challenging her mother by refusing to eat, instead of agreeing with

her as the tag question demands. There is a very strong division of status in this directive

by Laura. In several other situations previously discussed, she has addressed Rachel's

face-needs by using imbedded imperatives in the form of polite requests. She has

accepted the blame and counted their confrontations as misunderstandings when Rachel

has challenged her authority and right to make certain requests of her. Laura has even

issued honest apologies when Rachel challenged her. The use of tag questions in each of

these examples are demarcation points upon which Laura makes it clear that she has the

authority and status to require Rachel to cooperate, if these directives do not accomplish

complete compliance.

   While Laura uses the tag question as an aggravated way to arrive at consensus,

Adam uses the tag question as a way of checking comprehension and attitude. This

example of a tag question occurs at the beginning of the interaction following a general

statement by Adam of what they will be doing in the basement:

4.29)   Adam: Gotta move some big things around, **okay?**

His use of the tag question "okay" is a directive that implies that he expects his children to be ready to respond to his directives positively. He is checking comprehension of what is to occur along with checking attitude. However, it does not carry the intense aggravated connotation that occurs in Laura's speech.

Proposal for Joint Action

The "Proposal for Joint Action" is a directive that lessens the asymmetry in relationships, and provides for the speaker and hearer to engage in an action together as partners. Adam uses a "Proposal for Joint Action" as a transition in Interaction #1. It is a way to end other activities and gather the family in order to further the action by getting the meal started.

4.30)   Adam: (to 2-year-old son) I told you to leave things alone
                    and not help yourself, <u>didn't I</u>? <u>Didn't I</u>? Next time
                    you help yourself I'm gonna spank your bottom.
                    (Teasing) Cause I'm tired of saying that same thing
                    over every time. And then you just go do it anyways.
          Laura: Ni-this-We'll have to figure out if – I think you'll
                    have to just cut out what you want, Rachel.
                    Like this picture or something but –
          Rachel: I know.
          Adam: **Le[t's sit down and get ready to eat here** – cause
                                      everything's getting cold.]
          Laura: (to Rachel) [Let's eat now. I'll put] it over here for now.

While the use of "let's" mitigates the difference in status between the parents and children and brings everyone together to share a new activity, Adam is still in his role as director. It is he who issues the directive. Adam's initiative to begin the meal accomplishes his purpose. It brings Laura and Rachel's activity to an end, and everyone

comes to the table. In Interaction #2, the Proposal for Joint Action appears at the outset

of the project as Adam is explaining to Rachel what they need to accomplish and how

they will go about it. In fact, one is a response that counters a proposal for joint action by

Rachel on occasions, they occur at transition points as Adam changes his focus and

tackles the organization of a new area of concern. The use of this directive seems to

emphasize his attitude that the project he has undertaken with his children is a

cooperative venture. His use of "Mitigated Directives" diminishes status differences

between his children and himself as he outlines the projects they will be working on and

emphasizes the importance of them working together.

Among the mitigated directives, Laura uses this directive most frequently. These

directives come at strategic points in the interaction. They are used to make transitions,

to redirect Rachel and to break the tension, such as when conflict is close to erupting.

She employs the "Let's do X" form, proposing that each member of the family will take

part in the action and therefore reducing the distance in status. One is a directive to

change the family's usual seating pattern while they have a guest. In another she joins

with Adam in making the transition from play and food preparation to sitting down to eat.

> 4.31)   Adam: Le[t's sit down and get ready to eat here.]
>   Laura: [**Let's eat now.** I'll put] it over here for now. (Referring to
>   one of Rachel's play projects.)

Permission Directive

Laura uses a "permission directive" only once in this setting during the meal to

direct Rachel to pass food to her:

4.32)   Laura: Here, Rachel. **Can I have it please?**

Laura is not seeking Rachel's permission, but issuing a directive. The use of this "permission directive" mitigates the status differences between mother and daughter, yet guides Rachel in using proper manners and accomplishes Laura's purposes with minimal strain on their relationship. Adam does not employ this type of directive in any setting with his daughter.

Explanations as Directive Statements

As Laura explains the standardized test procedure to Rachel, she describes what her daughter can expect. Rachel adds what she already knows about the procedure as well as asks questions about what her mother describes. Among the interactions is an "explanation as directive," a directive that is both specifically intended for Rachel, but can be generalized across all populations based on the constraints of the given situation.

4.33)   Laura: So anyway what they do, Rachel, is they take your. your .. **you answer questions**. They'll give you all of thi, this third, fourth, and fifth grade. tes, questions.
          Rachel: Yeah?
          Laura: **You answer the questions that you, that you're ca, able to answer. As many of them as you're able to answer, and .. and as well as you can answer them.**

Another example comes from Interaction #4.

4.34)   Laura: **Rachel, it's time to put that down so we can pray.**

Along with the pronouncement, Laura directs Rachel with an explanation about why she needs to. In this setting, Laura uses a variety of strategies to keep the children on task toward the goal of going to bed. She uses them to negotiate through the various rituals,

as well as unplanned activities that seem to inevitably occur when a parent is trying to
accomplish a goal that the children do not want to reach.

In Interaction #5, Laura uses the "explanation directive" at the end of the
interaction. She repeats the same explanation three times as a directive in an effort to get
Rachel's attention and obligate her to stop her behavior. Rachel is playing with her cat in
a way that the cat does not like. She persists in it, even as her mother repeatedly explains
why Rachel should not continue to treat the cat in such a manner. Laura uses the
explanation as a counter example in an attempt to direct Rachel in how to treat the cat.

> 4.35)   Laura: Oh, Rachel! [Rachel**, she doesn't like to be lifted up over**
>   **your head]**, honey.
>   Rachel: [I love Rosie all the way up to the top of her ears.]
>   Laura: **She doesn't like being lifted up over your head, you know that.**
>   Rachel: I love, uh. [Rosie].
>   Laura: **[Yes,] but she still doesn't like being lifted up over**
>   **your head.**

Laura chooses a mitigated directive rather than an aggravated directive in this situation,
downplaying the difference in their status. Laura recognizes that Rachel is trying to show
her cat affection, not hurt it. Although Laura is quick to come to the cat's rescue, she
wants to encourage her daughter to treat the cat lovingly. She uses the explanation with
the counter example to try to help Rachel make a better choice of how she shows the cat
affection.

Adam employs this type of directive during Interaction #1 when describing the
process of adding zeroes in math problems to Rachel. The basic formula is for this
directive is "You + action," where "you " is both the hearer, and everyone else. Both
Laura and Adam use this directive form to describe universal procedures to Rachel.

Pronouncements

Laura uses a pronouncement following story time and a very brief look by each child at the book:

4.36)   Laura: **It's time to say our bedtime prayers.**

She uses this as a final warning and transition that bedtime has arrived when the children begin to give their attention to playing, rather than attending to the directive in other forms, both imperatives and proposals for joint action.

Comparison of Mother and Father

In comparing the mother-daughter interactions to the father-daughter interactions, directives make up over half of the interactions Laura has with Rachel, while they make up slightly more than a third of the interactions Adam has with Rachel. In both instances, Aggravated directives occur much more frequently than mitigated directives. In fact, aggravated directives make up seventy-four per cent of Laura's directives in seventy-nine minutes of interactions across a variety of situations in comparison to eighty per cent making up Adam's directives in fifty-three minutes in similar situations.

Laura's patterns of interacting with Rachel mirrror in many ways, the findings of how adult women interact with one another. In Interactions #1 when the entire family is together, Laura chooses most often to mitigate her relationship with Rachel, regardless of the types of directives she uses or the challenges she receives from her daughter. She negotiates with Rachel, and shows a desire to stay connected with her at the expense of what Adam seems to perceives to be respect. In the first primary conflict that occurs

during this setting between Laura and Rachel, shown in Example 4.1 above, while Laura

downplays Rachel's challenge to her through apologies, Adam flexes his superiority as

her father and emphasizes Rachel's challenge as a negative behavior. He insists her

behavior and attitude toward her mother's authority change. He is "rescuing" his wife

and showing affiliation to her. Shortly after in a similar challenge, Laura uses the very

same strategies of apologizing for inconveniencing her daughter with no interference or

support from Adam. When Rachel tries to take control of activities at the table, Laura

plays along with her guessing game, while Adam sees this as a challenge to parental

authority. He insists the game stop and that Rachel tell her parents straight out what she

wants to do.

However when Rachel challenges Laura over other issues, such as diet, Laura is

quick to take offense, and has no trouble establishing her authority over this issue.

However, while maintaining her stance of authority, Laura softens, and tries to re-

establish connections again with Rachel using endearments, and mitigates again by

apologizing and explaining that she misunderstood what Rachel was trying to say.

Rachel, while backing down, does not make attempts to establish connections with her

mother.

4.37)   Laura: We're trying to be, how do I put it…trying to just have a
                    Little bit of meat..to accent the rest of the meal, sort of thing
                    Rather than make it the center point of our..meal.
          Rachel: So we only have a tiny bit of meat on the side, and, eat the rest.
          Laura: (firm voice) Well, I don't deny you your food, Rachel, cause you,
                    Do I?
          Rachel: [sulkily] I don't want the rest of my noodles.
          Laura: You don't want the rest of your noodles? Why not?
          Rachel: Just don't.
          Adam: Getting full?
          Rachel: No, I just want tomatoes. Just, and meat..right now.
          Laura: Well, we need to eat, you need to eat the noodles with our meat,

Honey, to till up on them. [Like I said, we don't/]
        Rachel: (distressed)   [I ate most of them.]
        Laura: Okay. (Louder) We don't want to eat the meat as the, center of
                    Our, meal.
        Rachel: No, I said I want mostly tomatoes, and [I want the rest of my]
                    Meat!
        Laura: [Ohh, mostly. Okay.]
                    Okay. I misunderstood, I'm sorry.

        Following dinner Laura is discussing upcoming remodeling with the guest

observer which will include changing where the children presently play into the family

dining room. Rachel overhears this and exerts control and insists she wants arrangements

left as they are. Laura withdraws from Rachel and delineates their status, placing herself

in a superior position over Rachel, but she continues to negotiate, and they re-establish

their connection.

        4.38)   Rachel: I thought uh, I thought, we were gonna eat at-over here, so we
                        Could put at Daddy could put other stuff.
                Laura: (firmly) No. We'll eat over there, uh, we're gonna make it,
                        He's gonna make a corner unit with a table over there.
                Rachel: I know [and we'll] eat there.
                Laura: [And then-] Yeah. And then what we'll probably do is,
                        Ta-some kind of..cabinet/bar here, so we have more cabinet space.
                Rachel: Well, what's – where – what's a dining room?
                Laura: Dining room? The area . that's over here. Right through the
                        Door. The first half of that room.
                Rachel: (shouting) That's the playroom!
                Laura: Rachel/, (chuckles)
                Rachel: (mock screaming) When will you get it through your head!
                Laura: Excuse me? Is that the way you're supposed to talk to your
                        Mama?
                Rachel: No/
                Laura: We'll work that out, okay.
                Rachel: (softly, but not willing to give up) It's a playroom.
                Laura: Rachel, we can have a playroom and a diningroom combined.

In this same interactional setting, Adam maintains his status of authority throughout.

Occasionally he uses mitigating language to soften situations as when Rachel makes

strong hints that she wants more meat, something her mother discourages in example 4.20. Adam finds an excuse to let Rachel have another serving of meat, and uses the subject "we" to incorporate his wife in the decision legitimizing his action while maintaining her authority. In the situation in which Rachel attempts to get her parents to play a guessing game, found in example 4.24 above, although Adam refuses at first to take part and is quick to end it, he does demonstrate interest in what Rachel wants to do, and in trying to reach a consensus with her about their afternoon plans.

In Interaction #2, Adam acts as director of the situation with his children performing acts or tasks as he directs them. The most commonly used directive in this situation, as pointed out earlier, is the imperative. The permission provision is also used frequently, which defines what Rachel can and cannot do.

In Interaction #3, Laura is alone with Rachel and her younger brother. Laura has no trouble displaying authority and directing Rachel in what she can and cannot do. However when Rachel and Matthew start to fight, after placing demands on Rachel to leave her brother alone, in Example 4.15, she then mitigates the directive by her tone of voice, revealing an underlying desire for her children to interact peacefully without trying to exert control over one another. This once again demonstrates her inclination to follow in adult women patterns of interaction even in dealing with her daughter and son.

In Interaction #4, Laura has no trouble exerting authority. It is the end of the day. She is alone with Rachel and her younger brother after dinner, putting them to bed and reading a story. Before the story begins, Matthew is playing with one of Rachel's toys, and when Rachel asks for it back, he throws it. She gently tells him he needs to pick it up and hand it to her nicely and he starts to scream. Laura tells Rachel she needs to pick it

up herself and leave him alone. Rachel begins to have a tantrum, insisting her mother is

not being fair. Laura explains her reasons, but when Rachel continues in the tantrum she

remains unmoved, and tells Rachel to go ahead and let Matthew have the toy. There is

no mitigation as she takes a position of authority.

> 4.39)   Laura: Please give Rachel that, Matthew. No, please give Rachel her
>   Pez candy the dispenser. Matthew! Please? I will try to get
>   You one, okay? But you need to give that one to Rachel. Come
>   on. (Banging noise)
>   No! That wasn't nice to throw it down, was it. Was that nice?
>   Rachel: Matthew, go pick it up.
>   Laura: Na, Rachel, just go pick it up and take it.
>   Rachel: I don't want to!
>   Laura: Then fine, give it to <u>him</u>.
>   Rachel: I always have to pick it up when HE, throw, when I throw stuff.
>   Laura: [I us-often make him pick] things up to.
>   Rachel: [Why don't you make he..]
>   Laura: But he's also four years younger than you/.
>   Rachel: No he isn't, he's <u>one</u> year.
>   (Pause)
>   Laura continues reading.

As the interaction continues, it takes time for Matthew to settle down. Laura has

to stop reading several times to stop Matthew's negative behavior. Finally, she is able to

read to them in peace. About half way through the story, however, Rachel interrupts to

ask questions about the characters where sophisticated vocabulary occurs. Laura

perceiving this as an attention-getting device shows impatience with Rachel, provides a

very brief explanation and continues with the story. Following the story, Laura allows

Rachel to ask questions and look at the pictures. Then she announces it to be time to go

to bed. Matthew and Rachel have been stimulated by the adventure they have just heard

and Laura has to get them back on schedule by announcing time to say bedtime prayers.

4.40)   Laura: It's time to say our bedtime prayers.
        (Whispering with Matthew)
        Okay..(???) Would you not like Rachel to pray with us?
        Okay.
        Rachel: (Whines) Me?
        Laura: She wants to stay. [Let her pray.]
        Rachel: [Mmmm-mm].
        Laura: Rachel, you need to get in your room. I'll be there in a minute.
        Okay.
        Rachel!/

Rachel leaves the room.

When Matthew continues to conflict with his sister, Laura exerts her authority to send Rachel out of the room using a bald command in order to settle the situation. It seems important to Laura to separate the children in order to maintain equilibrium in her relationships with her children before they go to sleep which she accomplishes with Matthew. She plans to join Rachel later and suggests she will resolve this conflict then.

In the final interactional setting of the Harre family, Interaction #5, Rachel is alone with Rachel and Matthew again, reading a bedtime story and putting them to bed. Laura uses the story's theme to express how much she loves her children as she says goodnight. Rachel follows her mother's example with her cat, and holds the cat up high above her head while telling her how much she loves her. The cat does not like this, and Laura intervenes. This interaction is found in Example 4.35.   Laura explains to Rachel that the cat does not like this, while Rachel continues to explain to the cat and her mother how much she loves the cat. Laura does not tell Rachel to put the cat down, rather she only continues to explain that the cat does not like to be held up in the air. She does not exert status of authority over the situation, but only authority of knowledge, as she tries to teach Rachel how to treat the cat, and show her love in an appropriate manner.

In the interview with Laura Harre, she said that she and Rachel's father shared equally in caring for their children. This seemed to hold true in the situation in which they were together, and statistically this also seemed to be the case. The number of interactions Laura had with Rachel during the interactional setting where both parents were present was seventy-nine, while Adam's was seventy-two. However, the ways these parents talked to their daughter were vastly different.

Conclusion of the Harre Family's Interactions

Adam and Laura each behave with Rachel in most cases in the ways that men and women have been found to interact with adults. Laura's interactional style favors maintaining intimacy and minimizing differences. She apologizes, uses endearments, and negotiates constantly during times of conflict with her daughter. However, on certain issues of behavior, she clearly establishes authority and maintains her status, even while engaging in mitigating behavior meant to maintain a connection with Rachel. Adam's interactional style clearly establishes authority. While he remains approachable, he often acts as a benevolent dictator. He never mitigates his status or authority. In the case of the Harre family, there are clear gender differences in their interactions with their daughter that support the findings of research on gender and language.

Family # 2- The Sands Family

The analysis of the Sands family data follows the same format used to describe the data presented in the Harre Family Analysis. It includes first, the researcher's interview with the family followed by the analysis of family interactions. The description

of the interactional settings will include setting, participants, length of time, number of

utterances between each parent and his or her daughter, and kinds of directives used in

the situation. Directive types, which are found in the data to be used in specific ways that

differ from those already presented in earlier discussions, will be described. Situations

within the interactions, including topics of conversation, interactional styles, relational

elements of parents and children and ways that they use directives that shed further light

on the formation of directives and their use in relation to the research questions will be

discussed where relevant. A comparison between the Harres and Sands will follow the

analysis of the Sands family. A comparison among all the parents and a discussion of

evidence of gender related interactional issues follows in the next chapter, along with a

comparison between data gathered in the interview and data gathered through random

audiotaping.

In the data provided by the Sands family, there are two interactional settings

between parents Sam and Betty, and daughter Cathy included in this analysis. Each of

these interactions is quite lengthy in comparison to ones provided by other families. One

is twenty-three minutes in length and the other is forty-two minutes in length. The

interactions occur with both parents present with their daughter.

Family Interactional Patterns

The family was observed by the researcher during an afternoon visit following

Cathy's return home from school. The parents, Betty and Sam, were interviewed

together, while their daughter Cathy was interviewed by herself following her parents'

interview. The questions asked (found in Appendix A) were designed to provide

background information on the relationships among the family members, to discover if mothers, fathers, and children perceive their relationships the same, and to compare family members' descriptions of their interactions with the data they provide.

Interview with Sam and Betty Sands

The focus of this analysis is on the mother's and father's descriptions of interactions with their daughter. Family issues they discussed that involve their daughter will also be included. In order to obtain a more accurate understanding of the relationships and interactions among family members, the interview was conducted as a conversation, which the questions served to guide. In reporting the information provided, the interview questions are not followed in the exact order they appear in Appendix A, but are organized in a way to provide a clear and understandable picture that characterizes the relationships among family members.

The Sands were first asked how many minutes or hours they believed they spend with their daughter each day. Betty responded that she spends around ten hours per day with Cathy during the summer when they are home together, and about six hours per day during the school year. Sam thinks he is home with Cathy three to four hours a day. Betty is alone with Cathy whenever Sam is at work or away from home, which can be for months at a time, since he serves in the National Guard. He is gone for training and practice one weekend a month and two weeks every summer. He has also served in the United Nations Security Forces on international peace keeping missions for months at a time. Every Saturday morning, Sam and Cathy go to get doughnuts, and have time alone

together then. Cathy also spends time with Sam when he is working around the house and yard.

Betty says she and Cathy spend a great deal of time together talking. During the school year, their conversations are task oriented, revolving around what Cathy has to accomplish for school. They are also discussions about "rules." That is making wise choices and following behavioral expectations. In the summer, their conversations often develop from questions Cathy asks about things she sees or hears. Betty and Cathy took an extended trip to Mexico this summer, leading to many in-depth conversations about what they saw and experienced. Cathy is sensitive to the concept of "fairness" which leads to discussions about what happens in other countries, especially to children. Cathy also loves animals and likes to talk about them. Sam comments that Cathy is a "non-stop talker." Someone may ask her a question that gets the conversation started, but she controls the conversation. Because one of Sam's primary interests is horticulture, he talks to her about plants, trees, and gardening.

The kinds of activities they engage in at home as a family include eating dinner together which is something Betty feels strongly about and Sam puts up with. Other activities include reading books, playing games, and talking about everything. They also go shopping together, attend church as a family and visit extended family that lives nearby. In addition, they take occasional outings to get ice cream, visit local public gardens, bowl, and take walks while Cathy rides her bike alongside her parents. They have recently taken a cross-country car trip to visit family.

Betty and Sam agree that it is Betty who maintains the schedule of family activities. However both are quick to laugh as Betty says she delegates the

responsibilities to include Sam, and he nods in agreement. Concerning who supervises Cathy, Betty says she is the one that keeps their daughter focused. Sam doesn't recognize behavioral precursors to major problem behaviors and he allows them to continue and escalate. Betty tells the interviewer that Cathy has Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder. One of the associated problems is an inability to control impulses. Betty has learned to recognize certain behaviors that if left unchecked develop into greater and greater problems. She feels she is the parent who has to take the responsibility to keep Cathy focused.

When asked if they teach Cathy things at home, both say, "yes." However they have different approaches. Betty makes time for structured teaching situations, especially when working with academic skills. She teaches Cathy about cooking and cleaning, but also instructs her on some of the topics in her school subjects. Cathy also takes swimming lessons. Sam, on the other hand, says he uses the time he has to teach Cathy. His teaching is spontaneous, such as pointing out types of plants and trees while they are out in the yard, or gardening together.

In discussing specific responsibilities, Betty says she gets Cathy ready for bed, and Sam puts her to bed. This is another time when he and Cathy are alone together. He says they cuddle and talk until they both fall asleep. Most of the supervising of the daily routine is done by Betty, including homework. She also feels she is mostly responsible for disciplining Cathy when it becomes necessary.

When it comes to discipline, the parents agree it depends on the circumstances. They have a strategic plan, which is to talk through problem issues with Cathy. Sometimes this strategy works. However, in times of frustration, Betty says she

sometimes resorts to yelling and swatting. Sam arbitrates between the two when their clashes become intense. On the other hand, Betty also expresses her feelings that Sam steps away from discipline issues, and does not get involved.

In order to get Cathy to do the things they want her to do, Betty said they start by telling her what they expect, or what they want. They use counting as a focusing mechanism, to help Cathy transition from the behavior she is engaged in to the behavior she needs to be engaged in. The counting is not followed by consequences as in the case of some parents' discipline strategies. In addition, they again use talking through issues as a means of getting Cathy to do what they want her to do, especially when trying to help her make improved choices over ones she has made in the past.

The interview concludes. Their responses to the questions provide an intimate portrait of the workings of their family. It includes discussion about some of the differences between their styles of interacting, and the resulting differences in parenting styles. They discuss some of the difficulties that stem from these differences, and from Cathy's special needs. They even share some of the shortcomings they perceive exist in their relationships with their daughter Cathy. In addition, they also share some of the intimate and joyful experiences of their family life. A comparison of parental interactional styles within this family will be presented at the end of the analysis, and their interactional styles will also be compared with the other families in the study at the end of this chapter.

Interview with Cathy Sands

Cathy Sands is an articulate, bright and talkative child, and the interview goes quickly. She cannot estimate how much time she spends with either of her parents each day, but she says she spends most of her time with her mother. When they're alone together, she likes to play house with her mother. Some of the things she mentions they s they talk about include what Cathy has been doing, how to play the piano. She also she likes to hear stories about when Betty was a little girl. However, she especially enjoys her mother reading to her.

Once in a while she spends time alone with her father such as when they go out to places like to the grocery store. They wrestle and tickle each other a lot when they are at home together. Cathy says she likes to tell him spooky stories when he is falling asleep beside her because she wants to scare him. Her favorite activity to do with her father is wrestle with him. When asked when they are together as a family and what they do, she answers that they have dinner together.

In response to being asked who plans the family schedule, Cathy replies it is her mother who plans and keeps family on schedule. Her mother is also the one who tells her what to do and keeps her focused on what she is supposed to be doing. Her mother helps her with homework and teaches her more about what she is learning in school as well. One of the things Cathy mentions her mother is teaching her is how to play the piano.

She describes the same kinds of strategies regarding discipline and how her parents get her to do what they want her to do. She says they call her by her full name, first name and two middle names. If she doesn't do what she is supposed to do, they might spank her. Another strategy they use is grounding.

Answers to the interviewer's questions regarding discipline conclude the interview. Cathy's responses to the interview questions reveal a slightly different perspective on activities she does with each parent and when they are together than her parents' responses to the same questions. However they do not contradict each other and serve to add dimension to the Sands' family life and the family members' relationships. Her answers to questions about time spent with each parent, and who is in charge substantiate her parents' responses to those questions.

TABLE V

SANDS – INTERACTIONS

	Interactional Setting	Length of Interactional Setting	# of Interactions	Aggravated Directives			Mitigated Directives			Total Directives		
				#	/	ratio of Interactions	#	/	ratio of Interactions	#	/	ratio of Interactions
FATHER	#1 Daughter's Room Redo	23:10	61	12		.20	5		.08	17		.28
	#2 Homework and Household Tasks	42:00	22	9		.41	2		.09	11		.50
MOTHER	#1 Daughter's Room Redo	23:10	128	37		.29	6		.05	43		.34
	#2 Homework and Household Tasks	42:00	147	34		.23	7		.05	41		.28

Father

Among the data provided, in the sixty-five minutes Sam Sands and his daughter Cathy are together he delivers twenty-nine directives to her, which makes up thirty-five per cent of his turns with his daughter. In the first interaction, he has sixty-one turns with her, among which there are seventeen directives, making up twenty-eight per cent of the

turns. In the second interaction, he has only twenty-two turns with her, and among the turns there are twelve directives, which make up fifty-four per cent of the turns. Sam engages in frequent physical play, such as funny faces, tickling and rough housing, along with wordless vocalizations that punctuate their physical activity. He strives to find solutions to Betty and Cathy's negotiations and problems throughout.

Mother

Betty has a total of 275 turns with Cathy in the sixty-five minutes that make up the two interactions in the data the Sands family provided. She has one hundred twenty-eight turns with her daughter in Interaction #1, with forty-two of those being directives, which account for thirty-four per cent of her turns. In Interaction #2, she takes one hundred and forty-seven turns with Cathy, with forty-one being directives, which account for twenty-eight per cent of the turns. Betty is highly involved with Cathy verbally. In the first setting, her interactions are filled with explanations and negotiations with Cathy. In the second interaction, she provides considerable instructional support for Cathy as her daughter does her homework.

Interactional Settings

In the data provided by the Sands family, father Sam, mother Betty and daughter Cathy are always together. There are no other participants. They provided only two settings in their data. The first setting involves the three of them in a goal-directed project, the re-arranging and re-decorating of Cathy's bedroom, which lasts just over twenty-three minutes. The second is a highly structured event where each member of the family goes about different tasks in the same room, following a family meal. Cathy does

homework while her parents work on their own projects and give her assistance. The second interaction lasts forty-two minutes.

Interaction #1

During the first interaction, parents Sam and Betty are trying to re-arrange daughter Cathy's room, and help her re-decorate it. She has specific expectations, very few of which her parents are able to meet. The interactions involve continuous confrontation, but they are handled with a great deal of humor. Cathy challenges most of what her mother and father propose, yet has a difficult time articulating what she wants. However, Betty and Sam work hard to solicit her cooperation each in his or her own way.

Betty is much more verbally involved with Cathy than Sam. She speaks to their daughter nearly twice as often as he does. He engages in frequent physical play, such as funny faces, tickling and rough housing, along with wordless vocalizations that punctuate their physical activity. The interaction lasts just a little more than twenty-three minutes.

Interaction #2

Interaction #2 takes place in the family dining room following lunch. Sam and Betty are involved in small jobs around the room while Cathy works on her homework. Once everyone settles into his or her post-meal activities the topics of conversation between family members change frequently, as related to the tasks. Conversation revolves around the assignments Cathy is working on and topics included in the assignments, as well as the tasks Sam and Betty are trying to accomplish, and activities for the rest of the day. These topics spark observations, anecdotes, and some prolonged discussion. Long pauses occur between interactions.

Because the nature of the goals between Interaction #1 and Interaction #2 are different, and expectations regarding each participant's role and behavior are clearly established in this setting, Cathy challenges her parents less often, therefore less confrontational language and less effort is spent on negotiation. While Cathy works on her homework, she seeks her mother's help at various times.

In this interaction as with Interaction #1, Betty is much more actively involved with Cathy than Sam is. Yet the same overarching dynamics occur. Betty, with a preference for high-involvement interaction, continues to use frequent overlaps and back channel cues. She organizes the activities that are taking place while Sam steps in and out of "family activities" and acts independently. Sam has even less involvement in this interaction than in Interaction #1. Still, Betty looks to Sam for support and final authorization over the family's activities.

This interaction lasts forty-two minutes, and includes long pauses between interpersonal exchanges once Cathy begins her assignments.

These two settings include similarities and differences in the ways directive types are found to be used. An analysis of directives in each interaction follows.

TABLE VI

SANDS – DIRECTIVES

INTERACTIONAL SETTINGS

Directive Type	Daughter's Room		Homework	
	F	M	F	M
Aggravated Directives				
Imperative	6	16	6	14
Imbedded Imperative	1	2		
Permission Provisions		6		4
Hearer's Need				1
Speaker's Need		2		
Pseudo-Mutual Requirements		2		3
False Collab.	2	1		2
Question Dir.	3	7	1	11
Tag Question		1		
Pronouncement				
Directive by Example	1		2	
Suggestion			1	2
Mitigated Directives				
Proposal for Joint Action	1	4	1	4
Permission Directives	2			1
Hints	1	2		
Explanation Directives	1		1	4
Singular Suggestions				

Types of Directives

Of all the turns Sam takes with his daughter Cathy, twelve are aggravated directives, or twenty per cent. Of this type of directive, Sam includes imperatives, "quasi-questions" and "a question directive," an "imbedded imperative," a "directive by example," and a "false collaborative." In comparing similarities between Interaction #1 and Interaction #2, Sam uses six imperatives in each setting. He also uses "directives by example" and "question directives." In contrast, however, he does not employ "quasi-questions," "imbedded imperatives," or "false collaboratives." The range of directives he employs in Interaction #2 is far narrower than in Interaction #1, in keeping with the change in setting and types of activities, and the considerable decrease in number of interactions he has with Cathy (Table VI).

Five of the directives Sam gives daughter Cathy in Interaction #1 are mitigated. They include two "permission directives" and one instance each of a "proposal for joint action," an "indirect or passive directive" and a "hint." Sam uses only two mitigated directives in Interaction #2. All are types he has used in Interaction #1. They include the "indirect passive" directive and the "proposal for joint action" (Table VI).

Betty uses an aggravated directive thirty-seven times when addressing her daughter Cathy in the first setting. Consistent with previous analyses, the most frequently used directive is the imperative. The next most frequently used directive types in this situation are the "permission provision" and the "question directive." Other directives she uses include "pseudo-mutual agreements," "want statements," "quasi-questions," "imbedded imperatives," and "tag questions" (Table VI).

Betty uses thirty-four aggravated directives in her turns with Cathy in Interaction #2. In comparison, twenty-nine per cent of her turns in Interaction #1 are aggravated directives. The decrease in the number of directives used in this setting is most likely due to the structure imbedded in Interaction #2. As in Interaction #1, Betty employs as wide a range of directives in this setting, including a significant number of imperatives, followed in frequency by "question directives," "quasi-questions," "permission provisions," "pseudo-mutual requirements," "false collaboratives," and a "hearer's need statement." While she includes the "hearer's need" statement in the second interactional setting and not in the first, three types of directives are not present in the second interactional setting that appeared in the first: the imbedded imperative, the "speaker's want" statement, and the tag question.

Betty uses mitigated directives much less frequently than aggravated directives. There are a total of six mitigated directives during Interaction #1. Among the types of mitigated directives found in her data are only two varieties. The most frequently used type is the "proposal for joint action," with four instances, followed by "hints," of which only two instances occur.

During the second interaction, Betty uses a mitigated directive very similar to the pattern found in Interaction #1 where she uses mitigated directives six times. In that situation, this also accounts for a very small ratio of the interactions. The most common mitigated directive she uses is the "proposal for joint action." She also uses indirect/passive directives as directive statements twice, whereas in Interaction #1, only Cathy's father did. Additionally, she uses one "permission directive," which she did not use previously.

Analysis of specific directives that have been found to be related to situational factors will be discussed in the following section, comparing situational and interactional influences to explain meaning and intention.

Imperatives

The most frequently used directive by both Sam and Betty is the imperative. Imperatives are used by the Sands most often to effect an immediate physical action, such as getting Cathy to put an object in a particular place, or getting Cathy to move herself to a particular place or getting her to accomplish a particular task, as in making her bed.

Negative imperatives are used differently. In the case of the negative imperatives, Betty uses them to prohibit Cathy's behavior, similar to removing permission. In addition, these commands refer to a future action, not an immediate one.

    4.42)   (Tape begins)
            Cathy: …bed, in my new bedroom.
            Sam: Okay, well I have a comment to make to you, too.
                    Water will ruin that cabinet.
            Cathy: [I know.]
            Betty: [Cath,] so **you do [not put your fingers,]**
            Cathy: [I'm not going to play in it.]
            Betty: (raised volume & pitch) **You [don't even ..]**
            Cathy: [I'm not gonna <u>play</u> in it.]

            Betty: When you get a fish, **you don't even wiggle a <u>finger.</u>**
            Cathy: [I'm] not going to.
            Sam: [Kay.]
            Betty: Okay.
            Cathy: 'Cause –
            Betty: -Good!
            Cathy: Because my other one..2 of my fish died from me catching them
                    That one time.
            Sam: Yup.
            Betty: Kay. [We'll (????)].
            Sam: (to C) **[Move over,] rover**.

In this excerpt from Interaction #1, Betty uses a negative reverse imperative to describe behavior for Cathy that is forbidden. At the end of Example 4.42 is an instance of how the imperative is used to bring about a physical action, that is, getting Cathy to move from where she is to another location, delivered by her father in this particular instance.

While Betty uses sixteen imperatives in Interaction #1, and fourteen in Interaction #2, Sam uses five of the imperatives in each setting, which are stated as bald commands. One in each setting is an elliptical form, a one-word to three-word phrase that conveys a command, such as calling a person's name while they are engaged in an activity. This has been previously discussed in other data in this study. The implied meaning of elliptical forms in these contexts carries an imperative command to either "do" something or "stop doing" something in relation to the context.

4.43) Betty: Or, Cathy, what if we go up – pillows like this?
      Can you move that a second? Like that? No?
    Cathy: Unh-unh.
    Betty: Or if we put them up like this.
    Cathy: (subdued) Sure.
    Sam: She was at first kind of thinking of something to be more-
      Make it more sofa-like.
    Betty: Ohhhkay. That's what you want? Okayyyy.
      So that's why you want some big pillows. To make them .
      Feel more like a sofa.
    Sam: Okay.
    Betty: [And-]
    Cathy: [And] what I wanted is like, blow-up sofas like you gave [Austin.]
    Betty: [(laughs)]
    Sam: Yeah. But this will be even (???) than blow-up sofas.
      We'll be able to come up with. Let me show you.
      Okay, **go get the other um, one of the other ones.**
    Betty: Oh, that would work. Could snuggle up on there.
      Your friends could sit there.
       (Pause while Cathy gets pillow)
    Betty: Kay. You wanted something else here?

Sam: **Just a second,** Cath.
Betty: Now, is it not-do you not like the colors there, on this?
Cathy: Mmmm.
Betty: [Okay.]
Sam: [Okay.] Well I have an idea here. Just a nimute.
Betty: Would you like .. this?
Cathy: (Very sad and quiet) I don't want a thing with that on.
Betty: (Firmly) Cathy. I'm sorry, babe.

Sam's command and elliptical imperative occur as Cathy and her parents are experimenting with the creation of a sitting area in Interaction #1. He has directed Cathy to bring in another pillow, and when she returns, as they arrange the pillows, he says, "Just a second, Cath," directing her to "stop" or "wait" referring to whatever the child is doing. This example of an elliptical imperative adds additional evidence of how the Sands use the imperative to direct present action.

In another example, the imperative takes an interesting twist in the way Betty Sands uses it. While related to previous observations of her use of the imperative to initiate action that Cathy must take, Betty both commands and permits Cathy to make a choice through this type of directive.

4.44)   Betty: Is that what you want?
        Cathy: For right now, but . . I want to get my <u>sofa</u>.
        Betty: Well, that will be different.
               Yeah. Okay/ .
               Do you want a pillow made out of the, yellow so it matches,
               or do you want t-to just leave the top on it that's there?
               And **you decide/.**

Betty establishes herself in a powerful position of authority throughout the interaction through the use of the directives she gives, especially imperatives that carefully structure Cathy's behavior. Her authority and control of the situation is emphasized in this pattern

of directives shown in the first interaction, and is strengthened in this use of an imperative to "allow" Cathy to "decide" by giving a command.

In Interaction #2, imperatives account for fifty per cent of Sam's aggravated directives. Betty's use of the imperative amounts to less than fifty per cent of all aggravated directives in this interaction. In spite of the overall count of imperatives, when comparing ratios, Sam employs imperatives more often than Betty in interacting with Cathy.

In the situations found in Interaction #2, imperatives are stated as bald commands. However, rather than separating the status between speaker and hearer, most of these imperatives have an underlying casualness and intimacy in their tone, gently furthering the action, and softened as Betty adds endearments and discourse softeners. The imperatives are used to encourage Cathy to share what she's learning, and to "keep going" on her homework. For example, one of Cathy's assignments is to read aloud. Occasionally she stops to look at a picture or share a related thought with her parents. To help Cathy refocus, Betty encourages her with, "Go ahead," and "Finish up." While they still focus on immediate behaviors, the commands in this interaction do not seem intended to hem Cathy in, but to further her progress on an activity.

> 4.45) Cathy: Mom.
>   Betty: What babe.
>   Cathy: Can I read "Make Way for Ducklings" now?
>   Betty: [Not until you finish –]
>   Cathy: [I ate seven -]
>   Betty: and wash your hands and –
>   Cathy: No_ you said eat seven and I did.
>   Betty: Okay.
>   Sam: **Eat your meat and one of your squash–**
>   Cathy: (Shrieks)
>   Betty: **One more bite**
>   (Spitting noise)

> (To Sam) So I want that here and I was thinking of
> hanging these here and thought that well, might interfere, so
> we could put them here or put a little cup over here that's fine.

Cathy: Ehh!

Betty: Great.

Sam: It would be easier to get to up here, but I don't know about the Bill stuff.

Betty: We could take one of these off.

Sam: Yeah we could put two on that one,

Betty: Okay.

Sam: (coughing)

Cathy: (humming in the background)

Betty: (to Cathy) **Come on squirt.**
> (Noise in background)

Cathy: Mom.

Betty: We'll listen to you read now.

In comparison, Sam uses the imperative in Interaction #2 to give Cathy specific behavioral objectives, as shown in the example above. They are bald commands that clearly establish his authority by telling Cathy what she must do.

Imbedded Imperatives

While not occurring in high frequency, in some instances, Betty softens imperatives by surrounding them with familiar polite request frames. These forms are used to encourage cooperation and show that the authority figure is bridging the gap between his or her status and that of the hearer. They are directives framed as requests, but carry significant weight requiring the hearer to respond. Betty frames both of these imbedded imperatives in a question format beginning with the modal "can" followed by the subject pronoun "you" followed by the rest of the request.

Sam also uses an imbedded imperative as discussed in the analysis of his data. Sam has remained rather quiet and independent of Betty and Cathy through the decision

process, going about the room moving things. But while listening to Betty attempt to

negotiate with Cathy, who continues to challenge her, Sam bids for a turn to provide a

possible solution to the decorating dilemma. He is about to "rescue" Betty and Cathy, as

described in Tannen's (1990) work on how men respond to women with whom they are

intimately involved, and solve the problem. There has been a pause in the interaction of

the three allowing a new topic to emerge. Sam, however, has trouble getting the floor,

leading him to demand he be given the floor, which is manifested in an imbedded

imperative and permission directive.

4.46)   Betty: Kay. You wanted something else here?
         Sam: Just second, Cath.
         Betty: Now, is it not-do you not like the colors there, on this?
         Cathy: Mm-um.
         Betty: Okay.
         Sam: Okay.
         Sam: Well, I have an idea here.
                   Just a minute.
         Betty: Would you like..this?
         Cathy: (very quietly and sadly) I don't want a thing with that on.
         Betty: (firmly) Cathy. I'm sorry babe.
         Cathy: I don't want that showing that, Mom.
         Betty: Than, we can change this, at some point, [for a sofa.]
         Cathy: [But if-]
                   But if it-
         Sam: **Will you wait a minute and –**
                   (Voice straining as he picks up something heavy) **let me tell my
                   idea?** I know Dad has to go away a lot, but,
         Cathy: See, [I won't like] that there.
         Betty: [Sit up there.]
         Cathy: See what? I [don't like it up there.]
         Betty: (From distance) [Cathy, can you come, please?]
         Cathy: What?
                   (Cathy leaves room to join Betty)

                        PAUSE

         (Footsteps as they re-enter)

132

> Sam: Okay, here's what I'd do.
> **Are you ready to hear it?**
> Cathy: I don't know if I am.
> Betty: Well/, (Laugh) then why don't you get back into bed/, and
> Think it over for a bit. Ooooh. It's kind of cute!
> Sam: What, the toosh?
> Cathy: (Screams)
> Sam: Okay. Here's my idea. What if we pull this [out] from the wall,
> Cathy: [(yell)]
> Betty: Uh-huh/
> Sam: about four to six inches.
> Betty: Um-hum/
> Sam: And then we could build just a little filler, back there.
> And that would give you enough room.
> Cathy: (cough)
> Sam: So that these things could sit back a little farther.
> Betty: Um-hmm.
> Sam: And there'd be a little b-more sitting room.
> Betty: Does that feel good?
> Cathy: No.
> Sam: (Loudly) Does this [feel good?]
> Cathy: [laughing]

He interrupts Cathy and Betty's discussion to propose a solution to their disagreement. The directive takes the form of a request and includes a permission directive, "let me," but expresses frustration on Sam's part. He has made a bid for the floor and been ignored as Cathy and Betty continue in their discussion of color, and other problems with creating a sofa-like sitting area. His use of the imbedded imperative "Will you wait a minute and let me tell you my idea?" places Betty and Cathy in an obligatory position to recognize his position of authority and grant him the floor. However, Sam continues to have some trouble being heard.

The excerpt above encapsulates the way the Sands interact with each other. This example will be discussed further when gender issues are presented.

Quasi-Question and Question Directives

Directives placed in question frames are among the most frequently used directives in the data. Most often, they are used as a teaching device. Betty employs "quasi-questions" and "question directives" to prompt Cathy to perform something that she has been taught to do in this type of situation. Betty takes on the role of instructor, with its inherently implied status of authority.

4.47) Betty: Your feet are cold.
        Cathy: Oh well.
        Betty: (Gently) **What do you need to do?**
        Cathy: Get another (????).
        Betty: (Loudly) Then do it!
                (Laughing) You're puttin' them on me! Squirt!
        Cathy: [Murmur]
        Betty: [Goshshsh.]
        Cathy: (?????), just – uh,
        Betty: Like Raggedy Ann and Andy.

These varieties of questions as directives are frequently used by Betty, especially in Interaction #2. In fact, following the imperative, she use directives framed as questions most frequently. This is due to the fact that Betty plays the role of instructor, and uses "question directives" as guides to help Cathy through her homework. She uses a number of question frames to posit these directives. In the example below excerpted from Interaction #2, she begins with the question word "what."

4.48) Cathy: If you really spelled the word quick and you were pronouncing
              it a different way, it would be saying "queek"….
        Betty: Well . . . there is no there is no vowel on the end, so it would be
              a short vowel, **so what does a short 'i' say.**

Betty uses the "question directives" in these two examples to remind Cathy of knowledge that she believes Cathy has and to apply it in the current situation.

Another way she uses the "question directive" is to direct Cathy's attention.

4.49)   Cathy: See, that's where I like it.
                (Chuckle like she's being tickled)
                That's where I like it.
                (four second pause)
                 See?
        Betty: **Well, but do you see the window?**
        Cathy: Yeah. I can still see the animals.
        Betty: It glares in it, and that m-looks like everything's crowded
                 over here and then there's nothing over there.

Betty again uses the question as a teaching device to point out to Cathy a problem in her

design plan. In contrast to Examples 4.47 and 4.48 where Cathy should already have the

knowledge of how to behave, Betty is now drawing Cathy's attention to a problem in

order to highlight it and give Cathy the opportunity to see what is at issue before it is

pointed out to her. Betty is in an authoritative position in this situation because of her

knowledge, which she is imparting to Cathy.

Sam uses directives in a question frame in Example 4.46 from Interaction #1 to

bid for the floor as described above. While this is not the only time he uses questions as

directives, it is a unique way found in this data. In this interaction, Sam is not actually

looking for an answer to his question, although he receives a negative one. He is making

a point. He has been trying to get his daughter's and wife's attention to offer his

suggestions, but he has been ignored as they negotiate the decorating dilemmas. His

question-directives are actually telling them to listen or suffer the consequences, which

can be surmised, would mean his withdrawal from the situation and leaving them on their

own, or he might decide to put an end to the process itself. He sets himself outside and

above their conflict, prepared to solve the problem and put an end to the disagreements whether or not Cathy likes what he has to say.

The final way that Sam uses a question directive in this discourse is as a "hint."

4.50) Sam: Because I think all it takes is unscrewing. the top/
        Betty: Okay
        Sam: And stapling a new piece of fabric on it.
        Betty: Would that make it. feel a little more like what you want?
        Cathy: Noooo/.
        Sam: No.
        Betty: Okay. [Well . .]
        Sam: [So you] don't want to recover it.
        Betty: /Okay\.
        Sam: **Do you want it covered in purple or pink?**
        Cathy: Definitely not pink.
        Sam: [(high pitched laughter)]

Betty has suggested changing the fabric on the bench, but Cathy responds negatively. Then Sam makes a statement about Cathy's negative response to yet another suggestion from her parents, "So you don't want to recover it." He then changes strategy midstream, and offers her specific choices using a question, "Do you want it covered in purple or pink." By doing so, he is requiring her to make a choice, hinting that if she does not choose, he will and she might not like it. His hint works and she moves closer to negotiating.

Another variation of this directive that Betty uses is to prompt Cathy to make decisions regarding the re-design of her room. As Sam does when he proposes "pink or purple" in Example 4.50, Betty's questions, although true questions requiring an answer, are directives for Cathy to choose or else lose the privilege.

4.51) Sam: That looks more like. . it all . flows together, [if it's]
        Betty: [If it's]
        Sam: over closer, rather than at two, real separate groupings.

Betty: Okay. Well, which ever.
        (To Cathy) **Do you have a preference?**
        (Pause)
        Okay good. We'll just decide then.
Cathy: /Nooo\.
Sam: [That's a good idea.]
Cathy: [Daddy, don't] move it down there. I like it.

Coming to the end of a negotiating sequence as far as she is concerned, Betty is ready for Cathy to make a decision. "Do you have a preference?" is not a simple "yes" or "no" question. Betty expects Cathy to tell them what her choice is. Cathy, however, continues to want to drag out the process. In the end, her parents' plan is the one adopted.

Betty also uses question frames to effect behavior. She poses a "Why don't you X" question to her daughter using a falling intonation pattern. In the following example, Betty includes sarcasm in the directive to make a point.

4.52) Sam: OK, here's what I'd do.
              Are you ready to listen to my idea? Or do you want to hear it.
        Cathy: I don't know if I am.
        Betty: **Well/, (laughs) then why don't you get back into bed/, and think it over for a bit.**

Upon examining the context, Betty does not actually expect Cathy to get back into bed. She is noting the fact that the bed is still unmade and directing Cathy to consider her attitude by suggesting a consequence which most children find abhorrent in the middle of the day, that is being sent to bed. Taking into account Cathy's high level of energy, we can imply she too, would not look forward to this. Shortly after this exchange, Betty begins a sequence of directives aimed at getting Cathy to make her bed.

Sam also uses this type of directive with the "Why don't you X" format. The question has the tone of a suggestion, but expresses an obligation on Cathy's part.

4.53)   Cathy: It's just that I wanted some <u>big</u> pillows.
        Betty: Okay, [like what.]
        Cathy: [Like those] back pillows/
        Betty: [Okay.]
        Sam: (softly) [Uh, those] are too big for there.
        Betty: Okay, [but] maybe not the back [pillows].
        Sam;   [Uh]   **[Why don't go get -]**
        Betty: Some big pillows/
        Sam: **Why don't you go get one,** Cathy.
                And [try it.]
Betty: [Let's try it.]

In using these types of questions, neither parent is not seeking information, but expects an action, which may include a verbal response to the underlying question. These types of directives are especially noticeable while Betty is guiding Cathy through her homework. As Ervin-Tripp (1976) points out, quasi-questions carry almost the same weight of obligation as a bald imperative. They strongly imply the higher status of the one asking the "question" to have the power and right to obligate the hearer to carry out the "request." In comparison to Sam, Betty uses more "question directives" in the body of data than slightly more often than he does.

Tag Questions

The Tag Question as observed in the data of the families in this study is used by a parent to call attention to an attitude the parent wants effectively to be changed. In the following example, this type of directive emphasizes Betty's authority by drawing on two areas of status. First, Betty shares her knowledge of Cathy's meta-knowledge regarding the attitude Betty wants to effect. Secondly, she has the authority as Cathy's mother to confront her with this knowledge, which forces Cathy to acknowledge they both are

aware of the politics that are occurring, require her to acknowledge this is an

unacceptable attitude, and therefore alter it to one that is acceptable.

> 4.54) Betty: If it's the colors you don't like/
> Cathy: I just don't like the way it looks.
> Betty: Well, sweetie…
> Shall we get some magazines and show you . . that that's, a
> placement- that really balances well?
> Cathy: Nooooo/.
> Betty: (laughs) 'Cause you know it does, **don't you.**
> Cathy: (giggles) No, I just don't like it there. I don't like those either.
> Betty: You know what, Cathy? When you talk like that/ . . .
> thennn Dad and I won't even consider trying to make it work.

Directives by Example

Sam uses the "directive by example," a directive type not found in the data of any

of the other parents in this study. He uses them to solve problems that emerge, both in

Interaction #1 when discussing decorating options, then in Interaction #2 when Cathy and

Betty discuss a questionable homework problem.

After Sam has attempted to get Cathy and Betty's attention using an imbedded

imperative (noted previously in Example 4.46) and failing, mother and daughter leave the

room briefly, and are now returning.

> 4.55) Sam: **Okay, here's what I'd do.**
> Are you ready to listen to my idea?
> Or do you want to hear it?
> Cathy: I don't know if I am.

Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Goodwin (1990), in analyzing the data in each of their

studies have determined this type of directive to be aggravated because it establishes the

speaker as an authority and places the hearer in a subordinate position that obligates the

hearer to emulate the speaker's actions. However in examining Sam Sands' exchange with his daughter in this context, while he is offering his opinion, it does not carry the same separation of status that it does in the context of consulting other "experts," such as doctors or lawyers to whom money is paid for their advice. Sam is not a paid interior designer offering expertise, yet in this family, he is an authority figure in regards to what ultimately happens in the family's home, and what Cathy decides to do with her room. Sam has demonstrated that while he is anxious to step in and solve the ongoing dilemma, he is also still willing to allow Cathy to participate in the decision-making process.

Sam uses this directive again in Interaction #2 to help settle a question brought out in Cathy's homework. Betty is guiding Cathy through a lesson on punctuation. Sam has been uninvolved with Cathy's homework until a discussion on the placement of a period following the title for addressing a woman comes up.

4.56) Cathy: Does Ms. have a period at the end?
Betty: Well some, some people say it doesn't but I saw it recently that it does, so . .
Cathy: I put one.
Betty: OK [your teacher-]
Sam: **[I would.]**
Betty: What?
Sam: **I would.**
Betty: But when it was, made up it, was because it .. is not an an abbreviation for anything it shouldn't have a period.
Sam: I thought it was an abbreviation for ..miss which is an abbreviation For mistress or…
Betty: No it is not M-i-s-s-…and Mrs. is an abbreviation for mistress, I think.
Sam: Hmmm.

Although Sam and Betty continue to discuss the matter, they do not resolve why a period might belong at the end of the title. Sam places himself in an authoritative position,

directing both Cathy and Betty to follow his example. He provides a line of reasoning for his choice as the conversation unfolds, but it differs from Betty's. This is especially interesting in light of the fact that Betty's profession involves English grammar, which also gives her a certain weight of authority on this issue.

Sam's use of a "directive by example" on this occasion differs from his use of the same type of directive in Interaction #1. In the first interaction, he does not stress his authority, but uses it to express his opinion; whereas in this interaction, it is clear he is stressing his knowledge and attempting to establish authority.

False Collaboratives

While Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Goodwin (1990) label this type of directive as one that emphasizes status between the speaker and hearer, Sam's intention is to make this an inclusive statement, displaying his involvement in this project. Sam uses the "false collaborative," as frame to show affiliation as he proposes a solution to one of the problems they are facing in Cathy's room: creating a sitting area and avoiding overcrowding one part of the room.

> 4.57) Sam: Okay. Here's my idea. What if we pull this [out] from the wall,
> Cathy: [Yell]
> Betty: Uh-huh/
> Sam: about … about four to six inches.
> Betty: Um-hmm/
> Sam: And then **we could build just a little filler, back there**
>   and that would give you enough room. -
> Cathy: Augh!
> Sam: So that these things could sit back a little farther. –
> Betty: Um-hmm
> Sam: And there'd be a little b-more sitting room.

He initially makes a suggestion, "What if we pull this out from the wall," referring to the bed, which is something Betty, Cathy and he can do together. However, building a filler does not seem like a project the three could undertake together. What the directive does, however, is demonstrate Sam's interest in helping.

Permission Provisions

In Interaction #1, Betty uses the "permission provision" both to give Cathy permission to perform an act and to prohibit certain of her actions. The permission provisions establish boundaries. The negative permission provisions consist primarily of Betty simply saying "No" or "No, babe" to the manner in which actions are taking place. However, there are two distinctly different ways that Betty uses the permission provision.

In the following example, after repeated attempts to help Cathy express her ideas clearly and mitigate the challenges her daughter continues to throw at her parents, Betty provides examples of both acceptable and unacceptable behavior that Cathy is expected to follow. In these examples, Betty both gives and removes permission based on appropriate and inappropriate behavior

> 4.58)   Betty: I don't see any other way to move it, Cathy.
>   Cathy: I don't like it above that chest.
>   Betty: Well [th-]
>   Cathy: (Shouting to Sam) [Don't] give me that mean awrie face!
>   Betty: (laughing) We can [change] the chest.
>   Cathy: [Change?]
>   Betty: Or we can put, some, um,
>   Sam: OK, [here's-]
>   Betty: [other] fabric on the-her chest.
>   Would you like that?
>   Cathy: No.
>   Betty: If it's the colors you don't like/
>   Cathy: I just don't like the way it looks.

Betty: Well, sweetie…
Shall we get some magazines and show you . . that that's, a placement- that really balances well?
Cathy: Nooooo/.
Betty: (laughs) 'Cause you know it does, don't you.
Cathy: (giggles) No, I just don't like it there. I don't like those either.
Betty: You know what, Cathy? When you talk like that/ . . .
thennn Dad and I won't even consider trying to make it work.
Now if you want to, help us understand why/, and work with us, that's fine. But not to talk like that/.
Cathy: (softer) It's just I wanted some <u>big</u> pillows/

Betty achieves the effect she hoped for by demonstrating to Cathy what she expects through use of both positive and negative examples, giving her permission to express her ideas, but removing acceptability of challenging her parents for it's own sake. Cathy responds by expressing more specifically her likes and dislikes, rather than simply challenging whatever her mother suggests.

The second example of the distinctive way Betty uses the "permission directive" is of her using what would typically be viewed as a positive permission provision to withdraw permission. Cathy has been playing around and is having a fit of giggles.

4.59) Betty: Ouuuuch!
Cathy: Sorry. (giggles)
Betty: **Alright, Cath.**
Cathy: (More giggles)
Betty: Stop.

Usually, "alright" is thought of as having a positive meaning in granting permission. In this case it is a signal that Cathy must stop her behavior because she has performed it long enough.

As pointed out in previous discussions, "permission provisions" sharply mark the division of status between authority and subordinate. Betty uses this type of directive to

help Cathy learn acceptable behavior, and stay within its boundaries. In comparing the use of this directive between parents, Sam never employs "permission provisions" in this data, but chooses other means to establish expectations and boundaries.

In contrast to their use in Interaction #1, in Interaction #2, Betty uses permission provisions in response to requests by Cathy to be allowed to have or do something, rather than as guidelines for Cathy's behavior without her making a prior request.

4.60)   Cathy: Can I read <u>Make Way for Ducklings</u> [now?]
        Betty: **[Not until] you finish**
        Cathy: [I ate seven-]
        Betty: [and] wash your hands and
        Cathy: <u>NO</u> you said eat seven and [I did.]
        Betty: **[Okay.]**

As observed in the example above, Cathy is requesting she be allowed to do something based on having completed the requirements her mother has set down. Betty denies then gives permission, based on Cathy's argument that she has indeed met the requirements. Although Betty uses this strategy in her directives to Cathy, Sam does not. He chooses other ways to direct Cathy's behavior and set up boundaries within which she is expected to act, most notably the imperative.

Proposal for Joint Action

In Interaction #1, Betty uses "we can" and "we have to" to introduce the proposal, and the most common form "Let's do X."

4.61)   Sam: Uh, Why don't go get-
        Betty: Some big pillows/
        Sam: Why don't you go get one, Cathy.
               And [try it.]
        Betty: **[Let's try it.]**

In examining Betty's directive in context, and considering this is the isolated case of

"Let's do X" that is clearly a member of this directive category in the Sand's data, her

proposal seems to be influenced by Sam's "quasi-question" directive to Cathy "Why

don't you go get one, and try it." Betty's interactional style is one that is very sensitive to

the speech of those around her and she accommodates to their language as revealed in the

way she latches on to their ideas and proposals, and incorporates the language of her

conversation partners into her own language production.

The other examples of her use of "proposal for joint action" are framed within

different sentence structures, but still have the same implication.

4.62)   Betty: I just don't see any other way to move it, Cathy.
        Cathy: I don't like it above that chest.
        Betty: Well [the-]
        Cathy: (shouting at Sam) [Don't] give me that mean awrie face!
        Betty: (laughing) **We can change the chest.**
                Or we can put some other fabric on the-her chest.

4.63)   Cathy: But if I sit on that then my hair'll bump the picture.
        Betty: Well that's why . **if you'll sit up there, we'll check it out.**

Betty proposes action in each of the above examples that all of them can take part in as

solutions to problems that present themselves.

The instances of this type of directive in the Sands' data exist in a variety of

different forms. Sam's use of the "proposal for joint action" occurs in conjunction with

an imperative in which he directs Cathy to do her homework, to be followed by a family

decision about what to do after that. Sam employs this type of directive in both

Interactions, but they occur only once in each.

4.64) Betty: Okay, Cath, are you ready to go look at your room again or do
              you want to work on homework first?
       Cathy: I want to work on homework first and make my bed and do the
              playroom.
       Betty: Well we have to finish up some things in your room
       Cathy: Like what.
       Sam: Okay go get your homework first and get your homework done
              first and then **we'll go from there.**

Sam steps into the discussion of what tasks Cathy should accomplish and gives

her a concrete goal to work toward after which he directs that he, Betty and Cathy will

decide together what should be accomplished next. He includes each member of the

family in the decision making process in this directive.

The underlying mood of the "proposal for joint action" is an attempt to build

consensus and cooperation, while mitigating status differences. Cathy seems amenable to

these directives in Interaction #2, and does not attempt to challenge Betty or Sam over

these proposals in this situation.

Betty proposes joint action to Cathy using the most common frame found for a

"proposal of joint action." However, only one person can perform this action. In the

following example, Cathy is ready to start her homework. They have music playing in

the background.

4.65) (Pause in interaction)
       Cathy: Okay, Mom. I'm coming out to read.
       Betty: Okay. Just doing a little rearranging here.
              (to Sam) [Do you need some help?] Mmkay..
       Sam: [Coughs]
       Cathy: Okay,
       Betty: What are we reading?
       Cathy: "Make Way for Ducklings."
       Betty: **Okay, let's turn down the music.**
       Cathy: Okay. This book is by, um, what's his name?

Betty tells Cathy the music is going to be turned down using the directive, "Let's turn down the music." She is making a transition from "family time" to "homework" time and setting the mood, while establishing structure for this next phase of activities. She includes Cathy in the proposal of "Let's" as a way of keeping her involved in the process.

Pseudo-Mutual Requirements

Similar in mood and meaning to the False Collaborative used above, in Interaction #2, Betty uses "pseudo-mutual requirements" to describe things that are going to take place in which the whole family will be involved, things over which she, but not Cathy, has control. She uses a form "We're going to X." Cathy acts both surprised and a little unruffled when she learns of these plans, but Betty's firmness of voice and reassurance of "That's alright" makes it clear that these plans will occur, and Cathy knows what the expectations are for her. Betty makes it clear that Cathy has no choice in these matters, thus highlighting her authority. Unlike the constant challenging found in Interaction #1, she meets with little resistance from her daughter in Interaction #2 when using this directive.

Explanation as Directive Statements

In the discussion of previous data, it has been shown that this type of directive is used to describe a universal property or law, to rely on an outside authority, or to state a "house rule" regarding behavior. The parent removes himself or herself from the universal or rule, and therefore does not emphasize a status difference between the child and the parent because this universal or rule applies equally to all parties. It is often

constructed in the passive voice. In Interaction #2, Betty uses this directive four times.

She uses this type of directive in the context of explaining conventions of English to

Cathy as she asks questions related to her homework.

> 4.66) Cathy: Does Ms. have a period at the end?
> Betty: **Well some, some people say it doesn't but I saw it recently that**
> **it does, so. .**
> Cathy: I put one.
> Betty: **Okay. [Your teacher -]**
> Cathy: [Would -]
> Betty: What?
> Sam: I would.

Betty calls on an outside authority to provide Cathy with direction in completing her

homework. She makes a statement "Some people say it doesn't but I saw it recently that

it does, so." "People" refers to a group who has the authority to make such rulings on

conventions of English. Then Betty refers to Cathy's teacher, who in this case, will be

the ultimate authority in grading Cathy's work and of deciding whether it is correct or

incorrect. She is attempting to make a statement regarding the conventions of English

that are outside her authority to decide, but will guide Cathy in making an appropriate

choice.

Comparison of Mother and Father

In the interactions of both settings, Betty has a high-involvement style as

described by Edelsky (1981) and Tannen (1990), and reveals the desire for a high degree

of intimacy in the interactions. Her speech frequently overlaps that of her husband and

daughter. With her husband, these overlaps include finishing his ideas and adding to

what he's expressed. With her daughter, these include both supportive overlaps,

extending Cathy's discourse, as well as competitive exchanges when Betty and Cathy

each try to prevent the other from getting the floor. Betty supports both their speech through back channeling, as well as offering her own ideas. She has a total of two hundred and seventy-five turns in a total of sixty-five minutes between the two interactions with Cathy. Among those two hundred and seventy-five turns, she directs Cathy eighty-six times.

During the first interaction, Betty has a total of one hundred and twenty-eight turns with Cathy. Forty-five of the turns are directives. Betty's turns with their daughter are nearly twice as many as Sam's, 128 compared to 61. This compares with Sam's total of sixty-one turns of which a total of seventeen directives are delivered in the first interaction. Betty discusses ideas and negotiates with Cathy more than Sam does as the child challenges boundaries of expected behaviors. In contrast, Sam uses significantly fewer words. His verbal exchanges with Cathy preface and punctuate his more physical approach to his daughter's attitude and actions. He engages in physical play and humor when addressing her challenges whereas Betty controls Cathy's behavior through verbal means. Both Sam and Betty frequently resort to humor to defuse Cathy's challenges in this situation.

In the first interactional setting, Cathy has a very firm concept of what she wants. However bringing that concept into reality with existing materials is a major challenge for her parents. Betty appears to be the one who keeps the process moving forward, breaking down the design into elements that can be addressed and negotiated as she attempts to reach the mutual approval of child and parents. It is she who initiates negotiations, explains the possibilities and limitations to Cathy's concepts in concrete terms, and facilitates activities. Yet Sam holds ultimate authority. As discussed in the

previous section, he moves to the heart of issues, cutting through Betty and Cathy's

negotiations, moving directly to possible solutions. He enters their negotiations to

"rescue" these two women from their indecision, and to "fix" the problem. Betty turns to

Sam for support, and to include him in the process throughout, and relies on him to give

final approval.

4.59)   Sam: Okay, well I have a comment to make to you, too.
                      Water will ruin that cabinet.
          Cathy: [I know.]
          Betty: [Cath,] so you do [not put your fingers,]
          Cathy: [I' not going to play in it.]
          Betty: (raised volume and pitch) You [don't even . .]
          Cathy: [I'm not gonna play in it.]
          Betty: When you get a fish, you don't even wiggle a /finger\.

Sam uses the passive statement "water will ruin that cabinet" to express to Cathy a

universal principle, implying that she must not get water on the cabinet. In contrast, her

mother follows up her husband's directive by giving specific directives to their daughter

that describe what Cathy cannot do, rather than leaving Cathy to infer what she should or

should not do based on a universal law.

The passive construction does not emphasize the parent and child status, but

having knowledge and imparting it does give the speaker power over the hearer. The

father and child struggle momentarily as he delivers the information and the child quickly

counters she already has the knowledge, attempting to avoid a loss of face.

Sam uses an "explanation" directive in the second interaction as he did in the first.

It follows a question directive in example 4.52 checking on Cathy's progress in

accomplishing certain tasks.

4.65) Cathy: Mom now can I make something out of my little play dough
                  clay?
        Betty: Umm
        Sam: I think first of all …
        Betty: Is your bed made?
        Cathy: No. I just have to make my bed.
        Betty: Okay, what else then .
        Sam: Okay, is all your stuff out of the dining room/ and the living room?
        Betty: She also has homework.
        Sam: **Oh, those things have to be done first.**

He frames it in the passive voice to state a house rule, rather than drawing on his authority as the father and stressing status differences.

In comparing the Sands, they have drastically different amounts of turns with their daughter. Betty has more than twice as many turns with Cathy as Sam does in the first setting and nearly seven times as often in the second setting. In comparing the ratios of both parents, Betty uses slightly fewer directives with their daughter than does her husband Sam. In comparing their differences between aggravated and mitigated directives, they are nearly equal.

Sam Sands uses only a few varieties of directives in these interactions with his daughter, Cathy. He very clearly establishes his status of authority, while maintaining intimacy with her. His personality as expressed in these utterances seems introverted, especially in contrast to his wife. He interjects humor throughout the first interaction, supporting the intimacy he shares with Cathy while still maintaining his authority. This is also revealed through his physical playfulness with his daughter.

While he does not resort to humor in the second interaction, he maintains a presence of final authority throughout the family's interactions. In comparing how Betty and Sam each use the "pseudo-mutual requirement," Sam never uses the "pseudo-mutual

requirement" in any of the data that were provided by the family, while Betty does use it on occasion.

Conclusion of the Sands Family's Interactions

Through these interactions, the personality qualities and dynamics of the relationships of Sam, Betty and Cathy seem to emerge. Daughter Cathy is the pivotal character in family interactions. Conversations between Betty and Sam have markedly different characteristics when they are alone.

Cathy appears to be a very spirited, impulsive, and emotional child whose expectations of events, others and herself seem to be greater in her thoughts than reality can provide. She seems not to like to be told what to do or how to behave and challenges both her parents frequently in the first setting, especially where boundaries have not been clearly established in advance. In order to establish order in what could melt into chaotic and unstable situations, Betty places rather strict boundaries on Cathy's behavior, while providing concrete direction on what can and cannot happen in the interactions. She is the negotiator, and keeps Cathy's feet in reality. She seems to prefer high-involvement interaction, and uses language as a means to maintain intimacy and control, especially with her daughter who shows strong tendencies to easily become out of control. Her use of language clearly expresses a deep care and affection for her child and her expectations of appropriate behavior as she establishes boundaries for Cathy within the situation. Betty uses both playful and serious means that concretely express these expectations. During these interactions that include the whole family, Betty's interactions with her husband take the shape of cooperatively constructed directives and commentaries. She

appeals to Sam for support and final approval of decisions reached through negotiations

between her and Cathy,

4.47)   Betty: Kay. You wanted something else here?
        Sam: Just second, Cath.
        Betty: Now, is it not-do you not like the colors there, on this?
        Cathy: Mm-um.
        Betty: Okay.
        Sam: Okay.
        Sam: Well, I have an idea here.
                Just a minute.
        Betty: Would you like..this?
        Cathy: (very quietly and sadly) I don't want a thing with that on.
        Betty: (firmly) Cathy. I'm sorry babe.
        Cathy: I don't want that showing that, Mom.
        Betty: Than, we can change this, at some point, [for a sofa.]
        Cathy: [But if-]
                But if it-
        Sam: **Will you wait a minute and –**
                (Voice straining as he picks up something heavy) **let me tell my**
                idea? I know Dad has to go away a lot, but,
        Cathy: See, [I won't like] that there.
        Betty: [Sit up there.]
        Cathy: See what? I [don't like it up there.]
        Betty: (From distance) [Cathy, can you come, please?]
        Cathy: What?
                (Cathy leaves room to join Betty)

                    PAUSE

                (Footsteps as they re-enter)

        Sam: Okay, here's what I'd do.
                Are you ready to hear it?
        Cathy: I don't know if I am.
        Betty: Well/, (Laugh) then why don't you get back into bed/, and
                Think it over for a bit. Ooooh. It's kind of cute!
        Sam: What, the toosh?
        Cathy: (Screams)
        Sam: Okay. Here's my idea. What if we pull this [out] from the wall,
        Cathy: [(yell)]
        Betty: Uh-huh/
        Sam: about four to six inches.
        Betty: Um-hum/

153

```
Sam:    And then we could build just a little filler, back there.
        And that would give you enough room.
Cathy:  (cough)
Sam:    So that these things could sit back a little farther.
Betty:  Um-hmm.
Sam:    And there'd be a little b-more sitting room.
Betty:  Does that feel good?
Cathy:  No.
Sam:    (Loudly) Does this [feel good?]
Cathy:                      [laughing]
```

Sam seems to acts alone in these interactions. In Interaction #1, his utterances, including directives, are more frequently addressed solely to his daughter or to his wife and daughter as a single unit while they are engaged in negotiations. His turns seem to be meant to cut through their negotiations and go directly to a solution. His suggestions are straightforward and direct. When he does enter negotiations, the choices he offers are limited, with the expectation of achieving a quick decision in juxtaposition to Betty who is process oriented and becomes involved in discussions that explore options. In Interaction #2, Sam interacts with both his wife and daughter on separate issues. Yet in both situations, he establishes himself as the final authority through his moves and use of language, and is supported in that status by his wife as the interactions unfold.

Sam and Betty show very strong differences in the ways each behaves with their daughter Cathy. Each clearly follows the patterns described as features of their respective genders. Sam remains somewhat independent and only interacts verbally with Cathy to solve her problems. He seems to prefer physical play to verbal interaction, and incorporates frequent teasing and humor in the situations where he is most involved. He appeals to rules when giving directives. Betty also resorts to humor frequently in the first family interaction, but she also exhibits many of the features that

have been identified as feminine strategies in her interactions with Cathy. She is the parent who interacts the most with Cathy, and while she also provides the most directives she and Sam do show cooperative behavior in delivering consequences. Sam expects and is given final authority in most situations, while Betty provides support.

Family # 3 – The Dansons

The analysis of the Danson family includes first, the researcher's interview with the family followed by the analysis of family interactions. The description will include setting, participants, length of time, number of interactions between each parent and the son, and kinds of directives used in the situation. Situations within the interactions, including topics of conversation, interactional styles, relational elements of parents and children and ways that each parent uses directives that sheds further light on ways directives are formed and used in relation to the research questions will be discussed where relevant. Comparisons among all the families will be discussed in the following chapter.

Family Interactional Patterns

In the data provided by the Danson family, there are seven separate interactions. Three include both parents with their children, while three include the father alone with their children, and one includes the mother alone with the children. The total amount of time included in all the interactions is eighty-five minutes. The interactions will be described as they are analyzed, including setting, participants, length, number of interactions and kinds of directives. Situations within interactions, including topics of

conversation as they relate to the use of directives will also be included. Interactional styles and relational elements of parents will also be discussed where relevant.

The family was observed by the researcher as a participant observer during an evening of activities and dinner. Following the meal, parents and children were interviewed separately regarding various aspects of each child's relationship with each parent, and interactions as a family. These questions were designed to provide background information on the relationships among the family members, to discover if family members perceive their relationships the same, and to compare family members' perceptions of their interactions with the data they provided. Following is a narrative description of the interview from the information provided by Strom and Patrina Danson. As discussed in the presentation of the data collected from other families, the interview questions are located in Appendix A. The questions are not directly presented here, but are used as a framework to organize this additional source of data about the family's relationships and interactions. This information provides yet another facet to enable a better understanding of interactions and the underlying relationships that will better serve to answer the research questions.

Interview with Patrina and Strom Danson

Since this study focuses on the mother's and father's interactions with their son, the information provided in the interviews that pertain to these relationships will be focused upon. Family issues that involve the son are included in order to more fully understand the dynamics of these parent and child relationships. As the Dansons answer the interview questions, the one not answering the question often adds insight and

comments to the other parent's response. As the questions are posed, for example how

the family spends time together, they answer together, cooperatively offering information

to the interviewer.

In response to questions concerning the amount of time each parent spends with

their son, and when they spend time alone, Patrina responded that she spends time with

him and his sister together in the afternoon and on weekends. In her response, she does

not separate time spent alone with Karl as the children are home together. She estimates

this time to be about five hours a day during the week, and thirteen hours a day on

weekends. In the summer, they are often at home together throughout the day, similar to

their school year weekends. Strom is responsible for getting the children up and ready in

the morning during the school year and spends between an hour and two hours with their

son then. He also spends time in the afternoon with the children when they get home

from school. He estimates he spends approximately seven hours a day with them, and

thirteen on weekends when the family is home together. Patrina and Strom do not have

any structured individual time alone with their son, but spend time alone with Karl when

one or the other parent drives him to extra curricular activities, as well as in routine

activities around their home. Topics of conversation include relationships, activities Karl

is involved in and talking about his interests, such as science. Karl also likes to ask his

father about his own childhood and life experiences.

When asked about spending time together as a family, the Dansons both mention

they often make dinner together as a family, and they always have dinner together. They

also spend the hour between eight and nine o'clock having "Family Hour," a time for

them to all be together. They said sometimes this hour is spent reading, or playing games

and talking. They do no watch much television. When asked what the Dansons talk about when they are together, they replied that they talk about geography and the world, and nature. They use the "Family Hour" to teach their children about the world taking articles from the "National Geographic" and "Wildlife Fact Files" and paraphrasing them so the children can understand. Besides the times mentioned above, they also spend time together going to Karl's baseball games, going to church, and shopping for groceries. They also have chores to do around their small farm. While they perform many of the duties together, this also provides time when one of the parents may be alone with one of the children. Strom said his philosophy is "enjoy them while they're young because they grow up so fast." As an older father, he said he didn't want to miss out on any time with his family, find his children had grown up, and did not know who they were. He remarked, "I may not like everything they do, but by golly, I'm gonna **know** what they're doing."

Because of the way the Danson parents' work schedule is, Strom is in charge of the morning activities, and Patrina takes care of the afternoon and evening activities. However they both are quick to acknowledge it is a coordinated effort. There are certain things each one is in charge of, for example Patrina helps Karl with his piano lessons, and Strom helps with homework. Because of their demanding careers and schedules, they keep a "family book" that contains all the sports schedules, classes, appointment calendars and any other kinds of information pertaining to their schedule for the month that anybody in the family would need to know in order to keep the family functioning. This makes coordinating their lives much easier, and everyone knows where each is supposed to be at any given time.

When it comes to supervising the children, they share the responsibility, but also have developed strategies to help the children manage themselves on routine activities. They keep a checklist of tasks each child is responsible for, and the child goes over it and checks off the list as he or she completes the tasks. They have divided the lists into an "A.M. List" and a "P.M. List." Strom says he is time and task oriented, and manages the family's schedule more than his wife does.

As mentioned earlier, they both teach Karl things at home, such as topics concerning the world and what is in it. They teach him the tasks required to help care for their farm.

Regarding discipline strategies and who takes care of it, Strom and Patrina have different approaches. Strom says that Karl is a very easy child to handle. He talks to him, and tells him "what the deal is" and Karl does it. Patrina concurs. Strom mentions, however, that when Karl was very little, Patrina would "ask" Karl to do something, such as "Would you go make your bed?" leaving Karl the opportunity to say, "No." This lead to some discipline issues in the past. Strom observes that if you leave the door open and say "maybe," then the child thinks there is a possibility. He continues, "Only give choices when there is one." However, Patrina noted she has made changes to her linguistic choices, and Karl has matured, making discipline in terms of punishment a moot issue.

The interview with the Dansons reveals that Strom has a very strong personality, and clear ideas about the way he wants their family life to be, and Patrina seems to support it. His interview statements suggest he has a strong, vested interest in his wife and children. He seems to want to impart his values to his family which seem to be

family togetherness, mutual love and respect, and individual and mutual responsibility to each other.

Interview with Karl Danson

Karl and Brianna Danson were interviewed together. Karl is a friendly child who is easy to talk to, but he is more reserved than his sister, who is eager to share her ideas and experiences with the participant observer. However, due to the focus of this study, Brianna's observations will not be included in this analysis.

Karl's estimation of the length of time his parents spend with him supports the number of hours Patrina and Strom have concluded; that is between four and five hours a day in the school year, and close to thirteen hours a day in summer and on weekends. The times he is alone with his parents he says is in the car when they are taking him places. The things they do together include taking care of their home and the farm, shopping, cooking meals together, eating together, and their family hour every night. He says the things they talk about when they are together includes everything. They talk what happened that day, about what is going to happen, and the things they are involved in doing.

He said both his parents plan the family schedule and keep the household running. Which parent supervises depends on who is home with him and his sister. Because the children help in meal preparations, no one calls them to dinner. Their father is home with them in the morning and he helps them get ready for school and takes them. His mother usually helps them get ready for bed. Both parents help him with his homework at

different times. Regarding who teaches him things at home, he said it depends. He could

not think of anything specific when asked.

When asked about discipline procedures at home, he said his parents usually just

talked to him. When he was little, he said his mother used "time out." He said they

would tell him what they wanted him to do when there was something they wanted him

to do.

The interview with Karl was quite brief. His perception of interactions and

relationships within the family are very similar to those of his parents.

TABLE VII

DANSON – INTERACTIONS

	Interactional Setting	Length of Interactional Setting	# of Interactions	Aggravated Directives		Mitigated Directives		Total Directives	
				#	/ ratio of Interactions	#	/ ratio of Interactions	#	/ ratio of Interactions
FATHER	#1 Son's Room Redo	7:00	72	20	.28	7	.10	10	.38
	#2 Painting Son's Room	16:40	84	30	.36	5	.06	6	.42
	#3 Meal w/ Father, Son, and Daughter	11:30							
	#4 Meal Prep	15:00							
	#5 Outdoor Family Meal	6:15							
	#6 Family Meal and Pre-paring to go out	25:00							
	#4 Meal Prep	15:00	79	26	.33	4	.05	30	.38
	#5 Outdoor Family Meal	6:15	15	5	.33	1	.06	6	.40
	#6 Family Meal and Pre-paring to go out	25:00	9	12	1.33	6	.66	8	2.00
	#7 Casual Interaction	6:45	4	2	.50	5	1.25	7	1.75

161

Father

In the data of the Danson family, father Strom and son Karl are together in six settings: re-designing Karl's room; painting the room; preparing a meal with a guest observer present; a meal without the mother present; a meal with all family members present; and an occasion where the family ate together and prepared for an evening out. In total, father and son were together nearly an hour and nineteen minutes. During these six interactions, Strom had one hundred and ninety-two turns with Karl. Of those turns, one hundred and fifteen or slightly more than half of them were directives.

Consistent with the findings reported in the data of the previous two families, directives identified as aggravated occurred much more often than those identified as mitigated. Fifty-five per cent of the turns are aggravated, while twelve per cent are mitigated. Strom had among the highest ranges of directive types among all the parents. He used all fourteen types of directives identified across the seven interactional settings the Dansons provided.

Mother

Patrina Danson has a total of sixty-three turns with her son Karl in four interactions. The amount of time the two are together in the data is fifty-three minutes. In this body of data, the number of turns Patrina takes with Karl are a third of those between Strom and Karl. She uses a total of fourteen directives. Among the data, she uses five different varieties of directives.

Interactional Settings

Among the data provided, she and Karl are together with the rest of the family for all but four minutes. The interactional settings that were analyzed include Interaction #4 – family meal preparation with the guest observer; Interaction #5 – family meal outdoors; Interaction #6 – family meal and preparations to spend the evening at Karl's Little League baseball game; and Interaction #7 – Karl and Patrina involved in their own activities in the same proximity.

Interaction #1

This interaction occurs late in the evening in Karl's bedroom. Father Strom, son Karl and daughter Brianna are in Karl's room discussing furniture arrangement. Strom measures the room and furniture with Karl's help. Each of them has a different idea of where to place the furniture, and they discuss options, including buying additional pieces. At last, without having reached a final decision, Strom announces it is bedtime. They verify the time they'll be getting up and the children ask their father to wake them.

The interaction lasts only seven minutes, but is quite verbally interactive. Each member of the family present is highly engaged throughout the entire interaction. It includes thirty-five turns on the part of the father to the son. Twenty-six of these turns contain a directive, of which seventeen are aggravated and nine are mitigated. This ratio is closer than is found in most of the data, both among the other families in the study and among the Danson family. Also of note, in this setting, Strom uses a wider range of types of directives than appears in the other settings where he and Karl are together.

Interaction #2

The second interaction takes place the next morning in the same room. First, father, son, and daughter prepare the room for painting. Then Strom assigns jobs to each child and instructs the children how to paint. Then Strom gives the children instructions on how to use the paint rollers. Each of them is assigned an area to work in. There are several close calls with paint being stepped in, and also nearly being knocked over. Strom delivers warnings and reprimands about being careful and gives further instructions on how to handle the painting equipment. At last they all settle into their particular job, and significant progress is made. Throughout this interactional setting, the conversation deals almost exclusively with various aspects of accomplishing the task, and frequent directives from Strom.

It lasts almost seventeen minutes. In this task-oriented setting with the children being novice painters, a great deal of instruction is required in getting the task accomplished. The result is an extraordinary number of directives. As occurred in the data of Laura Harre, in this setting Strom, on occasion, gives more than one directive in several of his turns. Strom has a total of forty-three turns directed to Karl. He delivers forty-four directives. During the course of the interaction, Strom's use of each type of directive establishes the mood. While it is obvious he is in charge, he strives to create a sense of unity with the children.

Interaction #3

In this interaction, Strom, Karl and Brianna are having dinner together in the dining room of the Danson house. Patrina is away on a business trip. Behavioral

expectations and goals are already established and understood regarding mealtime interaction. Because the dinnertime routine is already established, it allows the family members to spend time exploring and discussing other topics.

Interspersed between the routines associated with mealtime, such as passing the food, addressing appropriate manners, and discussion of the food presented, are questions that lead to family stories and history lessons from Strom. The meal begins with conversation about the food, and routines that occur in preparing to settle down to eat. They then discuss diet and nutrition as they begin their meal. Karl solicits stories from his father about his childhood on a farm, which causes the children to compare their father's experiences with their own. Then Strom changes the topic to what he plans to accomplish after dinner, and what he wants Karl and Brianna to do. They are preparing to paint, and Karl and Brianna ask questions about painting "in the old days," which leads to discussion of life in ancient civilizations. As the meal progresses, the conversation returns to the food they are eating. Karl introduces a new topic, telling Strom he had a bad day yesterday. Strom pursues the topic and Karl explains what happened to him. Strom listens and offers help when Karl has trouble explaining some of the details, but does not offer sympathy or solutions to the problems Karl experienced. Following this, Strom tells Karl and Brianna to eat some grapes, and grapes become the final topic of conversation as the tape comes to an end.

This interaction lasts eleven and a half minutes during which Strom has forty-six turns with Karl. This interaction is the most highly interactive of all the data between Strom and Karl; both in the total number of turns and the ratio of the number of turns and the length of time father and son are together. Also of interest in this interaction is the

fact that it contains the lowest percentage of directives of all the interactional settings between Strom and Karl. Only eleven per cent of the turns contain a directive.

In comparison, the next most highly involved interaction is the one in which Strom and the children are painting Karl's room together, Interaction #2, which in contrast is the setting that contains the most directives. It is highly goal oriented and requires Strom to take on the role of both director and instructor, however the way Strom employs directives in this setting is not unique and has been discussed in the previous data analyses.

Interaction #4

Interaction #4 takes place in the kitchen of the Danson house. It lasts fifteen minutes. Those present include father, Strom, mother, Patrina, son, Karl and daughter, Brianna, as well as the guest observer. The family has gathered in the kitchen to prepare dinner, creating a goal-oriented situation. Strom and Patrina are preparing dinner, each busy with specific dishes, while Karl and Brianna help as needed, and the guest observer watches. Strom and Patrina jointly involve the children in assisting them and direct them in the task of setting the table. Conversation revolves primarily around the present action of meal preparation. Brianna frequently solicits attention from her mother, father, brother or the guest observer. The guest observer does not engage in meal preparation with Patrina and Strom, but does occasionally become engaged in conversation with Patrina and Brianna.

In this interaction, Strom has twenty-six turns with Karl, a little more than half the number of turns that he has with his son in the goal-directed activity of painting Karl's

room, or during the dinner where only he, Karl and Brianna participated. Thirteen of those turns are directives. Patrina has fourteen turns with Karl, of which six are directives. These account for nearly half of the turns. For Strom the number of turns is nearly twice as many as Patrina and Karl, yet the ratio of directives is within close range. There are no directives identified in the mitigated category in Interaction #4. As a goal-directed situation, it could be predicted that more directives would be aggravated than mitigated, but in the data analysis thus far presented, no situations have occurred in which there were no mitigated directives.

Interaction #5

In this interaction, Strom, Patrina, Karl, and Brianna are all present at dinner. They are eating outdoors on their patio. This interaction is comparatively brief, lasting only six and a quarter minutes. The interaction on tape is not the entire meal. As with Interaction #3, in which Strom and his children have dinner without Patrina, expectations of the meal routine and appropriate behavior have already been established. Therefore, although mealtimes are highly structured in the Danson household, conversation is not constrained. During this time, the family converses about the day's events: what occurred throughout the day while they were apart from each other, events that will take place later in the evening, and making plans for tomorrow. There are occasional references to present action occurring at the dinner table. The conversation is dominated by Strom and Patrina, and includes requests for information and provisions of information as questions are directed to her, primarily by Strom.

During this interactional setting, Strom has a total of six turn with Karl. Five of those turns include a directive. All of them are aggravated directives. All of the directives except the "false collaborative" relate to the routines of mealtime at the Danson house, such as saying grace and passing food. Patrina interacts with Karl only five times and no directives occur. However, she does give directives to both Strom and Brianna and has twenty-two turns with all the members of her family in this situation.

Dinner begins with "grace" followed by Patrina asking about Karl's baseball practice and one of his friends who had called earlier in the day to ask Karl to go swimming. The conversation turns back to immediate needs at the dinner table. Strom then solicits information from Patrina about a class she is teaching the following day, and the day's family schedule. Karl tells his mother about hitting a homerun in his game earlier, and his father provides details. He then goes on to tell additional details about the game, and the players.

This interaction is second in the percentage of directives found in Strom's interactions with Karl. The only one which contains a higher ratio of directives is Interaction #2, in which Strom, Karl and Brianna are painting Karl's room. It is the only interaction in which Strom does not use any mitigated directives. It even surpasses the goal-oriented situation of Interaction #3, where the family is preparing a meal together. In speculating the reason the percentage is so much higher, the most logical assumption is it is due to the brevity of the interaction, and the limited number of turns between Strom and Karl in comparison to all the other interactions, regardless of goal or purpose.

In evaluating the differences in the parents' interactions, several possible explanations may account for them. It can be surmised that Patrina, who does not have a

high involvement interactional style, possibly due to her upbringing in the upper mid-west, allows Strom, who comes from the south, to assume a more verbally authoritative position in the family hierarchy. In addition, her personality seems somewhat introverted in comparison to Strom who appears to be extroverted. Their differences in the data provided seem to exist together harmoniously. A third factor is that Patrina has been at work, and has returned home to the family for dinner, while Strom has been at home, influencing the moods of the adults.

Interaction #6

In Interaction #6, the family, Patrina, Strom, Karl, and Brianna are having dinner in their dining room and preparing to go to one of Karl's Little League baseball games. The interaction lasts twenty-five minutes and contains both casual elements as well as goal-directed ones. During the meal, the parents primarily address each other, but the children are included in the conversation as they ask questions and make comments about the topics introduced by their parents as well as their activities being the topics of conversation. In addition, there are several turns between Strom and each of his children in which he directs them to eat.

One of the topics of conversation is Karl's and Brianna's swimming lessons earlier that day, and joining the swim team. Karl is concerned about Brianna's swimming abilities and asks if he will need to take care of her. Strom assures him she will be fine and directs Karl to concentrate on his own team responsibilities. As the meal is concluding, Strom begins to give directives to Karl and Brianna regarding the need to prepare to go to Karl's game. Brianna is sent to take a shower. Karl is directed to assist

her. Karl has his equipment ready and sits at the table with his parents. Every few minutes, Strom and Patrina send him back to help Brianna and keep her on track, at which times, they return to discussing topics that pertain to them.

Karl seems to take advantage of being alone with his parents, particularly with his mother, to solicit her attention. He joins in the adults' conversation pretending to take part in it, while humorously twisting the topic to focus on him. The result is a shift from the serious tone of the conversation as his mother laughs, and rewards him with affection. Strom, then looking for an ice cream scoop, is reminded of Karl's experiences at science camp where they made ice cream and discussed states of matter and types of reactions. He and Patrina take advantage of the opportunity to help Karl apply what he has learned. As Strom finishes dessert, he sends Karl to get Brianna out of the shower. Everyone's attention is now turned toward assisting Brianna in getting ready, and gathering various items together that they need to take to the ballgame. Additional conversations spin off from these main focii of attention as the Danson's leave.

During this interaction, Patrina initiates conversations much more frequently than she does in the other interactions. She introduces new topics, including telling Strom what the children have done throughout the day, and things she and the children have accomplished together. One of the primary differences in her involvement in this interaction and previous ones can be inferred through the family conversations. It would seem that the interactions in which she has less involvement occur on days when she has had to be at work while Strom has been at home throughout the day. Interaction #6 occurs on a day when she has been at home while Strom has been at work

During this interactional setting, Patrina has thirty-one turns with Karl. Only seven of these turns include a directive. Strom has thirty-seven turns with his son Karl, fifteen of which are directives. This interactional setting has the second lowest ratio of directives of Strom to Karl of all the interactions provided by the Danson family.

Factors that affect the interaction include the presence of Patrina, to whom Strom pays considerable attention, and Strom's attention to their daughter, Brianna. While Karl seems to be "on task" during dinner and following family expectations by eating his meal, using his manners, and being prepared to go out for the evening, Brianna, who is five years old, seems to need more direction to stay on task and behave according to the family's standards. In addition, the topics of conversation that emerge throughout the interaction affect the kinds of directives that are used. As the interaction takes place and the conversation unfolds, it becomes evident that this family has a deeply developed sense of connectedness and mutual responsibility among its members which also affects the kinds of directives that occur (see Table VIII). As Ervin-Tripp (1976) points out, intimate relationships such as those among family members have been found to use directives that include less explicit information and require more implication to understand, including various types of imperatives, hints and directives encased in layers of mitigation.

Interaction #7

Interaction #7 takes place in the living room of the Danson home. Patrina, Brianna and Karl enter and leave the room as their various activities lead them. Strom is at home, but in another room. Conversations between each of these three and Strom

occasionally drift into the living room. However, the primary focus of this interaction is between Patrina and Karl. Patrina is helping Brianna fix a toy when Karl enters and initiates a conversation with Patrina questioning if he can have a birthday party at home with games. Her answer, "Yeah," is a permission provision, which allows Karl to have his request. While the conversation continues, Karl presents ideas for the party. Patrina listens and briefly responds to her children's ideas and offers backchannel support. He asks about games and toys to go with the party, then goes out of the room to figure out how to make enough bows and arrows for all his guests. He returns shortly with a prototype of a bow he plans to make and displays it.

During the interaction, Patrina issues directives to Brianna several times, but not to Karl. The interaction lasts eight minutes. Patrina has thirteen turns with Karl during these eight minutes. Only once does she use a directive.

Types of Directives

The directives found in the data of the Dansons includes all of the directives identified as aggravated directives, and four of the directives identified as mitigated. The most commonly used directive is the imperative. Other directives which were also used frequently, but less commonly than the imperative include the "imbedded imperative," "hearer's need statements," and question directives. These and other directives which have been found to have been used in different contexts or in different ways are presented below.

TABLE VIII

DANSON – DIRECTIVES

INTERACTIONAL SETTINGS

Directive Type	Room Redo Part1 / Part2		Dinner Prep; Meal		Going Out		Father, Children Meal	Family Meal	
	F	F	F	M	F	M	F	F	M
Aggravated Directives									
Imperative	13	22	6	2	4	3	1	2	
Imbedded Imperative		2	2	1	2	1	2	2	
Permission Provisions		3			1	1			
Hearer's Need		6	2		2		1		
Speaker's Need		2	1						
Pseudo-Mutual Requirements	1								
False Collab.		2							
Question Dir.	1	4	1	3	3	1	1	2	1
Tag Question		2							
Pronouncement	1					1			
Directive by Example									
Suggestion									
Mitigated Directives									
Proposal for Joint Action	4	3	1		2			1	
Permission Directives		5				1			
Hints									
Explanation Directives	3				1		3		
Singular Suggestions									

Imperatives

In the interactional settings provided by the Dansons, Strom's use of the imperative flows from his role as director in most of the situations. It compares to the interaction described in the data of Family #1, the Harres, where Adam directs his children in cleaning the basement, and that of Family #2, the Sands, as Betty guides her daughter through her homework. The use of the imperative, although clearly delineating the status of the parent as the one in charge, is casual and based on familial intimacy, as described by Ervin-Tripp (1976).

The most common way that the imperative is used in Interaction #1 while Strom and the children are trying to come up with a plan for rearranging Karl's room is illustrated below. Strom issues directions while measuring the room and furniture, which includes several elliptical imperatives to highlight new information, as described in Ervin Tripp (1976).

4.75)   Strom: **Come stand with your finger here, Karl.**
                 Right there.
                 On the wall, buddy.
                 Over there. There.
                 Now, just stay there.

Strom uses the imperative to direct Karl to assist him in measuring, "Come stand with your finger here." He then follows the commands with elliptical imperatives that position and reposition Karl, understandable only because of their context.

A different way that Strom uses the imperative here is as an attention focusing device. He introduces an observation statement that directs Karl's attention using the verbs "see" and "look."

4.76)   Strom: **See Karl** your, your, (sigh) your dresser. would fit right
                here.
        Karl: Yeah, I know.
        Brianna: Daddy?
        Karl: And that would be a perfect place cause I never use [????]
        Brianna: [You know what?]
        Strom: [Cause it's 44] inches.
                And look. This is, this space is 46.
                And if we were to put your dresser right here..
                And then it only comes out this far…in the floor.. It's 20 inches.
                So it comes out 20 inches, in the floor, right here.
        Brianna: (quietly) Daddy?
        Strom: **So see**, it would come -
                What love.

He uses the imperative form of verbs describing 'vision' in this way to focus Karl's

attention on the specific arrangement Strom believes would work best in his room and

also conveys Strom's excitement and underscores his conviction about the placement of

the dresser.

He also uses the imperative to get his children's attention and help them focus on

the directive to follow using 'listen' before attempting to provide explanations.

4.77)   Strom: Now, **listen guys**, the most important thing/ . . is to get it
                completely covered, so that there's no spots. So it's okay to
                go over it more than once, okay?

He provides explanations in conjunction with the imperatives, and permission directives

(which will be discussed separately) to help the children accomplish the job.

Strom uses twenty-two imperatives in the second interaction. They are clustered

around specific types of activities throughout this setting. The first occurrences appear as

Strom introduces Karl to the painting process. As he describes the steps in the process,

he uses a series of bald commands, along with imperatives that explicate the subject,

"you," softening the directive.

4.78)   Strom: All right, K.D.
          Karl: Let's start painting.
          Strom: Let me show you how.
          Karl: Next part.
          Strom: **You just take and you run it/**
                You want to get plenty of paint on here.
          Karl: If I roll all the way through-

            (Seven second pause while father demonstrates)

          Strom: And **you just start**, and what you do is, uh
                And **you start like this, and start rolling up/**
                And then you've to . **go over it again, and then go sideways**.
                It'll take a little while to get enough paint on there. Rollin'-
                Then **just paint up all the way's high as you can**.
                And when you get it up, then we'll paint sideways.
                And **don't be afraid to go over it several times**, okay?
          Karl: Okay.

Karl is eager to begin, but first his father provides instructions through imperatives, and

"hearer's need statements" while he demonstrates the techniques he expects Karl to use.

Karl comments on the demonstration and his perception of the situation as he follows

along with his father's instructions and explanations. He is eager to comply.

Strom intersperses explanations with the directives during the demonstration

providing additional context in an effort to make the directives more relevant and help

Karl to be successful. His use of imperatives in a demonstration setting, which narrate

his actions, is quite similar to the pattern used by Betty Sands in guiding her daughter

through her homework.

Imperatives also appear in "crisis" situations, when quick action is needed to avert

an accident or minimize damage.

4.79)   Strom: **Be careful when you step on it,** instead of just steppin' on it.
        Karl: Dad, I got the light switch pretty good.
        Strom: Good heavens!
        Karl: Want me to (????)? I got just . about, not even . half a centimeter .
                uh-of-away because I, knew that the little thing was (jaze off)-of-
                just a little.
                Like here. Ouch. I could s-I could [see here -]
        Strom: [Okay, you guys],
                let me . **just stand back** and –
                Careful, Karl! Bubby?
                Do I have to give you the same thing I gave your lecture.
                You about stepped in the paint.
                You all just stand here at the (soom). Let me get the baseboard
                where you're workin', okay?

In an attempt to contain the paint and control Karl and Brianna's enthusiasm, Strom

employs the imperative, however in a softened frame with "just" and the subject "you

all" explicated.

Imperatives emerge in the data of Interaction #6 as the family is preparing dinner,

and the children are directed to set the table. They are framed as bald commands.

However, one stands out because it is a command that demands a favor.

4.80)   Strom: **Do me a favor, Karl.** Go tell your sister to get out.

The demand is followed by the actual request, which is also framed as a bald command.

This is a change from previous interactions in which Strom has used imbedded

imperatives to frame personal favors and requests. This is a less mitigated directive and

places a strong obligation on Karl to comply, while at the same time, it suggests a deeper

level of intimacy between father and son, that the father would make this kind of request

and demand on his son. He prefaces the real request with a command to do a personal

favor, which displays a high level of intimacy and bonding on the part of the two males,

then Strom makes the real request which places trust and responsibility on the shoulders of the boy and gives him power and authority over his sister.

Patrina uses the imperative more than any other kinds of directive, in keeping with the findings on the use of imperatives among intimates. Her apparent meaning and attitudes follow the previously described data, and sheds no new light. For example, in Interaction #6, while preparing dinner, she uses an elliptical imperative, calling Karl by name when he is out of the room to mean, "Come here."

One anomaly is a directive that gives Karl responsibility for his own work. In response to a question from Karl whether the spices he's ground for her are fine enough, she says, "Look at it and see." Although in her role as mother with acknowledgeable superior status, she gives him a directive that places responsibility for the task back on Karl's shoulders, and allows him to use his own judgement which provides for Karl's positive face. In the context of intimates, it also establishes a deeper level of trust, as the parent conveys on the child additional responsibility.

Of the imperatives used by Patrina in Interaction #6, there are two kinds. The first is framed with a number of mitigators and she addresses to everyone at the table. It is a reminder to continue to gather data while she is out of town. However, Karl is the only one to respond to Patrina.

4.81)   Patrina: **Now be sure you turn it on when you guys are here by Yourselves.**
            Karl: Uh-huh.

The other imperatives follow up on Strom's directives that bring to everyone's attention the fact that they need to finish dinner and get ready to go to Karl's baseball

game. She admonishes Karl and Brianna to "hurry," emphasizing the sense of urgency with the imperative.

> 4.82) Karl: Uh, Brianna, which shower are you taking?
>   Can she-she take,
> **Strom:[I don't care as long as she does it.]**
>
>   Patrina: **[That's OK. Just hurry up and go.]**
>   Strom: [We've wasted]
>   Patrina: **[Hurry, hurry, hurry.]**

Patrina is influenced by Strom's attention to time and his insistence that they need to leave soon. This illustrates his observation in the interview that it is he who is concerned with time management and maintaining the family schedule more than Patrina. It is obvious, however, that Patrina strives to accommodate Strom's punctuality.

Hearer's Need Statements

Strom alone uses this type of directive in the Danson family data. He uses the "hearer's need statements" in conjunction with imperatives. The first instance occurs as he gives step-by-step instructions on painting technique when he is describing what he considers to be especially important points. Following is an excerpt from his giving Karl lessons on painting in which he uses these directives together to instruct his son.

> 4.83) Strom: All right, K.D.
>   Karl: Let's start painting.
>   Strom: Let me show you how.
>   Karl: Next part.
>   Strom: You just take and you run it**/**
>   **You want to get plenty of paint on here**.
>   Karl: If I roll all the way through-
>
>   (Seven second pause while father demonstrates)

Strom: And you just start, and what you do is, uh
    And you start like this, and start rolling up/
    And **then you've to . go over it again,** and then go sideways.
    It'll take a little while to get enough paint on there. Rollin'-
    Then just paint up all the way's high as you can.
    And when you get it up, then we'll paint sideways.
    And don't be afraid to go over it several times, okay?
Karl: Okay.

This use occurs again during a dinner conversation. Strom uses the "hearer's need statement" along with the imperative while instructing Karl concerning his responsibility in taking care of his sister.

4.84)   Karl: Dad do I have to swim with her make sure she doesn't sink down
         down in the bottom?
    Brianna: I can jump right back up with my feet? Talk about from here it's
        almost thirty shummmmm-
    Strom: **You won't have to do those things, Buddy.**
    Brianna: -and you go (deep breathing) deep.
    Strom: You just go on with your . practice, and-
    Karl: -Yeah.

He uses a negative frame with the "hearer's need statement" to answer Karl's question followed by the imperative to help Karl understand what expectations exist for his behavior and responsibilities toward his sister. From Karl's question, and later in Patrina's directives to him, lies evidence of the deep connections and mutual responsibility members of this family have developed. Strom uses his status of authority in this situation to establish boundaries for Karl on what he is expected or allowed to do while he and Brianna are at swim practice.

In the same way, when he addresses problem issues in Karl's painting, Strom employs the "hearer's need statement" directive.

4.85)   Strom: Now-now, buddy, you're going to spill all over if you do that.
        You need to roll it/ . . into this area right here/
        Karl: Yeah/
        Strom: Just dip down in, and then roll it right in here, and that gets the
        drips off.

In these situations, Strom uses the "hearer's need statements" to point out things that he deems to be of supreme importance. He uses them six times throughout Interaction #2, and at least once in each of the other settings except Interaction #5, when the family dines outdoors.

Imbedded Imperatives

"Imbedded imperatives" occur when Strom directs Karl to do something personal for him. This use of imbedded imperatives was noted by Ervin-Tripp (1976). He softens the directive by using a "polite request" frame ("Would you X?"). He uses this type of directive twice in each of the interactional settings. As discussed in the data of Laura Harre, these types of directives recognize that what the parent is asking the child to do is on the outer boundary of normal expectations and that the child's "face" is in jeopardy. The parent continues to have the right and authority to obligate the child to perform the directive, but he or she addresses the child's face needs by placing the directive in the light of "helping" the parent, therefore improving the child's face.

The two imbedded imperatives that occur in Interaction #4, however, present a slightly different tone in the directive. Strom gives Karl cornbread to set on the table, and uses an imbedded imperative that tells Karl what to do, rather than making a request.

4.86) Strom: (to Karl) Well I'm cutting the corn bread and **you can put it up in just a minute.** Careful, don't burn your hand. (Handing something to Karl) There you go**.** **You can hold it under the bottom, Bubby.**

Strom uses these directives to guide Karl's behavior. He taps into Karl's existing schema of helping his parents prepare dinner and serves to give Karl advance warning to be ready to carry something hot to the dinner table. The second is a softened command that appears as a choice of how to handle the hot dish, but is still a directive between a well-seasoned adult sharing his expertise with a less-experienced child. It also carries the same kind of weight and obligation as a "directive by example."

Strom also uses an imbedded imperative at the beginning of the meal to direct his family to taste the first squash out of their garden. As the meal's cook, he is asking them for a personal favor. In addition, he is using this strategy to get everyone to try the dish, one that may not be favorably received by everyone, but by using a polite request, he obligates them to comply. His request is framed to make the least imposition on their negative faces, to not be imposed upon, yet his request of them, as a favor to him, must be complied with in order to maintain his positive face of acceptance and respect.

Another, most unusual imbedded imperative later in the interaction directs Karl to check on Brianna who is taking a shower. Karl has been placed in charge of helping Brianna, and while she takes a shower, Karl has been sitting and conversing with his parents. Strom's request is an intricate and carefully softened directive, not due so much to the nature of the request, as much as to Strom's southern heritage.

4.87 Strom: **Could you go suggest to your sister that she has probably spent enough time in the shower now.**
Karl: OK. (Shouting from his seat at the table) Brianna!

> Strom: She can't hear you in here, Buddy.
> Karl: (from far away) Brianna!

Strom's sense of humor is revealed in this clear understatement of his feelings. He has been directing his children to act quickly, using imperatives to "hurry," and "proposals of joint action such as "We've got to get after it!" With his use of this polite request filled with softeners such as "probably" and concepts such as "suggest," a sense of sarcasm comes through.

Following the previous patterns found in the earlier data of Strom and parents in the other two families analyzed so far, Patrina uses the imbedded imperative to frame a personal request for assistance in two settings. Once in Interaction #4 when the family is preparing a meal together and once in Interaction #6 when she asks Karl to help Brianna with her shower. Not only does Patrina use a polite request, but she also calls Karl by a pet name. By making this request in the manner she chooses she softens the obligation and addresses both his negative face needs not to be imposed upon, and his positive face needs to be seen as competent. Karl seems eager to comply and takes great pleasure in taking care of his younger sister's needs. Once again, this provides evidence that this family has established a sense of responsibility for one another in their children, especially in Karl, the older brother, regarding his younger sister.

Question Directives and Quasi-Question Directives

Strom uses question directives and quasi-questions throughout these interactional settings primarily in the same ways that have been previously discussed, that is to activate the child's previous knowledge and schema for behaviors and facts. In

Interaction #6 he uses it to remind Karl of proper hygiene, asking him if he has washed his hands. During the same interaction, while Brianna is in the shower, Patrina and Strom discuss science camp with Karl and the activities he's been engaged in there. Karl shows off his newly acquired theoretical knowledge to his parents. Both Patrina and Strom give Karl the opportunity to apply this knowledge to the real world while they have ice cream. They use question directives to solicit information and application as a kind of teaching device. This same usage has been exhibited in the previous analyses of the Harres and Sands.

In Interaction #4, he uses it as a way to direct Karl to assist him. In this situation, Strom is searching for serving bowls, but can't find any. He asks Karl if he knows where the bowls are, but the implication is that Karl help find the bowls.

4.88)　Strom**: Do you know where the rest of our bowls are?**
　　　　Karl:　　Bowls? No problem? No bananas?
　　　　　　　　(Cupboard doors open and close)
　　　　Karl:　　Hey there's plenty up there.
　　　　Strom:　 Yeah but I need one for the noodles. I need a,
　　　　Karl:　　Oh – one of those -\
　　　　Strom:　 refrigerator bowl.

Strom's question is not just asking Karl for information, but expecting help in locating what he needs, as can be seen by Karl's response. Karl does not even interpret the question as requiring a yes/no response, but responds by saying, "No problem" and looking for bowls for his father rather than answering it as the yes/no question it is framed as.

In Interaction #1, following his announcement of "It's bedtime Beanie Bobs," Strom uses a question directive to remind his children that they have to get up early the next day to paint.

> 4.89) Strom: **So we're getting' up at six to paint?**
> Karl: So we're being up at six can you get us up?
> Strom: Hmm?
> Karl: Can you get us up?
> Strom: Yup.

It's clear from the context that since Strom is in charge, he is not asking them what time they are getting up to paint, rather he is telling them. The directive is framed as a question to soften it. This is even more clearly established by Karl's response. He asks the question, "So we're being up at six can you get us up?" which recognizes Strom's authority and status and requests his assistance in helping Brianna and him meet their father's expectations. However, the rising intonation at the end of Strom's directive, which is what creates the perception of the statement as a question, softens the impact in conjunction with the use of the subject "we" that expresses family unity and agreement. Similar in weight to "tag questions" as directives in the data previously discussed, this question directive reveals that Strom with his status of authority is setting up expectations for behavior, and expecting his children to agree to it, which they do.

Another type of "quasi-question" directive appears in Interaction #2 while the three Dansons are painting. Strom says, "Okay?" following the giving of a set of instructions. Ervin-Tripp (1976) identifies this type of directive as a post-posed question. It functions in ways similar to a "tag question," but is not attached to the instructions.

> 4. 90) Strom: Now, listen guys, the most important thing/ . . is to get it
> completely covered, so that there's no spots. So it's okay

to go over it more than once, [Brianna.]
        Karl: [Yeah.]
        Strom: **Okay?**

Strom uses "okay" first of all to make certain Karl and Brianna have heard his directive.

Secondly, he uses it to obligate Karl and Brianna to follow the directive "the most

important thing is to get it completely covered…so it's okay to go over it more than

once." He uses his authority as the director of the project to establish what they, as

workers, will do.

      Patrina also uses question directives in Interaction #7 as the family is preparing

for dinner. She repeats the same question directive three times, with increased

aggravation in her voice, while directing Karl in setting the table.

    4.91) Patrina: **Is there ice in the glasses? Karl, is there ice in the glasses?**
                      Is this for the tea?
            Strom: Yeah, it is.
            Karl: Yeahowwww.
            Patrina: (impatiently) **Karl, is there ice in the glasses?**
            Karl: Yo-o-o-o-o.

At this point in the interaction, dinner is nearly ready and the table is supposed to be set.

Patrina is checking to see that everything is ready, including ice in the glasses. As

previously discussed, she is not simply asking a yes/no question, but is directing Karl to

put ice in the glasses if it isn't there already. After several attempts to get an answer, she

receives an affirmative response from Karl, and her attention is turned to the next task.

Permission Provisions

This type of directive is also used with moderate frequency. Four appear in Strom's interactions with Karl. All are positive, that is permitting action. The first way he uses the "permission provision" is as a discourse marker that occurs before he changes his course of action.

> 4.93)   Strom: (to Brianna) You can pull . this sheet sheet here out too, baby.
> > **All right, K.D.**
> > Karl: Let's start painting.
> > Strom: Let me show you how -

Strom initiates new action by saying, "Alright," while at the same time he sets up a situation in which Karl is being directed to act.

The second type of context in which Strom uses a "permission provision" is in response to requests from Karl that he be allowed to do something, as well as in response to some requests for information. This use of the "permission provision" as reported in the previously analyzed data, is the most common way to respond to a request by a child that they be allowed to do something. One such "permission provision" occurs during Interaction #6 while the family is having a meal and preparing to go out. Both Strom and Patrina expect Karl to help Brianna get ready to go. Karl asks where Brianna should shower and Strom responds with a "permission provision" to get the activity started. Patrina responds at the same time, in much the same way and sends the children off to get ready punctuating the need to hurry with imperatives. Yet her approach is softer in comparison to Strom's by her use of "just" in front of the actual command. In addition, her tone of voice is also softer and more encouraging than Strom's during this interactional sequence.

4.94)   Strom: [We got to go.]
        Patrina: [Karl, will you turn] the water on for her?
        Karl: Oh yeah. I will.
                (Intervening topic)
        Karl: Uh, Brianna, which shower are you taking?
                Can she-she take,
        Strom: **[I don't care as long as she does it.]**
        Patrina: **[That's OK. Just hurry up and go.]**
        Strom: [We've wasted]
        Patrina: [Hurry, hurry, hurry.]
        Strom: [a minute here, I'm serious! We got] to get after it.
        Karl: [Okay! Brianna, go go go go go go!

It also demonstrates the responsibility which Strom and Patrina expect of Karl in taking

care of his younger sister. Neither Strom nor Patrina uses a negative "permission

provision" with Karl in the data.

Proposal for Joint Action

The range of mitigated directives found in the interactions of the Dansons with

Karl is quite narrow. Strom only uses the "proposal for joint action." Most of the frames

he employs for "proposals for joint action" incorporate the subject "we." He uses the

"Let's do X…" format most commonly associated with this type of directive only once.

In the example below, he incorporates the phrase "we could" or "we would" as he

discusses the possibilities of furniture arrangement with his children.

4.95)   Strom: There is one uh, other al-alternative here…
                 And **that would be to put your dresser right here/, and put
                 your bed in front of the window.**
        Brianna: [Daddy?]
        Karl: [But,] it . . might take up this space over /here\.
        Strom: No, cause **we'd point it this way**.
        Karl: Oh yeah, I thought you were talking about pointing it [against]
        Strom: [Un-unh.]
        Karl: the wall.

188

Brianna: And so,
Strom: **We could point it this way.**

These are more than mere suggestions. Strom is including Karl in figuring out the best way to arrange the room and making the decision together, although he makes it clear he is still in charge. He discusses several possibilities with Karl using the same grammatical construction before they come up with the final plan.

Only once does this type of directive appear in Interaction #2. It is framed in a way that creates a sense of teamwork out of the three separate efforts being put forth by Strom, Karl and Brianna on this painting project. He uses a "we need" statement to frame this directive.

4.96)   Karl: Are we gonna do the whole thing today?
         Strom: Yeah, **we've got to do it to[day].**
         Karl: [Alright].

This directive is in response to Karl's question, "Are we gonna do the whole thing today?" Although each person is working individually, they are still working to accomplish the same goal. Strom does not distinguish between statuses, but recognizes the importance of each one's contribution through his use of this "proposal for joint action."

The "proposal for joint action" that occurs in Interaction #6 is intended to make the members of the family hurry in finishing their dinner and making preparations to go out so they will not be late.

4.97)   Strom: Baby, go on now.
         Patrina: We have to –

189

Strom: **[We got to go].**
Patrina: [Karl will you turn] the water on for her.

4.98) Karl: Uh, Brianna which shower are you taking?
                    Can she-she take –
        Strom: [I don't care as long as she does it.]
        Patrina: [That's OK. just hurry up and go.]
        Strom: [We've wasted]   [a minute here, I'm serious! **We got]**
        Patrina: [Hurry, hurry, hurry.]
        Karl: [OK! Brianna, go, go, go, go, go!]
        Strom: **[to get after it.]**
        Brianna: [Kaaaaaaaarl!]

Strom includes the whole family in these "proposal for joint action" directives. From the

first instance when he notifies the family what time it is and when they have to leave, and

they discuss what action must take place in order to be ready, an intervening topic of

conversation has sidetracked the family into another discussion. Strom includes everyone

in this directive to refocus them on what needs to take place

Explanations as Directive Statements

Strom uses an explanation as a directive statement three times during the second

interaction. Ervin-Tripp (1976) included these among her examples of "hints." Although

statements and explanations occur throughout the discourse that support other types of

directives, these particular statements imply that a course of action be taken or avoided.

4.99)   Strom: **Now-now, buddy, you're going to spill all over if you do that.**

This directive is framed as an "if-then" statement. Strom is telling Karl to stop the action

he is performing through implication, by telling him what the consequences of his action

will result in, results that by implication are not advisable. Strom uses this same type of

implication and directive again.

A second way that Strom uses an explanation as a directive statement is in answer

to a request from Karl.

Karl: Now when I'm down near the bottom, can I use the paintbrush?
Strom: **I'll use this thing down near the bottom, that's what we got**
     these for.

Strom's statement neither expressly gives nor removes permission to Karl's request to

paint the bottom of the wall. He implies the removal of permission to Karl's request by

clarifying how the bottom of the wall will be painted: by Strom's using a special tool

made for that particular job.

Strom uses two "explanations as directives." The first is to emphasize the need to

hurry, also part of example 4.104:

 4.101) Karl: Uh, Brianna which shower are you taking?
       Can she-she take –
   Strom: [I don't care as long as she does it.]
   Patrina: [That's OK. just hurry up and go.]
   Strom: **[We've wasted]** **[a minute here, I'm serious!** We got]
   Patrina: [Hurry, hurry hurry]
   Karl: [OK! Brianna, go, go, go, go, go!]
   Strom**:**   [to get after it.]
   Brianna: [Kaaaaaaaarl!]

He emphasizes his point that the family needs to hurry through this explanation directive,

"We've wasted a minute here, I'm serious!"

He uses this type of directive again in directing Karl to get Brianna out of the
shower.

4.102) Strom: Could you go suggest to your sister that she probably has spent
                enough time in the shower now.
        Karl: OK. (shouting from his seat at the table) Brianna!
        Strom: (quietly) She can't hear you here, buddy.
        Karl: (from further away) Brianna!

Strom uses the explanation that Brianna can't hear Karl that far away to imply he needs

to get up from the table and to into the bathroom to tell her it's time to get out. Karl

understands this, and does get up from the table and move closer to the bathroom.

Permission Directives

As discussed earlier, Patrina uses only one mitigated directive with Karl. This is a

permission directive, which she frames using a negative.

4.103) Patrina: **Don't let me forget to take Katy and Kelly's jackets to
                 the game tonight. And Dylan's yo-yo ball.**

This is the only time in the data that a permission directive is formed in the negative.

However, as is the case when these directives are places in a "positive" frame, it

mitigates the distance between the speaker and hearer, placing an obligation on the hearer

to help the speaker, or allow the speaker to impose on them in some way. In this case,

Patrina is "imposing" on Karl to help her remember things that need to be taken to the

baseball game.

Strom uses a "permission directive" five times with Karl while showing him how

to paint in Interaction #2. He uses the frame "Let me X." They occur on occasions when

Strom wants to perform an act in the space Karl is presently using, or to perform an act in

place of Karl. They are another directive used when Strom is imposing on Karl in some

way, such as placing importance on his actions over Karl's, or physically imposing on his son's space.

4.104) Strom: **Let me show you how.**

4.105) Strom: **Let me get the baseboard where you're workin',** okay?

These directives address the negative face needs of the child not be inconvenienced. As a mitigated directive, Strom softens his directive to Karl through the permission directive and solicits Karl's cooperation.

False Collaboratives

False collaboratives occur as Strom explains to Karl how to paint.

4.106) Strom: And you just start, and what you do is, uh
And you start like this, and start rolling up/
And then you've to . go over it again, and then go side ways.
It'll take a little while to get enough paint on there.
Rollin' –
Then just paint up all the way's high as you can/
And when you get it up, then we'll paint sideways/

Strom really doesn't mean he and Karl are going to paint together. Instead, by saying "we'll paint sideways" he is explaining to Karl the method he is to use to get the best results. "We" expresses an example that Strom wants Karl to follow inferring that this method of painting is what he, Strom, would do if he were painting, and as the authority figure, this is the method Karl is obligated to follow.

In the other false collaborative used in this interaction, Strom follows the pattern previously seen, of describing an action using the subject "we" for an action that can only be undertaken by one person. This creates the mood that "we're in this together,"

resulting in a sense of unity between the speaker and hearer. In Interaction #6 the use of

the "false collaborative" occurs as Strom and Karl discuss plans for the next day. Strom

says, "We'll see…" when he actually means he will make a decision later, perhaps with

Karl's input.

Pseudo-Mutual Agreement

As Strom looks around, he proposes the possibility that Karl's room needs

something to make the design work.

> 4.107) Strom: [That wall] is <u>just</u>.
>   Karl: [That would be -]
>   Strom: It would really be a nice wall if it had your desk/, and the . .
>   and the shelves on the back of the desk, just like it is, but then/ .
>   and then two shelves on either side. **Maybe we're just gonna**
>   **have to get you an entertainment center,** for this side, and a
>   matching book shelf for the other side as long as they're the
>   same size, more or less –

As described in earlier analyses of the Harre and Sands families, Strom is suggesting

"we" when only he is making the decision on behalf of Karl, who will be the beneficiary.

Strom will also be the one who actually "gets" or purchases the entertainment

center and shelves he's suggesting, although Karl will be the recipient of them. The use

of "we" creates a mood of unity, in essence saying, "We the family, of which I am head,

and of which you are a member, will take care of you by getting you something I feel you

need."

Speaker's Need Statements

There are far fewer "speaker's need statements" than "hearer's need statements" Strom uses the "speaker's need statement" to place an obligation on himself regarding something he needs to accomplish.

> 4.108) Strom: Here, let me do it.
> **Need to sweep this.**

This type of directive places an obligation on the hearer, one that is implied, similar in tone to removing permission to not perform an action. Because the one in authority makes the statement about his own role, it gives the action prominence. This directive type only occurs twice while he is working with Karl and Brianna on painting.

Strom also uses it in an instance when Karl and Brianna are putting ice in glasses to point out that he also needs ice, "I need ice in my glass." This directive obligates them to make sure they put ice in his glass, too. He places emphasis on his glass with ice using this "need directive" because he already has a glass he wants to reuse and it is in a separate location away from where Karl and Brianna are filling glasses.

Tag Questions

During Interaction #2, "Tag questions" occur twice and show up on the ends of other directives. They function to emphasize the directive, and solicit the hearer's agreement, thus strengthening the status difference between speaker and hearer. There is no verbal response on the part of the son to the directive, but lack of further discussion leads to the implication that he complied with the directive.

Pronouncements

As has been described earlier in the data of the Harre family, pronouncements are used to accomplish such things as expressing standards of behavior or initiating family rituals. Strom uses a pronouncement to bring the action to a close and prepare the children for their nightly ritual of getting ready for bed.

> 4.109) Karl: So like. . . Can I move my finger?
> Strom: (laughing) You-move your fingers?
> Karl: I'm about to say, "Whoo-whoo," and it's the-feel it man.
> Strom: (laughs) Okay-
> **It's bedtime Beanie Bobs.**
> Karl: (sighs)

Strom's use of the pronouncement sets the schema in motion in his children's minds of what will happen next and what they need to do. It concludes the days activities, something Strom, in the position of "father," has the authority to do.

Comparison of Mother and Father

Throughout the analyses of the Dansons' data, Strom and Patrina's interactional style depends on the topic, and purpose of the interaction, as well as on experiences throughout the day surrounding the interaction in the data. Patrina appears to be a thoughtful person, displaying a warm affection for her family in the use of affectionate terms as well as ways she interacts with each of them. While Strom's humor is displayed more in his interactions with her, Patrina's humor is brought out more often in these data through the interactions among her and her children.

Attributable to their cultural backgrounds as much as to their different personalities, Strom's interactional style promotes the greater number of directives found in the interactions in which he is involved. While both Patrina and Strom take time to listen to each other as well as their children, he, nevertheless, obviously takes greater control over situations than Patrina does. This is corroborated by the interview data he and Patrina provided. His interactions with their son Karl contain forty-one per cent directives while Patrina's contain only twenty-three per cent. Their use of aggravated directives is directly reflected in this, with Strom having thirty percent in his interaction and Patrina having nineteen percent, creating a range of eleven percent. Their use of mitigated directives revealed a similar range. Patrina used only one mitigated directive throughout all the data of sixty-three interactions, while Strom used twenty-four mitigated directives in one hundred and ninety-two interactions. This provided a range of thirteen percent. In viewing the type of directives used separately, each of their uses appears much closer than in combining the directive types.

While the topic of conversation and goal of the interaction does affect the type of directive that parents use, in this case it seems to have an especially strong effect on the type of directive in the data of Patrina Danson.

The kinds of interactions revealed in the data were consistent with the information provided in the interviews with the Dansons. During the activities they engaged in as a family, each person played a role. Although the data were all gathered at home, when they discussed outside activities, again, each member of the family was mentioned and had a part in it, such as going to Karl's baseball game, swimming lessons and team involvement, and science camp. Strom could be seen as the supervisor and time manager

of family activities, while Patrina added support. The amount of interactions each had

and the percentage of directives further corroborates this. This family seems to have a

clear and accurate understanding of their relationships and family interactions and they

are purposeful in developing these relationships.

Throughout the data, Strom has emerged as the primary authority figure in the

Danson family. He plays the role of director in family activities and interactions. In

general, his interactional style is high involvement with those around him as described by

Tannen (1990). He reveals strong leadership qualities as he lays out expectations, directs

activities, and guides his children through unfamiliar actions. He has very high

expectations of his children's behavior and ability to follow directives. As with many of

the directives throughout the body of data, he provides explanations to accompany the

directive and provide reasons behind his making the directive to serve as additional

support for Karl's and his family's compliance.

Although his children may require direction, he is never challenged in the data the

family has provided. Father and children express affection and display strong bonds

through the nicknames he uses with them, their compliance with his directives, and ways

conversations develop, such as being asked by his son about his childhood. The children

feel secure enough in their relationships with their father to approach him with their ideas

and ask him personal questions as evidenced in the first three interactions analyzed in this

family's data above.

Strom's style of interaction with Karl is highly verbal. The joking and teasing

that occurs is gentle sarcasm and dry wit. A sense of warmth and ease between father

and son comes forth from the interactions. There is no physical play in these data between father and son, or daughter for that matter.

While she uses more imperatives than any other kind of directive, Patrina's choices of directives include five different varieties. The number of directives she gives is the lowest of all the parents. One factor which could contribute to such a low number of directives is the type of interactions that happen to occur during the taped settings since the topics of conversation that unfold and the types of activities that occur within the interaction help to shape the language of the interactions, including number and choice of directives. Nevertheless, it also provides clear evidence that under most circumstances in her interactions with her son, Patrina uses fewer directives.

Each of the uses of directives found in the data of Patrina is not unique to her. What is of most interest is the narrowness of her choice of directives and the limited number of times she uses them in comparison to her husband, even in the same interactional settings. In the meal preparation sequence, it is clear that while Strom is a high involvement speaker, in comparison, Patrina is less likely to initiate a conversation or direct a situation, but is easily involved when approached by someone else. She speaks a total of forty-three times throughout the interaction and clearly establishes her status and authority through the use of her directive choices, as discussed earlier. Rather than using mitigated directives, she softens directives and shows intimacy by the nicknames and endearments she uses with her children.

In the interactional setting where the family is having dinner before going out, she is much more highly engaged, and does initiate interactions with each member of the family. There is a more equal exchange between Strom and her than in the other

interactional settings that the Dansons provided. As noted in the description of this

interactional setting, Patrina has been at home all day while Strom has been away at

work.

Strom appears to be a high-involvement speaker and uses language to develop

intimacy with his family. As he mentioned in the interview, he values knowing his

children. However, masculine interactional features are still prominent in his interactions

with his family. In the following example, he listens to his son explain about bad

experiences he had the day before.

4.110) Karl: Yesterday was a bad day for me.
Strom: Why?
Karl: After you know when the goat, um, the goats did it to me, I really
        Didn't feel hungry or anything. And the-then after supper, like, oh
        Matthew left, I was hungry and I think that's why I didn't eat
        supper-'cause I just decided…
Strom: Why did you say you were limping?
Karl: Um, because, you know those kind of big wheel pricklies that are
        Laying around on the ground sometimes?
Strom: Like cockleburrs?
Karl: Umhmm. Well…you know on that one tree by the goats?
Strom: Yeah. Thorns off the (?????).
Karl: Yeah, thorns! Yeah, um, I stepped on one, and it got in a bit.
        So I pulled it out and..
Strom: When did you <u>do</u> that?
Karl: I don't remember, I think when I was feeding the <u>goats</u>/, I stepped
        on it, and it hurt (?????).
Strom: Need to have some grapes.
Karl: Okay. I'll have a couple.

Strom does not pursue the topic any further, or make any suggestions to Karl about ways

to avoid having this happen in the future, but changes the subject to the grapes that are on

the table, and directs the children to have some.

Throughout the data, Strom makes it clear he is in charge through his use of

directives, the expectations for assistance, and mini-lectures he delivers. His interactions

have a high percentage of directives, which have already been analyzed. Strom expects

help when he cannot locate what he is looking for. In Interaction #2, he asks Karl for

help when he is unable to locate the tape measure when he first wants to use it, but is able

to find it without help.

4.111) Strom: Do you know what you did with the tape last night son?
        Karl: Um, the last time I saw it [it was on the-]
        Strom: [Well unh-unh].
        Karl: Well, I was holding it.
        Strom: I found it. It's right here.

Strom uses this strategy in Interaction #4 as he is searching for serving bowls, and again

in Interaction #6 when he can't locate an ice cream scoop.

In managing the family activities, Strom delivers short lectures that demonstrate

his displeasure with certain aspects. In Interaction #1 while painting he warns the

children repeatedly about handling the paint. The following example occurs following

several "near misses" with spilled paint.

4.112) Strom: Careful , Karl! Bubby? Do I have to give you the same thing I
                gave your lecture. You about stepped in the paint.

Strom recognizes his warning as a lecture in this case. In Interaction #6, as the family is

preparing to go out for the evening, Strom lectures them about the time.

4.113) Strom: [We've wasted] a minute here, I'm serious! We got to get after it!
                Patrina: [Hurry, hurry, hurry.]

Here Strom is addressing not only Karl, but the entire family. Patrina joins with Strom in

motivating the children to be quick about their preparations to leave. This sequence

demonstrates that they can cooperatively direct the children, although Patrina is primarily adding support to an earlier directive Strom delivered to get the preparations started.

Conclusions of the Danson Family's Interactions

Strom and Patrina interact with Karl in much the same way that men and women have been found to interact with adults. Strom has a much stronger presence than Patrina, who is often quiet and does not interact frequently with Karl. He establishes his authority, while demonstrating solidarity with Karl. He demonstrates his desire for intimacy with his son through solidarity moves, including the use of "we" in referring to Karl and his place in the family, and including Karl in his activities. He and Patrina both give Karl significant responsibilities, especially regarding caring for his sister, which again creates intimacy and solidarity among the family members. In interactions, Strom more than Patrina demonstrates a strong preference for gender related interactional styles by incorporating a primarily masculine style in his interactions with Karl.

Family # 4 - The Vietch Family

The analysis of the Vietch family includes first, the researcher's interview with the family followed by the description and analysis of family interactions. The description of the family interactions includes setting, participants, length of time, number of turns between each parent and their son, and kinds of directives used in the situation. Situations within the interactions, including topics of conversation, interactional styles, relational elements of parents and children and ways that they use directives that shed further light on ways directives are formed and used in relation to the

research questions will be discussed where relevant. Following the reporting of each participating family member's answers to the interview questions, each interaction will be described followed by an analysis of the parents' use of directives. Situations within interactions, including topics of conversation that involve directing the focus child will also be included. Analysis of the effects of gender on the interactions concludes the family's analysis. Interactional styles and relational elements of parents and children will also be discussed where relevant. Comparisons among all the families will be discussed in the next chapter.

Family Interactional Patterns

The Vietch family is made up of the father, Rick; the mother, Lisa; the focus child in middle-childhood, a son, William; a younger daughter, Joy; and a baby daughter, Marion. A description of the Vietch family begins with the parents' responses to the researcher's interview questions, followed by the responses of their son William to the same questions. The responses to the interview are followed by the analysis of their interactions, which first includes an analysis of their use of directives followed by findings regarding the effects of gender.

The Vietch family was observed by the researcher as a participant observer during a Saturday afternoon and evening visit, which included a meal. Following the meal, which was recorded but is not among the interactions analyzed in this research, the mother and father were interviewed together. The focus child, their son William, was interviewed together with his sister Joy following the parent's interview. Only William's responses to the questions are included in this analysis. The children were interviewed

together because at the time the interview was conducted, it was unclear how the data would be analyzed.

As discussed previously, the questions were designed to provide background information about the relationships among the family members, especially the relationship between the focus child, the child in middle-childhood, and each parent. In addition, they were designed to discern how these family members perceive their relationships, and then to compare each of their descriptions about their interactions with the data that they collected for the researcher to achieve triangulation.

Interview with Rick and Lisa Vietch

Because this study focuses on the mother's and father's interactions with their son, the information from the interviews pertaining to their relationships will receive primary focus. Family issues, which involve the son, are also included. The interview questions appear in Appendix B. In order to obtain a more accurate understanding of the relationships and interactions among family members, the interview was conducted as a conversation, which the questions served to guide, sometimes leading to information being given "out of order." As the interview proceeded, the Vietchs provided information that answered questions they had not yet been asked. In reporting this information, rather than follow the interview question format, the information is organized below to provide a clear and understandable picture that characterizes the relationships among family members.

In response to questions regarding the amount of time the parents spend with their son William, when they spend time together, and in what kinds of activities they engage,

Lisa estimates she spends between thirty and sixty minutes a day alone with her son in the evening, and approximately five hours a day with him and the other family members during the week. They said they spend time at home alone in William's room talking; they read together, do homework and cook, go on walks and bicycle rides, swim and go shopping. She reported she and William had participated in a city sponsored "Fun Run" together earlier that year.

Rick estimates he spends approximately the same amount of time as Lisa alone with William each day, and more on weekends. He believes he spends about four hours a day on average with his family. Activities he says he spends time doing with William include playing soccer and golf, Christmas shopping, and role-playing. In addition, he reports that William likes to read out loud to him. Both parents report spending time with William on Cub Scout activities.

The things Lisa reported she and William talk about together are usually personal or private issues. He will initiate discussions with his mother on topics about which he is especially concerned, while other topics are ones a parent has raised and asked him to think about. In those cases, after introducing the topic, Rick and Lisa allow William time to think it over, then allow him to choose the time he is ready to discuss it.

Questions regarding how time is spent as a family solicited the following information. They reported that the entire family is together in the morning before the school and workday starts, in the evenings, and all day on weekends. Lisa plans the family schedule and is in charge of the time management aspects of their routine. In describing their schedule, she says "it is flexible, structured by blocks of time in which

certain things need to happen," such as getting ready for the day, meals, homework, and getting ready for bed.

She and Rick share the responsibilities of caring for the children and helping them accomplish what needs to be done once the routine and schedule are established, depending on their own work schedules. Rick gets William and Joy up and ready to go to school in the morning while Lisa attends to baby Marion. Lisa helps the children with their homework and supervises after- school activities. Rick looks the homework over again when he gets home. He also gets the children ready for bed and reads their bedtime story to them.

As a family, Lisa says some of their family time is planned with structured activities, such as special lessons and Cub Scouts, or they might take a few hours one day to visit a museum or go to the zoo. However, the family mostly spends time together in the same activities she and William do, especially on weekends. Other activities the Vietchs do together include household projects. In addition, they have game nights, watch videos together and read to one another.

Regarding questions about things the parents want to teach their children or have already taught them, Lisa says she has taught William and Joy some children's songs and prayers. She has also taught them about their family history as they have looked at pictures and family artifacts together. In addition, she enjoys sharing her knowledge and skills in arts and crafts with them. She mentions that she wants to teach them other skills she has, which include playing the piano and swimming.

The things Rick has taught William are more physically related skills. He has taught him to work out with weights and shared his hobby of cycling with William,

activities they now share together. He has also taught his son sports related skills and knowledge. Rick, too, has shared his family's roots with his son in a project William chose to do for school. He has also addressed some life skills with William, which include developing problem-solving strategies, and coping skills such as relaxation techniques for dealing with stress.

In order to solicit cooperation in accomplishing required tasks, the Vietchs report having several techniques they apply as situations arise. They do initial planning with the child to let him know what his or her responsibilities are and their behavioral expectations. In addition, they allow the child to make choices. Once the child knows what to expect they tell the child what to do, adding encouragement and praise. Rick added that when he and Lisa turn a chore into a game, the children are much more eager to comply. Another technique is to reward good or helpful behavior. They use "allowance jars" in which they put money for the child when they have completed the required job. However, Lisa confesses that they often forget about the "allowance jars" and at times, she does "gripe" at her children to get them to do their chores.

The Vietchs believe they have a carefully designed, well-planned strategy for dealing with discipline issues. In their words, "Three strikes, you're out." They apply this by warning the child about inappropriate behavior, and counting to three if the behavior does not change appropriately. If the child persists in doing the inappropriate behavior, the child is given "time out." Additional "time out" may be given for a negative attitude, or resultant inappropriate behavior. Another strategy they report applying is problem-solving techniques when conflicts occur.

This concludes the interview with Lisa and Rick Vietch. Following the parents' interview, the participant-observer interviewed William and Joy Vietch using the same format and questions.

Interview with William Vietch

William Vietch and his sister Joy were interviewed together using the same questions as were asked of their parents. However because the study focuses on children in middle-childhood, only his answers will be included. Although the interviewer had been close friends with Lisa and Rick Vietch for twenty years at the time the research was conducted, and both the researcher's family and the Vietch family had spent a significant amount of time together, William seemed quite uncomfortable with being interviewed, and resisted giving much information. The information he does give corroborates much of what his parents had said. The additional and different information William provides serves to emphasize the aspects of the relationships he felt were most important or rewarding, and were aspects of the family interactions he did not feel were too private to share. On the other hand, he steered the interview away from areas where he preferred to maintain privacy regarding his relationships with his parents by claiming to "not know," or remaining silent while his sister answered.

William reported the same amount of time spent with his mother and father as they did. He did not provide information for the questions regarding amount of time spent alone with each parent. The things he recalls doing with father include playing soccer and golf, having ice ball fights and playing computer chess. He does not offer any topics of conversation he and his father have had. When asked about time spent with his

mother he reports he doesn't know what kinds of things they spend time doing together or talking about. This response seems to act to protect his vulnerability and the desire to maintain the privacy of this relationship, which leads one to believe his relationship with his mother is sancrosect in his mind, unlike that of his relationship with his father. When asked about things the family does together, he mentions eating out.

His perception of his parents time management of family activities is that there is not a plan, and that they mutually share all the family responsibilities of caring for their children. He does note that his mother helps with homework on days she is home with them. It is she who calls them to dinner because the children spend time with Rick when he comes home from work, and it is his father who puts him and his sister Joy to bed.

Regarding the things his mother and father have taught him, he once again skirts answering this question regarding his mother, saying he "can't think of anything." He does remember his father taught him how to use a telephone.

His description of the way his parents' discipline is somewhat different than the strategies they explained to the interviewer. William says he gets told "don't do that," which is repeated in an increasingly louder voice. If he persists, his parent "makes you stop." He is silent on the topic of what his parents do in order to acquire compliant behavior.

These silences, and the limited amount of information provided, especially in contrast to the answers provided by his younger sister reinforces the perception that William is uncomfortable sharing information about his family and their relationships with someone outside the family, even someone who has spent a lot of time with them. Issues pertaining to his relationship with his mother are particularly sensitive and he

responds in a way that indicates he feels any questions related to this relationship are too private to discuss and puts up a wall of silence or pretends ignorance.

The Vietchs appear to think carefully about the questions and to be candid in their responses. While providing as much information they seem to feel is necessary, they nevertheless seem to remain vague regarding the specific topics they discuss with their children, and seem to maintain as much privacy for William's sake as possible while still providing insight into their relationships with him. The interview allows a different perspective on the family dynamics than the view provided from the data in the interactional settings alone. Together, and with the interview with William, the understanding of the family dynamics has a greater dimension than would be available from either the interviews or the interactions alone.

TABLE IX

VIETCH – INTERACTIONS

	Interactional Setting	Length of Interactional Setting	# of Interactions	Aggravated Directives			Mitigated Directives			Total Directives		
				#	/	ratio of Interactions	#	/	ratio of Interactions	#	/	ratio of Interactions
FATHER	#1 Making Valentines	12:00	29	7		.24	7		.24	14		.48
	#2 Meal/ Watching Television	58:00	13	13		1.00	1		.08	14		1.08
	#3 Son with Homework	11:00	40	5		.13	7		.18	12		.30
	#4 Family Restaurant	9:00	5	4		.80	1		.20	5		1.00
	#5 Preparing to go out	9:00	16	9		.56	2		.13	11		.69
	#6 Family Meal	11:38	16	5		.31	0		0	5		.31
	#7 Xmas Decorating	3:00	5	2		.40	0		0	2		.40
MOTHER	#4 Family Restaurant	9:00	10	7		.70	1		.01	8		.80
	#5 Preparing to go out	9:00	15	9		.60	2		.13	11		.67
	#6 Family Meal	11:38	21	7		.33	1		.05	8		.38
	#7 Xmas Decorating	3.00	6	3		.50	3		.50	6		1.00
	#8 Game with Mother and Children	18:00	46	18		.39	0		0	18		.39

Father

In the data of the Vietch family, Rick Vietch and son William are together in seven different interactional settings: making Valentines; watching a TV Christmas special while having dinner without Lisa; William doing homework while Rick makes dinner; the family "diner;" preparing to go out; a family meal; decorating for Christmas. Rick has total of one hundred and twenty-four turns with William over a period of one hundred and thirteen minutes. The percentage of directives in these interactions amounts to fifty percent. Thirty-six percent are aggravated directives, while fifteen percent are mitigated.

Fitting into the previously described patterns of directive type use, the most common type of directive that Rick uses is the imperative. Of note here, is that he uses fewer imperatives in comparison with the other fathers, regardless of situation. In addition, throughout all the data of the Vietch family, Rick uses fifteen types of directives, the greatest diversity of any parent. Rick does not use all the directives in all settings, but the distribution results in between one and four occurrences of a broader range of directives in each interactional setting than among the other fathers in this case study.

Rick's use of language seems conscious of developing connections with his son. He does this by using suggestions and explanations in his utterances, as well as asking William questions about his thoughts and feelings as they process the experiences. While he demonstrates in various situations that he is quite capable of exerting authority, his utterances do not contain as much language of status as that of the other fathers. This could be attributed to the fact that Rick is a trained counselor. It is unclear if his

language choices are intentional or emerge from years of training and experience in the counseling field.

Mother

Lisa Vietch is with William in five different interactional settings: the family "diner;" preparing to go out; a family meal; Christmas decorating; and alone with the children playing a game. She uses only nine different types of directives in the five settings from which data are provided. She is with William over a period of nearly fifty-seven minutes, during which she has ninety-eight turns with him. Among these interactions forty-five percent are aggravated and seven are mitigated creating a total of fifty-one percent of the turns being directives, which is the same as her husband, Rick.

Lisa is less likely to mitigate directives the way the mothers of the daughters do, however she does negotiate with William on several occasions. She uses the imperative more frequently than any other type of directive in all the interactional settings except one, the game setting, in which she uses "permission provisions" more frequently.

Interactional Settings

In the data provided by the Vietch family, there is half as much time provided by the mother as the father. The data in the interactions give supporting evidence to the data gathered in the interview that the parents share the role of caretaker, even while together. In the interactional settings where Rick and Lisa are together, they also interact frequently with each other, providing each other assistance, as well as discussing ongoing family and work situations or events that have taken place apart from the family. The

interactions between Rick and Lisa create the impression that a strong bond exists between the two, besides the shared role of parents.

In the data provided by the Vietch family, there are eight interactional settings between parents Rick and Lisa, and son William included in this analysis. Four of the interactions occur with both parents present, while three occur with the father alone with the children, and one occurs with the mother alone with the children. The total time among the eight interactions is one hundred and thirty-one minutes and thirty-eight seconds. In all but two of the interactions, all three children are present during the interactions. Those two exceptions include one in which Rick is making dinner while his son William does homework in the kitchen, and the other is one in which Rick, Lisa, William and Joy interact as the family prepares to go out for the evening.

In the data provided by the Vietch family, father Rick and son William are together a total of one hundred and thirteen minutes and thirty-eight seconds over the course of seven different interactions.

Interaction #1

Interaction #1 takes place in the Vietch's dining room. This interactional setting lasts twelve minutes. William and his sister Joy are making Valentine's cards. Rick Vietch is attending his baby daughter, Marion, while assisting Joy with spelling and William with finding materials with which to create the cards. During the interactional setting, Rick has twenty-nine turns with William. Among those turns are fourteen directives, or nearly half of the interactions. These directives are equally divided between aggravated and mitigated directives.

William is at first, secretive about the Valentine he is making, and rejects his father's inquiries. Rather than perceiving this as a challenge to his authority, Rick allows William to keep to himself. Soon, William presents the Valentine to Rick, his attitude changed. Rick asks William to read it out loud, and helps him through mistakes William has made in the grammar. William decides to make more, but needs help locating more paper. Rick verbally guides him through the process. Joy continues to need help with spelling. Soon, Rick announces that the children need to begin cleaning up as bedtime is close.

Interaction #2

Interaction #2 takes place in the Vietch's family room, where William and his sister Joy are watching a Christmas special on television, and eating dinner at the breakfast bar that separates the kitchen and family room. Rick is in the kitchen preparing dinner. He interjects comments about what is happening on the show from time to time, and the children share their thoughts and ideas on the unfolding action with him as well. Their father makes it clear to them that being allowed to watch television and eat dinner is an unusual occasion for their family.

The interactional setting lasts fifty-eight minutes. There are long pauses between conversational sequences during this setting as the participants' attention is focused on the TV. The result is a total of thirteen turns by Rick to William. Fourteen directives in these thirteen turns occur, with one containing two directives.

The topics of conversation that emerge during this interactional setting revolve around Christmas, specifically what is happening in the TV special, and directives

regarding the logistics and expectations of getting to eat dinner while watching TV. Only one directs the children's attention to a visual joke in the show.

Interaction #3

During this interactional setting, Rick is alone with William in the kitchen. He fixes dinner while William does homework. The interaction lasts eleven minutes. During that time, Rick forty turns with William, including twelve directives. In this situation, Rick uses slightly more directives that have been identified at mitigated than aggravated.

The interaction involves Rick helping William get started on his homework, then William doing his homework, an English grammar assignment, out loud. Rick is making dinner, and asks William about his preferences for the meal. After several minutes, Rick asks William about the assignment, including questions that ask William to evaluate his experience, but William finds he is unable to answer the questions because as he says, "I don't know, Dad." Rick relates some of his own school experiences to William, then goes back to fixing dinner, and talking to William. William interrupts Rick and asks to be allowed to finish his homework. Rick apologizes, and William goes back to his work.

Interaction #4

In this interactional setting, Lisa Vietch has created a "diner" she calls "The Big Dealer," and plays the role of the owner/waitress. She moves in and out of the role she has created. As she cooks and serves the food, she steps into the created role. Between

"orders" she carries on a normal conversation with Rick. Once all the "orders" have been filled, she returns to being herself, even when offering additional food.

Rick takes care of baby Marion while the two older children watch a Christmas special on TV, and Lisa cooks. She and Rick discuss Marion's fussiness, work and extended family issues between "orders." Once the food starts being given out, the conversation topics revolve around food and the logistics of settling each child.

Lisa changes roles and uses directives when she calls out a child's order number, and helps them get situated. Rick issues directives concerning the TV and general behavior. The directives found in this interaction are a combination of those that one would expect to find in a public setting where one is being served, with the server in complete control, and parents taking care of children. During this interactional setting, Rick has only five turns with William, all of which are directives. Lisa has ten turns with their son, eight of which are directives.

Interaction #5

In this interactional setting, Lisa and William return home from shopping. They are engaged in an argument over money William owes Lisa, and it continues as they begin to prepare to go out for the evening. Rick and Joy have been at home working on Joy's homework. Lisa begins to organize the family to go out for a special program William is involved in at church. Neither of the children wants to get ready, and Joy is especially upset about having to go. Lisa enlists Rick to help her, and while they are apart from their children, she expresses her concern about William's ability to perform his part in the upcoming program. It can be inferred that this is possibly the underlying

216

source of the discord William is causing in his present behavior. William often displays challenges to his parents in the data and he is especially thorny in this interactional setting. While Lisa irons William's pants, and directs Joy to pick up, William begins to act out by playing with a ball in the house. This brings out a very strong reaction from his mother. The stronger Lisa's directives become, William continues to challenge her, even when consequences are imposed. Rick is drawn in as William notices him watching, and throws out a challenge to his father. Rick takes over and delivers time-out consequences while continuing to try to change William's attitude and move him along the process of getting ready. Finally, William calms down enough to go get dressed, and he and Rick join Lisa and Joy upstairs in getting ready.

The interactional setting lasts nine minutes. Rick and Lisa have almost identical amounts of turns and directives with their son. Lisa has fifteen turns with William. Rick has sixteen turns with William.

Interaction #6

In this interactional setting, the entire family, Rick, Lisa, William, Joy and Marion, are having dinner together. It is almost Christmas, and following the rituals that initiate the meal, such as saying "Grace," they discuss whose turn it is to light the Advent wreath, and try to figure out an equitable way for Joy and William to share in this family ritual. Following their discussion of Christmas, the family discusses the meal, and Lisa draws attention to the progress baby Marion is making eating on her own. She and Rick decide this is the time to wean her from a pacifier. They carefully announce this to the older children, who immediately begin to make jokes and hint at it, bringing out parental

directives regarding references to pacifiers of any kind. Marion begins to ask for it, and Lisa enlists William in helping distract the baby by having him show her all the Christmas ornaments on the tree.

While William and Marion look at the Christmas tree, Lisa tells Rick about a feature she and Joy heard on the radio recently. She tries to include Joy in relating the experience. As dinner concludes, Rick comments on his allergies, and William and Joy try to get him to use the congestion in his sinuses to make whistling noises for their entertainment.

The interactional setting lasts eleven and a half minutes. Rick has sixteen turns with William, about a third of which are directives. Lisa has twenty-one turns with William.

Interaction #7

In this interactional setting, the family is gathered in the family room working on different projects independently. Lisa is trying to untangle a Christmas garland. Rick is reading to Joy, William is rocking in a rocking chair, and Marion is toddling around the room. Marion becomes tangled in the garland and Lisa becomes frustrated with untangling it. Rick offers to help her and as they work together, they notice William is being unsafe in the way he rocks the chair. He argues with them over the incidence, and the tape ends.

The interactional setting lasts only three minutes. Rick has only five turns with William. Almost half the turns are directives. Lisa has six turns with William, all of which are directives.

Interaction #8

During this interaction, Lisa and all the children play a board game while watching television. At first, the children pay more attention to the video than the game, and Lisa decides it should be turned off. When the children protest, she gives in, but insists they have to pay attention to the game. She controls the game and keeps the game going through imperatives such as, "Go," and using elliptical commands, such as calling the child's name, or announcing it to be a specific turn.

Baby Marion's naptime comes during the game. As Lisa is taking her upstairs, William offers to take his mother's place in the game. She agrees to have him roll for her.

From the start of the game, William appears sullen. When the game doesn't go the way he wants he becomes upset, and tries to manipulate the cards. When Lisa addresses William, her voice is stern. The two seem to be at odds throughout the game until Lisa takes Marion to lie down. At that point, William offers to take Lisa's turns for her. She agrees. While she is out of the room, the children continue the game, with William acting on Lisa's behalf. Lisa teases and is verbally playful throughout the game, but this activity is primarily directed at her daughters.

This interaction lasts eighteen minutes. During this interaction, Lisa has forty-six turns with William. Eighteen of the interactions are directives, which make up more than a third of the turns.

Types of Directives

As has been found to be the case among the other three families, the most common type of directive used by the Vietchs is the imperative. As noted earlier, Rick uses every available type of directive at least one time, while Lisa, like Patrina Danson, has a much narrower range of directives. The form and meaning of the directives used in the Vietch data most often conforms to the ways directives have been presented both in the literature and in the current data. Therefore, only those directives in which some significantly different facet of usage has been found will be presented. Directives will be presented in order of frequency of use.

TABLE X

VIETCH – DIRECTIVES

INTERACTIONAL SETTINGS

Directive Type	Valentines	Father, Children Meal	Homework	Family Time		Going Out		Family Meal		Xmas Decorating		Game Mother, Child
	F	F	F	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	M
Aggravated Directives												
Imperative		3	2	4	6		5	2	4		1	5
Imbedded Imperative	3		1	1	1			1			1	9
Permission Provisions							1	1	1	3		1
Hearer's Need						3	1	2				
Speaker's Need								1				
Pseudo-Mutual Requirements			1					3				
False Collab.	1			1								
Question Dir.	2	1				2	1	1	1	2		1
Tag Question		1	1			2		1	1			
Pronouncement		1		1		2						
Directive by Example												
Suggestions												
Mitigated Directives												
Proposal for	1					2	1	1				

220

Directive Type	Valentines	Father, Children Meal	Homework	Family Time		Going Out		Family Meal		Xmas Decorating		Game Mother, Child
	F	F	F	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	M
Aggravated Directives												
Joint Action												
Permission Directives			2									
Hints												
Explanation Directives	1		2	1	1				1			
Singular Suggestions	5		3						1			

Imperatives and Imbedded Imperatives

In Interaction #1, after giving Rick the special one he made for him, William decides to make more Valentines for other significant people in his life, but he needs more supplies. Rick verbally guides him through steps of locating more paper in a storage closet.

4.114) Will: I want to write a Valentine's, um thing for Mom and uh for..
Rick: Do you want some red paper?
Will: Yeah.
Rick: Um..**if you look in the closet in the hall, Will, across from the bathroom…**
Joy: (Sing-song) Pass the tape please!
Will: Okay, just a minute, let me (??????) Okay.
Joy: (Still singing) Pass the tape!
Rick: Can you pass Joy the tape?
Will: (Whining) I'd like to know where the tape is!
          (Back to regular voice) Oh yeah. Never mind.
Rick: Bonk. Okay, Will, **if you turn on the hall light in that closet across from the bathroom,**
Will: Yeah?
(4 second pause)
Rick: Okay that one that that plastic, storage container that has the slide Drawer on it-
Will: Alright, I see it I see it I see it!
Rick: Yeah, that's got the paper in it.
(7 second pause)
Will: I can't find any red paper.
Rick: **You might have to dig a little bit but there is some red in there.**

Will: If I can't find red, I'll, I'll get pink.
Rick: Yeah, pink's even good for Valentine's, huh.
(4 second pause)
Will: Yeah? (3 second pause) Nope, I can't find any.
Rick: You sure? There's not a pad in there?
Will: Oh, there's not…let me see.
Rick: **You might have to kind of dig for it in the bottom there's**
        A lot of paper of paper there.
Will: Hey yeah, there we go.
Rick: I thought there was…

Rick uses a number of "if" statements that frame the imperatives and act to soften what would otherwise be bald commands. He uses these "if" statements to physically effect William's actions such as, "if you turn on the hall light," meaning "Turn on the hall light." He follows these statements with explanations, "Yeah, that's got the paper in it.," the mitigated "hearer's need statement," "You might have to dig for it in the bottom there's a lot of paper there.," and statements that agree with William's ideas, "Yeah, pink's even good for Valentine's, huh." All of these directives are surrounded by softeners that help to mitigate status between the parent and child, and act to address the child's positive face needs. The child is given responsibility to meet his own needs, yet is fully supported by his father.

Throughout Interaction #1, Rick uses only three "imbedded imperatives." The use of this kind of directive follows the pattern of making a personal request, or asking the child to do something which the parent believes may be perceived as an imposition through a polite request, that is an "imbedded imperative" as the preferred choice of directives. In these cases, Rick asks William to help his sister, and in the others, he asks William to do him personal favors.

Rick's use of language in this sequence is anything but status conscious, or authoritative. He seems much more conscious of developing connections with his son. He does this by using suggestions and explanations as frames for describing where to find the paper. In addition, he supports William's suggestion that if red is unavailable, pink would be appropriate for the Valentines.

In Interaction #2, Rick precedes his use of the imperative with several announcements and explanations that are intended to prepare the children to act when he does give the command.

> 4.115) Rick: It's almost time to come to the table, okay?
> (voice rising with humor) Are you listening?
>
> (PAUSE 3:04)
> Rick: Okay, William? **Come to the table, come to the..up and eat.**
> Will: (Still watching TV) Wow!
>
> (Children obey and settle in quietly at bar overlooking family room,
>
> PAUSE 2:30)

He uses "Okay" in a post-posed position, which both commands their attention and cooperation and checks their comprehension, then follows up with the "question directive" "Are you listening?" and finally issues the bald command, "Come to the table, come up and eat."

As the setting continues, Rick uses the imperative to direct his children's attention to some visual humor in the TV special they are watching.

> 4.116) Rick**: Notice the elf has Mickey Mouse ears on?**
> Will: And look at Santa. He's playing golf, <u>inside.</u>

Again, the imperative is softened by the use of rising intonation at the end as he frames the command as a question. William picks up on his father's intention and shares his own points of interest in the scene, using the same imperative structure, "Look" as an attention getting device. There is a pause in the interactions between father and children as they continue to watch the show.

In Interaction #5, where the family is preparing to go out, a series of directives using a variety of directive strategies appear in order to get William back on task. Both Lisa and Rick interact with William in this interactional sequence.

4.117) Lisa: **Uh, the <u>ball</u> is never thrown in the house. Please put it on the back porch. One…if I get to three I'm taking the ball.**

Rick: (???????)

Will: But I'm not doing anything.

Lisa: Two/.

Will: I don't! (Breathing heavy, then crying) You're really irritating me. (Sound of bouncing)

Lisa: **Take it all time now.**

Will: Nooooo! I - Noooo! I'll go! I'll go! I'll-

Lisa: **We don't <u>ever</u> through this ball in the day room. I'm throwing it out.**

Will: No it isn't!

Lisa: You can whine some more.

Will: (to father) What are <u>you</u> looking at?

Rick: (Quiet, stern voice) **Don't take that attitude with me, William.** (7 second pause)
(To Lisa) Wh-where is the clothes William needs to put on?

Lisa: Upstairs. His shirt's upstairs in the [???].

Rick: **[You need to] go start on that now. [You have a choice of -]**

Lisa: [-I don't]   know where his Pants/ … oh there.

Rick: You have a choice of starting on that or having a time out in the Dining room.

Will: (Clears throat).

Rick: And you have until three to make your choice, but I'm going to add To your time. One. Two…**What's your choice?** (Pause)
Is it to put your clothes on or gonna take time out?

Will: Why do I have to tell <u>you</u>?
Rick: (Very quietly) **You want more time for that attitude?**
Will: (Shouting) I just said why will I have to tell you!
Rick: It doesn't require an explanation.
        (Turns attention to Joy)
        (???) kind of picture, hmmmm?
        (??????)
Joy: (Whining) How—Dad, how long?
Rick: Oh, it won't be real long honey.

The first imperative, used by Lisa, is surrounded by a pronouncement and an explanation directive, and is preceded by "please." However this polite request is not meant to soften the statement, but to create distance through formality, which emphasizes Lisa's parental authority and status. When William tries to negotiate with Lisa, which in essence challenges her, she issues another imperative that delivers consequences for his attitude and behavior.

When Rick enters the interaction, he uses a combination of the imperative and hearer's need statement, which emphasize his status and authority. He also uses a "permission provision" to withdraw permission from William to continue his course of action. The encounter also includes question directives, which will be discussed below.

Question Directives and Quasi-Questions

The "question directives" that appear in Interaction #1 by Rick Vietch occur together. He uses this directive to guide William in looking in a box to find pink and red paper to make more Valentines. This particular use is different from the previous data analyzed. "Question directives" have been used to help a child recall learned information, but in this case, Rick is directing William "to look again."

4.118) Rick: You might have to dig a little bit but there is some red there.
　　　 Will: If I can't find red, I'll, I'll get pink.
　　　 Rick: Yeah, pink's even good for Valentines, huh.
　　　　　 (pause)
　　　 Will: Yeah? (pause) Nope, I can't find any.
　　　 Rick: **You sure? There's not a pad in there?**
　　　 Will: Oh, there's not…let me see.
　　　 Rick: You might have to kind of dig for it in the bottom there's
　　　　　 a lot of paper there.
　　　 Will: Hey yeah, there we go.

The first question directive directs William to look again while the second is meant to

activate a conceptual vision of what the child is looking for. Rick has experience with

the box of paper and remembers what form the red paper was in which he conveys to

William with a question.

In Interaction #2, Rick uses the "question directive" with the imperative and an

explanation to direct William's actions.

4.119) Rick: You least the sound, honey.
　　　　 (firmly) **William! Where are you go, come <u>back</u> up here**.
　　　　 You're not through eating. This is just like the <u>table</u> even
　　　　 though we're eating at the counter.

He uses the question directive "Where are you going" to imply what he then says openly,

"Come back here." Apparently William is not making the correct implication, and

complying with the directive because Rick stops even before finishing his "question

directive" and switches to a bald command and an explanation, which is also a directive

that William must sit down and finish his meal. Further explanation follows placing

parameters on this novel setting.

In Interaction #5, as mentioned above, Rick uses a variety of directives when he

and William engage in a confrontation. Following his use of the imperative that clearly

establishes his authority, Rick announces that William has choices, to either obey and get

ready to go or to have consequences of time out. After allowing time for William to

process the choices, he directs him to make the choice using a question.

4.120) Will: (to father) What are <u>you</u> looking at?
   Rick: (Quiet, stern voice) **Don't take that attitude with me, William.**
    (7 second pause)
    (To Lisa) Wh-where is the clothes William needs to put on?
   Lisa: Upstairs. His shirt's upstairs in the [???].
   Rick: **[You need to]**
    go start on that now. [You have a choice of -]
   Lisa: [-I don't]   know where his
     Pants/ … oh there.
   Rick: You have a choice of starting on that or having a time out in the
     Dining room.
   Will: (Clears throat).
   Rick: And you have until three to make your choice, but I'm going to add
    To your time. One. Two…**What's your choice?**
    (Pause)
    Is it to put your clothes on or gonna take time out?
   Will: Why do I have to tell <u>you</u>?
   Rick: (Very quietly) **You want more time for that attitude?**
   Will: (Shouting) I just said why will I have to tell you!
   Rick: It doesn't require an explanation.
    (Turns attention to Joy)
    (???) kind of picture, hmmmm?
    (??????)

William continues to challenge his father, which lead Rick to the second question

directive "Do you want more time for that attitude?" which provides William with

additional choices, again, to obey and cooperate, or suffer additional consequences. Rick

uses the question directives to place the responsibility for his actions squarely on

William's shoulders, and to widen the gap in their status. However, it will be by making

a choice that William chooses to either ameliorate the gap and once again re-enter an

intimate relationship with Rick, or negative consequences that will further the gap between their statuses.

Lisa also uses question directives, but they only appear once in each of three different settings. They all take the form of "Why don't you X?" A question for information either precedes or follows the directive. The following example is taken from Interaction #5 as Lisa and William have come home from shopping.

4.121) Will: I knew what you were talking about.
Lisa: **Then why don't you give me a dollar?**
Do you not understand why you need to give me a dollar/ -
If you don't understand that, then I'll [explain it again.]
Will: [I sort of .]
Rick: You understand it, but you just don't want to do it.
Am I right?
(Very quietly) **Am I right?**

Lisa is directing William to give her money, which he does not want to do. She asks him if he understands why he owes her money in order to move along the process of getting him to give her the money.

Rick also uses a question directive to confront William with his reluctance to pay his mother what he owes her. This kind of question directive has been analyzed in the Harre and Sands data, where a parent confronts a child with knowledge they believe the child has, and making the child acknowledge they know what he or she is doing, but wants to pretend to be ignorant. It forces the child to acknowledge the mind game he or she is playing, and that the parent is accurate in their assessment of the situation. Rick uses post-posed questions that function as directives in this manner throughout the data.

Permission Provisions

While Rick only uses one "permission provision" throughout the entire body of data, it is a directive that Lisa uses in several situations. The most frequent use of this directive type is during Interaction #8 when she and the children are alone together playing a board game. She uses this directive nine times. It is used as a device to direct the game, allowing a child to take his or her turn, or stopping action by withdrawing permission when a child is acting and it is not his or her turn, or is acting inappropriately during the turn.

> 4.122) Lisa: I know you're, **okay Will**. Your turn, buddy.
> Joy: I am out of cards.
> Lisa: I think uh, well-uh! **You can't just grab one and put it back**.
> Will: Ahhhhh!
> Lisa: Blue.
> Will: Ahhh, ahahahah! (Pounds table) Ow!

Lisa permits Will to go by signaling him with the permissive "Okay," then officially handing him his turn with "Your turn, buddy." During his turn, she then rescinds permission for Will to take a card, look at it, and return it to the deck when he doesn't like what awaits him.

Pseudo-Mutual Agreement

Also found in Interaction #5 is the "pseudo-mutual agreement," which Lisa uses twice, both times concerning watching TV. The first time she intends for the television to be turned off, and phrases it as a "pseudo-mutual agreement."

4.123)　　　(TV playing in the background)
　　　　Lisa:　Oh, I got a RED. No, she get the double yellow.
　　　　　　　　You're not, William, not paying attention.
　　　　　　　　Let's turn this off ['cause we can't see it in the kitchen.]
　　　　Will:　　　　　　　[Nooooooo!]
　　　　Joy:　　　　　　　　[Nooooooo!]
　　　　Lisa:　Yes, Will. Pay attention to the game then.
　　　　Will:　I am.
　　　　Lisa:　Okay.

She uses the form of a proposal for joint action, but in reality, only one person could

actually accomplish this act, and it is clear she is the only one who is interested in having

the television off. Although in her status and authority she could follow through with the

proposal and turn off the show, and she even goes so far as to say, "yes" when her

proposal is rejected, she gives in to the children's begging, and issues an imperative to

maintain her authority, "Pay attention to the game, then."

Pronouncements

The pronouncement is an impersonal statement, which often announces an

upcoming event, such as mealtime or bedtime, and carries with it the obligation of the

hearer to participate and perform related expected behaviors. In the case of the four

families studied, including the Vietch's, pronouncements act to conclude one activity and

initiate another. It is also often used as a transition between activities.

In the data of the interactional settings provided by the Vietch family, Rick uses

pronouncements to begin the bedtime process in Interaction #1, making Valentines. In

Interaction #2, the TV meal, he announces that dinner is ready, which brings the children

to the table. He also uses it to express expected behaviors and consequences to his son in

Interaction #4, the family diner, and Interaction #5, preparing to go out. The following

example is from Interaction #4.

4.124) Will: Dad, can you please turn it /up?
        Rick: **It's self-serve on the T.V., so..**

Rick is advising William that the responsibility to take care of the problem of the volume

of the TV is up to William, but he uses an impersonal explanation to frame the directive.

The Vietch family is the only one that demonstrates this use for this type of directive.

Both Rick and Lisa Vietch use the "pronouncement" in this manner on one occasion

each. They use it as a way to focus on the behavior that is expected rather than on those

involved: child as performer or parent as direct authority. Although they are diminishing

their status, at the same time, the person issuing the pronouncement must be imbued with

authority to deliver it, while the hearer is placed under obligation to comply.

Explanations as Directives

Similar in ways to the pronouncement is the "explanation as directive." An

interesting feature of note in Rick Vietch's patterns of directives is his use of this type of

directive. He often precedes or follows his directives with explanations. Whereas it is

not uncommon for a parent to use a passive construction in giving directives regarding

universal laws of behavior, or use explanations as a kind of directive, as in the "Hint,"

Rick incorporates both the directive and the explanation. He uses an explanation alone as

a directive only once in the data provided.

Comparison of Mother and Father

As would be expected, the setting, goal of interaction and participants present has a strong effect on the way linguistic elements take shape. It is also evident that the gender of the child as well as the gender of the parent has a significant effect on the linguistic features.

While Lisa's interactions with William often contain conflict, her manner of dealing with him is firm, yet her voice is usually gentle. She uses language that separates their status, and emphasizes her authority, but her tone of voice softens the language. She also incorporates humor into her interactions when she is with the children, but it does not appear specifically in interactions with William. The kind of humor she uses with them includes using silly voices, adopting different characters, making up silly words and using them with the children in playful situations, as well as teasing them about what is occurring at the moment. She seems to have an energetic personality which contributes to her interactional style.

Her interactions with Rick are quite different. Her wit is sharp and her humor is dry. Their conversations are clearly on an adult level, and include topics of work, extended family, family management, and ideas. Her choice of language is more sophisticated. She is more active in conversations with Rick. She shows characteristics of enjoying involvement in conversations, but her temperament and interactional style are medium involvement. Her interactions and vocal qualities alter between speaking partners in the same conversation, gentle and warm with the children, matter of fact and sophisticated with Rick. In situations where she and Rick are together with the children, they cooperatively manage the situation.

Rick has a more high involvement interactional style than his wife. He talks much more than Lisa although he seems to have a more relaxed temperament in contrast to her energetic one. Nevertheless in the data provided, he appears easily engaged in activity and conversation. He initiates most of the conversations with William. As pointed out earlier, he tries to help William process experiences and stretches him cognitively. It appears he easily shares his own thoughts and feelings, which come just short of lecturing. His use of humor is gentle and pointed at the situation, and sometimes himself, but not at the child. He seems easily approachable, and to value his relationship with his son. He works to establish connections and increase intimacy. Both of these observations are backed by the fact that in this data, he initiates conversations with William, and tries to engage him in deeper emotional topics than any of the other parents do. He emphasizes this over his own status, and often mitigates directives and softens his language rather than work to establish his authority. This occurs as long as he, or long-established family rules are not directly challenged. When William tries to cross the boundaries, Rick seems to be quick to take control and mete out consequences intended to help William make better choices of behavior.

There are clear differences in the ways the mother and father interact with their son William. Rick, in particular, stands out among all the fathers as having a different approach to his son in the data of the interactional settings the family provided. Of note is that he uses fewer imperatives in comparison with the other fathers, regardless of situation. In addition, throughout all the data of the Vietch family, Rick uses fifteen types of directives, the greatest diversity of any parent. Rick does not use all the directives in all settings, but the distribution results in between one and four occurrences of a broader

range of directives in each interactional setting than among the other fathers in the case study.

In addition, his interactions with William have many of the markings that have been identified as less powerful, such as using mitigating language, including apologies, tag questions, and polite phrases. He apologizes for misunderstandings and experiences his children share in which his son feels he is being treated unfairly. He appears to be more concerned with developing intimacy with his son than in showing his status and authority. This is demonstrated in the way he initiates interaction with his son, uses polite expressions, such as "Excuse me" when interrupting, and providing explanations for many directives as well as adding tag questions to show affiliation and agreement. He encourages processing of experiences and provokes evaluation of them, as well as examines emotions. At the same time, these features are mixed with traditionally masculine interactional styles.

For example, as William is doing his homework, Rick asks him to explain what they do in class with the material and how what he is doing works.

4.125) (Pause in William's reading English assignment out loud.)
    Rick: Are you done, Will?
    Will: No. (He continues with reading aloud.)
    Rick: Um, can I interrupt you? When you get to that part right
           there at the end, that subject, verb, pattern noun check thing,
           are, now, is that part of what you guys have learned, to say
           about that, or does that written on your sheet?
    Will: Well it's just, yeah. It's written on your sheet.
    Rick: Let me see it.
    Will: See? Cause it's subject, noun, verb, pattern one check.
    Rick: Oh.
    Will: Pattern one means…second (???).
           Pattern one means second (???) and the, I don't know why it's
           there, Dad.

Rick: But, but, you don't have it all written out, you know, you just kind
         of like a [code] thing, you just have initials for it, huh?
Will: [Huh?]
         Yeah.
Rick: An then, [then so you-]
Will: [That's, that's] how you write it.
Rick: Actually, so when you guys do that in a class, you all do, you can
         recite together as a group, the whole class recites these things?
Will: Yeah, oh yeah. All, all-
Rick: -That's sure neat. That's a real different
         Way than I ever learned to do, that kind of English, Will. I, I'm
         Impressed that you know all those [parts of speech].
Will: [How how'd] you do it?

Rick then explains how when he learned English grammar, he had to diagram sentences,

and he found it quite boring. He compares this method to his son's experience.

4.126) Rick: Sounds like that way to do it, you LEARN it better, cause you
                SAY it over and over again, and…Do you feel like you
                understand..why those words go where they go, and wh,
                [what role they play?]
       Will: [Not really. We] they just, they just, they you know, that just.
                I mean, I have no clue why you even to do Shurley. I mean,
                I don't even know who made it up, I mean/
       Rick: Well, somebody named Shurley, huh? Well, why do you think
                you're learning this stuff?
       Will: I don't know.
       Rick: You don't know? I mean, hasn't (??) talked about it in class?
       Will: No.
       Rick: Or has Mrs. H. said why you're doing this?
       Will: Hm-umm.
       Rick: Well, let me ask you, why do you think it would be useful to learn
                Those things?
                (5 second pause)
       Rick: Any ideas?
       Will: Mmmm..I want, like, hmmmmm
       Rick: There are some yummy pears. Will, can you eat more than one
                Pear, do you think if I slice two of them up?

The topic changes and William never really has to answer his father's question, but it has planted a seed and initiated a dialog for further analysis of the reasons behind what William is learning in school.

In this interaction, Rick shows interest in what William is doing. He begins with small talk and gives William power by asking him questions for information. He regains power when he relates his own experiences with learning English. At the same time he builds intimacy by telling about his personal experience and revealing his emotions toward it. He describes how different his experience learning English grammar was and how superior he thinks William's experience is, and why. He then attempts to get William to think through his own experience and analyze it. The interaction has elements of a lecture, which is often considered a male interactional strategy, and William responds to Rick's analysis questions as if it were, by answering, "I don't know Dad." in a voice that suggests he also doesn't care. Although at this point Rick is unsuccessful in accomplishing the analysis, he has worked hard to further build his relationship with his son and at the same time, provided him a foundation for furthering William's cognitive development.

In Interaction #1 Rick also uses mitigated speech and seems to value his relationship over his son over authority. As Rick watches the children make Valentines, William does not want Rick's interest in his work. Rick backs off, just short of apologizing.

> 4.127) Rick: So what are you guys doin' now, huh?
> Joy: How do you write Kim?
> Rick: K…
> Joy: K…
> Rick: (to William) You doin' more Valentine's still? Will, what are

you doing?
Will: (Whining) I'm makin' Valentine's for somebody, that's all.
Rick: OK, no I just asked you. I'm not looking.
I'm just asking what you're doing.

Rick responds to William's moodiness by attempting to reassure his son, rather than viewing this as a challenge to his authority, which is what it seems to be. Rick must suspect it is a special Valentine, and allows William privacy to complete it. Within a few minutes, William presents the finished Valentine to his father.

4.128) (Long Pause)

Will: (Exaggerated voice) This is for you!
Rick: For me?
Will: Umhmm.
Rick: Is it a Valentine for me?
Will: Yeah!
Rick: (Reading) Happy Valentine- Can you read it to me.
Will: (Reading) Happy Valentine's day to Dad. From me to y…
my.. me to you.
Rick: We can change it to be me.
Will: (Reading) I love you.
Rick: Ahh, thank you, Will. (Hug & pat) I love you too, buddy!
Thanks for my Valentine!

In example 4.127, William challenges his father's involvement, then in example 4.128, we find the reason behind the challenge. William has been making a Valentine for his father, which Rick must suspect. This is inferred, because of the response he has toward William's attitude since in other situations, he handles William's challenges with directives, and consequences as in the following example. Lisa is trying to organize the family to go out, and she catches William playing with a ball in the house, which we learn is never allowed. Rick is on the periphery watching.

4.129) Lisa: Uh, the <u>ball</u> is never thrown in the house. Please put it on the
                 back porch. One…if I get to three I'm taking the ball.
        Rick: (???????)
        Will: But I'm not doing anything.
        Lisa: Two/.
        Will: I don't! (Breathing heavy, then crying) You're really irritating me.
                 (Sound of bouncing)
        Lisa:**.** Take it all time now
        Will: Nooooo! I - Noooo! I'll go! I'll go! I'll-
        Lisa: We don't <u>ever</u> throw this ball in the day room. I'm throwing
                  it out**.**
        Will: No it isn't!
        Lisa: You can whine some more.
        Will: (to father) What are <u>you</u> looking at?
        Rick: **(Quiet, stern voice) Don't take that attitude with me, William.**
                 (7 second pause)
                 (To Lisa) Wh-where is the clothes William needs to put on?
        Lisa: Upstairs. His shirt's upstairs in the [???].
        Rick: **[You need to]**
                 go start on that now. [You have a choice of -]
        Lisa: [-I don't]   know where his
                 pants/ … oh there.
        Rick: **You have a choice of starting on that or having a time out in**
                 the dining room.
        Will: (Clears throat).
        Rick: **And you have until three to make your choice, but I'm going to**
                 add to your time. One. Two…What's your choice?
                 (Pause)
                 Is it to put your clothes on or gonna take time out?
        Will: Why do I have to tell <u>you</u>?
        Rick: **(Very quietly) You want more time for that attitude?**
        Will: (Shouting) I just said why will I have to tell you!
        Rick: **It doesn't require an explanation.**
                 (Turns attention to Joy)
                 (???) kind of picture, hmmmm?
                 (??????)
        Joy: (Whining) How—Dad, how long?
        Rick: Oh, it won't be real long honey.

In Interaction #2, Rick also expresses his authority in very clear terms.

4.130) Rick**:** You least the sound, honey.
                 (firmly) **William! Where are you go, come <u>back</u> up here**.

You're not through eating. This is just like the <u>table</u> even though we're eating at the counter.

In these two interactions, Rick clearly establishes his authority and power over William. In the first, William continues to overtly challenge his father. Rick uses bald commands in imperative forms that set boundaries on William's behavior, yet give him choices with consequences. By refusing to provide William with an explanation, "It doesn't require an explanation," he particularly moves to separate William's status from his.

In the second example, William does not overtly challenge Rick, but his behavior evokes a bald command, firmly issued, with an explanation attached from Rick, "Come back up here you're not through eating yet."

Rick uses other traditionally male to male interactional styles to relate to his son. William tries to get help from Rick, hinting Rick do something for him that he himself is capable of doing. Rick offers suggestions, but does not do what William wants.

4.131) Will: (Growling) I want to know where that paper [is!]
　　　　Rick: (exaggerated copy of William's voice)　　　[It's] up here.
　　　　Will: Where?
　　　　Rick: It's on the counter right here.
　　　　Will: Need a chair, need a chair, need a chair.
　　　　Rick: Well, you can stand up if you want.
　　　　Will: I don't feel comfortable.
　　　　Rick: Uhh, you don't feel comfortable unless you're sittin'.
　　　　Will: Please, I need a [chair].
　　　　Joy:　　　　　　　　　[I know] how to spell black.
　　　　Rick: Spell.

William wants his father to get him a chair, but Rick resists. Although he offers William solutions, he does not solve the problem for him, and turns his attention away from William to his younger sister when his son makes his request explicit.

Lisa interacts with William much less than Rick, however she uses the same amount of directives in percentages as Rick, although with considerably less variety. She primarily employs imperatives, except in Interaction #8 when she and the children are alone playing a board game. In this interaction, she uses the permission provision and the psuedo- mutual requirement extensively. She rarely uses the mitigated directives that West found in use among female doctors. However, relationships between mothers and children have vastly different expectations than those between a doctor and a patient. Although doctors are caregivers, their role does not include the full range of responsibility and socializing of a patient as a mother or other primary caregiver does with a child. The patient usually maintains that responsibility. A mother must be authoritative, and at the same time she must build a relationship with the child. She must make decisions on the child's behalf that the child may challenge and reject, and she will still have to go through with them.

In her interactions with William, she does not incorporate explanations as often as Rick, and her negotiations with him are few. She negotiates with William on one occasion, when they have just come home and are preparing to go out for the evening again. Lisa attempts to get William to pay her money he owes her by negotiating with him.

> 4.132) Will: I knew what you were talking about.
> Lisa: **Then why don't you give me a dollar?**
> Do you not understand why you need to give me a dollar/ -
> If you don't understand that, then I'll [explain it again.]

Will: [I sort of .]
Rick: You understand it, but you just don't want to do it.
       Am I right?
       (Very quietly) **Am I right?**

The negotiation stops when Rick makes a blunt observation about William's behavior, which Lisa has hinted at through her negotiations. Here Rick uses an authoritative strategy of calling William out, while Lisa has been using a mitigated strategy of negotiation in an attempt to continue her intimate relationship with William. Rick comes to Lisa's rescue and puts an end to the negotiations as seen with Adam Harre on behalf of his wife, and in Sam Sands' interactions in solving his wife's and daughter's design differences.

Although Lisa demonstrates in the above example that she does negotiate with William, in the data provided, she maintains an authoritative relationship with him. When she initiates conversations with him, it is usually in the form of a directive. He does not initiate conversations with her. Their interactions are based in the present, and do not involve feelings or ideas, but rather actions or behaviors. These interactions are in stark contrast to the interactions she describes in the interview that she has with William when they are alone.

One example of her use of authoritative speech also comes from Interaction # 5, during the family's preparations to go out.

4.133) Lisa: **Uh, the <u>ball</u> is never thrown in the house. Please put it on the back porch. One…if I get to three I'm taking the ball.**
       Rick: (???????)
       Will: But I'm not doing anything.
       Lisa: Two/.
       Will: I don't! (Breathing heavy, then crying) You're really irritating me. (Sound of bouncing)

Lisa: **Take it all time now.**
Will: Nooooo! I - Noooo! I'll go! I'll go! I'll-
Lisa: **We don't <u>ever</u> through this ball in the day room. I'm throwing it out.**
Will: No it isn't!
Lisa: You can whine some more.
Will: (to father) What are <u>you</u> looking at?
Rick: (Quiet, stern voice) Don't take that attitude with me, William.
  (7 second pause)
  (To Lisa) Wh-where is the clothes William needs to put on?
Lisa: Upstairs. His shirt's upstairs in the [???].

In this interaction, Lisa acts decisively and authoritatively, yet William continues to challenge her. In the final step of her delivering consequences, William attempts to draw her into negotiating. Again, Rick is drawn into the interaction as William turns his challenges from his mother to his father, who has been watching. This causes Rick to have to take part, and he again rescues Lisa, meting out the consequences she set up.

While Lisa uses authoritative linguistic structures, her tone often mitigates them. While her directives clearly delineate status, and place her in authority, they are quite often delivered in soft, undulating tones. If she does not seem to work as hard as Rick in developing and maintaining a relationship with William by talking to him about emotions or analyzing situations, it is perhaps because this has already occurred in private.

One example of her use of mitigated tones occurs during Interaction #7 as the family is gathered in the family room, each doing different things. While Lisa is untangling a Christmas garland, she notices William in a dangerous position in the rocking chair.

4.134) Lisa: (to Rick) I hate this time of year.
             (to Will) Please don't rock like that.
Rick: Remember what happened before? With the chair?
        Will? [When Joy was -]

Will: [Yeah, but I'm] not rockin' that way.
Rick: [Well?}
Lisa: [Hmmm. (?????)].
Will: I'm rockin' [forward].
Lisa: **[We asked] [you not to do it.].**
Rick: [You can still tip that way.]
Lisa: **The only way you can do that chair is to sit on your bottom.**
Will: I <u>am</u> sitting on my bottom!
Lisa: **Not like [/that\].**
Rick: [You were] on your knees, Buddy.
Will: One foot barely under the other.

In this interaction, Lisa brings attention to William's misuse of the rocking chair, and both parents negotiate with William in an attempt to change his behavior. Lisa mitigates the directives by saying "We asked you not to do it," and in her tone of voice, which remains soft. Both Lisa and Rick offer explanations. Rick's directives and explanations point back to past tragedy and potential consequences while Lisa explains the correct way to sit in the chair. In this particular instance, Lisa seems to be using a male interactional strategy of adhering to the rules, while Rick is using explanations.

One interaction that is strikingly different from any other is Interaction #7, when Lisa plays a board game with William, Joy, and baby Marion. From the beginning she oversees the game, making sure the game progresses and each of the children is playing according to the rules and gets his or her turn.

4.135) Lisa: **Okay**, gonna go first. Go ahead.
                (to Will) 'kay,(?????) yet, buddy?
        Will: (Whining) Mom! (?????)
        Lisa: She's not. [You don't have to do that.]
        Will: [(?????????????????????)]
        Lisa: **Okay, Joy.** Here up on the coo, pile of cards okay.
                (funny voice) Want a (?????) by me? Please?
        Will: Don't look at me.
        Lisa: **Draw a card. You got…double yellow. Draw another yellow**.
        Joy: I..

```
Lisa:    I. Oh, I got a red. No, she gets the double yellow.
         **You're not, William, not paying attention.**
         **Let's turn this off 'cause we [can't see it in the kitchen.]**
Will:                                    [Noooooooo!]
Joy:                                     [Noooooooo!]
Lisa:    **Yes, Will. Pay attention to the game then.**
Will:    I am.
Lisa:    Okay.
         (5 second pause)
Lisa:    **Okay, um. Now, No!**
Will:    I'm trying to get off one!
Lisa:    **Now. It's your turn. You can (????).**
```

During the interactions, she first insists that the children pay attention to the game, in spite of the TV being on. When they protest, she mitigates her response, and does not follow through even while saying the TV will be turned off. She lessens her authority in doing this, yet seems to gain the children's cooperation. She does not refer to the TV again, until the end of the setting. There are constant reactions between William and Lisa. As usual, William is thorny, and reacts strongly to anyone interacting with him, however Lisa's interactions show that she believes William isn't obeying the rules of the game, and she is challenging him. Lisa primarily uses permission provisions, including "no," "okay," and "you can X" along with statements announcing whose turn it is, such as "It's your turn." There are also imperatives, such as "go" to keep the action moving.

Her interactions with William are often directives that he interprets as challenges. Although she commiserates with the children when they receive a penalty card, as well as celebrates with them when they pick up a card that lets them progress in the game, this occurs more with her daughters than with William. William is more competitive, and his attitude is quite negative when he is behind, sometimes leading him to try to manipulate

the game to his advantage. This allows very little relationship building to occur between Lisa and William during this interaction while she tries to make sure the game is being played fairly.

Conclusion of the Vietch Family's Interactions

While Lisa and Rick have very different ways of interacting with William, when together, the examples above show how they work in concert, as they described in the interview. In characterizing each of the parent's interactions with William, Rick appears to work more at building a relationship with William than Lisa does, trying to involve William in dialog. Her interactions with William are primarily based in the here and now, dealing with time and behavior management issues. Yet as discovered in the analyses of the three other families, Rick still seems to have the final authority.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Findings Regarding Gender

Each of the parents in the study seemed to show a remarkable trend toward following the patterns of adult interactional styles described in the literature in regard to his or her own gender during interactions with his or her son or daughter (Aries, 1982; Coates, 1996; Ervin-Tripp & Lambert, 1992; Freed, 1991; Fishman, 1990; Hobbs, 2003; Holmes, 1998; Leet-Pellegrini, 1980; Macauley, 2001; Maltz & Borker, 1998; Meunier, 1996; Mulvaney, 1994; Ochs, 1992; Pillon, Degauquier, & Duquesne, 1992; Sheldon, 1991; Tannen, 1990). In addition, the gender of the child also seems to influence the interactional style of the parent, which has been noted in earlier studies (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle, & Fivush, 1995; Belsky, 1979; Bronstein, 1984; Cherry & Lewis, 1978; Clarke-Stewart, 1978; DeFrancisco, 1992; Lamb, 1977; Russell & Russell, 1987, 1988; Siegal, 1987).

Mothers

Laura Harre and Betty Sands, the mothers of daughters Rachel Harre and Cathy Sands, respectively, engaged in more language intended to build rapport than did most of the fathers, or than Lisa Vietch or Patrina Danson did with their sons. Laura and Betty

246

used explanations and mitigated directives, and spoke more often with their daughters in ways that tried to establish solidarity with them while attempting to gain their cooperation. In addition, they interacted more often with their daughters than Lisa or Patrina did with their sons.

Of the mothers, Laura Harre with 13 different types of directives, and Betty Sands with fourteen, show greater diversity in their choices of directives in comparison with Lisa Vietch, who used only nine different kinds of directives, and Patrina Danson who used only five different types.   Directive choices are closely tied to the situation in which they are used.

Mothers of Daughters

Although these mothers show a preference for solidarity and rapport, they do nevertheless display their status and enforce their authority in specific contexts. These include situations where the girls try to take control, are slow to cooperate, and challenge their mothers on issues where the mothers perceive they are the authority, such as decisions of maintaining home and health. This reveals that although each of these mothers prefers to have a relationship with their daughter that fosters intimacy and rapport, they are not willing to give up their authority for that closeness. Although their perceptions of boundaries of authority and status differ from the fathers, they do not allow their daughters to usurp authority and control.

It is also striking that Laura Harre usually mitigates her exertion of authority not long after she has made a move to establish her superior status. She accomplishes this through vocalizations such as sighing, a softer tone of voice when subsequently

addressing her daughter, and explanations of why she has made this move or her feelings about the situation. Both she and Betty Sands use humor to mitigate their authority and diffuse their daughters' challenges.

Both of these mothers include past, present and future events in the topics that arise. Their conversations with their daughters also include references to feelings, the mothers' own or a third person referent, and are found in topics that refer to present and future action.

As noted in studies on women's interactional choices, both these mothers use apologies with their daughters (Lakoff, 1973; Tannen, 1990). Laura Harre uses "real apologies" twice in attempts to restore her relationship with her daughter. Betty Sands also uses apologies, but they are "false apologies" as a strategy of exerting power while issuing directives to explain unacceptable behavior as reported in Glinert (1998) and Tannen (1994).

Mothers of Sons

In interactions with their sons, Lisa Vietch and Patrina Danson seem not to place as much emphasis on solidarity and rapport as Laura Harre and Betty Sands do. In addition, following the findings of Belsky (1979) that parents interact more with their children who share their sex. In the data provided, Lisa Vietch interacts with her son about a third less often than her husband, Rick, does and the amount of time they are together is half the amount of time as her husband. Half of the interactions Lisa has with their son William are directives. Also of note are Lisa's changing vocal qualities from one situation to another. When she is applying strategies of intimacy and rapport, she

often uses a soft, warm voice with William. However when William's challenges are especially strong, the quality of her voice develops a firm quality. This is especially noticeable when she and William come home continuing an argument about money he owes her, and increases later in the interactional setting when William brings a ball into the house and begins to play with it instead of getting ready to go out. In contrast, her vocal quality consistently has a firmer and deeper quality when talking to her husband in adult conversations. Lisa incorporates humor into many of her interactions. The adult conversations with her husband are often filled with sarcasm and dry wit. She engages in silly, light-hearted humor with her children on playful occasions, such as while playing a board game, and creating the "family diner."

However, another side of Lisa's personality develops as she and the children play the board game together, and further as they play "family restaurant." While she incorporates a great deal of humor in these situations, she very clearly is in charge of both, directing the events in a display of authority and status through bald commands.

Most of Lisa's interactions with her son are based in current activity and present action. She does not refer to feelings, as Laura Harre and Betty Sands do, and even as her husband Rick does. She does foreshadow upcoming events in the immediate future, however, as she reported she and Rick do with William to prepare him emotionally for transitions to other activities.

Patrina Danson interacts with her son much less than any of the other mothers do with their child, and close to two-thirds less than her husband, of which only twenty-two per cent are directives, again supporting the findings of Belsky (1979). The percentage of directives is again two-thirds less than Strom's. Her interactions primarily include

present activity, but include discussion of past or future events, and limited review of concepts her son has been learning, which seem to support findings in Bronstein's (1984) study of Mexican mothers and fathers interactions with their sons. There is some humor present in her interactions, but it is usually concrete. One exception is an occasion when Karl seeks attention from her and uses adult-world concepts applied to himself. While she does not initiate the humor, she clearly understands it and responds by giving Karl affection and teasing him in return.

Both mothers of sons give them responsibilities for their younger siblings, as well as expecting assistance from them on occasion. They give their sons responsibility for accomplishing assigned tasks without assistance. This may be due to other factors than gender of the child, such as the fact that both of these sons are oldest children. However, this variable was not part of the scope of this research.

Fathers

The fathers maintained their status throughout their interactions with their children by means of directives and providing explanations, which came close to lecturing on occasion, identified by Tannen (1990) as a male interactional feature. All of the fathers provided some explanation along with directives, including when the directive was intended to alter inappropriate behavior. This kind of behavior is also noted in Tannen (1990), and in Bronstein (1984). When the child persisted in unacceptable behavior, the fathers took action and delivered consequences. They did not mitigate their position of authority at that point. However, they did use mitigating strategies from their position of authority to maintain their relationship with the child. In comparing their use

of directives, the fathers all used a wide range of directives with Rick Vietch using 15, Strom Danson using 13, Adam Harre using 12, and Sam Sands using 11.

The fathers followed patterns of interaction described by Tannen (1990) as male strategies in their attempts at intimacy and solidarity. This occurs in their attempts to "fix" things, and to solve problems by coming up with solutions, rather than negotiating to a solution with a child. For example, both Adam Harre and Sam Sands stand back and listen to the negotiations between their wives and daughters, then step in to "fix" a problem by solving their disputes. Rick Vietch, too, engages in settling confrontations between his son and wife. Strom Danson brainstorms with his children, especially Karl, before coming up with a design for Karl's room. As Strom looks around the room and considers Karl's furniture, he announces, "Maybe we're just gonna have to get you an entertainment center, for this side, and a matching book shelf for the other side, as long as they're the same size, more or less." His statement uses the subject "we," displaying solidarity, referring to the family as a group caring for its members. Rick Vietch carefully explains to his son William where to find more paper for making Valentines.

The fathers also maintained a certain level of independence in their interactions with their wives and children, another male feature identified by Tannen (1990). This behavior seemed to stretch along a continuum among the different fathers. The father who seemed to exhibit the need for the most independence was Sam Sands, who participated verbally in the interactions found in the data of the Sands family less than was found in the data of the fathers of the other families. Adam Harre and Strom Danson had similar levels of independence. While they worked side by side cooperatively with their wives, and expected assistance from their children, the occasions on which they

were involved in activities with their children were highly directive rather than interactional. It was the children who most often initiated topics of conversation that extended beyond the present action. Finally, Rick Vietch stands at the opposite end from the spectrum of Sam Sands. While he performed action outside and alongside of his son's activities, and used frequent directives in several situations, he also initiated in-depth conversations with his son, and often softened or mitigated his speech. At the same time, when his wife was present, she often initiated directives, which Rick then backed up and acted as final authority.

Fathers of Daughters

Each of the two fathers of the daughters interacted differently with them than the other father. Adam Harre spent almost a third less time with his daughter than his wife, but he interacted with his daughter almost a third more than she did, which is contrary to the findings of Belsky (1979). It must be noted that Adam is a high involvement speaker with an extroverted personality. He shows interest in his daughter, and building intimacy with her, which is accomplished by providing answers for her questions, as revealed in the interview, and taking care of her. When issuing directives he clearly expects Rachel to comply. He remains calm, but does not mitigate his position of authority. Following a reprimand for a breech of behavioral expectations on her part, Adam is quick to move on and restore her face. He uses humor to diffuse volatile situations and restore harmony. He does not engage in physical play with her.

The fathers of daughters also displayed rescuing techniques of their daughters and wives throughout the data as a way of showing care and intimacy as Tannen (1990)

252

reports. On one occasion, Adam Hare rescues his daughter from leaving the dinner table unsatisfied. She has been complaining that she is hungry for meat, however her mother insists she needs to learn to eat less of it. Adam finds that the meat she had was "a lot of fat," and therefore she is permitted to have another piece. He rescues her on another occasion from sharp saw blades, of which Rachel is frightened, as father and daughter clean the basement.

Adam also intervenes in an altercation between his wife and daughter. Rachel challenges what her mother has directed her to do after the fact. While Laura Harre perceives the challenge as stemming form a misunderstanding on the part of her daughter, and apologizes, Adam perceives Rachel's challenge as a threat to parental status and authority. In essence, he "rescues" his wife from his daughter's challenge.

Another means of developing intimacy emerges from the interactions of Sam and Cathy Sands. Sam engages in frequent physical play with his daughter and teasing. In the interview he describes how they cuddle as he puts her to bed at night. The intimacy they share develops from non-verbal interactions.

This does not occur in the interactions between Adam and Rachel Harre. Their intimacy develops from verbal interactions. Adam, while he does not negotiate with Rachel, does provide lengthy explanations to her. He also enlists her assistance in accomplishing tasks together, which allows them time to explore topics of interest, and more extensive conversation.

In contrast, Sam Sands prefers physical interaction with his daughter, and uses physical humor as a significant means of directing her. Sam has a low-involvement style of interacting. He tends to remain on the periphery of interactions, and does not initiate

interactions except to give directives and solve problems often incorporating personal presence markers, such as "I think…" which has been found to be a much more common attribute of women's speech than men's (Sommers and Lawrence, 1992). Yet while he does not seem as involved in the settings with his daughter, he both is given and implicitly expects to have the final authority on any decisions.

Fathers of Sons

Between the fathers of the sons were found both important similarities in expectations and interactions, yet some differences in their approaches with each of their sons. Both the fathers of sons expected their sons to have a certain amount of autonomy in solving their own problems when the boys seemed to want assistance. An example occurs in the Danson family during dinner while mother Patrina is away. Son Karl introduces the topic of problems he had yesterday. Strom Danson listens and asks questions, but makes no suggestions about ways Karl might avoid these problems in the future, nor offers help or comfort to him in any way. This is similar to the findings Bronstein (1984) made in her study where fathers of boys behaved toward them in more achievement oriented ways.

This same type of interaction occurs between Rick Vietch and his son William. During the setting when William and his sister Joy are making Valentines, Joy remarks that Rick has shared his ice water with her. William accuses Rick of being unfair, because his father wouldn't share the ice water with him. Rick comments that William is right, he is being unfair, but that William could get his own water and add ice. Another instance occurs while the family is pretending to have a family restaurant; William wants

Rick to turn the volume up on the television. Rick tells William, "It's self serve on the TV, so…" In a third setting Rick is alone with William as he works on his homework. William announces in an irritated voice that he does not have a chair. Rather than providing any assistance, Rick suggests that William stand up as an option. William then openly asks his father for a chair, but is ignored.

However, there is a limitation to what may be inferred here. The primary variable influencing the interactions may be due to the boys as oldest children rather than their being boys.

Strom Danson shows a strong preference for high involvement interactions, especially with his children. During the experience of re-doing his son's room, there is little silence, and Strom dominates the conversation. He creates a running commentary to the children about possible arrangements as they look at the room's layout. The next day while painting, Strom thoroughly explains how to paint, and lectures each of the children when they are not careful to keep the paint contained. During dinner alone with his children, Strom talks only slightly less, while the children are much more involved in the conversation, but this interaction serves to build intimacy and connection. They discuss family history, and the activities in which they are engaging together, along with comments on present action.

Both Rick and Strom Danson stand out with their preferences for high-involvement interactions with their sons. While the data do not show Strom involved in the same kinds of interactions with his son as Rick and William Vietch, in his interview he expresses his desire to maintain intimacy, and uses talk as one means of maintaining it.

Rick, however, straddles the fence between the strategies women tend to use in establishing intimacy through talk, and men's ways of talking, both described by Tannen (1990). Rick Vietch's interactions with his son stand out in that while he maintains his authority when challenged and is quick to do so, at other times he makes overtures to his son that attempt to establish closeness and intimacy. He initiates conversations, tries to help William process his feelings, and spurs his son to think deeply about motives.

When Rick is drawn into a battle between his wife Lisa and his son William, he takes over as was observed in the data of Adam Harre, and delivers the consequences, which is clearly a masculine style interactional trait. Nevertheless, unlike the other fathers, he seems more interested in developing intimacy and rapport with William than maintaining his status. He mitigates directives with more softeners and polite expressions, and even apologizes when he disturbs his son or asks him for personal favors. He also initiates conversations and takes them to an intimate level that the other fathers have not been observed doing. However he does demonstrate that he is quite capable of establishing authority, especially when his son challenges him. He does not mitigate or soften his position during these interactions, nor offer explanations as the mothers do.

Use of Directives Among Families

There is a broad range among all the parents in the percentages of directives that occur in the interactions between each of them and their son or daughter. Among all the parents in the study, Laura Harre delivered the most directives, with fifty-seven per cent

of the interactions she has with her daughter being a directive. She is closely followed by Strom Danson, with fifty-six per cent of the interactions with his son being a directive.

In explaining this, the personalities of the children in these two families and the ways their parents interact with them is of primary importance. Rachel Harre is a high-involvement speaker, who seeks frequent attention and is eager to participate in whatever her parents are doing to the point of trying to control the situation, which puts her and her mother at frequent odds. Laura Harre reacts to Rachel's behavior linguistically, and finds herself in a position of giving frequent directives as a means of controlling the situation and Rachel's behavior.

While Karl Danson is also eager to participate in his family activities, he does not exert himself or try to control the situation. He seems to understand where the boundaries lie. Karl has an easy-going personality, and when he seeks attention, he uses subtler means, such as asking his father to tell about his childhood, or humorously engaging his mother in the topics the adults have been discussing. Strom Danson sets the boundaries in advance, rather than reacting, and makes it quite clear that he is in charge and what his expectations of Karl are. The primary occasion for the use of directives also takes place when Strom is directing Karl and his sister through activities, such as painting, dinner preparations, eating dinner, and preparing to go out.

In determining why there are fewer directives found in the interactions of the Sands with their daughter and the Vietchs with their son, especially when considering both of these children pose frequent challenges to their parents, specific strategies are found that are used to maintain parental control, yet do not include directives. These are found to occur in the linguistic data of the parent who interacts the most with the child.

257

For example, Betty Sands, who interacts far more with her daughter than her husband does, uses explanations and attempts at discussion as negotiating techniques to outline for her daughter what is acceptable or unacceptable behavior. Rick Vietch, who interacts more with his son than his wife does, also attempts discussion, gives explanations, makes suggestions, and allows his son to make choices, therefore allowing him more control over his circumstances within given parameters.

The parent who delivered the least number of directives is Patrina Danson, with only twenty-two percent of her interactions with her son being directives. The number of interactions she has with her son are far fewer than those of the mothers with their daughters. In comparison, Lisa Vietch, mother of the other son, has a third more interactions with her son than Patrina does with hers, even though the amount of time they spend together is very close to the same. In comparing use of directives, Lisa Vietch's interactions contain fifty-one percent directives. A comparison of the two boys' personalities also shows that this contributes to the amount of directives the mothers give. Once again, the personality of the child plays into the use of directives and the differences found. Both children show introverted qualities. As noted earlier, Karl Vietch is an easy-going child who does not challenge his parents in the data provided. He is also clearly aware of their expectations. William Vietch, on the other hand, is a child who is moody and often challenging in interactions with both his parents, even when he knows what their expectations are. Karl does not require the kinds of directives that are necessary with William. While Karl is eager to cooperate with his parents and complies with them readily, William seems to want to be left alone and only interact with his parents on his terms. He frequently challenges them.

Nevertheless, in the situations where William challenges his parents' rules, the incidence of directives increases significantly for both parents. As discussed earlier, in the setting of the family restaurant, Lisa and Rick interact more with each other than their children, while the types of activities they are engaged in with their son, are specifically geared to directing William to get his food and turn down the television. This causes the percentage of directives in this situation to increase to eighty per cent for Rick, and seventy per cent for Lisa. Two other settings include above average use of directives for the Vietchs. One is of Rick alone with the children in another meal setting while the children watch a Christmas special on television. The same kinds of situations occur as Rick directs them to the table, and outlines behavioral expectations since this is a special occasion and needs special direction. The second one involves getting ready to go out for the evening. Both parents are present in this situation. William comes home from shopping with his mother, and they enter the house having an argument. His challenges to parental authority over getting dressed up, then playing with a ball in the house, a behavior he knows is never permitted, continue throughout the rest of the setting, again escalating the percentage of directives used.

Comparisons within couples, show the greatest range is between Patrina and Strom Danson, with her directives accounting for only twenty-two percent of the interactions with their son Karl, and Strom's accounting for fifty-six per cent of his interactions with him. This is followed by the Harres. While Laura Harre's interactions include more than half directives, Adam Harre's interactions with his daughter include forty- percent directives. The Sands have very similar percentages of directives in their interactions: Sam's interactions include a usage of thirty-five per cent directives and

Betty's includes thirty-one percent. The Vietchs each use directives fifty percent of the time in their interactions with their son.

The most important underlying variables in determining the amount of directives includes the type of activity and the goal of the situation, and in some cases as well, whether or not the parents are together or alone. For the Harres, the number of directives was slightly higher when they were alone with their children, and when the activity was goal-oriented, which most of them were. In addition, Laura was faced with settling sibling disputes, contributing to a greater number of directives, something that did not occur when Adam was alone with them.

For the Vietchs, the most significant variable was the goal of the interaction. Even in non-goal oriented situations, interactions with directives most often occurred where Lisa or Rick was trying to get William to change his behavior. In general, being alone with their children did not affect the number of directives given by either of the Vietchs. In addition, throughout all the data of the Vietch family, Rick uses fifteen types of directives, the greatest diversity of any parent. Rick does not use all the directives in all settings, but the distribution results in between one and four occurrences of a broader range of directives in each interactional setting than among the other fathers in this case study. Among the fathers, the closest in comparison of number of directives is Adam Harre, who uses twelve different types of directives in the two settings from which his data are taken. Rick does not use all the directives in all settings, but the distribution results in between one and four occurrences of a broader range of directives in each interactional setting than among the other fathers in this case study.

In the interactions of the Sands, in the data, neither was ever alone with their daughter Cathy. The amount of directives in Betty's interactions was fairly consistent in both situations the family provided. The situations they provided in their data were vastly different, and the kinds of interactions that took place between Betty and Cathy were notably different. Betty gave slightly more directives in the situation where the three were engaged in re-doing Cathy's room, and the behavioral expectations for Cathy were not as clear. In the situation where Betty helped Cathy with her homework, even including the directives given in instructional sequences, Betty gave fewer directives. However, Sam interacted far less with Cathy while she worked on her homework, yet had a much higher percentage of directives in his interactions with her than while re-doing her room. Once again, these directives primarily occurred when Cathy challenged him over behavioral expectations, and presumably these were behaviors she would have already been aware were not acceptable.

In the incidence of the Dansons, the situation was the driving force behind the number of directives. Patrina delivered more directives when she and Strom were together making dinner than in any other situation. Strom gave more directives, however, when he was alone teaching his children how to paint. He also gave significantly higher directives during their meal outdoors, which focused on the routine of getting a meal started.

Influence of Gender on Interactions Between Parents and Children

In examining the first research question as to whether men and women are found to have the same gender-related language in their speech when they assume the role of parent and their conversational partner is their son or daughter, the results of this study

are clear that the fathers and mothers who participated do interact with their sons and daughters in ways that can be identified as gender-related and secondly, that the gender of the child does indeed affect the interaction. However, the mothers' and fathers' use of gender related features identified with adult interactional styles are not consistent. In the data provided through the audio taped interactions of each family, the conversations between mothers and their children were different than the conversations between the fathers and their children.

Features of Gender in Interactions

Women often do not seem to care about power, rather valuing rapport and consensus (Tannen, 1990) and perceiving talk as the central core of their relationships (Mulvaney (1994). In general in the findings of this study, the mothers seemed less interested in establishing their status and more interested in maintaining intimacy, especially the mothers with daughters. Among the fathers, all but one showed a preference for maintaining their level of authority and status, even while attempting to develop rapport and intimacy in their relationships with their son or daughter as has been described in the linguistic interactions among men (Tannen, 1990). However, as Tannen also points out, men do have their own set of behaviors that they use to show intimacy. These behaviors include taking care of people they love, such as solving problems for them and "rescuing" them in difficult situations. The fathers in this study showed these same kinds of behaviors throughout the data.

As Sheldon (1991) concludes, communication for the intent of building solidarity and establishing dominance can be found among both genders. For example as described

262

above, the fathers do have strategies for building intimacy, while occasions occurred in which mothers very clearly cared about exerting their power and establishing their status of authority. These situations were ones in which the mothers perceived they had an inherent right to expect the child to follow directives or behave according to the mother's expectations and the child challenged them. Some of the examples were altercations between siblings, flaunting previously established family rules, and not adhering to their mothers' requirements on personal care issues. In these cases the mothers incorporated the same kinds of strategies to achieve dominance that the fathers did, issuing bald commands and using other forms of highly aggravated directives.

Fathers behaved in the situations in much the same way as boys observed in playground games (Lever, 1978). The activities within each situation were rule-governed and goal-oriented, and at different levels each exerted independence, or expected the child to be independent, as described by Siegal (1987). While most of the fathers tended not to initiate conversations outside of presenting information, attempting to get information, or directing the child, they still valued intimacy with their child as evidenced both in their interactions and in information provided in the interviews. There were similarities among the strategies mothers and fathers used to achieve intimacy in some of the instances where this occurred, and also some strikingly different ways. As described earlier, the fathers primarily followed masculine style strategies used for developing or demonstrating intimacy which often included solving a problem or fixing a situation, rescuing someone, or requiring dependence of the child on the father. These behaviors follow descriptions by Tannen (1990). However on occasions, particularly during family meals, the fathers of the boys both showed qualities of being good listeners when their

sons wanted to express themselves, and also of being able to openly talk about their own childhoods. Rick Vietch, father of one of the sons, sometimes discussed his feelings about a situation. Both fathers of the daughters also showed qualities of being good listeners, although this was while they were in the background and the girls talked to their mothers. At these times, the fathers attempted to provide a solution to the problem under discussion.

Mothers tried to establish intimacy and rapport with their daughters through negotiation. These negotiations included explanations, and attempts at discussion trying to persuade the child to see things from her point of view, or to reach a compromise. Challenges when a child was asked to do something as a personal favor were perceived as misunderstandings or accepted as the mother's fault. She apologized in these instances. These mothers tended to mitigate their position of authority. One of the mothers of the sons negotiated on a very limited basis, while the other did not at all, and they did not use language to mitigate their authority, as in offering apologies. The connection seemed to already exist, and the boys sought intimacy and connection by taking responsibility in certain instances for their mothers when they wanted to, rather than the mother working at the relationship.

Studies that have previously been done which examine mothers' and fathers' interactions with their sons and daughters continue to be corroborated in part. As described earlier, the first study was performed by Bronstein (1984) among Mexican families. In her study she found that mothers' and fathers' interactions are significantly different from each other. The mothers in her sample spent more time in caregiving while the fathers spent more time in play, and also did more explaining and information

giving than did the mothers. There was also a difference based on the gender of the child. Fathers seemed more interested in the boys and gave them more attention than the girls. The kinds of activities they engaged in with each were also different. Fathers engaged in more cognitive and achievement oriented interactions with boys, and engaged more on a social level with the girls. She did not find an effect on the mothers' interactions.

Russell and Russell's (1987, 1988) study among Australian families found, however, that the mothers in their sample group were more active and enforced family management issues, and also provided the children with more information than the fathers did. The fathers did not seem to favor cognitive/achievement activities with sons over daughters, but engaged in more verbally playful activity and affectionate behavior than the mothers did.

In the current study, while the mothers and fathers showed significant differences in the ways they interacted with their sons and daughters, the ways they interacted were not consistent with either Bronstein's or Russell and Russell's findings.

In examining caregiving aspects of the parents in each family, there were differences among them. The parents of the sons both have demanding jobs. In the interview, they describe sharing responsibility for childcare based on their personality strengths and on the time constraints each faces with his or her job. In the data provided, there was evidence that supported this. The Dansons reported that when they were all home together, they all worked on dinner preparations together, and indeed, one of the interactional settings they provided showed this. In other interactional settings provided, when one of the parents had been away at work, the other parent prepared the meal. In

the Vietch family, Rick prepared dinner and guided the children through the meal when Lisa was at work. When Lisa was home, however, she prepared the meals. When they were home together, they shared the responsibility of caring for the children, and shared equally in providing directives.

Among the parents of the daughters, there was a clearer division of labor. In the interview with the Harres, they describe sharing decisions about and responsibility for childcare. However in the data provided, Laura seemed to carry more of the responsibility, because Adam was not home. When they were home together, as in one of the interactional settings they provided, everyone did participate in meal preparations, and Adam and Laura seemed equally involved with their daughter.

In the Sands family, they reported in the interview that Betty was responsible for most of their daughter's care, and that on occasion, she delegated certain responsibilities to Sam. It is very clear in the data that Sam takes very little responsibility for Cathy's care, although he has the final say on issues pertaining to her.

Another aspect of interactions between parents and children as noted by Bronstein (1984) and Russell and Russell (1987, 1988) is information giving. If one considers explanations as information, the fathers of sons in the current study do provide their children with more information than the mothers of the sons. However, the mothers of the daughters were also found to provide information to them in the situations where they were alone. Adam Harre, the father of one of the daughters also provided as information much as his wife to their daughter.

Regarding cognitive and achievement oriented interactions, both Strom and Patrina Danson and Rick Vietch, which includes both fathers of the sons, engaged their

child in interactions which activated cognitive processing. Betty Sands assisted her daughter in achievement test preparation, with some support from her husband, Sam. While neither Adam nor Laura Harre, parents of one of the daughters, engaged her in actual cognitive or achievement oriented interaction, they did discuss various subjects in school, and an upcoming achievement test, clearly establishing the importance of being able to achieve on a cognitive level.

While play and humor were most often incorporated into interactions, and not a separate kind of interaction, there were notable exceptions. Lisa Vietch, mother of one of the sons, did engage specifically in play with her children, adopting a different character and creating a family diner, and playing a board game with them. There appeared differing amounts and levels of playfulness and humor among the families. Aside from the two occasions described above in which Lisa Vietch set aside play time with her children, the Vietch family used more subtler levels of humor, including funny voices to soften directives, or pointing out humorous situations. Rick Vietch also used some physical humor when his swollen sinuses caused an unusual whistling noise his children begged to keep hearing.

Funny voice qualities were also used by Adam Harre when diffusing potentially volatile situations with his daughter. Both Adam and Laura Harre used mild sarcasm and irony with their daughter. Adam Harre also reported in the interview that he does spend time in physical play with his daughter, although this did not appear in the data. Strom Danson used irony and sarcasm pointed at the current situation with his son. While Patrina responded to humor that Karl instigated, she did not incorporate it into her own interactions with him. The Sands incorporated humor and physical play frequently into

their interactions that occurred while redoing Cathy's room. Though on a milder level, humor was also present in their second interaction while Cathy read out loud to them from one of her library books.

In characterizing the use of play in interactions with the children, the fathers were more likely to engage in it, as found in the previous studies, however mothers also engaged in it, depending on their personality. The gender of the child did not seem to have an affect on this type of interaction.

Additionally, there is no evidence in these data that the child in middle childhood expresses a preference for one parent over the other when requesting to have his or her needs met, particularly in the families that share caregiving. However, in the current study, differences are present in the ways both mothers and fathers interact with their daughters and sons which suggests the parents show a preference for gender. First of all, most of the parents in the study seemed to show a preference in attempting to establish intimacy with the child of the same gender, as first reported by Belsky (1979) when he discovered that parents interacted more with the child of the same gender.

For example, the mothers of the two daughters had higher incidences of interactions with their daughters than the mothers of the two sons. Not only were the interactions quantitatively different, but qualitatively as well. The two main types of interactions that occurred between these two mothers and their daughters involved imparting information to them, and giving them directives. These often involved negotiation of meaning through explanations and discussions during occasions when the child requested information from the mother about topics adults present were discussing, and in providing instruction on homework or upcoming events. In the case of attempting

to gain compliance with directives regarding immediate behavior, frequent explanations and discussions, or apologies were displayed accompanying the directive, which had the effect of "small talk" which Tannen (1990) describes as attempts to maintain connectedness and intimacy.

The mothers of the sons interacted less frequently with their child than the mothers of the daughters did with their child, as well as in comparison with the fathers of the sons (their husbands). They did not initiate conversations with their sons except to give information or directives, and they did not engage in small talk with them. The conversations between these mothers and their sons were based in the current situation.

The father of one of the daughters was also found to interact less often with her than the mother, and the interactions were founded in the current situation. However, the father of the other daughter did interact more with her than her mother did. Yet similar to the other father, the majority of the interactions between this father and daughter primarily concerned the current situation as well. While he interacted with her more in terms of his talking, he was less willing to listen to her than were the fathers of the sons.

The fathers of the sons interacted with them nearly as much as the mothers of the daughters. These findings that fathers interact more with sons than mothers do support the finding of Liddell, Henzi, and Drew (1987). Both fathers tend to be high involvement speakers, and initiated conversations with their sons. Both fathers provided extensive explanations along with directives and both spent time listening to their sons. As described before, the father of one of the sons, Strom Danson, tended to maintain his status of authority, while the father of the other son, Rick Vietch tended to mitigate it.

Both of these fathers also exhibited strategies of trying to get their sons to think on a cognitive level when appropriate.

While the current study did not support findings in use of directives among women found in Goodwin's (1990) observation of working-class Black children and West's (1990) study among white, middle-class physicians, it does concur and reveal there are striking similarities in the ways language choices are distributed within genders. In addition, as the studies cited above show, both girls and women across age and economic class, among other cultural factors, are able to use language in ways that emphasize their status over that of their conversational partner, usually in situations of conflict.

The findings in my research bear this out. During times when any of the mothers experienced challenges from their children, if negotiation and attempts to draw the child into a consensual relationship with them failed, they would resort to strategies that emphasized their status. Their strategy for exerting power in their relationship with the child seemed to follow similar steps. Acts which the child was expected to know were inappropriate yet chose to engage in active rebellion initiated a direct act of power demonstrating authority and establishing the mother's superior status. In dealing with other types of situations in which directives were given, the initial step was making a request, statement or observation, which if ignored led secondly, to attempts at negotiation, and finally to the delivery of a conclusive statement of authority, which confirmed the mother's superior status and put an end to the situation. All but one of the mothers in this study, the one who had no conflicts with her son, exhibited occasions of

high-involvement interactions with her son or daughter in an attempt to negotiate at the beginning of a conflict, which eventually led to a power movement for status.

Among the men, their use of directives did follow the patterns of use of "aggravated" forms found among the male doctors in West's (1990) study, but were not as status oriented as the competition for status among boys as described in Goodwin's (1990) study. It is clear the relationship between the children and their father is different than among male peers who are consistently struggling to negotiate status. The fathers have an inherent status of authority that peers do not enjoy. In addition these fathers are concerned not only with maintaining their own status and authority, but with nurturing their child. Two of the children in the current study, one of the boys and one of the girls, have relationships with their fathers that result most often in the child's compliance with directives, while two of the children, also a girl and a boy, do not. Both of these fathers use the same type of strategies in situations where they are challenged when giving directives.

Directive Types and Gender

In examining how directives are used, the current study did not match the findings of West (1990) or Goodwin (1990) regarding gender usage of specific types of directives. However, the directive types used among the families in this study follow the findings of Ervin-Tripp (1976), regarding the kinds of situations in which specific directives are found. Not all directive types in this study were found to be consistently connected to a gender or a situation. Only those that were will be addressed.

Imperatives were the primary type of directive found in the data. This includes bald commands, explanations as hints, and elliptical types of directives. They were used both in extreme occasions, when children challenged their parents, as well as in very calm situations when parents interacted with their children in an intimate, nurturing setting. Ervin-Tripp (1976) found a link between situations and when the imperative is used. Imperatives framed as commands are often used among intimates to make requests. Nor are they, as is often thought, intended to emphasize a separation of status. The closer in status two people are, or the more intimate, she found more use of the imperative to accomplish certain speech acts. In the current study, this also seems to be the case. Hints were used to focus on the task and not the participants, and occurred more often among families and living groups where interpersonal relationships were important. She found that hints occurred when the speaker was making a special request that they hoped the hearer would correctly interpret and also in situations where the expectations were clear and the underlying meaning was clear to everyone involved. This was not always true in the cases found in the current research. Hints were clear in that they were connected to the situation and action taking place, but they often included explanations that acted as directives and required sophisticated implication by the hearer. They do, however, occur as abbreviated forms of directive especially among intimate groups with closed networks of communication (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Ellipticals again, followed the findings of Ervin-Tripp that explains them as abbreviated forms of directives directly tied to the actions of the hearer.

Imbedded Imperatives in the current research were used in making personal requests, for instance, when a parent asked a child to do something as a personal favor.

272

Another common situation was when a parent directed a child to do something that the child could consider extended beyond their responsibilities. The use of mitigators in the imbedded imperative served to soften the directive and address the child's face needs. Ervin-Tripp's research supports these findings.

Ervin-Tripp found more instances of Question Directives than many other relationships. She also describes them as directives "that give the listener who does not want to comply an out." (p. 38). She includes tag questions in this category, as well. However, in the current study, one of the primary uses of question directives seems to be attempting to activate a child's schema for that situation, as a teaching device. The question directive provides them the opportunity to comply without further consequences. While tag questions in this case may imply the speaker (parent) expects either a positive or a negative response, it nevertheless places a strong obligation on the child to comply. Strom Danson uses question directives to gain assistance from his son by asking him on several occasions where a given object is that he is looking for. His son provides the requested assistance cheerfully.

Another form of the question directive includes the post-posed question, that is questions such as "Okay" that follow statements or other directives. Ervin-Tripp found that these kinds of questions were added to imperatives when the action to be taken was outside the normal duties of the hearer, or when physical distance between the speaker and hearer was greater than normal. They were also used among solidarity groups as an informal mitigator. In the current research, "okay" was included in several directives by both fathers and mothers and seemed to be a way of emphasizing the directive, attempting to build solidarity and ensure cooperation.

Need and Want statements in Ervin-Tripp's research were used between a speaker of higher rank than the hearer, and is noted in West's (1990) work as being particularly aggravating. Ervin-Tripp noted they occur among families when the speaker expects the hearer to comply. These were used relatively little in the current research data, and are used in special circumstances when compliance is hoped for but not certain. It occurred more commonly among the three families with children who frequently challenged requests by their parents. In each of the cases, the children did comply.

Permission Provisions were not addressed in Ervin-Tripps's study of directives. This study, however, found two distinct ways that they are used. First, they allow the child to do something that the child has asked to do or to withdraw permission for an act, which if ignored, leads to further directives and consequences. The second way they are used is to establish boundaries within which the child is expected to operate. These occur without the child asking for permission to do something, but the parent expresses them in a situation as action occurs.

From this research it can be seen that while types of directives among family members cannot be linked specifically to the gender of the parent or of the child, specific directives are linked to certain kinds of situations. In addition, directives are among the most common interactional features between parents and children.

Mothers and Fathers Influence on Each Other

In examining the second research question, do parents influence each other when they are together, it was found that they did influence interactions. Mothers and fathers of the sons cooperatively issued directives to them. In the Vietch family, the mother

more often noticed the son involved in questionable behavior, and brought attention to it, wherein the father joined his wife and together they would direct the child to change his behavior. The father would then assume the role of final authority in getting the child to comply. When the father did notice the child's misbehavior, the mother would remain outside the conflict.

In the Danson family, the mother usually did not become involved when the father spoke to the children to issue a directive. She did, however, during the interactional setting when the family was preparing to go out. Following the father's initial warning that time was short, the mother began to give the children specific directives regarding what was required and urge them to hurry. The father also did this.

The fathers of the daughters were influenced to engage in confrontations between their daughters and wives when such situations occurred. In the Harre family, the father took over the situation and verbally disciplined his daughter regarding challenging his wife. In the Sands family, however, while the father did step in to solve what he perceived was the problem, his wife and daughter continued their discussion while ignoring his attempts until he implied there would be unexpected consequences for their not paying attention to him.

The three families that reported they approached child rearing together were more likely to cooperatively manage situations than the family that did not. Additional ways parents supported each other included assisting with caring for the children and with other projects as the family interacted.

Another aspect of the ways parents influenced each other's interactions with their child is that when the parents were together, they interacted more with each other than

with the child. This was first noted by Clarke-Stewart (1978) when she discovered that

when fathers were present, the mothers' interactions with the children decreased.

However, she did not find that the parents' interactions increased. On the other hand, in

the current study's findings, the parents do interact more with each other than the

children. The primary kind of interaction with children when both parents are present is

management through directives, either to assist the children in behaving appropriately, or

setting them up to talk.

Implications

Over the past thirty years, when research first began to investigate the kinds of

interactions that occur between fathers and mothers with their children (Bronstein, 1984;

Cherry & Lewis, 1978; Clarke-Stewart, 1978; Liddell, Henzi, & Drew, 1987; and

Pederson, Yarrow, & Cain, 1980) as well as to find specific relationships between their

interactions and the ways they influence children's socialization (Adams, Kuebli, Boyle,

& Fivush, 1995; DeFrancisco, 1992; Girolametto & Tannock, 1994; Lamb, 1977; Siegal,

1987) society has seen changes in what is called the traditional structure of the family and

roles of the father and mother. There are far fewer "traditional" families, as defined by a

two-parent household where the father is the primary breadwinner and the mother

remains at home and cares for the children. In two parent households, more mothers

work outside the home, and more fathers are assuming a much greater role in the daily

care taking responsibilities of their children.

In examining what has changed in the roles of each parent, all but one of the

families in this study report in their interviews that the mother and father share equally in

decisions about child rearing, as well as in caring for the children. This was born out in the analysis of the interactions the families provided. While the mothers of three of the families reported they spend more time with the child than the fathers, this did not mean that they had more interactions with the child. In fact, all but one of the fathers purposely make an effort to spend time at home with their wives and children in activities they share together. The fourth father also spends time with his daughter each night putting her to bed, which includes cuddling and talking. While fathers seem to spend more time interacting with their sons, one of the fathers of the daughters was found to interact with her as frequently as the fathers did with their sons, and more than her mother, who also spent a great deal of time interacting with her. However, one aspect of family relationships that has not seemed to change with the times is the father's position of ultimate authority. Even when mothers' exert power and authority over their child, when the father is present, they allow him to become involved in the issue and have the final word.

In the current study, while there are some clear differences in the ways mothers and fathers interact with their sons and daughters, there are also important similarities as discovered by Belsky (1979). Each of the parents values the relationship he or she has with the child. Each assumes responsibility for imparting the family's values and culture, while training the child to be a productive, contributing member of society. Even among the ways they go about this, the similarities outweigh the differences as presented earlier.

Researchers in the past thirty years have come to recognize the importance of both mothers and fathers in a child's development. Belsky (1979), Lamb (1977), and Siegal (1987) have all examined how each parent affects various aspects of a child's

identity and subsequent ability to function successfully in society. Ultimately, the question to which we seek answers is how to help children develop a healthy identity which will allow them to have healthy, successful relationships with both males and females and become productive members of society. Gender remains an important feature of a person's identity. DeFrancisco (1992) describes how fundamental a person's sex identity is in interpersonal relationships. "Gender is a primary social category and thus has pervasive influence on interpersonal communication." (p. 42). Parent/child relationships are the primary relationship that establishes and nurtures this identity. Children first learn to perform in ways that are appropriate to their gender by the interactions they have with their parents.

Fathers in particular play a critical role in developing gender appropriate behavior. Siegal's(1987) description of Johnson's Reciprocal Role Theory would indicate that the father is instrumental in socializing both boys and girls into appropriate gender behaviors. Reciprocal role theory says that fathers treat sons differently from daughters, while mothers tend to treat both sons and daughters the same. However, as Siegal (1987) points out, both parents are responsible for the "sex-typing" of a child. In relation to the present study, the mothers and fathers in each family did have very different relationships with their son or daughter, while there were consistencies between families in terms of interactional style and gender. It seems likely that the daughters in this study will be socialized into female gender appropriate behavior through the frequent interactions with their mother, while this is reinforced through the very different interactions they experience with their fathers. On the other hand, the sons will be socialized into what is recognized as appropriate masculine behavior through the example

set by their fathers, and their interactions with them. In addition, the kinds of interactions each of these children sees between their mother and father will also have a profound affect on the ways they learn to act in a gender appropriate manner.

Yet acting in a gender appropriate manner is not enough. Feminist theorists have shone the light on an important issue of power and value, and lack of it. An understanding between men and women regarding their different ways of interacting is important in order to accomplish a balance of power. As parents work together as partners to care for and socialize their children of both sexes, children will be socialized into these expectations. As evidence of the changes that have already taken place in our society, it must be noted that three of the four families in this study do not follow the formerly called "traditional" family roles, but intentionally assume mutual responsibility for the raising of their sons and daughters.

It must be noted that as a case study, there are strict limitations to the generalizability of the results. Expanding the study to include more families could substantiate findings in this research. The next step in this research process would be to compare within-family relationships between fathers and mothers and their sons and daughters to see if the findings are consistent. In addition, I hypothesize that there is a birth-order variable influencing the kinds of interactions among the parents and their sons. Additional research examining the relationships within families structures of different types of cultural groups could offer important additional insight into societal structure and interactions, and cultural diversity regarding gender socialization. It is also necessary to expand the research base in order to more fully determine the link between the use of directives and situation. Not only has this study raised questions about

directives, but it also raises additional questions about how mothers and fathers talk to their sons and daughters in regard to time elements. In other words, what is the relationship between gender of parent and gender of child in discussion of past, present, and future events, and what, if any, is the emotional tone of these interactions. Investigations into parent-child relationships continue to raise many interesting questions that can spur further research into context and how it influences the use of language.

REFERENCES

Adams, S., Kuebli, J., Boyle, P., & Fivush, R. (1995). Gender differences in parent-child conversations about past emotions: A longitudinal investigation. *Sex Roles, 33*, 309-323.

Al-Zumor, A.W. (2003). *Apologies in Arabic and English: An inter-language and cross-cultural study*. Retrieved January 10, 2004 from http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ea/politeness/apologiesinarabicandenglish.htm.

Annas, P.J. (1987). Silences: Feminist language research and the teaching of writing. *Teaching writing: Pedagogy, gender and equity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Aries, E. (1982). Verbal and non-verbal behavior in single-sex and mixed-sex groups: Are traditional sex roles changing? *Psychological Reports*, *51*, 27-134.

Arliss, L. (1991). *Gender communication*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss Hall.

Beattie, G.W. (1981). Interruption in conversational interaction and its relation to the sex and status of the interactants. *Linguistics, 19*, 15-35.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Bellinger, D. (1979). Changes in the explicitness of mother's directives as children age. *Journal of Child Language, 6*, 443-458.

Belsky, J. (1979). Mother-father-infant interaction: A naturalistic observational study. *Developmental Psychology, 15*, 601-607.

Berger, J., Fisek, M.H., Norman, R.Z., & Zelditch, R, Jr. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interaction: An expectation-states-approach*. New York: Elsevier, Science.

Best, D., House, A., Barnard, A., & Spiker, B. (1994). Parent-child interactions in france, germany and italy. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*, 181-193.

Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances: An introduction to pragmatics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1983). The dynamics of political interviews. *Text 3*(2): 131-153.

Boxer, D. (2002). *Applying sociolinguistic: Domains and face-to-face interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Broen, P.A. (1972). The verbal environment of the language–learning child. *Monograph of American Speech and Hearing Association, 17*, December.

Bronstein, P. (1984). Differences in mother's and father's behaviors toward children: A cross-cultural comparison. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 995-1003.

Brown, P. (1998). How and why are women more polite: some evidence from a Mayan community. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader.* (pp. 81-99) Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buium, N. (1976). Interrogative types in parental speech in language-learning children: A linguistic universal? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 5*, 135-142.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc.

Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory* (2nd edition). New York: McMillan.

Carli, L. (1990). Gender, language and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 941-951.

Cherry, L. & Lewis, M. (1978). Differential socialization of girls and boys: Implications for sex differences in language development. In N. Waterson & C. Snow (Eds.), *The Development of Communication*, 189-197.

Christen, Y. (1991). *Sex differences, modern biology and the unisex fallacy*. Translated by Nicholas Davidson. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Clarke-Stewart, K.A. (1978). And daddy makes three: The father's impact on mother and young child. *Child Development, 49,* 466-478.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Davies, B. & Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal of Social Behavior, 20*(1): 43-63.

DeFrancisco, V.L. (1992). Ethnography and gender: Learning to talk like girls and boys. *Topics in Language Disorders, 12*, 40-53.

Drach, K. (1969). The language of the parent: A pilot study. *Working Paper, 14*, Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

DuBois, B.L. & Crouch, I. (1979). The question of tag questions in women's speech: They don't really use more of them, do they?" *Language and Society, 4*, 289-294.

Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society, 10*, 383-421.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is sybil there? The structure of some american english directives. *Language in Society, 5*, 25-66.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1987). Cross-cultural and developmental sources of pragmatic generalizations. In J. Verschueren & M.B. Papi (Eds.), *The pragmatic perspective.* (pp. 47-60) Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. & Lampert, M. (1992). Gender differences in the construction of humorous talk. In K. Hall, M. Buchholtz, & B. Moonwoman (Eds.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference* (108-117). Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California.

Freed, A. (1991). Language and gender. *Linguist List 2.339: Gender Related Lanuage.* Retrieved August 15, 2001, from http://www.emich.edu/~linguist/issues/2/2/339.html.
.
Fishman, P. (1990). Conversational insecurity. In D. Cameron (Ed.), *The Feminist Critique of Language*, 234-241.

Gannett, C. (1992). *Gender and the journal.* Albany: State University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Girolametto, L. & Tannock, R. (1994). Correlates of directiveness in the interactions of fathers and mothers of children with developmental delays. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 37*, 1178-1192.

Gleason, J.B., (1987). Sex differences in parent-child interaction. In S.U. Phillips, S. Steele, and C. Tanz (Eds.), *Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective* (pp.189-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glinert, L. (1998). Apologizing to the nation. Retrieved January 11, 2004, from http://acjournal.org/holdings/vol2/Iss2/editorials/glinert/index.html.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Goodwin, M. H. (1990). Cooperation and competition across girls' play activities. In J. Coates (Ed.) *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 121-146). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from mars, women are from venus*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers..

Gur, R.C., Turetsky, B.I., Matsui, M., Yan, M., Bilker, W., Hughett, P., & Gur, R. (1999). Sex differences in brain gray and white matter in healthy young adults: Correlations with cognitive performance. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 19* (10): 4065-4072.

Halpern, D.F. (1992). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities* (2nd Edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halpern, D.F. (2000). *Sex differences and cognitive abilities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harris, S. (1984). Questions as a mode of control in magistrates' courts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 49,* 5-27.

Herbert, R.K. (1989). Sex-based differences in compliment behavior. *Language in Society, 19*, 201-224.

Hobbs, P. (2003). The medium is the message: politeness strategies in men's and women's voice mail messages. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 243-262.

Hoffman, L.R. (2002). Managers as negotiators: A test of power versus gender as predictors of feelings, behavior, and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 7,* 63-85.

Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: a sex-preferential politeness strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *12*, 445-465.

Holmes, J. (1989). Sex differences and apologies: One aspect of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics, 10* (2), 194-213.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. Longman: New York.

Holmes, J. (1998). Women's talk: the question of sociolinguistic universals. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and Gender: A reader (pp. 461-483).* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Holtgrave, T. & Yang, J. (1991). Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62* (2), 246-256.

Holzman, M. (1972). The use of interrogative forms in verbal interactions of three mothers and their children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1*, 311-336.

Holzman, M. (1974). The verbal environment provided by mothers for their very young children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 20*, 31-42.

Hoyenga, K.B. & Hoyenga, K.T. (1979). *The question of sex differences, psychological,cultural, and biological issues*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Johnson, D. & Roen, D. (1992). Complimenting and involvement in peer review: gender variation. *Language in Society, 21*, 27-57.

Kersting, K. (2003). Cognitive sex differences: a "political minefield." *Monitor, 34* (5), 54.

Kimura, D. (1992). Sex differences in the brain. *Scientific American, 10*, Summer Quarterly, 26-31. Retrieved January 3, 2004, from http://www.dhushara.tripod.com/book/socio/kimura/kimura.htm.

Kimura, D. (1996). Sex, sexual orientation and sex hormones influence human cognitive function. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 6*, 259-263. Retrieved January 3, 2004, from http://www.sfu.ca/~dkimura/articles/sex.html

Kobashigawa, B. (1969). Repetitions in a mother's speech to her child. *Working Paper, 14*, Language-Behavior Laboratory, University of California, Berkely.

Kramarae, C. & Treichler, P. (1985). *A feminist dictionary*. London: Pandora Press.

Kramarae, C & Treichler, P. (1990). Power relationships in the classroom. In S.L. Gabriel & I. Lawrence (Eds.), *Gender in the classroom: Power and pedagogy* (pp. 41-59). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychology as conversation.* New York: Academic Press.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lamb, M. (1977). Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. *Child Development, 48*, 167-181.

Lever, J. (1978). Sex differences in the complexity of children's play and games. *American Sociological Review, 43*.

Leet-Pellegrini, H.M. (1980). Conversational dominance as a function of gender and expertise. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, & P.M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 97-104). New York: Pergamon.

Leezenberg, M. (2002). Power in communication: Implications for the semantics-pragmatics interface. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*, 893-908.

Liddell, C., Henzi, S.P., & Drew, M. (1987). Mothers, fathers, and children in an urban park playground: A comparison of dyads and triads. *Developmental Psychology, 23*(2), 262-266.

Macauley, M. (2001). Tough talk: Indirectness and gender in requests for information. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 293-316.

Maltz, D.N. & Borker, R.A. (1998). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 417-434). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

McCracken, N.M. & Appleby, B.C. (1992, March). *Gender issues in the teaching of English: A dialogue*. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cincinnati, OH.

Meunier, L. (1996). *Gender and language use*. Gender and Postmodern Communication. Retrieved August 16, 2001, from http://www.philo.at/mii/gpmc.dir9606/msg00013.html.

Miles, R. (1989). *The women's history of the world.* Topsfield, MA: Salem House.

Moerk, K. (1972). Principles of interaction in language learning, *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 18*, 229-257.

Mulvaney, B.M. (1994). *Gender differences in communication: An intercultural experience*. Retrieved August 15, 2001, from http://www.cpsr.org/Members/cjohnson/mulvaney/

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Socio-linguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, G. Kasper, & R.O. Freedle (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1550173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Osborne, M.L. (1979). *Women in western though*t. New York: Random House.

Owen, M. (1983). *Apologies and remedial interchanges: A study of language use in social interaction*. New York: Mouton.

Pellegrini, A., McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A., Sigel, I, & Brody, G. (1986). The effects of children's communicative status and task on parent's teaching strategies. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 11*, 240-252.

Phillips, J. (1970). *Formal characteristics of speech which mothers address to their young children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Mass.

Phillips, J. (1973). Syntax and vocabulary of mother's speech to young children: age and sex comparisons. *Child Development, 44*, 182-185.

Pilkington, J. (1998). "Don't try and make out that i'm nice!" The different strategies that women and men use when gossiping. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 254-269). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Pillon, A., Degauquier, C., & Duquesne, F. (1992). Males' and females' conversational behavior in cross-sex dyads: From gender differences to gender similarities. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 21* (3), 147-172.

Remick, H. (1976). Maternal speech to children during language acquisition. In W. von Raffler-Engel & Y. Lebrun (Eds.), *Baby talk and infant speech*. Lisse Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Russell, G. & Russell, A. (1987). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood. *Child Development, 58*, 1573-1585.

Russell, G. & Russell, A. (1988). Mothers' and fathers' explanations of observed inter-actions with their children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 9*, 421-440.

Sachs, J., Brown, R.T., & Salerno, R.A. (1976). Adults' speech to children. In W. von Raffler-Engel & Y. Lebrun (Eds.), *Baby talk and infant speech*. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Sachs, J. (1987). Young children's language use in pretend play. In S.U. Phillips, S. Steele, & C. Tanz (Eds.) *Language, Gender, and sex in comparative perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. New York: Free Press.

Shaywitz, B.A., Shaywitz, S.E., Pugh, K.R., Constable, R.T., Skudlarski, P., Bronen, R.T., Fulbright, R.K., Fletcher, J.M., Shankweiler, D.P., Katz, L., & Gore, J.C. (1995). Sex differences in the functional organization of the brain for language. *Nature,* 373, 607-609.

Sheldon, A. (1991). Gender. *Linguist List2.339: Gender-Related Language*. Retrieved August 15, 2001, from http://www.emich.edu/~linguist/issues/2/2/339.html.

Siegal, M., (1987). Are sons and daughters treated more differently by fathers than by mothers? *Developmental Review, 7*, 183-209.

Snow, C. (1972). Mothers' speech to children learning language. *Child Development, 43*, 549-565.

Sommers, E. & Lawrence, S. (1992). Women's ways of talking in teacher-directed and student-directed peer response groups. *Linguistics and Education, 4,* 1-36.

Springer, S.P. & Deutsch, G. (1989). *Left brain, right brain* (3rd Edition). New York: W.H. Freeman.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow & Co.

Tannen, D. (1994). Interpreting interruption in conversation. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from nine to five*. New York: William Morrow & Co. Inc.

Tarvis, C. & Wade, C. (1984). *The longest war: Sex differences in perspective*. Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich: San Diego.

Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in interaction*. London: Longman.

Thorne, B., Kramarae, C., & Henley, N. (Eds.). (1983). *Language, gender and society*. Newbury House Publishers: Cambridge, MA.

Walters, A.E., Stuhlmacher, A.F., and Meyer, L.L. (1998). Gender and negotiator competitiveness: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76 (1), 1-29.

Weiman, H. (2002). Gender differences in Cognitive Functioning. Retrieved January 3, 2004, from http://faculty.kendall.edu/hweiman/GenderDiffs.html.

West, C. (1990). Not just doctors' orders: Directive-response sequences in patients' visits to women and men physicians. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 328-353). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Thorn, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (102-117). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Winter, J. (1993). Gender and the political interview in an australian context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 20*, 117-139.

Wood, J.T. (1994). *Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture* (pp. 141-143). Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Wolf, E. (1999). *Envisioning power: Ideologies of dominance and crisis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolfson, N. (1984). Pretty is as pretty does: A speech act view of sex roles. *Applied Linguistics, 5* (3), 236-244.

Zimmerman, D.H. & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorn & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS FOR DATA COLLECTION FOR

C. SKINNER'S DISSERTATION

The purpose of my dissertation is to examine the differences in the ways mothers and fathers interact and socialize their sons and daughters. As of yet, I do not have a hypothesis. I am using a case study approach, using four families with children of very similar ages. I am concentrating on comparing interactions with the older children, 2 boys and 2 girls.

I want to collect natural interactions of all kinds. I need about 20 hours of tape, which can include pauses, which are a natural phenomenon of interacting. The interactions should include each parent interacting with each child. Ideally, I'd like to have mostly one on one interaction, to separate out influences parents may inadvertently exert on each other, but some group interaction is also most welcome, such as meals. Find occasions when you each spend time with the child alone, turn on the recorder and just let it role. It may take a few minutes for each of you to get used to the recorder being there, so take time to talk about it, play around, etc. I prefer not to have "tape references" on the tapes I will be analyzing.

I am looking for all kinds of interaction: instruction, play, reading stories, routine activities, mealtimes, discipline, conversation, etc. These are just a few ideas to help you get started.

Please keep track of the following information for each tape:

Who is interacting

Date, time, place, & situation

Other persons present

Age of child at time of interaction in years and months.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your help.   Please let me know if you have any questions, or need anything. I need the project completed sometime this year. You can do a little at a time and give me a tape now and then, which is probably the best method at first, so I can see if I'm getting the kind of data I am looking for and need. Hope you have fun doing it!

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR BOTH PARENTS AND CHILDREN

1. How many hours or minutes do you think you spend with _____?

2. When do you spend time alone with _____?

3. Where do you spend time alone with _____?

4. What sorts of things do you do together?

5. What do you usually talk about when you're alone with _____?

6. When are you all together as a family?

7. What do you do together?

8. Who plans the family schedule and keeps it going?

9. Who is usually in charge of supervising _____?

    -prepares children and gets them to the table for meals

    -gets them ready for school

    -gets them ready for bed

10. Who helps with homework if necessary?

11. Who teaches things at home?

12. Who usually handles discipline? What strategies or consequences do you

    use?

13. What do you usually do to get (child) to do what you want? What does

    (parent) usually do to get you (child) to do what they want?

APPENDIX C

IRB FORM

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Date: April 30, 1999   IRB #:   AS-99-048

Proposal Title: "DIFFERENCES IN LINGUISTIC INTERACTIONS OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS WITH THEIR CHILDREN"

Principal   Dr. Carol Moder
Investigator(s):   Cathleen Skinner

Reviewed and
Processed as: Expedited (Special Population)

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s):   Approved

Signature:

_____   ___April 30, 1999___
Carol Olson, Director of University Research Compliance   Date

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modification to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

VITA

Cathleen Skinner

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: THE EFFECTS OF STATUS AND GENDER ON INTERACTIONS
BETWEEEN PARENTS AND THEIR CHILDREN

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Education: Received Bachelor of Arts degree in Telecommunications from Oral
Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma in May, 1981. Completed requirements
for certification as a German teacher 7-12, May 1988. Completed the
requirements for the Master of Arts degree with a major in English as a
Second Language at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in
May, 1990. Completed certification requirements to teach Spanish and
German K-12 in May 1992. Completed requirements for Doctor of
Philosophy degree with a major in English at Oklahoma State University,
Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2005.

Experience: Employed at Oklahoma State University as a graduate assistant to
teach Freshman Composition I and II to both native speakers of English and
international students, and academic writing to international graduate students,
1988 - 1990.   Employed by Oklahoma State University's English Language
Institute-Kyoto to teach Japanese students English as a Second Language,
1990 - 1991. Employed by Putnam City Schools to teach Spanish in the
elementary school, 1992 – 1994. Employed as a tutor to teach Spanish to high
school-aged students through Parents Educating Teens, 2002-2003.
Employed to teach Spanish at Mulhall-Orlando High School, 2004 to present.

Professional Memberships: Founding president of Oklahoma Elementary Foreign
Language Teachers Association; Member: Oklahoma Foreign Language
Teachers Association; Oklahoma Teachers of English as a Second Language;
American Association of Applied Linguistics; Teachers of English as a
Second Language; American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language.