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ABSTRACT

An empirical study was carried out to determine the communicative tactics and strategies used by three African-American community organizers' to realize the identity claims of status and involvement with public audiences. Six episodes (three audio taped excerpts of speaking and three written documents) from their community organizing activities, were selected for study. Using the content analysis procedures of Stiles' verbal response mode taxonomy supplemented by situational and contextual background information from field notes and casual conversations, the facework tactics and strategies of their tasks, roles dimensions and relationships were analyzed in each of the six episodes.

The results from this analysis showed that their facework was dominated by indirectness, politeness strategies and modest levels of familiarity. Although community organizers' strategies generally claims favorable public images that resulted in cooperation and compliance from the public, they also unintentionally risked misunderstanding, manipulation and inequities at the same time. These results confirmed the central point that these community organizers' facework accomplished the goals of identity claims of status and involvement that were shaped and guided by the conflicting needs for independence and involvement.
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One of the realities of social life is that people are constantly forming impressions of each other and making attributions about other people. We do this because we need to understand our world, particularly other people. As we form impressions and make judgments, we quickly realize that just as we are judging others, they are judging us. It then becomes apparent that it is in our interest to control, if we can, other people's impressions so that they will treat us as we would like them to.

The motivation to manage the impression one gives is greatest in situations that involve important goals such as friendship, approval, material rewards, and the like, where individuals feel dissatisfied with the image they currently project, when they feel dependent on a powerful person who controls important resources (such as one's boss), or after a failure or an embarrassing incident. The primary objectives of managing the impression one gives are to obtain important and valuable outcomes, such as power, resources, and approval, or to avoid costs, or any negative occurrence, in a social relationship. Obtaining these favorable outcomes and avoiding negative costs are accomplished by claiming favorable or powerful social identities of the self for others' benefit.

According to Tracey [1], those favorable or powerful identity claims that are created through the communicative moves that people make in interaction can be
understood as the social phenomenon of face#. These face claims are of two kinds: positive, which concern the desire to be appreciated and approved of by selected others and negative, a person's want to be unimpeded and free from imposition. Tracey further defines the "ways particular communicative moves speak to or realize the identity claims of self and other in specific social situations" as facework.

Although the notion of face has been pervasive and commonplace for hundreds of years, the most important systematic analysis of this phenomenon did not appear in the social sciences until 1955 with Goffman's article entitled "On Facework" [2]. Indeed, Goffman argued that

"...there is no occasion so trivial...as not to require each participant to show serious concern with the way in which he handles himself and others present".

According to Goffman, face involves the symbolic messages people convey about themselves. Such messages are intended by individuals to impress other people with favorable qualities such as intelligence, ability and skill, empathy and the like. Whether face is "given" in that it is explicitly and consciously used to create a particular impression, or "given off," in the sense that it is communicated in the context of instrumental activity without conscious thought or intention [2,3], this phenomenon is the byproduct of and supports instrumental activity. Therefore, although face is a latent part of instrumental activity, how facework is managed can either support or limit a person's capacity to fulfill the goals of instrumental activity.

---

# Although face is only one of many behaviors that reference social identity, face and social identity, along with public image are used interchangeably.
Overview

In the thirty-seven years since Goffman's writing and work in this area, research in sociolinguistics and social psychology has advanced our understanding of face, the role of the communicative tactics and strategies of facework in realizing face, and the critical importance of both to everyday affairs. In fact, the study of face and facework has become one of the most prolific areas of investigation in the social sciences today.

Recent interest in the role of language in our social lives has focused on the relationship between discourse and the process of claiming a favorable social identity. Evidence from Brown and Levinson's work on politeness [4], and more recent work by Tracey [1], Tannen [5] and Lakoff [6], suggests that certain aspects of public discourse are key in claiming those social identities that we value, and challenge ones that are unfavorable. Illocutionary acts are one important feature of all talk and writing that figure prominently in the social phenomena of face and facework.

According to Austin [7] an illocutionary act is what is performed or done in making an utterance (any stretch of discourse such as a sequence of sentences, or a single phrase, or even a single word) used by a particular speaker, on a particular occasion. Illocutionary acts are distinct from simply uttering the words (a locutionary act), from producing some external effect on the actions or attitudes of others (a perlocutionary act), and from the propositional content of the utterance. For example, in the utterance, "Close the door!", the illocutionary act is the speaker directing another person's behavior.

As implied by Austin, and subsequently elaborated by Searle [8], Vendler [9], and others, the latent or intended meaning of this command is found in the force of its
illocutionary act. The illocutionary force of an utterance depends on the speaker's communicative intent, which must be inferred in context. The same words may have different illocutionary forces indifferent contexts. For example, the utterance, "It is cold in here," may be a simple assertion, or it may have the force of a directive if addressed to someone who is responsible for keeping the room cold.

Illocutionary force must be on some other person. For example, the utterance "Close the door" has directive force only on the person addressed, not on anyone who overhears it. The illocutionary force on the recipient is entirely determined by the speaker and is distinct from the perlocutionary effect. For example, telling someone to "Close the door" has the illocutionary force of a directive on that person regardless of whether the perlocutionary effect is compliance, refusal, anger, or incomprehension.

Since every illocutionary act presupposes not only a speaker, but also an other who is the intended recipient of the utterance's illocutionary force, every illocutionary act has an intersubjective component. The intersubjective component of the illocutionary force of an utterance describes the particular quality of the relationship of one person to another. Thus, the fact of directing also sends metamessages, or implicit information about relations among people, and their attitudes toward what they are saying and doing and the people they are saying and doing it to. So, for example, by directing, the speaker is implicitly expressing the following information:

"I am someone who should say what people here should do, and, in that sense, people here have to do things that I say I want them to do."
This intersubjective aspect of the force of the latent meanings of illocutionary acts that are a part of every utterance is shaped and guided by the universal concerns of independence and connection.

According to Tannen [5], the utterances of public discourse, like all human activity are subject to the needs that motivate them. While arguing that a commonly-accepted understanding of human beings is that all people simultaneously are individual and social creatures, Tannen points out that as individuals, we need to preserve our independence. Conversely, as social creatures, we need to connect with other people for our survival. She further states that these universal, interpersonal needs "to be connected to each other and to be left alone" motivate all utterances, and therefore relationships. Thus, our interpersonal behavior reflects our attempts to balance these conflicting needs for independence and connection.

Along these lines, Tannen states that although cultures and peoples place different relative value on these needs and express them in different ways, both independence from and connection with other people must be served simultaneously. She labels the balancing act of showing that we're involved with others while, at the same time, showing that we are keeping our distance from others a "double bind" [10, 11]. Specifically, too much connection threatens our sense of independence, and to much independence threatens our intimacy with others.

Tannen elaborates on this double bind by first indicating that what we say to show involvement is a threat to our own individuality and that of others. She suggests, for
example, that trying to "reach consensus with other people, minimizing differences between ourselves, or avoiding the appearance of superiority" all point to a symmetry that underscores our closeness and similarities. This creation of community or closeness, however, flies in the face of our need, as individuals, to be autonomous.

By contrast, Tannen explains that what we say to show independence is a threat to our own and others need for involvement. By telling others what to do, for example, we try to establish or maintain our authority, and in its asymmetry, this authority indicates that we are not the same; more precisely, that we are positioned differently along a hierarchy of status and involvement. The inherently adversarial dynamics of maintaining these hierarchical differences work against our desires to be connected to or in solidarity with other people.

On the basis of this analysis, Tannen concludes that "serving one need necessarily and inevitably violates the other." Therefore, as we engage in discourse, we are required to make decisions about what we say in order to resolve the paradox of satisfying the simultaneous interpersonal needs of being connected with, and yet staying autonomous from others [5]. The communicative tactics and strategies of this balancing act comprise the facework that accomplishes the goals of the identity claims that are driven by the needs for independence and connection. This entire process can be described as follows:

communicative tactics and strategies (facework) accomplish the goals of identity claims (face) that are shaped and guided by the conflicting needs for independence and involvement.
Tannen indicates however that while people continually make adjustments in their communicative behavior in order to balance independence and connection, the very nature of this paradox rules out the possibility for complete resolution. As such, the utterances of public discourse always suffer from the imperfections and paradoxes inherent in this balancing act. Consequently, the attempt to balance the conflicting needs of independence and involvement through the communicative moves that accomplish the goals of identity claims constitutes a fundamental dilemma that confronts us all. It is within this framework of discourse and identity, and the constraints of independence and connection that community organizing will be considered.
A Framework for Studying Community Organizing

Community organizing is a political process to determine who decides what about which issues by increasing the power of those who currently have little say about decisions that affect their lives. As a strategy for local empowerment, community organizing involves bringing people together in the places where they live and work to achieve desired social and economic changes. While most of the work that community organizers do may be understood in terms of the direct contributions they make to local empowerment, practitioners and observers [12] acknowledge that the ability to make such contributions depends on how organizers are viewed by the people involved.

Specifically, community organizers must establish an image of competence and credibility in the eyes of the public if they are to be effective in their work. In fact, what influence community organizers have in persuading people to identify their own needs, to come together in a group to achieve their goals, improve their skills, confidence and awareness, and their understanding of problems and issues will depend considerably upon whether people trust them and have confidence in their skills and abilities. Thus, accomplishing local empowerment depends on the community organizer's ability to establish a favorable public image or face.

Evidence from social theory [13], social interaction theory [14], communication studies [15], help-intended communication situations [16], and the social phenomena of face and facework, [1, 2,17] supports the idea that community organizers claim certain identities through the intersubjective aspect of the force of the metamessages of illocutionary acts.
However, this process of claiming identities is constrained by the particular problematique of community organizing.

Community organizers belong to a group of practitioners, including policy analysts, public managers and planners, that Forester describes as "future-oriented actors" [18]. As a member of the planning profession, community organizing must work together with other people to solve problems. Like other professions that concern complex human relationships, community organizing is not based on specific technical skills or areas of specialized competence. Community organizers’ knowledge is largely tacit and their skills of a behavioral sort potentially available to many. [19] As a result, the basis upon which community organizers claim legitimate authority and solidarity with other people is always open to challenge. Specifically, community organizers cannot claim unquestioned status or formal authority to practice. Also, guidelines for the most effective involvement or contact with their audiences are unavailable or not well-defined.

Within this context, community organizers’ direct and indirect influence comes from their ability to control the public’s ongoing assessment of them in community organizing activities. Consequently, community organizers are motivated, intentionally and unconsciously, to manage the symbolic resources at their disposal in order to 1) distinguish them from others by achieving legitimate authority to lead their communities, and 2) maintain and increase solidarity and shared purpose with their communities. These are the specific goals of community organizers’ identity claims for status and involvement.
Whether community organizers are consciously aware of the communicative tactics and strategies they use to achieve these goals or even recognize that identity claims are part of their work varies among individuals and settings. My experience as an organizer and in conversation with colleagues, suggests that, in general, community organizers are often unaware of the identities they claim in the pursuit of their instrumental objectives. In fact, this aspect of community organizing remains a mystery even to its most accomplished practitioners. Thus, while most community organizers can articulate the need for authority and rapport, which is the basis of their influence, they seem to be less sure about the explicit ways in which they claim these favorable and powerful identities.

To date, most research on community organizing has focused on the instrumental tactics and strategies of community organizing, and the circumstances of their use. The systematic investigation of how community organizers claim identities for themselves, their roles, and their abilities, how these claims are sustained and supported, and their specific functions has received limited attention. Given the importance of face and facework to community organizing, it is impossible to understand fully how community organizers make substantive contributions to the goal of local empowerment without also considering both the explicit and tacit ways their identity claims are managed. Making this process a focus of study can provide us with a more complete understanding of the practice of community organizing.

Unless community organizers are able develop effective communicative tactics and strategies for realizing the identity claims of status and involvement in their interactions with the public, their ability to do their jobs well will be limited,
or, in some cases, jeopardized. By identifying these tactics and strategies, what shapes and guides them and the outcomes and consequences of their use, community organizers can begin to think in new ways about what they do.

Using a model of community organizing based on the social, constructive perspective of language use, and focusing on the relationship of discourse to identity, this study examined the communicative tactics and strategies used by three African American community organizers to accomplish the goals of their identity claims of status and involvement that were driven by the needs for independence and connection. This study focused on

1) the different circumstances within which the conflicting needs for independence and connection arose for these three community organizers and, in response to these different circumstances, consistencies and variations in their facework strategies and tactics;

2) the consequences of these facework tactics and strategies for achieving the goals of the identity claims of status and involvement; and

3) the implications of this facework for community organizing practice.

This study begins with an outline of Stiles' Verbal Response Mode methods [17] that were used for investigating the utterances of these community organizers' public discourse. Next, the conceptual background for this investigation is provided through an application of Pearce's communicative perspective on social action to community organizing, and an explanation of the connections between illocutionary acts, face and facework. After analyzing, the communicative tactics and strategies of six different
community organizing episodes, the consequences and implications of these results are considered.

---

# Episodes are defined as a sequence of speech acts that are perceived as a whole, as part of the same general activity, and are remarkable and dramatic to the participants and observers.
Research Methods for Investigating the Identity Claims of Status and Involvement

Two primary strategies were used in this study. The first strategy consisted of a situational description of the social setting or the occasion of each chosen episode of communicative interaction between a community organizer and one of the various public audiences with whom he interacted. This description provided an overview of relevant situational factors, and immediate contextual information that influenced the community organizer's communicative behavior.

The second strategy applied Stiles' taxonomy of Verbal Response Modes for the content analysis of the illocutionary acts that comprised the community organizers' communicative behavior.

---

# Despite the diversity of views on the nature, description and study of communicative contexts, most scholars characterize them in terms of the knowledge that humans have about how to interact in a specific setting. This knowledge ranges from background commonsense knowledge in a given culture to very specific personalized knowledge about a particular type of context, to emergent influences or those developing during the encounter.

According to Haslett [15] argues that the communicative context reflects participants' commonsense knowledge, which includes more specific, detailed areas knowledge such as cultural knowledge, knowledge about societal institutions, knowledge about social settings, and so forth, and by the task and the goals of the interactants. That is, commonsense knowledge, knowledge of cultural conventions for particular social situations, situational prototypes and goals, provide significant background knowledge for participants in the interaction. These antecedent and emergent variables interact with one another to alter participants' contextual knowledge and subsequent interpretations of the ongoing encounter.

She further states that the strategies people pursue vary as a function of the context, the other participants and the social relationships among the participants, and the goals that people want to reach. To select the most effective communicative strategies, people those aspects of their commonsense knowledge relevant to their purposes and to their interpersonal relationship(s).

* Verbal response mode is the designation given by psychotherapists for the illocutionary acts that characterize their communicative behavior in therapy sessions with clients.

** The general method of content analysis is the primary technique for studying social texts. By making inferences about messages contained in a text, content analysis attempts to describe the characteristics of messages embedded in public and mediated texts, accomplishes this goal. This technique systematically and objectively identifies specified characteristics within a text, and relates these characteristics to important input variables, such as how the context influences the type of messages constructed, as well as to important outcomes, such as how message content leads to attitude change.
utterances in each episode of communicative interaction with the public. The frequency and percentage, aggregation, and mean ranking of the literal and pragmatic meanings of the taxonomy's eight illocutionary act categories were calculated for each episode to describe the community organizers' communicative behavior in terms of status and involvement. Specifically, these measures illustrated what each community organizer's communicative behavior indicated about the

- task or what the speaker was up to,
- the role he played in the interaction, and
- the relationship or how he performed that role relative to the public in terms of status and involvement.

In combination, the situational description and content analysis illuminated the strategies each community organizer used to publicly manage these identity concerns or face wants for status and involvement.

**Sources of Observations**

The interorganizational collaborative activities of three different African American community-based organizations (CBO's) were the sources from which community organizers' public talk and writing were drawn. All three community-based organizations were located in the same city neighborhood.

**Units of Analysis**

Content analysis studies texts that already exist, accepts unstructured materials which observers categorize, and studies the data as they appear in a context. As a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context, content analysis not only examines the content, but also makes inferences.
The units of analysis, or more specifically, those objects about which the patterns of connections between communicative practices of illocutionary acts and status and involvement were described, were episodes in which community organizers' talked directly with or produced documents for a public audience. Each episode was comprised of either an uninterrupted stretch of spoken dialogue or writing by an individual community organizer, or, in one instance, a conversational exchange between one community organizer and other people. Each episode was excerpted from the larger context of ongoing interactions in a single community organizing activity.

The analysis of each episode consisted of two parts. The first part was an overview of the situational background of each episode. Information for the first section of the situational description was drawn from observational field notes and conversations with community organizers, and in some cases, with other participants in each community organizing activity. The focus of this data collection was on

the general community issues and concerns;

the past responses by the public to these issues that prompted the community organizer to help the public to respond differently;

the specific issue that the community organizer addressed;

the nature of the task faced by the community organizer;

and, in addressing that issue, the changes that the community organizer wanted to bring about.

Information for the second section of the situational description was developed from the array of immediate contextual resources that impact on all communicative practices. The three contextual resources of field (what is taking place), tenor (who are
taking part), and mode (what part language is playing in the interaction) delimit the range of social context variables that make up any given social situation.

Although the study's goal of revealing how the identity claims of status and involvement are realized in communicative practices required a focus on tenor, the description of aspects of the field and the mode were also included as an integral part of this level of the situational description. Specifically, the issues of field and mode were addressed through a discussion of

- the specific activity that was occurring,
- the physical setting of the community organizing episode, and
- the characteristics of the verbal or written channel of communication.

In exploring both these situational and contextual section of the situational description, the following questions were considered:

- what was the general community organizing issue?

# Halliday and Hasan [15] describe these three variables as

"...field...[or] what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what is it that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component?

...tenor...[or] who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationships obtains among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech roles that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved? and

...mode...[or] what part the language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its functions in the context, including the channel (is it spoken or written or some combination of the two?)
what specific example of the issue was under investigation?

what specific community organizing effort (project, approach, etc.) was developed to address this issue?

what group or organization started the effort?

what goals and objectives did the organization want to accomplish?

what specific techniques or strategies did the organization use to meet these goals?

who were the specific organizational participants or representatives, that is, the speaker(s) or writer?

what was the setting in or mechanism by which the organizational participant(s) communicated?

Units of Observation

The second part of each episode contained the selection and analysis of the unit of observation. The unit of observation or the specific materials measured were social texts, that is, audio taped, verbatim records of actual public, spontaneous conversations, speeches and other verbal exchanges, and written documents such as letters and memos from community organizing activities.

# Social texts were used as the unit of analysis for several important reasons. The analysis of meaning in social action cannot be conducted directly. Meaning is a fact of consciousness, not of behavior or its artifacts. What is present for analysis is a text — a text of behavior and its artifacts — from which the intentional meaning must be read. The text itself is removed from experience. It is not the moment-by-moment flow of energy, but is experience captured within some notational scheme. That notational scheme may be one's memories, field notes, audio or video recordings, and/or culturally produced products. Each text is a transformation of experience, not its representation.

The metaphor of text is intended to force the recognition that the understanding and explanation of human and natural phenomena does not contact experience directly, that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between what is experienced as an individual and what is analyzed as a researcher. The meaning of social action is as problematic as the meaning of any text. Textual meaning, is after all, both promiscuous and prolific. The text has some meaning for everyone, and each time it is examined, new meanings arise.
Sampling Strategy

Since all talk and writing reveal how speakers see themselves, other people and their relationship to each other, the strategy for selecting samples of talk and writing for this study was governed by

the degree to which a particular community organizing activity posed a typical problem of collaboration that community organizers confront and resolve in their practice, and

the ability of specific interactional episodes within these activities to reveal the tactics and strategies by which organizers claimed status and involvement.

Therefore, the collaborative community organizing activities, and the episodes within these activities that were selected for analysis, represented different ways in which the conflicting needs of independence and involvement arose, and were the sources for the data that were analyzed to determine the various strategies that the community organizers used to respond to these circumstances. This sampling strategy allowed the determination of consistencies and variations in the community organizers' facework tactics and strategies, given different presentations of this predicament.

Being open to following wherever the data led permitted the sample to emerge during fieldwork. On-the-spot decisions were made to take advantage of new opportunities during actual data collection. Since each episode of public talk and writing contained a large number of linguistic patterns, a small sample size was selected for analysis.

Texts can be written transcripts of speeches and conversations, written documents (like letters, personnel records, newspapers, and magazines), electronic documents (like audio tapes, films, videotapes, and computer files), or visual texts (like paintings, photographs, and architecture). There are as many kinds of texts as there are communication media.
Analytical Procedures

Preparation of Data [17]

All audio taped verbal texts were transcribed and, along with written documents, unitized in preparation for coding and analysis according to Stiles Verbal Response Mode taxonomy.

Transcription.

Although Stiles' Verbal Response Mode taxonomy does not require special transcribing procedures, written records of audio tapes were transcribed according to selected guidelines established by the taxonomy:

1) Brief acknowledgments, such as "mm-hm" and "yeah" were included.

2) Short sentences as opposed to long ones were used as often as possible.

3) Commas were used to separate independent clause and nonrestrictive dependent clauses but not independent clauses.

4) Each line of the transcript was numbered according to where it began, regardless of how long it was.

Unitizing.

Each utterance of the transcribed audio tapes and of the written documents was identified for coding according to whether it was an independent clause, a nonrestrictive dependent clause, an element of a compound clause, or a term of acknowledgment or address. As an illustration, the sentence
"If the city is unable to do some of their promises, we will work with them and behind them to make sure this effort goes over."

contains two clauses: one independent and one dependent clause. However, it was coded as a single unit because the dependent clause ("If the city is unable to do some of their promises") is restrictive in the sense that it depends on the independent clause ("we will work with them and behind them to make sure this effort goes over.") for its meaning, and thus, can not stand alone as an independently meaningful utterance. Thus, the independent clause 'counts' as the appropriate unit for analysis in this utterance.

**Coding [17]**

Stiles' Verbal Response Modes taxonomy measure consists of eight Verbal Response Modes that measure the degree to which utterances convey a high or low level of status and involvement. In assigning these eight Verbal Response Mode categories, each utterance was coded twice, once with respect to its grammatical form or literal meaning, and once with respect to its communicative intent, or pragmatic meaning. The assignment of grammatical form to an utterance was based on the more-or-less distinctive set of grammatical features that reflect an utterance's literal meaning, that is, the dictionary meanings of the words and standard meaning of the grammatical construction. The following grammatical form specifications were used:

- **Disclosure form (D)** is declarative and first person singular ("I") or first person plural ("We") where the other is not a referent.

- **Edification form (E)** is declarative and third person.

- **Advisement form (A)** is imperative or second person with a verb of permission, prohibition, or obligation (e.g., "may", "must," "should," "have to," "ought to").
Confirmation form (C) is declarative and first person plural ("We") where the other is referent. Compound subjects that include the speaker and the other (e.g., "You and I") are also confirmation form.

Question form (Q) is interrogative, with inverted subject-verb order or interrogative words such as "who," "what," "where," "when," or "how."

Acknowledgment forms (K) include nonlexical utterances such as "mm-hm," "oh," contentless lexical utterances, such as "yes," "no," or "well," terms of salutation, such as "Hi" and "Hello," and terms of address, including names and titles used as forms of address.

Interpretation form (I) is second person ("You") with a predicate that denotes an attribute or ability of the other. Terms of evaluation used alone, such as "Right," "Good," "Okay," or "Fine" are also coded as Interpretation form.

Reflection form (R) is second person ("You") with a predicate that denotes internal experience (thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions) or volitional action. Literal repetitions (exact repetition of all or part of the other's utterance), finishing the other's sentences, and using quotation forms to put the other experience into words (i.e., where "you are saying..." is understood) are also coded as reflection form.

The assignment of intent used the same Verbal Response Mode categories. By contrast however, the assignment of intent required consideration of the context or occasion meaning# of the utterance. Information gathered through field notes, participant observation and conversations with participants as reflected in the situational background and contextual levels descriptions, and in immediately preceding words or sentences, facilitated scoring the intent by providing additional explanations of what the speaker meant by the utterance. The following intent specifications were used:

---

# Occasion meaning , the pragmatic meaning intended on a particular occasion, is that which is intended by the speaker to be recognized as intended to be recognized by the hearer.
Disclosure intent (D) reveals thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions.

Edification intent (E) states objective information.

Advisement intent (A) attempts to guide behavior; suggestions, commands, permission, prohibition.

Confirmation intent (C) compares the speaker's experience with other's; agreement, disagreement, shared experience or belief.

Question intent (Q) requests information or guidance.

Acknowledgment intent (K) conveys receipt of or receptiveness to other's communication; simple acceptance, salutations.

Interpretation intent (I) explains or labels the other; judgments or evaluations of other's experience or behavior.

Reflection intent (R) puts other's experience into words; repetitions, restatements, clarifications.

As a notational convention, the form abbreviation was written first and the abbreviation for the intent was written second. For example, for the utterance "Close the door!", the Advisement form in service of Advisement intent is written A(A).

Analysis [17]

The analysis of the coding determined 1) the task that the community organizer accomplished in his communicative behavior with the public, 2) the role dimensions that he fulfilled through his words and language, and 3) the relationship created and maintained between the community organizer and the public along the dimensions of status and involvement.
First, in order to establish the community organizer's task, the frequency or percentage of each form and intent that occurred in all of the utterances of a given text were calculated for each form and intent separately and averaged across form and intent.

Second, aggregate measures of the frequency and percentage of forms and intents were calculated to characterize the role dimensions that the community organizer was realizing in his illocutionary acts. Depending on the proportion of speaker versus other values on source of experience, focus and frame of reference, respectively, the text was summarized according to the following three role dimensions:

- Informativeness versus Attentiveness or self-centeredness,
- Unassumingness versus Presumptuousness or deference, and
- Directiveness versus Acquiescence, or control.

For example, the role dimension of Informativeness is calculated as the proportion of utterances in the modes Disclosure, Edification, Advisement, and Confirmation (all speaker's experience). Conversely, the role dimension of Attentiveness is calculated as the proportion of utterances in the other four modes, Question, Acknowledgment, Interpretation, and Reflection (all other's experience), or equivalently, as one minus Informativeness. The role dimension of Presumptuousness is measured by the proportion of utterances in the modes focused on the other, that is Advisement, Interpretation, Confirmation, or Reflection. On the other hand, the role dimension of Deference, which is the opposite of Presumptuousness, is calculated as the proportion of utterances in the other four modes of Disclosure, Edification, Acknowledgment and Question, or equivalently, as one minus Presumptuousness. Finally, the role dimension of Acquiescence is measured by the proportion of utterances that use the other's frame of
reference, that is, Edification, Acknowledgment, Confirmation or Reflection. By contrast, the opposite role dimension of Directiveness is calculated as the proportion of utterances in the other four modes of Disclosure, Advisement, Interpretation and Question, or equivalently, as one minus Acquiescence. The summary of all of the utterances along these role dimensions indicated the role assumed by the community organizer in relation to the public.

Third, the mean ranking of the form and intent for each utterance was calculated to provide an index of the community organizer's relationship with the audience as measured by familiarity. Familiarity refers to a broad dimension of interpersonal behaviors that vary with the degree of the speaker's acquaintance or involvement, and with his relative status with the public, as well as with the task and setting for any given episode.

"A person may behave familiarly toward intimates and social inferiors, whereas similar behavior toward strangers or social superiors could be called (pejoratively) 'too familiar'." [20]

Specifically, the familiarity ranking provides an overall measure of each community organizer tactics and strategies to claim status and involvement in his relationship with the public.

As indicated earlier, the eight Verbal Response Modes are ranked in a hierarchy that represents different levels of familiarity [17]. In establishing mean ranking, each form and intent code for every utterance was assigned a number, with 1 indicating the lowest degree of intimacy and status, and 8 indicating the highest degree of
status and involvement. These two numbers are averaged for each utterance#. The mean ranking of the averaged form and intent categories for all utterances in an interaction according to this hierarchy provides a Familiarity Index for the entire episode. Thus, the familiarity index 1) assigns unit ranks to the eight modes (and implicitly assumes an interval scale, to average across utterances); 2) weights form and intent codes equally; and 3) weights all utterances equally, across differences in utterance length and content [20]. This index summarized the community organizer's relationship to the public along the dimensions of relative status and involvement. In addition to the index, the number and percentage of high ranked (5 and above) and low ranked (4 and below) modes was calculated for the total number of Verbal Response Modes.

Finally, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs were calculated to provide further indication of the communicative strategies the community organizer used to claim status and involvement or familiarity with the public. This hierarchy of familiarity predicts that "individuals who are on a relatively intimate terms should use more highly ranked modes than individuals who are socially distant...; and individuals with greater relative power should use more highly ranked modes than individuals with less relative power because with greater

# The force of every illocutionary act has two aspects, literal and pragmatic that posit some relationship between the speaker and the other. The literal meaning or form indicates what is said, while the pragmatic or intent indicates what is meant regardless of how it is said. In Stiles' taxonomy, he averages the form and intent to determine the familiarity rank for each utterance. Stiles offers no explicit rational for averaging the form and intent. However, it seems reasonable to infer that Stiles' considers these two aspects of illocutionary equal in the sense that 1) both form and intent publicly communicate meaning about three aspects of experience (focus, frame and source). Although form refers to grammatical or literal meaning in contrast to intent which is pragmatic and must be read from the context, Stiles does not suggest that these differences indicate that one aspect of illocutionary force carries more or less weight than the other.
intimacy and relative power the seriousness of a given face threatening act is lower".[20]

Also, by combining Verbal Response Modes in specific ways, Stiles' familiarity hierarchy also specifies which indirect speech acts (mixed modes) should be regarded as polite, and their relative degree of politeness.
The Rationale for Selecting Stiles' Verbal Response Modes Methods

Learning about the ways that community organizers use facework tactics and strategies requires methods for analyzing the relationship between communicative practices and situated identity. Developed in direct response to the limitations of several approaches to the study of illocutionary acts through verbal process analysis#, Stiles' taxonomy of eight Verbal Response Modes provides a systematic, comprehensive set of procedures for investigating the relationship of communicative practices to dimensions of situated identity. As a conceptually-based, general-purpose system for coding every utterance to determine the illocutionary force or what is done (rather than what is said) when someone says something, Stiles' taxonomy

- focuses on the relational aspects of verbal communication;

- directly measures the illocutionary force of utterances by analyzing the form or the literal construction of communicative practices along with inferring the intent from 'reading' the contextual cues of occasioned interaction;

- permits direct, quantitative comparisons across different interpersonal roles and relationships;

- recognizes the ever-present competitive aspect of interaction as demonstrated by the existence of multiple, conflicting face wants, and

---

# Verbal process analysis was among the first generation of research on helper response modes to explore the role of words and language in the relationship between speakers and recipients of communicative messages. Early researchers examined types of verbal action in dyadic or small group situations by dividing communication into small units, generally on the order of the sentence. This early work addressed the differences between response mode use displayed by therapists of different therapeutic 'schools' or with varying levels of professional experience. This approach has been critical in the close analysis of help-intended communication situations that are distinguished by careful description of actual helping interactions, psychometrically sound measuring instruments and interest in testing assumptions about the nature of help-intended communication. Over the years, a number of closely related taxonomies based on the concept of verbal response modes have emerged.
identifies how facework strategies are selected in situated social roles.

The principles of classification for Stiles' taxonomy are based on the fundamental dichotomy in all communication of speaker versus other as separate centers of experience, or knowledge, ideas, feelings, memories and voluntary behaviors. By integrating this fundamental dichotomy with the idea that every illocutionary act of every utterance presupposes not only a speaker, but also an other who is the intended recipient of the utterance's illocutionary force, Stiles' taxonomy indicates that the intersubjective illocutionary force of an utterance depends on

1) whether it concerns the speaker's or other's experience,

2) whether it takes the speaker's or other's viewpoint, and

3) whether or not the speaker must presume specific knowledge of the other to make the utterance.

According to these three principles of classification -- source of experience, focus, and frame of reference are dichotomous -- each can take the value "speaker" or "other" -- and are orthogonal in the sense that all eight (2x2x2) combinations of them are possible. The eight possible combinations of "speaker" and "other" values define a mutually exclusive and exhaustive set of families of the intersubjective aspect of illocutionary acts -- Disclosure, Advisement, Edification, Confirmation, Questions, Interpretation, Acknowledgment, and Reflection. For example, Questions are defined as utterances that concern the others' experience, are focused on the speaker (no presumptions required), and use the speaker's frame of reference. Stiles argues that the eight Verbal
Response Mode categories are theoretically universal insofar as any verbal communication must be from one center of experience (speaker) to another (other).

Each of the eight Verbal Response Mode categories can refer to the form or to the intent of an utterance in terms of these three principles. Form is based on the literal meaning or the grammatical form of the utterance based on standard principles of English grammar usage and forms. The intent is the occasion or pragmatic meaning determined by a "reading" of the context of the utterance. In this sense, context can include the entire history of the relationship between the speaker and the other, or it can be based on immediate contextual features, such as tone of voice, preceding utterances, cultural and situational knowledge, and the like. The intent is coded in terms of the observable or "on record" intentions of the speaker. That is, the epistemological position of the coder is equal to that of the hearer of the utterance. Each has access to the observable or "on record" intention of the speaker. For example, in the utterance "It's cold in here!", the utterance can be interpreted as a direct report of a person's experience of being cold, or it can be a hint to the hearer to close the window or door. According to Stiles' taxonomy, the hint is off-record, so the utterance could only be coded in terms of the on record or observable intention of reporting an experience.

The relation of form to intent is expressed, "in service of." For example, "Would you roll up your sleeve?" is coded QA, which is read as Question in service of Advisement, i.e., Question form (inverted subject-verb order) but advisement intent (guiding the other's behavior). Each of the eight Verbal Response Mode is associated with a specific grammatical form, which retains a "formal" portion of its illocutionary force even
when used to express a different intent. The taxonomy includes 64 possible form-intent combinations, eight pure modes, in which form and intent coincide, and 56 mixed modes, in which they differ.

**Advantages and Limitations of Stiles' Taxonomy**

Since 1975, more than fifty empirical studies by Stiles' and other researchers [17] have attempted to demonstrate the theoretical universality, content validity and practicality of this taxonomy. In describing the development of the taxonomy, Stiles [21] explained that he based his taxonomy on the intersubjective aspects of behaviors that have been studied for years by philosophers and linguists as speech acts or, more precisely, as illocutionary acts. According to these philosophers and linguists, illocutionary acts have an intersubjective aspect that presupposes an intended receiver and sender. Assuming that any verbal communication must be from one center of experience (speaker) to another (other), each category of Stiles' taxonomy specifies a particular type of connection from one center of experience to another. Stiles' Verbal Response mode categories, unlike content categories, imply an intended audience. For example, one person asks another a question or gives an opinion to another person or offers advice to another person. Because the speaker is doing something to another person, each category characterizes the relationship between people. Each Verbal Response Mode can be considered a microrelationship between the speaker and the intended audience. Thus, each Verbal Response Mode describes the interpersonal relationship or microrelationship for that utterance.

Stiles states that each utterance a person makes implies a source, focus and frame, that is, whether the speaker is interested in the hearer's experience or her own,
whether the speaker takes the hearer’s viewpoint or uses her own, and whether the speaker presumes to know something of the hearer respectively. Thus, any verbal response can be understood in terms of whose experience is the topic, on whom the topic is focused and whose frame of reference is used. In doing so, Stiles taxonomy links psychological and social principles in terms of certain aspects of relationships. Stiles points out that these psychological and social principles of the taxonomy reveal certain aspects of relationships that are theoretically universal in the sense that they exist interpersonally and cross-culturally in every discursive interaction. On this basis, Stiles argues that his Verbal Response Mode taxonomy provides a conceptual bridge from individual speech acts to two-person discourse and interpersonal relationships.

A second important advantage of Stiles’ taxonomy is that it selects schemes from more than one metaclass and uses each scheme independently. That is, Verbal Response Mode coding procedures combine classifying differences among the categories with measuring or rating them along some scalable quality. This combination of the two metaclasses of speech acts and affective ratings allows for a detailed, multidimensional analysis of each utterance in relation to the context, without blurring the distinctions between the classes. Thus, the Verbal Response Mode coding reveals the intensity and detail of any utterance in both a qualitative and quantitative way.

The universality of Stiles’ Verbal Response Mode taxonomy has been demonstrated in its widespread application to a variety of discourses in a number of formats, and its use in studying a wide range of social roles, and relationships. Stiles’ taxonomy has been used in a variety of situations including psychotherapy, medical
interviews, informal conversations, letters, family interaction, job interviews, university lectures, political speeches, labor negotiations, courtrooms interrogations, radio call-in programs and television advertisements. As a highly reliable taxonomy with well-established content validity [17], Stiles' taxonomy also has been used to study a variety of social roles and interpersonal relationships. These role-relationships include

- client-therapist
- physician-patient
- married couples-strangers
- parents-children
- attorney-witnesses.

The practical application of the taxonomy is evident not only in its widespread use, but also in the versatility of its procedures. A number of studies have demonstrated that the taxonomy can be applied to any part of talk and writing without requiring that certain topics be discussed or certain response formats be used. In addition, the categories can be coded from written documents, transcripts, audio tapes, video tapes, or live interactions. Also, the coding notations are based on familiar English grammatical terms and definitions, thus making training in the taxonomy relatively simple and straightforward, neither requiring special abilities and skills.

In addition, Stiles' taxonomy uses an observational access strategy, not self-report, to code what people do in verbal interaction -- their speech acts-- not what they think. For example, in uttering "What's for supper?", what the speaker has done is ask a question. Asking a question is an example of a speech act. The coder does not have to read the speaker's mind in order to code this utterance. The grammatical form and the intent are publicly accessible, and on-record.
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Finally, Stiles Verbal Response Mode taxonomy represents a system for measuring the two dimensions of familiarity, status and involvement, that are the focus of this study. Status and involvement relate to aspects of social power, and the growth of intimacy or involvement through reciprocity. Applicable across a very wide range of familiarity or measures of status and involvement, Stiles' taxonomy uses a wide array of aggregate measures to characterize the degree of familiarity in an interaction. The sensitivity of the taxonomy to social and linguistic nuances allows for the analysis of issues of politeness in interpersonal encounters, it is derived from reliably codable speech act categories and is systematically integrated with other measures and constructs in the system.

The most important limitation of Stiles' taxonomy is that the classification procedures do not measure an utterance's content, affect, psychological depth, truth, likelihood, relevance or eloquence, nonverbal or paralinguistic behavior (laughter, tone of voice or facial expression). As such, the taxonomy is limited to measuring only one aspect of familiarity, and does not directly assess other critical and more complex, relational aspects of interpersonal familiarity such as sequencing and rhythm. Despite this limitation, Stiles' Verbal Response Mode has been proven to be a practical, versatile, reliable and valid set of procedures for addressing the central concerns of this study.

Next, the study's conceptual focus on the identity claims of status and involvement as expressed through community organizers' talk and writing will be explained through

Pearce's communicative perspective on community organizing and its basis in the changing nature of planning
practice, as outlined by Baum, Friedmann, Forester and other planning theorists, and

the theoretical and practical connections between illocutionary acts and the identity claims of status and involvement, as conceived by Tracey, Brown and Levinson and Lakoff.
CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

A Communicative Perspective on Community Organizing

Pearce's Communicative Perspective on Human Activity [22]

The current level of theoretical and practical interest in and increasing importance of communication is unprecedented in human history. Recently, Pearce has documented this trend in:

- the new communication technologies, such as computers, videotexts, fiberoptics and the like,
- the social and structural priorities of and requirements for maintaining and managing these technological advances in contemporary information societies, and
- the major contributions from the humanities, the social and natural sciences and mathematics to communication theory and research.

Out of this communication revolution, a more sophisticated understanding of and alternative perspectives on communication have emerged. Among these alternative perspectives, Pearce has proposed that communication should be viewed as a "way of thinking".

Pearce argues that although communication can be and often is perceived as one among many activities that people do, a more complete conceptualization views communication as encompassing all forms of human activity, from mundane pursuits such as eating, sleeping and the like, to more complex, intellectual activities such as scientific theory-building. Pearce summarizes this alternative perspective on communication by explaining that
"all forms of human activity...are a recurring, reflexive process in which resources are expressed in practices and in which practices reconstruct resources."

Pearce's communicative perspective emphasizes the resources (norms, values, mores, stories, myths, explanations, motives, names, labels, hierarchies, roles, characters, and the like) that shape and guide practices (performances, rituals, procedures, methods, processes, and activities) often in subtle ways. He illustrates this perspective with the example of eating in a restaurant.

According to Pearce, eating in a restaurant, like other human activities, consists of actions that express "social identities, symbols and institutions" that make this activity meaningful for the people involved. In this sense, Pearce states that eating, like all other human activity, is a communicative event,

"and the manner, place and companions with whom one eats comprises a rich communicative system."

Pearce's perspective on communication provides a hermeneutical or interpretivist alternative to traditional approaches to human communication that are based on empiricist or rationalist epistemology and theory [23]. By avoiding the common separation of action and meaning that characterizes these twin perspectives of empiricism and rationalism, Pearce's perspective "joins actions or practices with meanings or resources in a dialectical, coevolutionary relationship" [22] where the existence of one presupposes and requires the existence of the other. Within Pearce's alternative perspective, people actively express resources according to the contexts of their "culture, personal relationships, social roles, and autobiographies", and in the expression of these resources, people
reconstruct them. Accordingly, community organizing, as a form of human activity, can be analyzed with Pearce's alternative communicative perspective.

**The Social Practices of Community Organizing**

Pearce describes social realities as those "sets of social practices together with the other persons required to enact them and the stories that make them coherent.". According to this conceptualization, community organizing comprises a social reality involving a set of communicative practices that characterize community organizing, the relationship community organizers have with the public, and the socially-situated identities or face wants that define this relationship and influence interpersonal communicative behavior.

**From Instrumental Rationality to Communicative Interaction**

The history and theory of political planning indicate that all forms of planning practice grow out of the idea that scientifically-based knowledge about society can be applied to improve society. These forms of planning revolve around the core concern of how knowledge properly should be linked to action [24]. According to this conceptualization, the planning profession has been described as that 

"...variety of activities...employ[ing] apparently technical or rational methods for analyzing public problems and recommending actions to respond to them". [12]

As a profession explicitly concerned with establishing practical knowledge for understanding and solving social and human problems, planning typically is described as the conscious or deliberate predetermination of a sequence of actions aimed at accomplishing a problem goal [25]. According to this definition, the planning process
involves selecting and coordinating actions, as well as monitoring and guiding the execution of a plan to a successful conclusion.

While this conceptual definition of planning has been articulated in a wide range of disciplines such as cognitive psychology, social and political theory and philosophy, a basic assumption common to them all is that planning is a primary, commonplace, problem solving human activity. Although each discipline delineates different dimensions and procedures of planning, the prevailing conceptualization of the nature and process of planning which dominates current knowledge and understanding in each of these disciplines is that planning is an individual psychological event. By contrast, although planning can be described as problem solving in an intellectual sense, a number of planning theorists [18, 24, 27, 28] suggest that this description overlooks the critically important social dimensions of most planning activity.

Clearly, a major dimension of planning practice is instrumental and technical, and sometimes involves the work of a single individual engaged in problem solving tasks. However, this instrumental rationality operates within the social context of interpersonal relationships. Contrary to rational-instrumental conceptions of planning practice, the social context of the interpersonal relationships inherent in planning is intensely dialogical and discursive. Therefore, according to this conceptualization, the everyday, interpersonal social actions of planning practice are accomplished primarily through talking and writing. For example, Forester [18] tells us that planners routinely

"...describe projects, meetings and what someone said, present information to others, suggest new ideas, agree to perform certain tasks or meet at certain times, argue for particular efforts, report relevant events, comment upon
ideas and proposals for action...and engage in other minute, essentially pragmatic communicative acts."

And, through these pragmatic communicative acts, planners are involved in a fundamentally interpersonal undertaking which necessarily involves people solving problems with other people. Consequently, while planning often is instrumental and may involve individual, routine problem solving tasks, it always is social and communicative.

Forester further suggests that through these intensely social spoken and written communicative acts that characterize planning practice, planners attempt indirectly to claim favorable or powerful social identities for themselves. Planners make these claims through latent communicative strategies, or metamessages, designed to manage how people perceive and evaluate them, and in turn, respond to them. Since planning is fundamentally an interpersonal enterprise, planners' effectiveness in planning activities depends on the extent to which they can create favorable or powerful social identities, or faces, that result in valuable and important outcomes. In other words, planners' abilities to enact and support positive social identities, or to challenge unfavorable ones are critical in accomplishing desired goals and objectives.

In conclusion, the work that all planners do involves social, communicative acts that deal with their identity concerns or face wants. However, planners deal with these concerns in significantly different contexts. Specifically, the work that community organizers do with the public through social mobilization planning strategies and tactics represents one specific context of contemporary planning practice in which the communicative dimensions of situated social identity are explicitly emphasized and can be understood.
Community Organizing as Communicative Planning Practice

Increasingly, community residents are joining together by participating in neighborhood organizations to enhance their neighborhood support systems, exercise their political skills to solve neighborhood problems, and as a consequence, better the quality of their living environment. Within these efforts, growing numbers of progressive practitioners, such as social and political activists, community leaders, social service workers, and others, have chosen democratic social processes as the primary means for community development and social action. The increasingly widespread practices of grassroots community organizing and social action represent a movement away from the theories and tactics of mainstream, participatory and advocacy planning that were popular during the 1960s and 1970s. [29] Contemporary grass-roots community organizing achieves its goals through a particular set of social practices known as social mobilization planning.

Social mobilization [24], one of several forms of political planning that community organizers do, is designed to empower community residents in the places where they live and work. Social mobilization planning, like the other major planning traditions of social reform, policy analysis and social learning, is future-oriented advice-giving that links knowledge with action. In describing social mobilization's goal, Friedmann [24] explains that this tradition of planning

"starts from below as a form of self-liberation with people in their own communities taking hold of their own lives guided by their belief in their own agency. It requires the particularized, historical struggle to overcome the familiar problems of people's livelihood. The "client" is the mobilized community or group and the impulse and knowledge for social mobilization comes from within the community itself."
Friedmann further explains that the emergence of social mobilization planning as a preferred approach to community organizing is the result of several important historical and political trends. In addition to the limitations of the rational-instrumental model of planning practice described earlier, the increased complexity of the environment of planning practice, and major challenges to the hegemony of professional planning expertise are important considerations in the emergence of social mobilization as a major approach to community organizing.

The Increasing Complexity of Planning Practice.

Professional planning practice initially responded to problems of physical and social disorder that arose in the wake of industrialization in American cities. During that period and in subsequent years up until the 1960s, planning problems focused primarily on the physical environment and were conceptualized and addressed by planners in accordance with clearly defined means-ends solutions. However, Friedmann [24] argues that, in recent years, the demise of the certainties of positivism in all areas of social theory and life, the conditions brought about by the accelerated pace of historical events, and the unprecedented nature of contemporary events have complicated the stability required for mainstream planning to occur effectively. As a result, the practice environments of planning are no longer characterized by stability and clarity, but reflect instead, the constant transition and turbulence of modern technological existence. As these conditions constrain the forethought and plan-making processes characteristic of mainstream planning, planners routinely are required to deal with the more difficult, non-programmable problems without the benefit of adequate planning theory, methods and strategies.
Challenges to the Hegemony of Planning Expertise.

With the emergence of the Civil Rights Movement and the changing social environment of cities, urban renewal programs and other urban planning efforts became the object of opposition and bitter dispute. As racial minorities, the urban poor and other disenfranchised groups sought increased significant control over and political participation in decision making within the public domain, their social protest activities comprised a radical critique of the foundations of the social science disciplines and the inability of these disciplines to make good on their promise to provide solutions to the most pressing social problems of that period. Objective scientific knowledge based upon a firm empirical foundation was discovered to be disguised forms of deep ideological biases and controversial value positions that lent support to the status quo. Value-free, objective empirical research, and the liberal faith entrenched in the social disciplines literally were declared invalid and largely irrelevant by minorities, radical activists and disenchanted practitioners. As such, it was argued that mainstream, positivist nomothetic social science was inadequate in its ability to provide any critical perspective on contemporary political and social events.

Simultaneously, the social context and political events of the late 1960s and the early 1970s prompted serious ethical and strategic questions about professional practice in general, and the planning profession in particular. During this period, the very basis upon which planners and other professionals had established their claims to expertise and professional status was questioned seriously from within. Since the early 1970s, discussions among practitioners in medicine, planning, engineering, architecture, law, psychiatry, divinity, education, management and and many other professions reflect a shift from a
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general confidence in professional knowledge and its products toward a growing
dissatisfaction. These discussions have concluded that instrumental rationality and
applied science, the positivist hallmarks of professional theory, research and educational
training, no longer guaranteed effective practice, even in the traditional professions such as
medicine and law. The acquisition and mastery of domain-specific knowledge, skills and
technique were necessary, but insufficient conditions for practice. As a result of the
limitations of the rational-instrumental model of planning, the increased complexity of the
environment of planning practice, and the challenges to the hegemony of professional
planning expertise, substantive changes have occurred in the relationship between planning
practitioners and the public.

The Community Organizer-Public Relationship

According to Alexander's expansion of planning and other future-related
activities such as community organizing [28], the advising, and interpretive/communicative
perspectives can shed light on the some elements of the difficulties that community
organizers face in creating a favorable social identity of status and involvement. In Advice
and Planning, Krieger [27] uses the ordinary activity of giving advice to characterize the
work that planners do. He argues that planning, like giving advice, involves persons in a
relationship of trust, mutuality and truth to one another that allows them to talk about
and describe problems, and how these problems should be addressed.

"In asking for, giving, receiving and responding to advice, each person must figure out what to say about a difficult situation...to make sense out of a situation and tell a story that makes it meaningful..."
Krieger argues that the advising relationship requires an adviser and an advisee role, and specific ways for these roles to be enacted. On the one hand, the advisee is confronted with a problematic situation for which ordinary means for its resolution are unavailable or inadequate. That is, the advisee lacks the know-how to solve the problem. On the other hand, the “adviser claims to know what to do, and in giving advice, confirms the authority of his claim.”

On this basis, Krieger asserts that advice-giving relationships, including planning, are inevitably unequal, with the advisor holding greater status relative to the advisee. Thus, whether in intimate or more public contexts, "the roles of advisor and advisee feel different and seem unequal in power."

In *Planning in the Public Domain*, Friedmann [24] explained the social mobilization planner’s responsibility for mediating theory and practice. In this "Janus-faced" role, planners draw on substantive data, information and theoretical insight to talk about and write to specific audiences about specific problems in order to engage them in the educative processes of social learning. The purposes of this dialectical dialogue between the planner and the audience are validation of the knowledge the planner presents or "new perceptions of the problem and new modes of practice."

In a more extensive look at this dialogical, educative process, Forester's *Planning in the Face of Power* [18] focuses on the interpersonal consequences of informational distortions on the planner's credibility, and by extension, her relationship with clients and constituents. Forester identifies the planners' power as based in the possession and use of information, that is, substantive data, and knowledge of and access to bureaucratic
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procedures, organizations, and the like. Through his efforts to interpret and inform, planners exercise power in a highly politicized environment.

Although different, these perspectives of community organizing as advice, mediation/interpretation and informing are linked by the fundamental quality of communicative behavior that is designed to help. Elliot and his colleagues [31] refer to these situations of helping as

"a broad class of situations in which one person (helper, counselor, therapist, fellow support group, member, friend, interacts with a second person (help seeker, client, patient) with the intention of providing the latter with some form of...help."

Specifically, community organizers help the public to identify needs, to come together in a group, to achieve their goals, improve their skills, confidence and awareness, and their understanding of problems and issues. Despite community organizers' interest in providing assistance to people to help them get what they want, their ability to help is constrained by the role-related complexities of the conflicting identity concerns of status and involvement that must be addressed.

Krieger [27] reminds us that the planning profession emerged in the face of the breakdown of normal channels for solving problems. He further suggests that the basic task of the community organizer is to "use extraordinary means to do ordinary things." From this perspective, we can conclude that when the ability to organize communities effectively and efficiently through people's commonplace, ordinary relationships fails, people enlist the expertise of community organizers who offer advice on how to organize better to meet community needs.
Likewise, increased use of social mobilization techniques and procedures in community organizing illustrates other constraints that limit the ability of professional planners to apply their skills in these advice-giving situations. Instead of placing emphasis on the role of the professional planner, social mobilization strategies emphasize the fluidity of this role by indicating that the required skills do not rest with a single individual, but instead are shared among various people who emerge as various times as the leader because they possess the skills needed for specific tasks and situations [24]. Thus, not only do community organizers often lack technical expertise on which to draw, but they also serve at the will of the public and have no formal authority to dictate that the public follow their advice. This relationship of independence and connection is negotiated through the communicative facework strategies of status and involvement; and community organizers gain the important interpersonal commodities of credibility and influence through the efficacious management of these face wants.

The fact that the very nature of helping suggests the paradoxes of independence and involvement through the hierarchical roles of inequality inherent in the helping relationship is also of crucial importance. Although helping demonstrates care and concern, that is, solidarity and intimacy, between people, it also places the community organizer in a superior position that underscores the community organizer's superior status relative to others, and thus, their separation and autonomy. The implication of superior competence and the attempt to advise and direct the public's behavior intrudes upon the public's sense of privacy and freedom to act as they choose. As explained earlier, the paradoxes of involvement and independence must be balanced within the context of
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ambiguous authority over and contact with the public if the community organizer is to be successful in helping the public.

Thus, as community organizers advise, provide information, mediate, and the like, in help-intended communication situations, they choose what they intend the metamessages of their talk and writing to convey about 1) their independence from and involvement with the recipients of their messages, 2) the occasion and 3) what is being said. The strategic choices of illocutionary acts express community organizers' understanding of and desires for their relationship with the public, and through the expression of these choices, community organizers accept or adopt levels of status and involvement with the public. Ideally, the social identities that are projected will enable community organizers to accomplish their goals.

Social mobilization planning embodies this changed relationship by rejecting the planner-as-expert role of planning practitioners, and replacing it with a collaborative model of social interaction in which planners and their clients share more equal positions of power and influence as peers and co-partners in the planning enterprise. In this model, the role of the planner becomes more flexible, with less emphasis on professional status and training, and more on interpersonal skills and expressive behavior. In this sense, the planner can be one or a number of different individuals who exchange roles given the nature of the planning tasks that need to be done. Within this reconceptualization, the concerns and issues of interpersonal communication are at the center of planning theory and practice. By recognizing the flexible nature of the role-relationship of the planner to the public,
social mobilization acknowledges and confirms the primary role that negotiating complex social relationships plays in all planning activities.

Also, social mobilization maintains a central focus on analyzing and understanding the ways in which the practices of community organizing express how community organizers see themselves, the public and their relationship within the context of everyday, interpersonal interaction. According to social mobilization planning theory, the primary mechanisms for the expression of these resources can be found in the various forms of spoken and written interactional practices that characterize social mobilization planning. Specifically, as community organizers engage in public talk and writing, not only are they communicating substantive information, but they also are establishing and maintaining a relationship with the public: one that projects the socially situated identity or face that community organizers convey to the public. Next, an examination of the illocutionary acts that comprise these communicative strategies, and the connection of these illocutionary acts to the face wants of status and involvement will be explored.
Illocutionary Acts, Face and Facework

What People Intend to Do By What They Say

The use of words and language is the most basic and pervasive form of interaction between people#. Everyone uses words and language everyday in diverse ways in varied settings, primarily through talking to other people, or reading the words that are written to one another. As social practices, words and language do things*.

In recent years, Habermas [13], a leading contemporary critical theorist, developed a communications theory of society to locate, explain and analyze the practical, productive and reproductive effects of communicative action. The fundamental idea of this theory suggests that communication involves more than words, grammar, and syntax; it also involves what he terms "validity claims", that is, claims about the comprehensibility, sincerity, legitimacy and truth of what is being said. The theory suggests that normatively, communication should be understandable, sincere, legitimate and true.

Habermas' conceptualization of interaction revolves around this process of asserting, and responding to, validity claims in the gestures of others, especially in their speech acts. Thus, as people gesture and talk, they make claims about the means-end, correctness, and sincerity of their actions. Moreover, others implicated in such communications either accept these claims or challenge them, as demonstrated by the desired or undesired actions and responses that they display. Thus, an important aspect of all communicative, interpersonal social work is determining and using strategies that will lead to the acceptance of the claims being made, and desired actions and responses.

* This active dimension of words and language has been addressed in speech act theory, ethnomethodology and semiotics. Speech act theory studies the meaning of utterances as a functional unit in communication. Ethnomethodology is a branch of sociology which studies how people organize and understand the activities of ordinary life. Semiotics analyzes the systems using signs or signals for the purpose of communication.

Speech act theory and ethnomethodology both emphasize the idea that talking is a species of action. On the one hand, the primary principle of speech act theory is that the same sentence, the same string of words, can be used in different ways; that is, with the force of a request, an order, a question and so on.

On the other hand, ethnomethodologists have taken this idea even further by identifying a reflexive dimension to talk, stressing that an utterance can formulate both the nature of the action it is performing and the relationship between the parties involved in the talking. In addition, they note that utterances typically do not have just one but a whole series of consequences for the talkers and subsequent interaction.

By contrast, rather than emphasize function in this way, semiotists take into account both the words which are used for description and those which are not. This research tradition has shown that what is absent, or, more precisely, what is communicated in metamessages, is as important in providing meaning as what is present.
In orienting talk to its many different functions, people are using their language to express and reconstruct versions of the social world, reality and social interaction. Function, however, cannot be understood as a simple matter of categorizing pieces of speech. It depends, as semiologists point out, upon 'reading' the metamessages being communicated. That is, when language is conceptualized as a form of action performed in talk and writing between individuals with different goals, social context must be taken into account in order to read those metamessages. Social contexts, along with a system of distinction required for language to be used meaningfully, are not the property or creation of individual persons, but are of necessity shared across interpersonal, social and cultural collectivities. The common linguistic form for describing social action and interaction is the illocutionary act.

As indicated earlier, illocutionary acts, or what is done in making an utterance, are aspects of all talk and writing that convey action or what people intend to do by what they say. Illocutionary acts are defined by their force or logic of meaning and action. Illocutionary force

presupposes a speaker and hearer or recipient of the communicative message

defines the relation of the speaker and the other, and

depends on the speaker's communicative intent which must be read from the situational context.

For example, the utterance "Close the door!" may be seen as either a command or request, given the social occasion, the relationship of the people involved, and the speaker's intent.

All in all, the treatment of language as action by speech act theory, ethnomethodology and semiology moves toward a more social perspective on talk and writing.
Thus, every illocutionary act has an "intersubjective component that connects a speaker to a hearer or recipient" [17] and describes and defines the relationship of the speaker to the other for that utterance. The communicative practices and situated identities associated with this process can be explained by the phenomena of face and facework, that is, the socially situated identity concerns or face that these illocutionary acts express.
Face and Facework

Current research in language and social psychology demonstrates that relationships between people are based, in part, on the face or identity claims that people make for themselves or attribute to others in social interaction.\[1\] This social phenomenon of face is realized through the facework accomplished by the communicative acts that comprise both the tasks that people perform relative to one another, and the role-relationships* that they establish and maintain with one another.

Elaborating on her descriptions of face and facework, Tracey [1] tells us that the identity concerns of face and their realization through facework strategies are crossculturally universal and, if not always the focus of interaction, are pervasive in everyday life. She indicates that in our own culture, references to saving and losing face are commonplace ways for people to explain their own and other's behavior. Tracey points out, for example, that apologizing when making a request, noticing a friend's new accomplishment, threatening others and changing the topics of conversation can all be understood as appeals to face. Clearly, the identity concerns of face and facework occupy an important place in our interpersonal relationships.

Tracey indicates that the impetus for current research in two distinct approaches to face and facework in sociolinguistics and social psychology. These approaches can be traced back to Goffman's initial conceptualizations [2,3]. She argues that while both the sociopsychological lines of research and the linguistically-based

* Role relationships reference the relations that people have to each other in social interaction and which influences the way they interact.
Conceptual Background

politeness theory can be seen as orienting to face as the identity claims people make in social interaction, the traditions differ 1) in their focus on self or other's face needs, 2) what people's face wants are assumed to be, and 3) the degree to which they are elaborated and the attention given to the communicative practices that constitute facework. Despite these differences, however, each approach attempts to integrate the communicative practices of illocutionary acts with situated identity.

In the linguistically-based research tradition, Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness [4] represents the comprehensive approach that brings together face wants, communicative practices and situational influences. Drawing from Goffman's work and the idea of face as the public image every person wants to claim, Brown and Levinson's politeness-theory developed the idea of negative and positive face and the central concept of face threatening acts or FTAs.

According to Brown and Levinson, face, a universal commonality in language use across cultures, refers to the two common human social needs for caring, good opinion, intimacy and shared purpose (positive face), and the needs for deference, privacy, freedom and non-intrusion (negative face). Since it is in the practical interest of people to work to maintain each other's face, people use politeness strategies to maintain each other's face. Beginning with the linguistic unit of a speech act, where 'speech act' refers to the function or action performed by a particular utterance, face threatening acts are

"those acts that that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker."
Acts that seem to interfere with the hearer's freedom of action threaten negative face; acts that suggest that the speaker does not care about the hearer's feelings, wants, etc. threaten positive face. Brown and Levinson have constructed a hierarchy of politeness strategies for avoiding, minimizing, or undoing FTA's and a conceptual algorithm for predicting which strategy a speaker will use, depending on the FTA's seriousness. The variables that largely determine an FTA are the social distance of the interactants, their relative power, and the absolute ranking of the imposition in that culture.

Despite the problems of politeness theory concerning the the use of speech acts as the basis for their theory, the inadequacy of their politeness rankings and their simplistic and narrow approach to identity concerns, Tracey [1] suggests that Brown and Levinson's work provides a linguistically elaborated sense of how two very general identity concerns, positive and negative face, are displayed. By contrast, Tracey indicates that sociopsychological approaches are more adequate, however, in elaborating the complexity of identity issues that motivate communicative behavior that Brown and Levinson's theory misses.

Within sociopsychological research, Tracey describes extensions of face and facework in Goffman's later research emphasizing aspects of situationally-triggered identity management, self-presentation theories and bargaining and conflict represent major directions inquiry. In particular, the line of research on self-presentation theory# Self presentation refers to the numerous strategies that people employ to control and manage their outward images and the impressions of themselves which they present to other people...Self-presentation involves a wide range of behavior including 1) verbal presentations; 2) nonverbal and expressive behaviors; 3) artifactual displays; and 4) purposive behaviors. With regard to verbal presentations, self-presentation can be found in any verbal statement. This is most obvious when someone makes some direct claim about her own personal qualities, but even the most innocuous verbal statements that make no obvious claims about the self are self-revealing. The specific social
shares significant features with the concept of face, and like politeness theory, begins its analysis with illocutionary acts.

While Tracey points out that self presentation and other sociopsychologically-based approaches to face provide more elaborated concepts of identity, she indicates also that this research is limited in its inadequate attention to the communicative practices and behaviors used to realize the identity concerns. Given the limitations of both linguistically-based politeness theory and sociopsychological approaches to face, Tracey argues for the development of a theory of facework based on "a more realistic notion of social interaction as well as the way selection of facework strategies in situated social roles (e.g. teacher-student)...based on rights and obligations"

While confirming the identity implications of all messages, in every interaction, Tracey asserts that an adequate theory of facework should address the ways in which face wants or identity claims 1) depend on situation, personality and culture, 2) confirm the tensions between different aspects of face involved in social situations, and 3) indicate how communicative acts determine the level of face threats. She states that an important requirement of this theory of facework that can account for this active selection of facework strategies or illocutionary acts to project identities of status or involvement must study both the contexts or situations in which they occur and the actual illocutionary acts themselves. Contextual knowledge ultimately facilitates the assessment of the communicative intent of the patterns of illocutionary acts that speakers use.

identities and impressions of primary concern to all human beings are the universal interpersonal needs of conveying connection with and independence from other people.
Recently, Lakoff [6] addressed these requirements for a theory of facework by extending Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and its concept of identity concerns beyond positive and negative face issues to specify the communicative strategies used to enact, support or challenge different images or identities. Like Brown and Levinson, Lakoff begins with the concept of politeness, as

"a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange."

According to Lakoff, politeness is concerned with

"how languages express the social distance between speakers and their different role relationships", and how efforts by the participants to communicate and/or prevent the loss of a positive face, that is the positive image or impression of oneself that one intends to show to the other participants."

Lakoff indicates that speakers realize politeness by manipulating the interactional risk or face-threatening potential of illocutionary acts. These manipulations take the form of speech act replacements that include

- indirectness or avoidance of a confrontational speech act, as in the substitution of an imperative speech act with a less intrusive question speech act, or
- mitigation of the illocutionary force or intent of a speech act with a milder, face-saving superficial form. [4]

Lakoff points out that these choices are based on the context of the speaker's culture, the speaker's personal relationships with the hearer or recipient, and the social roles the speaker accepts or creates in specific communicative situations. Specifically, a speaker's understanding of and desires for her relationship with the recipient along the
dimensions of status and involvement exert a primary influence on the illocutionary acts that make up the speaker's talk and writing.
SIX STUDIES OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

On the basis of exploratory research that refined and validated the combined use of situational description and verbal process analysis for understanding community organizing#, Stiles' Verbal Response Mode procedures were used to study how three African American community organizers from different community-based organizations in the same city and neighborhood addressed status and involvement in their public talk and writing in six different episodes of community organizing. These procedures determined 1) the task(s) each organizer had set for himself in his communicative behavior, 2) the role dimensions each fulfilled through his words and language, and 3) the level of familiarity each community organizer accepted or adopted relative to his audience(s) along the dimensions of status and involvement.

The tasks were calculated according to the frequency or percentage of each form and intent of every utterance in a given episode. Aggregate measures of the frequency and percentage of these forms and intents were calculated to characterize the role dimensions that each community organizer was realizing in his utterances. The mean ranking of the form and intent for each utterance was calculated to provide an index of each community organizer's relationship with the audience. Finally, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent form and intent pairs were calculated to describe the specific communicative tactics and strategies each community organizer used to claim status and involvement with the public.

The two organizations and community organizing activities studied were

# In 1987, I participated in a participatory environmental design project in which interactions from design meetings were recorded and analyzed according to a variety of verbal process procedures including Stiles' verbal response mode taxonomy.
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**Brothers and Sisters** and its Common Square Reclamation Project, and

**The Unity Coalition** and its collaboration with the Planning Council, and

Within these organizations and the specific community organizing activities, the following six episodes of community organizing were analyzed:

**Brother and Sisters Common Square Reclamation Project**

1) Audiotape of an initial speech by the community organizer announcing plans for the project to the Mason Square community

2) Audiotape of a second speech by a community organizer outlining the specifics of the project to the Mason Square community

3) Letter from a community organizer of the project requesting support from Springfield City Council members.

**The Unity Coalition and the Planning Council**

4) Memorandum from the head of the Coalition to members of the Town Meeting Planning Council for consideration by the Common Square community

5) Conversational exchange between the head of Unity and Council members at a Town meeting

6) Letter from the head of Unity to members of the Council and the Common Square community in response to the October Town Meeting.

## All the names of organizations, locations and community organizers have been changed.##
Each case study begins with situational and contextual background information that provides a backdrop for the analysis of communicative behavior that follows. Each case study ends with conclusions that recap the major finds of the analysis.
THE COMMON SQUARE RECLAMATION PROJECT:
Creating Alliances

Episode 1: The First Meeting of the Common Square Reclamation Project

Recent trends in urban development have been characterized by the fact that some communities grow and prosper while others decline [32]. This trend is rooted in an ideology of growth that emanates from a loose collection of financial, commercial and real estate interest that shape city development. The result of the domination of this coalition has been the advancement of real estate development and downtown growth. While this direction of growth has certainly improved the personal and institutional well-being and wealth of elite groups and people who use the city principally for business and profit, this ideology also has caused the displacement of families and workplaces from gentrifying neighborhoods, the lack of resources in declining inner city neighborhoods and destructive forms of ghetto expansion, in the form of absentee landlords and crimes related to drug usage. Also, the concentration of power in the hands of these interest groups, and nonrepresentative city councils and city bureaucracies have become the legitimate mechanisms for citizen participation in planning and decision making.

The Situation

According to its residents#, until thirty years ago, the Common Square area of Eastern City, Massachusetts had been the center of retail and social activities for the city's Black community. Since that time, the physical, economic and social

#All references to and direct quotations from organization members' statements and thinking were drawn from field notes, participant observations and casual conversations.
conditions in the area have undergone considerable change. In conversations with people living in the area, I learned that much of the aging housing stock of former single family homes had been converted into multiple dwelling units, resulting in fewer on-site home owners, a transient rental population and absentee landlords. Residents reported that the relaxation of discriminatory housing practices, and the subsequent increase in housing opportunities for minorities in other parts of the city had resulted in Common Square becoming a waystation for young, upwardly-mobile individuals and families. As this segment of the Black population increasingly opted to rent or buy in other areas of the city, the older, less mobile, and poorer members of the community have been left with the difficult tasks of the economic and physical upkeep of residential property.

As Common Square had become more heavily concentrated over the years with Black and other social and economically disadvantaged minority groups, residents also reported that the shopping and retail district of this community had experienced significant disinvestment, urban blight and deterioration. Businesses that once contributed to the economic stability and vitality of this area had abandoned Common Square for other parts of the city and the surrounding metropolitan area. During several walking tours of the area, I observed that throughout a significant portion of the residential and retail areas of Common Square, vacant lots and empty buildings dominate the landscape.

Located in the heart of the Common Square retail district, the Monument Shopping Plaza, popularly known as the Plaza, has been of particular concern to many
Common Square residents. A small shopping strip that once housed a variety of small, thriving stores and shops serving the Common Square community and other residents of Eastern City, the Plaza had fallen victim to the ravages of urban blight in recent years. In stark contrast to earlier times, the Plaza presently consisted of rubbish-filled structures abandoned years ago by store owners and small businesses. The only remaining business at the Plaza was a liquor store. The steady stream of cars and customers to the liquor store had created constant automobile congestion, loitering and littering in the empty parking lot and inside the deteriorated structures adjacent to and near the liquor store.

A number of residents agreed that the recent escalation in the frequency and severity of the problems at the Plaza has had an increasingly negative effect on the quality of life for many Common Square residents. For example, they noted that activities at the Plaza were dominated by the sale and use of illegal hard drugs, loitering and alcohol consumption, and illegal dumping. Also, people reported that the abandoned buildings served as transient shelter for the homeless. Likewise, they believed that the absence of security and police surveillance at the Plaza had contributed to the increase in robberies, assaults and other criminal activities. Finally, a large number of people expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the lack of progress on the demolition of the Plaza and the surrounding area to make way for the construction of a new middle school. According to their calculations, this planned construction had been delayed for seventeen years.
The Project

In the spring of 1990, two members of a local community based organization known as Brothers and Sisters, Inc. began to discuss the possibility of starting a community-wide summer project to address conditions at the Plaza. According to these members, the project would involve removing the debris and rubbish from the Plaza parking lot, boarding up the vacant buildings, installing adequate lighting, and offering rehabilitative counseling and job and housing referrals for drug addicts, alcoholics, homeless and other people in need who frequented the Plaza. Upon completion of the physical and social rehabilitation efforts, Brothers and Sisters, along with other local groups and organizations, would co-sponsor a series of public, community-oriented events and activities at the Plaza.

The Organization

Brothers and Sisters, Inc. is a volunteer community organization based in Eastern City's Common Square community. Brothers and Sisters was started approximately three years ago by a small group of Black men and women, from a variety of professional, political, white-collar and skilled occupations, who are longtime friends and residents of the Common Square area. The organization's mission is to

"...initiate, develop, coordinate and enhance community assets..." Brothers and Sisters Mission Statement, 1989

As a relatively new community organization in the Common Square area, the founding members of Brothers and Sisters stated that the idea for starting the organization emerged from their perception that established groups and organizations had been largely ineffective in addressing important community issues. These members explained that in trying to fill in the gaps left by these established organizations,
they wanted Brothers and Sisters to assume a leadership role in providing services and advocacy for Eastern City's Black community.

Since 1989, Brothers and Sisters had sponsored a variety of neighborhood activities and projects to address issues related to uneven development within the Black community and problems evolving from this phenomenon. In efforts to confront and challenge the negative effects of uneven development in the Common Square community, members of Brothers and Sisters have collaborated with other individuals, groups and organizations in the Common Square community. Through mailings and leaflets, interpersonal contacts, media presentations, speeches and community meetings, Brothers and Sisters wanted to educate the Common Square community about various issues and causes, the urgency of unifying to bring about or resist change, and the importance of people standing up and being counted. Through its activities, the Chair stated that Brothers and Sisters hoped to become recognized as a leading community organization.

My observations of and conversations with organization members indicated that most members of Brothers and Sisters enjoyed a relatively high level of acquaintance with Common Square residents as longtime friends and neighbors. As friends and neighbors, most had been in daily contact with Common Square residents for many years, and continued to maintain a high level of current, on-going contact. Their interactions as neighbors, friends and relatives, as patrons of local businesses and as co-participants in and members of a range of social and political groups and local activities confirmed the substantial degree of role-diversification in their
relationships. Although the orientation of their interactions and role-relationships included task-oriented functions, I concluded from member's comments that most interactions between members and the community have been oriented primarily toward persons.

Members of Brothers and Sisters reported that, as a group, they have achieved levels of education and financial success that exceed the majority of Common Square residents. Most members had completed college, while many had finished graduate and professional degrees. All members were employed in professions such as law and teaching, and white-collar management and business occupations. Despite the status and expertise associated with their considerable educational and occupational achievements however, most members agreed that their relationships and interactions with Common Square residents were based less on these factors, and were more heavily-weighted in terms of equality and solidarity with other residents as neighbors and friends.

The relationships that members of Brothers and Sisters maintained with the area itself and with Common Square residents were described positively. Members consistently expressed great affection for the people of Common Square as well as for the area. Since many organization members lived in Common Square neighborhoods, they often talked about their own personal and pragmatic interests in the well-being and improvement of the area in discussions about the proposed project. For most members, Common Square was a geographic as well as a symbolic home. Despite the longevity and high quality of these connections to the area and with the residents,
however, it seemed to me that the interactions of members of Brothers and Sisters, as
functionaries of that organization, with the rest of the Common Square community, was
a new and relatively undefined and untested relationship. This new relationship was
moving members of Brothers and Sisters from acquaintances and interactions that
emphasized equality and solidarity to ones that stressed the inherent inequalities of
status and social distance. For example, members of Brothers and Sisters expressed
their awareness that participation in the organization helped to change their
relationship of relative equality with others based on neighboring and friendship to
one based on the more unequal relationship of advising and leading these same
neighbors and friends.

In light of its relatively recent beginnings, the need to establish Brothers
and Sisters' identity as a leader in the Common Square community was of prominent
concern for many organization members. For example, many members often mentioned
that the implementation of the proposed project would be a major step toward
accomplishing Brothers and Sisters' goal of becoming a prominent community
organization. Also, other members were convinced that a successful effort to define
problems and propose solutions for the Plaza through the project would publicly confirm
Brothers and Sisters' leadership qualities and abilities. Finally, by convening a
meeting of Common Square residents, leaders and organizations to consider its specific
proposal to address the conditions at the Monument Plaza, Brothers and Sisters would
have an opportunity to exert its authority by defining the forum in which the
deliberations would occur, the nature of the problem, how it would be addressed, and
what actions would be taken for the problem's solution.
In considering appropriate vehicles for establishing leadership status and authority within the Common Square community, members of Brothers and Sisters often discussed their personal relationships to the Common Square community as a primary asset. Their assessments suggested that the organization's credibility with the Common Square community would be based, in large part, on the network of personal relationships and contact that individual members maintained with other Common Square residents. In order to facilitate the efficient use of members' extensive and positive network of personal relationships and interactions, Brothers and Sisters decided that a team approach to leadership on the project would be optimally effective.

The Overall Goals

Although the project's immediate focus was on cleaning up the Plaza, members explained that this effort was being undertaken in support of a larger cause. First, members of Brothers and Sisters recognized the need for neighborhood activities designed to mobilize Common Square residents. To this end, the proposed project could develop a viable model of direct action for addressing future community issues. They added that participation in project activities would enhance residents' sense of their own abilities to create social change, while preparing them to assume a more substantive role in the redevelopment of Common Square. Members of Brothers and Sisters also pointed out that this project could help to create a power base for residents' participation in decisions made about Common Square. Such a power base would serve to change the relationship residents have with city government and politicians by
confirming residents' viability as an important stakeholder in the Common Square area. Finally, they indicated that participation in the project could convey a sense of the shared vision among a significant portion of Common Square residents, and that this area should remain the symbolic and geographical center for the city's community. Brothers and Sisters hoped that through this project, Common Square residents and other concerned citizens and organizations could begin to find mutual acknowledgment of the issues that joined them together and to determine the degree of overlap in how they individually defined a major issue of concern. This project would a solid foundation upon which concerned residents, citizens and organizations could unite in their interdependence.

In my estimation, the most obvious beneficiary of Brothers and Sisters' persuasive effort was the Common Square community. However, Brothers and Sisters also would benefit in a number of important ways as well. First, the project would provide Brothers and Sisters with a forum for reaching a large and diverse group of residents about their views on conditions at the Plaza in particular, and in the Common Square community in general. Out of that group, Brothers and Sisters would almost certainly encourage some people to become more active by participating in their project. If Brothers and Sisters could persuade enough people to participate in its project, it would establish itself as an important organization in the community. Also, widespread reporting of Brothers and Sisters' success in organizing this community could extend the organization's reputation to the Eastern City community-at-large.
The Strategy

The two members who proposed the project along with several volunteers from Brothers and Sisters membership represented the project and the organization as the planning and implementation project team. The project team decided to hold a community meeting to present Brothers and Sisters' plan for cleaning up the Plaza. Announcements of a community meeting to discuss conditions at the Plaza were mailed to Common Square merchants, heads of social service and community agencies and local politicians. Also, notices were posted in Common Square businesses and community agencies announcing the meeting to residents and other concerned citizens.

The Organizational Representative

Claude Lane, the primary spokesperson at the initial meeting of the Common Square Reclamation Project, was a mayoral aid and one of a small number of Blacks working in city government. In this position, Lane had received extensive public exposure, and was regarded by many Common Square residents as an up-and-coming young Black politician in Eastern City. Lane's connections with other political power brokers in the city made him similar to audience members who also were politicians and city officials. On the other hand, as a member of the political elite, Lane also was able to provide significant actual and psychological rewards for the Common Square residents.

According to members of Brothers and Sisters, Lane was chosen as the primary speaker because of his high level of credibility with the audience on several dimensions including his networks with city government and politicians, his possession
of knowledge and experience that many audience members did not have, and personal involvement and rapport with audience members that demonstrated good will and trustworthiness and similarity with diverse members of the audience.

Lane's political influence and visibility was balanced by his longtime residency in Eastern City. Lane had been actively involved in community affairs through membership and active participation in a number of Common Square organizations and activities. His sustained involvement in the Common Square community confirmed my perception that he resembled many Common Square audience members in important ways. Like his neighbors and friends, Lane had been directly impacted by the conditions at the Plaza. Also, it seemed reasonable to me that the consistency with which Lane had been involved with Common Square in the past and present enhanced his perceived trustworthiness. Based on Lane's past record of involvement in community issues, I concluded that many audience members felt that Lane's concern about Common Square was genuine and heartfelt.

Lane had spent several years as a city bureaucrat, and was an active member in a number of community organizations. Lane's membership in these organizations and city government provided him with experience and competence that many audience members did not have. In other words, he knew how to get things done, and had the connections to pull them off. On this basis, Lane could provide important contacts and information for the effective implementation of the Common Square project. As I listened to Lane articulate the plans for the project at a number of meetings, I concluded that he possessed a considerable understanding of the media, how to access important
resources and people, and city guidelines for the care and maintenance of city-owned property, and how Brothers and Sisters could use these resources to initiate and carry through the Plaza project.

Considered by many residents as the rising star in the leadership ranks of the Common Square community, Lane commanded the authority that was enjoyed by other heads of social service agencies, and established community leaders and local businessmen. Through this status as a community leader, Lane was strategically positioned vis-a-vis others in the community to exert his influence. However, primarily because of his status as a city bureaucrat, he maintained a level of social power that was unique among the Common Square leadership. As a governmental insider, Lane had established considerable credibility among Common Square leaders as one of a small number of Black individuals with:

- expertise in the day-to-day operation of city bureaucracy
- extensive networks with influential members of city government
- important informational resources.

Over time, I observed that Lane was in frequent, daily contact with the leadership of the Common Square community as their colleague and as a city bureaucrat. Their contact was ongoing given the nature of his work as an important professional link with city government, as a colleague in community leadership and as a neighbor and concerned Common Square citizen. Although tensions between present Common Square leadership and Brothers and Sisters were often discussed at organization meetings, a general sense existed among members that both groups needed
to come together to present a united front to and to wield power among entities outside of the community.

Lane had maintained an on-going relationship with a number of constituencies, and in the process, had demonstrated that he had the best interests of these different constituencies in mind. Some of the constituencies maintained an adversarial contentious relations with Brothers and Sisters and with each other. Lane expected to maintain a long term, on-going face-to-face relationship with all stakeholders from the Common Square community. He would continue to be active and an advocate, using his reputational qualities of fairness, expertise, and widespread acceptance in a number of settings. The community would provide Lane with a measure of resources, important primary networks and support. He would also continue to be in a collegial and collaborative relationship with community leaders.

Lane also had established on-going professional relationships with politicians and city bureaucrats who supported his emergence as a legitimate power broker in political circles. Within these circles, their support depended on the power Lane held with the Common Square neighborhood. While the community maintained an adversarial relationship with bureaucrats and local politicians, Lane hoped to maintain a balance and not unnecessarily antagonize either group. After a brief introduction and the showing of a fifteen-minute videotape of the Plaza, Lane spoke for approximately 10 minutes.

The Setting
The first meeting was scheduled at a local community center during the early evening hours directly after work and before supper when most people were free to attend. It seemed to me that both the location and time of the first meeting underscored the organization's expectation that residents' participation was important in accomplishing Brothers and Sisters' goals. Specifically, members explained that the community center was selected to convey the message that participation was intended primarily for the Common Square community. This location also confirmed that attendance was open to all residents who wanted to attend. Brothers and Sisters considered the location and openness of the meeting to be a comfortable arena for a diversity of community residents to interact with one another. The meeting was scheduled directly after work and before the supper hour when most people were free to attend.

Although the room chosen for this initial meeting could accommodate most of the formally-invited guests, it was small enough to appear crowded with fewer than half of the guests in attendance. According to Brothers and Sisters, the room's crowded atmosphere could heighten the sense of urgency, interest and excitement in the meeting. The space orientation was formal, with the distance between the audience and speakers primarily social. Audience participants faced in the same direction, but at varying distances from the table and chairs at the front of the room that had been reserved for speakers from Brothers and Sisters. Although none of the speakers were seated at the tables in front, they stood or sat near the front of the room. Brothers and Sisters placed a large television monitor and video set-up at the front of the room to show the audience a videotape of the Plaza. The formal arrangement and electronic
equipment suggested that an audio-visual presentation would be included as part of the meeting format.

As group vehicles for accomplishing various tasks, meetings routinely are practical work-oriented situations that involve people whose behaviors are relevant to achieving a specific task or goal. This particular meeting began with a specific topic that was fixed in advance by Brothers and Sisters, with each speaker from Brothers and Sisters addressing the main topic and only that topic. This structure limited audience participation to a question-and-answer period largely controlled by Brothers and Sisters. At the beginning of the meeting, speakers from Brothers and Sisters presented their views on conditions at the Plaza to the audience in planned speeches given in an expository fashion. Residents who attended the meeting were given an opportunity to react to and express their opinions and thoughts about the information presented during the meeting. One member of Brothers and Sisters determined the order of participants who wanted to speak by recognizing speakers from the audience.

Although the work accomplished was primarily task-oriented, concern among members with developing and maintaining positive, social relationships with the audience was prominent as well. Therefore, each speaker from Brothers and Sisters would be allowed the time needed for self-expression. Based on my own observations of and conversations with organization members, I inferred that the high level of connection and solidarity between members as neighbors and friends with residents of Common Square suggested that the discussion would be, in all likelihood, characterized by a degree of emotional responsiveness from all participants.
Consequently, while the content of Brothers and Sisters' presentation was largely informational, the interactional, affective and involved purposes would be emphasized as well.

Since Brothers and Sisters' project proposal was an overt expression of persuasion about which the speakers would express their own point of view, members expressed a high level of awareness of the need to be prepared to convince the audience about the project. Despite the fact that speakers for the meeting reported giving serious thought to the comments that they would make, most decided to speak as spontaneously as circumstances would allow. I anticipated that presenting their views in a relatively loose and fragmented manner would facilitate the flexibility required for tailoring what they would say to fit the situation. I concluded that this spontaneous, flexible speaking could be described more accurately as talking rather than making a speech or formally-planned presentation.

The meeting began and concluded at the stated times. The options on language choice were individually determined by each Brothers and Sisters' speaker. Although most people knew each other from the neighborhood, the extent of social activity accompanying Brothers and Sisters' formal presentation was minimal: introductions of speakers were brief, greetings by the speakers were moderate, and acknowledgments of specific audience participants were the only truly social aspects of the meeting's format.

The Audience
As a small, relatively young organization with limited resources, Brothers and Sisters understood that it could not work independently to implement the project. According to most members, the successful effort to change current conditions at the Plaza would depend on the widespread support and participation of Common Square residents, professional social service providers and other concerned citizens. Brothers and Sisters determined that the audience for this meeting would consist of:

- Common Square residents
- Social service agencies and providers
- Community leaders
- Business owners
- State and local politicians
- City bureaucrats
- Members of the local media.

During discussions at Brothers and Sisters' weekly meetings, members often talked about the variety of ways that Common Square residents and concerned citizens have responded to conditions at the Plaza over the years. Members pointed out that social service agencies currently provided direct services to alleviate symptomatic manifestations of conditions at the Plaza, including unemployment and substance abuse counseling, and housing and welfare referrals. On a number of occasions, they also recalled how a small group of business owners and community leaders had tried unsuccessfully to clean up the area surrounding the Plaza several years ago. Also, members of Brothers and Sisters described how Common Square residents often engaged in informal discussion and debate about and condemnation of the condition of and activities at the Plaza. Members believed that the general feeling among community residents was that conditions at the Plaza had deteriorated to an all-time low.
However, despite the community's present and past efforts to address conditions at the Plaza, and verbal demonstrations of concern, most organization members agreed that no systematic, community-wide effort to correct these conditions had been undertaken in recent years. Many members expressed the belief that while a majority of the residents and concerned citizens were dissatisfied with the results of past and present efforts regarding the Plaza, residents' primary tactic had been to avoid or ignore the situation at the Plaza as often as possible. According to organization members, this tendency of residents and concerned citizens to avoid dealing with Plaza had contributed to the longevity of the problems.

On the surface it may seem reasonable to think that the immediacy of living long-term with the day-to-day problems at the Plaza among Common Square residents and the personal jeopardy that they experienced from its duration would argue for their direct action to alleviate this situation. However, Brothers and Sisters' assessment of voting activity and membership in community organizations was that Common Square residents were not well-organized or politically active. According to Brothers and Sisters, residents generally do not view themselves as empowered to change the situation through their own direct actions. Instead, they depended on governmental and social service intervention to address the litany of issues and problems of escalating crime, unemployment, uneven development, and other forms of urban disinvestment that their community faces. One member of Brothers and Sisters member explained that while residents voiced their feelings, opinions, and concerns to each other, they generally relied on more influential people and organizations for the active resolution of community issues and problems. In light of residents' limited access
to or power with the city and within existing community agencies, this member also reported his belief that residents felt a significant degree of disenfranchisement.

According to this member, one unintended, negative consequence of this phenomenon was the overdependence of many residents on outside groups and individuals to initiate and carry through efforts to address issues in their own lives. In recognition of the inertia emanating from residents' sense of powerlessness and frustration, Brothers and Sisters recognized that shaping new beliefs among residents about various options for action and about themselves as agents of social change would be an important, yet difficult part of the work.

Also, among social service agencies and providers, and community leaders, Brothers and Sisters identified a range of support for and opposition against the problems at the Plaza. Within the ranks of potential supporters of the Brothers and Sisters' proposed project, several of these individuals and groups had tried to resolve these problems at the Plaza with limited success. Although these individuals and groups had not been involved in recent efforts to change conditions at the Plaza, Brothers and Sisters seemed optimistic that most of these groups and organizations agreed with Brothers and Sisters' assessment of the need to change the rapidly deteriorating conditions and support Brothers and Sisters' effort. Among these potential supporters, Brothers and Sisters saw the need to intensify their support from "lip service" to a more strongly felt commitment to take action.
According to members of Brothers and Sisters, however, opinions about its project were not uniformly favorable. They were aware that other social service agencies and providers and community leaders had conflicting attitudes on the issue and needed help to change their response from lack of commitment to endorsement. Several times, members of Brothers and Sisters raised the possibility that varied interest in and information about the Plaza might make some people or organizations unable or unwilling to make up their minds about what to do. According to Brothers and Sisters, these individuals and groups who stood "on the fence" needed to be moved further toward acceptance of Brothers and Sisters' proposal.

Another important concern among members of Brothers and Sisters was that a successful Brothers and Sisters' project would serve as an unwelcome contrast to what they had not been accomplished by other social service agencies and providers and community leaders. Although these agencies and leaders also believed that the conditions at the Plaza were problematic and should be addressed, it was also possible that they might also feel that the proposed project could overshadow and reflect negatively on their own efforts.

In addition, Brothers and Sisters also explained that among many Common Square residents, a general sense existed that Common Square leaders' ability to provide services and leadership to the community by addressing general and specific problems and issues was limited. Residents believed that the scope of influence among community leaders, groups and organizations did not extend beyond the specific agency responsibilities. And often they were ineffective even in those designated areas.
Brothers and Sisters also realized that other groups believed that the city, and not community agencies and organizations, should bear the responsibility for correcting the problems at the Plaza. According to these groups, the burden should not fall on an already overtaxed community. And Brothers and Sisters' project would merely add to the City's record of abandoning its responsibilities to the Common Square community. Among those in opposition to the project, Brothers and Sisters wanted to reduce this hostility or cast enough doubt on their opposition to cause a level of ambivalence that would encourage reconsideration.

Brothers and Sisters also understood that the City was legally responsible for the condition and use of the Plaza. Prior to the announcement of Brothers and Sisters' plan for the Plaza, the Mayor and other city officials, city council members, the district state representative(s) were supportive of other measures for redeveloping the Plaza and the adjacent area. Unless Brothers and Sisters convinced these individuals that support of its project was beneficial, city, local and state politicians and bureaucrats would continue to commit their resources in support of development proposed by more influential entities.

During its discussions about the proposed project, Brothers and Sisters determined that a major obstacle to resolving the problems at the Plaza was the manner in which people had dealt with those conditions in the past. In order to overcome the obstacles that would limit widespread participation on the project, members of Brothers and Sisters decided to focus on
changing people's perspective on the severity and immediacy of conditions at the Plaza,
clarifying the disadvantages of people's present behavior toward these conditions,
prescribing what behavior would more effectively address these conditions, and
encouraging people to become more productively involved in changing these conditions.

On the basis of the situational and contextual factors, I anticipated several areas of resistance among residents and concerned citizens based on conversations with members of Brothers and Sisters and my own observations of the Common Square community. Residents' tendency to avoid contact with the Plaza had become a norm for neighborhood behavior in this situation. The norm of avoidance provided a degree of stability and behavioral guidelines that defined appropriate responses to the Plaza situation. The proposed project would be a disturbance to this state of equilibrium that had become the modus operandi for many neighborhood residents. In addition the changing relationship between members of Brothers and Sisters and neighbors and friends may be incompatible with normative expectations from one another, encouraging resistance and rejection of these new unequal role relationships.

After the project team presented a 20-minute video tape of the Monument Plaza, Lane spoke to the audience. The following excerpt from Lane's comments illustrates the nature of his remarks:

"That was a pretty powerful film. I know the first time that I saw that film I was really amazed. I have drove Winchester Square Plaza thousands of times and I had an
idea of what went on over there but to see it that stark really touched and moved me. And I was over with Bill on a couple of days when he did the filming and it was just unbelievable to me that the people doing the things that they were doing over there in Winchester Square Plaza. They literally ignored us. No one was trying to hide from the camera. No one seemed that concerned with the camera. Everything we did was wide open and ...

I talked to a couple of people and this person told me that is just a microcosm of what happens in our community. And I hope that is not true. I know that's not true, but for some persons that is the image that is cast."
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

TASK: Lane's task was based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and Verbal Response Mode intents (across forms).
TABLE 1.1 - LANE'S TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Categories</th>
<th>Form and Intent N = 312</th>
<th>Form N = 156</th>
<th>Intent N = 156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(49%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbal Response Mode Analysis 89

Numbers 1 - 4 represent low ranked modes, and 5 - 8 represent high ranked modes. As Table 1.1 indicated, Lane's presentation during the initial meeting was dominated by Edifications and Disclosures, that is, statements of objective and subjective information respectively, in grammatical form and communicative intent. Essentially, Lane used third-person (Edification or information form) or first-person (Disclosure form) declarative sentences to talk about his own private experience (Disclosure intent) and about objective matters (Edification or information intent). These are represented by the D(D), E(D), E(E),and D(E) modes. The two categories of Edification and Disclosure accounted for 254 or 82% of all utterances.

According to Stiles' taxonomy, Disclosure and Edification differ only in frame of reference. While the intent of Disclosure is to reveal oneself by conveying subjective information, the intent of Edification is to provide data by conveying objective data. In Disclosure, the speaker reveals his or her own thoughts, feelings, wishes, perceptions or intentions, whereas in Edification, the speaker provides information that is neutral or objective, that is, shared with other people. To illustrate #

2 I know the first time that I saw that film, I was really amazed. D(D)
3 I have drove Monument Plaza thousands of times D(E),
4 and I had an idea of what went on over

# The coding is based on a reading of immediate contextual factors such as the preceding utterances, tone of voice, and the like; however, coding also is guided by background information. The degree to which the coding choices 'make sense' in terms of the situational overview and contextual background are also considered. For example, not only does the D(D) code make sense in terms of the immediately surrounding utterances, it also is in accord with other situational factors such as the expositional task, the need to develop rapport with and connections with the audience, the requirements of social penetration and the benefits of gaining reciprocity through self-disclosure.
In this excerpt, Lane was talking about the video of Monument Plaza that had just been shown to the audience. The coding of line 4 as Disclosure in service of Disclosure, or D(D), was based on several of my observations about Lane's utterances. First, immediately prior to line 4, Lane had been providing information about his reaction to the film and his experience with the Plaza. Lane's utterance on line 4 continued to provide information to the audience by conveying his personal thoughts and perceptions. Second, the subject of this utterance is first person, so the form was coded as Disclosure. Third, the intent of line 4 was to reveal Lane's private awareness of conditions at the Plaza, from his frame of reference and focused on himself with no presumptions about the audience required. Because a person would have to read Lane's mind to know for sure if his report of his perceptions about the Plaza were true, the code of Disclosure for the intent of Lane's statement was chosen. That is, Lane is "on record" as revealing his awareness and is not revealing objective, neutral information that could be shared or known by other people. So, the intent was coded Disclosure (D).

And it was just unbelievable to me that the people doing the things that they were doing over there in Monument Plaza. E(D)

They literally ignored us. E(D)

No one was trying to hide from the camera. E(D)

In this excerpt, Lane was talking about his experiences video recording activities at the Plaza. After expressing his personal evaluation of these activities in line 7, with a grammatical form that suggested that his evaluation would be shared by anyone who saw what he saw that day, Lane stated how people responded to the fact
of being video recorded. On line 8, the subject is third-person, so the form is Edification.

The intent was to communicate Lane’s experience, according to his viewpoint, without necessarily presuming knowledge about the audience. This utterance clearly reported Lane’s private evaluation of what people were doing at that time.

---

65 I want to address one question that’s going to be presented to each and every one of us that decides to take part in this project. D(C)
66 And that is why we should do it, E(D)
67 And why we don’t let the city do it. E(D)
68 I think the first answer is pretty clear. D(E)
69 The city hasn’t done it for seventeen years. E(E)

---

In line 69, the subject, the city, is third person, so the form is Edification. With regard to the intent, the central experience was Lane’s observation. Lane presumed no specific knowledge of the audience’s experiences in making this statement. However, the frame of reference was neutral, or objective. That is, this assertion’s truth or falsity could, in principle, have been determined without access to either Lane’s or the audience’s private experience. Its truth could be known by reviewing the city’s actions over the past seventeen years. Thus, the intent was Edification, specifically, to convey objective information.

---

10 No one seemed that concerned with the camera. E(D)
11 Everything we did was wide open. E(D)
12 I talked to a couple of people. D(E)
13 And this person told me that is just a microcosm of what happens in our community. E(E)

Immediately prior to utterance 12, Lane was talking about what had happened while he and another member of Brothers and Sisters were video taping at
the Plaza. After describing people's reactions to being filmed, he proceeded to describe
how the filming had been done. Utterance 12 used first-person declarative form to
convey information about his conversations with some people. His conversation was
observable or objectively factual behavior, that is, anyone who had been in the right
place at the right time at the Plaza could witness his conversations with these people.
Therefore, the utterance was coded Disclosure in service of Disclosure, or D(D).

The next most frequently occurring Verbal Response Modes was Confirmation
(agreements and disagreements), numbering 40 or 13%. Lane most often used first-person
plural (Confirmation form) where the referent includes the audience to compare his
experiences with the audience's. To illustrate, in the utterance

48 but, I think we have to show to the people in this
community that people care about this commu-
nity D(C)
49 that that blighted area can be used for something
very positive E(D)
50 And we're going to talk about that this
evening. C(C)
51 and Bill will be more specific on it. E(E)

the form is first person plural where the referent "we" includes the audience. The
intent was to indicate that Lane and the audience will share an experience (talking
about something), thus the source of experience was Lane's, but the frame of reference
was shared and the focus was on the audience.

Much less frequently, the Confirmation form was used to talk about objective
matters (Edification or information intent), that is C(E). To illustrate,

33 There are many persons in our community
who are trying to do economic development. E(E)
34 We have Joe Spruill who is heading up
the Weave Development project. C(E)

George Johnson is putting a development up right next to that project. E(E)

In this excerpt, Lane was describing what some people have been doing to improve the Common Square community. By using the first person plural in which the word "we" included the audience, line 34 was coded with the Confirmation form. In this utterance, however, Lane intended to provide information that fit an objective fact whose truth could be checked by anyone. Therefore, the intent was coded as Edification, or as an assertion of fact.

Altogether, the four modes of Advisement, Question, Acknowledgment, and Reflection comprised only 5% of all utterances. Thus, Lane's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents, was the exchange of information regarding objective and subjective issues through Edification and Disclosure (82%), with a secondary emphasis upon comparing experiences with the audience through Confirmation (13%). However, going beyond the immediate contextual features of preceding sentences to consider other features, such as the cultural and situational information, tone of voice and the like provides additional texture to the preceding analysis of Lane's task of exposition through Edification and Disclosure.

First, the general purpose of meetings that is, providing and exchanging information in public settings, is congruent with Lane's use of exposition. Also, the frequent use of Edification and Disclosure appears to have successfully quantified the broad outlines of this particular episode in a manner congruent with Forester's explanation of informational basis of planning practice [Forester]. Also, Friedmann's
account of the expositional focus of social mobilization procedures and the techniques of
mediating theory and practice often used in community organizing concur with these
Lane's expositional strategies. Finally, Lane's objectives of changing people's thinking
depends on the persuasive use of this exchange of information. However, providing
information also had implications for the Lane's identity claims of status and
involvement.

First, giving information to someone about something suggests that the
information being exchanged and provided is important, and as such, should be
attended to by the listener. Second, informing also implies that the speaker not only
wants the addressee to know, but also thinks that the addressee should know.
Furthermore, informing implies that the speaker is the one who should cause the
addressee to know. Therefore, the claims of status and involvement through the process
of providing information points to the inherent inequality between those with
information and those for whom information is being provided. Exchanging information
positions participants in a hierarchy of unequal status relative to one another: a
hierarchy in which the giver of information holds a high level of familiarity relative
to the recipient.

Furthermore, the specific use of Disclosures to convey subjective information
controls or directs the frame of reference for the information that is being exchanged.
The frequency of the Disclosure verbal response mode in Lane's comments had an
important impact on the claims of status and involvement because the directiveness of
Lane's Disclosures posed threats to the negative face wants of members of the audience:
a group of people that held varied and oppositional opinions and commitments about
resolving problems at the Plaza. On this basis, the degree to which the audience shared Brothers and Sisters' viewpoint on the Plaza was questionable. Consequently, the claims of status inherent in the frequent Disclosures in Lane's utterances posed noticeable face threats to the audience's sense of autonomy. However, the use of Disclosures also brought benefits in terms of mitigating the potential for face threats to the audience's freedom by supporting rapport and sincerity in the following ways.

Specifically, the use of Disclosures or I-statements for exchanging information personalized the information communicated in Lane's introductory comments. This approach underscored the possibilities of reciprocity between Lane and the audience, and created an atmosphere conducive to building rapport between them. Lane's approach functioned as a counterpoint to the inequality that typically characterizes the role relationship of providing and receiving information. In addition, the personal and intimate quality of Lane's frequent use of Disclosures in this episode of informing suggested that Lane was 'talking with' rather than speaking at the audience. The cultural implications of the approach of talking can be further explained through a consideration of this basic speech genre.

As a basic speech genre, talking implies that a person wants to say many things not because he has to, but because he wants to say them. Moreover, talking indicates that a person says things because of the desire to say them to a particular addressee, i.e., because he wants to cause a particular addressee (or addressees) to know what he wants to say. Consequently, talking is necessarily dialogically oriented. Even if only one speaker is doing all the talking, his attitude is still dialogical. The
Contextual Background

speaker is trying to communicate with a particular addressee, and she assumes that the addressee would want to know what he wants to say. This dialogical attitude can be observed frequently in public "talks".

When somebody 'gives a talk', comments or questions -- and even interruptions from the audience -- are normally expected. Talks are more informal, because they imply an expectation of spontaneous verbal exchanges. Since giving requires a recipient, it is significant that people usually "give" talks: . Talk implies something like 'open yourself to me', 'say things to me that would cause me to know what's on your mind', 'interact with me by saying things to me that are on your mind'. 'Let's talk about it' implies something like 'let's share our thoughts about it', suggesting a mutual activity and an effective communication between person and person.

Thus, the frequent inclusion of Disclosures across form and intent throughout Lane's utterances, in addition to more subtle contextual cues such as tone of voice and the spontaneity of his remarks, made Lane's comments seem more like a conversation between friends or equals than like a formal speech or presentation in which an official representative of an organization provides information to a listening, uninformed audience. Therefore, Lane's Disclosures suggested a level of mutuality and reciprocity that provided a degree of balance to the inherently unequal, hierarchical, face threatening act of exchanging information, and further served to balance the impositions inherent in Disclosures.
In conclusion, Lane perceived his task as exchanging objective and subjective information, a status-claiming activity that created social distance between him and his audience. In claiming the status of information-giver, he sometimes used the Verbal Response Mode of Disclosure to control the audience's frame of reference. While the directiveness of these Disclosures imposed on the audience's freedom, the support to positive face that was gained through the solidarity and reciprocity that Lane's Disclosures simultaneously balanced his utterances' impositions.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all verbal response modes that made up Lane's task into the higher-order conceptual role dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how these verbal response categories conveyed the role Lane assumed in this episode. Overall indices and the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Lane's utterances appear in Table 1.2.
TABLE 1.2 - ROLE DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OVERALL (Form and Intent)</th>
<th>FORM N = 156</th>
<th>INTENT N - 156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (I)-Attentive (A) (Self-centered)</td>
<td>(I) (A)</td>
<td>(I) (A)</td>
<td>(I) (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of central experience</td>
<td>(97%) (3%)</td>
<td>(96%) (5%)</td>
<td>(99%) (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassuming (U)-Presumptuous (P) (Deference)</td>
<td>(U) (P)</td>
<td>(U) (P)</td>
<td>(U) (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus or central topic</td>
<td>(84%) (16%)</td>
<td>(83%) (17%)</td>
<td>(86%) (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive (D)-Acquiescent (Ac) (Control)</td>
<td>(D) (Ac)</td>
<td>(D) (Ac)</td>
<td>(D) (Ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame of reference or viewpoint</td>
<td>(39%) (61%)</td>
<td>(23%) (77%)</td>
<td>(52%) (48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimension, the proportion of utterances whose source or central experience was derived from the audience's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentional actions was small. Specifically, 3% of the total of the form and intent modes were coded for the attentive modes of Question, Acknowledgment, and Reflection. By contrast, the overwhelming majority of Lane's utterances were informative or self-centered; that is, 97% of the time, when he spoke, the source or central experience that Lane expressed was based on his own thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions and behavior. This
was displayed by the greater frequency of the total number of Edification, Disclosure, Confirmation and Advisement response modes that Lane used. These data suggest that Lane's utterances indicated less interest in, and therefore, involvement with the audience's knowledge and experiences. By extension, the egocentric focus of the informativeness of Lane's utterances was minimally supportive of the audience's positive face wants of interest in and concern for them from Lane.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Lane's utterances in which the central topic focused on the knowledge of what the audience is, was, will be, or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending was indicated by the relatively low frequency (16%) of Advisement, Confirmation, and Reflection or presumptuous Verbal Response Modes. Instead, Lane's utterances were characterized by a predominance of deference toward the audience. This deference was displayed by the more frequent use of Edification, Disclosure, Question, and Acknowledgment response modes. That is, 84% of the time, Lane did not impose his own experience on the audience by presuming to know about them.

According to Stiles, presumptuousness has the greatest degree of familiarity, and consequently, poses the greatest impositions on an audience's desires for freedom and privacy. The analysis of Lane's utterances indicated that most often Lane assumed a role that lessened the face threats of presumptuousness by choosing deferent communicative behavior that lessened the power asymmetries inherent in presumptuous behavior.
Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control role dimension indicated that the proportion of utterances in which Lane used a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with the audience through the use of Edification, Confirmation, Acknowledgment and Reflection was 61%. That is, close to two-thirds of the time, Lane did not impose his own will on the interaction in order to direct the verbal exchange. Instead, more of his utterances were acquiescent rather than controlling and allowed a shared viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. The less frequent use of Disclosure, Question, and Advisement response modes (39%) that conveyed his own frame of reference or personal viewpoint confirmed Lane's general acquiescence to that common perspective, and limited the potential for impositions on the freedom of the audience.

In conclusion, overall figures for the role dimensions indicated that, for the most part, Lane's comments conveyed objectivity. He accomplished this primarily by being 1) informative in using his own thoughts, feelings and intentions rather than the audience's knowledge and experiences as the source, and 2) largely deferent or nonpresumptuous by making the central topic what his own and not what the audience's experience is, was, will or should be. Finally, more often than not, Lane acceded to a commonly held constellation of ideas, memories, meanings, and the like for giving meaning to the experience. Overall, Lane's comments can be summarized by the role dimensions of informativeness, deference and acquiesce. These set of role dimensions are associated most closely with the Verbal Response Mode of Edification. Thus, Lane's role can be characterized primarily as Edification or as providing objective information.
By disaggregating overall indices into the form and intent indices for each of the role dimensions of informativeness and deference, it became apparent that these form and intent indices are congruent with the overall indices on these two role dimensions. That is, Lane was consistent in how he perceived his role in terms of the task and his social relationship with the audience on these two dimensions. For example, on the role dimension of self-centeredness, both form and intent indices are congruent with the overall indices on this dimension. The form and intent indices indicated that Lane played the role of someone whose task was primarily informative and whose social relationship required that, in accomplishing this task, he avoid imposing upon or threatening the audience's negative face in providing that information. This required Lane to talk about his own knowledge and experiences rather than the audience's knowledge and experience. However, disaggregating the control (Directive-Acquiescent) dimension into its form and intent indices revealed a more complex picture of what Lane was up to.

The form index for the control dimension indicated that the literal meaning or the grammatical form of the majority (77%) of Lane's utterances were non-directive or acquiescent. Specifically, the grammatical forms that Lane used were constrained by his social relationship with the audience. This relationship has been described as one in which Lane had to convince the audience to follow a newly-emerging organization that needed to establish its legitimate claim to authority. As such, this relationship prompted Lane to convey a shared viewpoint in the form of his utterances, that is, one that was held in common with the audience. By using this shared viewpoint, Lane
could avoid imposing on the audience's negative face wants for freedom from outside control.

By contrast, however, the intent index for the control dimension indicated something quite different. According to these data, 51% of Lane's utterance intents, which were constrained by the task of conveying information to an audience that had to be persuaded to change its ideas and views, were directive or controlling. Therefore, contrary to outward appearances or literal meanings, Lane more often intended that the meanings he gave to the thoughts, feelings, perceptions and intentional behavior that he conveyed come from his own personal viewpoint. Thus, in terms of the control dimension, the literal meanings conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms contradicted somewhat Lane's Verbal Response mode intents. This discrepancy between the form and intent of many of Lane's utterances along the control dimension suggests that these utterance intents were too directive a task for Lane's relationship with the audience. In response, Lane adopted politeness strategies to conform to the constraints of this relationship. Lane's politeness strategies for mitigating directive intents with non-directive forms can be understood in terms of the earlier discussions of the face threats inherent in the communicative act of providing information, and the relationship between the organization and members of the audience.

In conclusion, it seemed that Lane's intention to take a more controlling stance in his interaction with the audience conflicted with the implicit norms suggesting that his relationship with the audience did not warrant this controlling behavior. In other words, he perceived his task, that is, what he was doing as
different from his social relationship with the audience which required a less controlling interaction. As a result, Lane was under pressure to direct the audience's frame of reference or viewpoint without offending or imposing upon them. In response, he chose discrepant form and intent combinations to obscure what was going on linguistically.

**RELATIONSHIP:** The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index was used as an overall measure of Lane's identity claims for status and involvement in his relationship with the audience. The analysis of Lane's use of specific Verbal Response Mode categories ranked from high (a score of 8 or Advisement) to low (a score of 1 or Acknowledgment) familiarity is detailed in Table 1.3. Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs that are included in Table 1.3 provides further indication of the strategies that made up Lane's community behavior.
TABLE 1.3 - RELATIONSHIP

Familiarity Index: 3.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW RANKED MODES</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RANKED MODES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E(D)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D(E)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C(E)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURE MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E(E)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D(D)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C(C)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A(A)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. K(K)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = Edification  D = Disclosure  C = Confirmation  K = Acknowledgment  A = Advisement

In summary, the mean rank of Lane's 156 utterances scored for 312 form and intent response modes on a scale of 1 (low) to 8 (high) produced amid-range Familiarity index of 3.45. A further analysis of this Familiarity index indicated that 263 or 84% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the Edification,
Disclosure, Question and Acknowledgment categories, those modes ranked lower on the familiarity hierarchy. The remaining 49 or 16% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the high-ranked modes of Advisement, Confirmation and Interpretation and Reflection.

This distribution of Verbal Response Modes on the familiarity hierarchy reflected the calculated Familiarity Index, demonstrating that in the majority of his utterances, Lane claimed a position of low status and involvement. Specifically, Lane resolved the tension between the face threatening act of informing that suggested greater familiarity, and the need to mitigate these face threats inherent in the act of informing with specific patterns of discrepant form-intent combinations. Lane's relationship with this audience can be further explained by the patterns of mixed and pure modes.

Out of the 156 form-intent combinations that made up Lane's utterances, 96 or 62% represented mixed modes or form-intent discrepancies. Of these 96 mixed modes, the Edification in service of Disclosure E(D) mixed modes occurred in the majority (68 or 71%) of the mixed modes. Lane's Disclosures intents imposed upon the audience in terms of their directiveness or tendency to restrict the audience's freedom. That is, Disclosures generally do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. When paired with the Edification form, which is lower on the familiarity hierarchy, Lane lowered or mitigated this controlling intent, and thus attempted to indirectly control without explicitly appearing to do so. To illustrate, consider the utterance
That was a pretty powerful film. E(D)

This utterance is third-person (Edification form) declarative that talks about objective data. The form indicates that Lane's declarative statement was neutral or objective and was shared with other people. In other words, the form of Lane's utterance argued for its veracity by implying that most people, upon viewing the film, would agree to the truth of Lane's statement. In fact, Lane's intention was to communicate his own thoughts and feelings about the film. Deciding the truth (sincerity) of any aspect of this statement would require seeing into Lane's mind, an indication that Lane was expressing his own thoughts and feelings. By lowering the Disclosure intent with the Edification form, Lane could avoid the appearance of imposing his own point of view, or opinions and feelings on the audience. Lane appeared to be acceding to the audience through an utterance that, on the surface, represented a view that was shared or held in common with the audience, when, in fact, he was imposing his own personal viewpoint on the interaction.

The next frequently occurring mixed mode, Disclosure in service of Edification or D(E) occurred in 12 or 13% of the mixed modes. An illustration of this mixed mode is in the example

I talked to a couple of people. D(E)

In this utterance, the Edification intent was raised or made more directive in the Disclosure form. This strategy seems counterintuitive, given Lane's apparent concern to mask the intention to be more controlling than he appears to be. However, the very act of disclosing may contribute to the sense of intimacy or closeness that Lane was trying to
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

claim with the audience in this episode. Self-disclosure, or the deliberate sharing of self, may thus function as a medium of exchange in the growth and maintenance of interpersonal relationships.

Research in social, personality and clinical psychology, as well as in communication studies [33] suggest that self-disclosure contributes to and increases the prospects of intimacy and reciprocity in interpersonal relations. Therefore, what Lane risked in appearing to be controlling or directive, and thus, posing threats to the audience's negative face wants for freedom and autonomy, with the Disclosure form, was offset by increasing the possibility of achieving closeness with the audience by deliberately sharing his own perceptions, feelings, opinions and ideas. This particular use of Disclosure suggests that Lane might have seen a potential payoff in the audience's increased solidarity with Lane and, by extension, with the organization.

While a variety of other mixed modes were used, Lane's overall strategy was to lower or mitigate higher-ranked, more imposing intents with more polite, lower-ranked forms. In fact, the majority of the 96 mixed modes, were lowered or mitigated. In those instances in which the lower-ranked, polite intent was raised to a high-ranked form, the imposition of the higher-ranked form was offset by supportive or positive gains for Lane. For example, the following utterance is an example of a low-ranked intent that has been raised to a high-ranked form:

34 We have Joe Spruill who is heading up the Weave Development project... C(E).

Although the Edification intent indicated Lane's deference in conveying information to the audience, while the Confirmation form was more presumptuous and
imposing, the Confirmation form also was reassuring to the audience by claiming Lane's shared experience with, and therefore, connection and solidarity with the audience. An understanding of the frequent occurrence of mixed modes also can be explained further by once again going beyond the immediate context to reconsider aspects of Lane's relationship to various audience members identified in the situational description.

Although the majority of Lane's utterances were mixed modes, the remaining 60 or 38% consisted of pure modes in which the form-intent combinations matched. The use of pure modes in certain utterances suggested that Lane did not perceive any particular conflict between his task or what he was trying to do and his social relationship with the audience in those specific instances. That is, he did not feel a significant degree of interpersonal pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

35 George Johnson is putting a development up right next to the project. E(E)

This third person declarative transmits objective information, scored Edification intent.

In the utterance,

52 I've got to talk fast now. D(D)

the subject is first person, so the form is Disclosure. The utterance communicated Lane's private motive, that is, his intention to say something else. It reflected Lane's experience, from his frame of reference, and was focused on himself.

In another example,

83 Trust me. A(A)
the subject is imperative in form -- with "you" as the understood subject -- and was coded Advisement. Lane presumed to impose an experience on the audience. Thus the source of experience and frame of reference were Lane's, but the focus was on the audience, that is, Advisement intent.

Finally, in the utterance

88 We're going to use the media to bring attention to that area.  C(C)

the form is first person plural where the referent "we" includes the audience. The intent was to indicate that Lane and the audience will share an experience (using the media), thus the source of experience was Lane's, but the frame of reference was shared and the focus was on the audience.
Conclusions

Lane’s task of exchanging objective and subjective information conformed to the practical, goal-oriented work that all community organizers are required to perform at meetings. Giving information through Edification and Disclosure, however, placed Lane in a dominant position relative to the audience, and signaled social distance between them. This dominance was problematic for Lane in two important ways.

First, the audience had knowledge about and experience with the Plaza. According to Brothers and Sisters, some audience members may have considered their knowledge and experience superior to the assessments offered by Lane. On this basis, Brothers and Sisters believed that these audience members would resist and oppose the project. Second, the audience had not been closely involved with the organization Lane represented. This lack of involvement did not warrant Lane’s claims of familiarity with the audience. The ways in which Lane used Edification and Disclosure to address these claims of status and involvement are described in the following.

In providing objective information, Lane’s Edifications were unassuming and acquiescent, indicating a low degree of familiarity or face threatening impositions in these utterances. However, the self-centeredness of these Edifications did not demonstrate interest in the audience’s experience. Consequently, while the focus and frame of Lane’s Edification response modes were not particularly threatening to the audience’s negative face wants, at the same time, the self-centered source of experience of Lane’s Edifications did not support the audience’s positive face wants either.
On the other hand, while the focus of subjective information through Disclosures was unassuming and polite, the directiveness or control in Lane's Disclosures restricted the audience to Lane's viewpoint or frame of reference, posing threats to the audience's negative face wants for autonomy and freedom from outside control. This threat to negative face, in addition to the threats to the audiences desires for attention and concern posed by the self-centeredness of Lane's Disclosures indicated a greater degree of familiarity. However, this effect of this claim of greater familiarity was offset by the contribution that Lane's Disclosures made to the growth of interpersonal relationship he had with the audience as the representative of an emerging organization. On this basis, I concluded that although Lane claimed greater familiarity and thus more impoliteness through the use of Disclosures, this verbal response mode also promoted increased mutuality and reciprocity with the audience.

The two role dimensions of informativeness and deference that Lane assumed were each characterized by consistency between form and intent. However, on the control role dimension, the form of the utterances that Lane used, which was acquiescent, contradicted the intentions that indicated greater directiveness. This discrepancy between the form and the intent on the dimension of control suggested that Lane experienced interpersonal pressure to obscure the restrictions he was placing on the audience by directing the frame of reference in the interaction.

Finally, the distribution of Verbal Response Modes, and the resulting Familiarity Index indicated that Lane adopted a relatively moderate degree of familiarity with the audience. The strategies Lane used in his communicative behavior to
achieve this Familiarity Index were conveyed by the frequency and patterns of mixed and pure form and intent Verbal Response Mode combinations.

The frequency of mixed modes was somewhat higher than the occurrence of pure modes indicating a higher level of interpersonal pressure for Lane to obscure what he was up to linguistically. The pattern in most mixed mode form and intent combinations was to mitigate or lower high ranked intents, which were constrained by the task at hand, with low-ranked forms, which were constrained by the social relationship. In other words, although Lane's Verbal Response Mode intents conveyed greater familiarity with the audience, his actual relative status and involvement with the audience prompted him to redress or make these intents less serious and imposing. The objective of Lane's politeness strategies in redressing these intents was to mitigate the impositions of informativeness and control.

Reactions

After Lane's concluding comments, another member of the project team briefly reviewed details about the plan of action for the project. While several audience members asked questions about the logistics and the wisdom of the plan, most people expressed support for the organization's efforts. A show of hands indicated that most people in attendance were interested in and supportive of the project.

At the close of the meeting, a number of people remained at the center to discuss their reactions to the video tape, and to ask questions about proposed project with members from the organization. As these discussions continued, representatives from local television
and radio stations interviewed several of the main speakers from the meeting. Later that evening, excerpts from the meeting and the interviews were broadcast on a local television station.
First Meeting Transcript - Claude Lane, Speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 That was a pretty powerful film.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I know the first time that I saw that film I was really amazed.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I have drove Winchester Square Plaza thousands of times</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and I had an idea of what went on over there</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 but to see it that stark really touched and moved me.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 And I was over with Bill on a couple of days when he did the filming</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and it was just unbelievable to me that the people doing the things</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 they literally ignored us --</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 no one was trying to hide from the camera,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 no one seemed that concerned with the camera,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 everything we did was wide open and ....</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I talked to a couple of people</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and this person told me that that is just a microcosm of what</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 and I hope that that is not true.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I know that's not true,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 but for some persons that is the image that is cast.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That (person coughing) is located on the main thoroughfare not only of the Winchester Square community or the Mason Square community but the city of Springfield.

There's a lot of people who should be very ashamed of that.

Certainly our city officials have to be pretty embarrassed to have that type of thing happening on State Street.

There are persons that live here in Mason Square, who have grown up here in Mason Square, shopped here in Mason Square, have roots here in Mason Square,

we have to be pretty embarrassed by that

and there is a dual responsibility there.

A question can be asked.

Why should we do this?

Why should we the people that live here in Mason Square be involved in cleaning up what is basically city property?

Some people will say that a school is going to be built there

and the city is going to have an obligation to clean that up anyway.

And that is true,

but I think we'll be hard pressed to say when the school is going to be built there.

That school has been planned to be built on that property since 1974

and we're closer to 1991 now than we are to 1990,

so that is 17 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Speaker (R)</th>
<th>Speaker (L)</th>
<th>Turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>There's many persons in our community who are trying to do economic development.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>We have Joe Spruill, who's heading up the WEAVE project, has headed up the mid-town plaza, the c-town plaza project;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>George Johnson is putting a development up right next to that project;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr. Byron's trying to put up a development over on Wilbraham Road by his former gas station.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>And they all ran into one problem -- trying to get key tenants</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>because when people come from outside our community one of the first things that they see is that Winchester Square Plaza.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>We don't see it anymore.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I know I don't see it anymore.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>It's been here for so long we've come to accept it.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>We've come to say that it's somebody else's job to correct it.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I'll get to how we can do that.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>But it's more than that.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>It's more than that.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes, we have to clean it up</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>but I think we have to show to the people in this community that people care about this community,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>that that blighted area can be used for something very positive.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>And we're going to talk about that this evening</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Bill will be more specific on it.

I've got to talk fast,

they asked me to come and give a pep talk.

and I'm down

every time I see that film I go down,

I don't go up,

I go down.

But I know there's a lot of work to do

and I know we have the resources to do it.

We have about 25 people here tonight,

we invited about 125,

but that's okay

because we'll start the project

and when we start the project people will come on board.

Most people really feel deep in their hearts like we feel that something has to be done.

I want to address one question that's going to be presented to each and every one of us that decides to take part in this project

and that is why we should do it and

why we don't let the city do it.

I think the first answer is pretty clear --

the city hasn't done it for 17 years

and if we wait on the city we're going to be living with that.

The city lives on Main Street,
the city lives on the suburbs of town,
this is ours.
This is where our businesses are,
this is where many of us grew up, many of us live at,
this is where we come to go to a beauty shop and the barber shops
and do some shopping.
This is the area that is identified as ours --
that's why we should do it.
We should do it because we can no longer live with it.
But I will tell you that once we begin to do it --
trust me --
the city will do their part
because they cannot afford not to do their part.
Part of our effort -- and I don't want to get into it too much because Bill will --
because we will bring attention just like this film brought attention to us,
we're going to use the media to bring attention to that area.
It's going to be positive attention
because it's going to be attention that we the people that care for the community are doing something about it.
We're meeting our responsibility,
the city is going to have to go out there and meet theirs.

Things are getting off the ground in our community.

Our community used to be labeled a laid-back community,

that is no longer true.

A very devastating incident happened to a fellow named Charles Fryer,

you're all familiar with him,

and the city is rallying around Charles Fryar.

And to do things with Mason Square citizens who have put together an effort to raise $8,000 for Charles Fry's defense fund.

It's not a question about whether he was right or wrong.

it's a question about the process of jury selection, a process of fairness in the judicial system.

There's an organization called "PRAT"

Mr. Langford just left.

All throughout our city there are neighborhoods, people living in small neighborhoods rallying around to push drugs out of their neighborhoods.

Some people will criticize PRAT and say "aw, they're just pushing the drug dealers and the drug users from one neighborhood to another."

But if you live in a neighborhood where they are at, they are your neighborhood.

Some people will say the same thing about us when we take this on.

They'll say we're just pushing them from one spot to another spot.
That's true to a certain degree, but part of our project is to bring people with us that can address some of the problems that the people have there.

Brian Wise here is a coordinator for a project named "Unity."

It's based out of Burgess Circle and what they do is drug education and some drug intervention and he's going to be with us on this and we're going to reclaim some people.

I'm not going to say that we'll reclaim most of them because reclamation is tough, particularly when you talk about human lives, but we will reclaim one or two people and we are working now with and some other people that can help some of the people there that need help.

Make no mistake about it, our job is to make that area a very positive area.

Bill is going to talk about the action plan and exactly how we're going to do this.

I would just like to leave us with a thought, and the thought is we have a lot of work to do, we've got to bring a lot of people in on this.

It's important that every segment of our community participates in this.
It's important that people see that we as a community have said,

hey, that's enough of this,

we rallied together from clergy to agency heads to community people, regular citizens, police officers like Mr. Moultrie, firefighters like Mr. Freize, everyone, coming together to address this problem.

Quickly now before I turn it over to Bill let me just tell you some of the things we've done to this point.

We've meet with the Springfield Redevelopment Authority,

they are a quasi-city agency that has the funding to do the renovation in the city property

and we walked the site with them and

they were as shocked as we were.

They understand their responsibility

and they have committed to moving the bulk items, boarding up the buildings and sweeping the pavement.

Now that was a commitment at a meeting,

and that's a long way from them doing it,

but that was a meeting commitment.

We're going to initiate them to do that

because we're going to start.

We've also met with the Mayor

and the Mayor has said to the head of the Springfield Redevelopment Authority that

yes, you must do this
yes, you must find the money somewhere to
to address this problem,

this is the city's problem.

Well, once again, that was said in a meeting

and make no mistake about it,

I understand that it's still a long way from doing

it,

but those have been positive reactions to this
date.

A question that I asked myself when we left those
meetings was simply:

In the last 17 years did anyone go down and ask
the city to meet their responsibilities?

And in the last 17 years did any of us here in the
community take on an effort to do it ourselves?

Maybe we did

and maybe we didn't.

The point simply is that here in August or near
August of 1990, I think we've decided to do that.
Episode 2: The Second Meeting of the Common Square Reclamation Project

According to my calculations, approximately seventy-five residents and concerned citizens had attended the first meeting of the Common Square Reclamation Project to hear Brothers and Sisters' plan to address the conditions at the Plaza. This initial meeting received widespread publicity on local radio and television stations. In addition to television and radio coverage of the meeting, several members of Brothers and Sisters were interviewed about the project for the local papers. As a result of this meeting and the extensive publicity it received, the project had become a major topic of interest not only in the Common Square neighborhood, but also throughout the city.

Based on attendance at the first meeting and reactions to the proposed project, Brothers and Sisters determined that sufficient support and interest existed to proceed with the proposed Common Square Reclamation Project. Members also believed, however, that the excitement and interest generated among residents at the first meeting needed to be channeled into participation in the actual implementation of the project.

Although most in attendance indicated their willingness to consider participating in the proposed project, members of Brothers and Sisters indicated that verbal commitment without consistent follow-through had been a recurrent obstacle for effective community action efforts. While the expressed commitment to change conditions at the Plaza was judged by Brothers and Sisters to be sincere, resources to sustain this effort were limited among many who would participate. Members agreed that residents' participation would require appropriate support and encouragement. Therefore, several important objectives to meet in this regard were identified by the organization.
The Overall Goal

Although the larger goal toward which these activities were directed was getting the project off the ground, Brothers and Sisters also wanted to use this second meeting to confirm its ability to mobilize people to follow the plan for the project. If successful in establishing its claim of leadership on the basis of a substantial commitment to the project from the Common Square community, Brothers and Sisters could prove its effectiveness in identifying, planning for and implementing a solid program.

consistent commitment to Common Square and the particular project
ability to capture and sustain the interest of many people.

An additional benefit would be that in their persuasive effort, Brothers and Sisters could established public confirmation of the value of their project and the willingness of a significant portion of residents and concerned citizens to follow the organization's leadership.

Common Square residents also would gain immediate and long-term benefits from the implementation of the project. Their actions to take direct action to solve an immediate, long-term and intractable problem would support the impression that Common Square residents have the concern, integrity, positive self-worth and power to change their situation.

In addition to providing an opportunity for other people to join its effort, Brothers and Sisters wanted to demonstrate its continuing commitment to the plan and
intention to follow through. According to the organization's project plans, the second meeting would provide prospective participants with an opportunity to allay their concerns about the ins-and-outs of participating in the project. At the meeting, Brothers and Sisters wanted prospective participants to receive the appropriate information to make an informed commitment to the project. Finally, Brothers and Sisters wanted to sustain momentum by encouraging people to rally for the project, and assuring them of the wisdom and success of the program. The goal of these objectives was to provide strong behavioral support to those audience members who would be committed to active participation and sustain their commitment.
The Strategy

At the close of the first meeting, Brothers and Sisters announced a date for a second meeting to review and implement the first steps of the plan outlined at the initial meeting. At this meeting, Brothers and Sisters intended to explain the detailed requirements of each step of the project, participants' specific responsibilities at each step, the risks involved in participating and ways that participants could avoid these dangers. The organization also intended to distribute leaflets and flyers to help people better understand the responsibilities of the project and appropriate ways to implement the project.

The Organizational Representative

Bruce Barron was selected as the primary speaker at this meeting. As official organizational spokesperson, Barron was a relative newcomer to the leadership ranks of the Common Square community. Although Barron was one of the founding members of Brothers and Sisters, a member reported that this meeting was Barron's first introduction to the general public in a leadership role within the Brothers and Sisters organization. They added that this project provided a vehicle for Barron, a behind-the-scenes leader, to take center stage.

Prior to this project, members pointed out that Barron had not functioned on an equal footing with other neighborhood agency heads, community leaders and business owners. Although Barron had enjoyed daily, personal contact with these individuals as a resident of Common Square, they explained that he had seldom interacted with these prominent members of the community as an equal, that is, as a leader. In this present
project, some members hoped that the relationship between Barron and these leaders would change from one of inequality to one that demonstrated more equality. As leader of this project, I concluded that Barron was adding the role of leader to the multiple relationships and roles he normally enacted with these individuals. Through this project, Barron would be exerting his claim to be afforded the authority and status of other community leaders.

I also concluded that as a current resident of the community, Barron had daily contact with conditions at the Plaza. As a resident of Common Square, an active member of several community and church-related activities, Barron's characterized his day-to-day, face-to-face interaction with residents as largely equal in authority, status and expertise on all but law enforcement matters. With Barron's emergence as a leader of Brothers and Sisters on this project, Barron expressed his understanding that he was extending his authority through the use of his law enforcement expertise.

Although Barron has extensive affiliations in Common Square as a resident in the community, I believed that he had to cultivate a new relationship with the community as a leader. That is, Barron needed to encourage people's recognition and support of him as a Brothers and Sisters leader. As the leader of the project, I observed that Barron, like the organization itself, was in a changing relationship with the community. As a primary spokesperson, he was, in my opinion, in an advisory position with participants in the project, and, by definition, was more powerful than community residents. As a result of this role relationship, I concluded that Barron had to learn to exercise this new role of status and authority in ways that would not alienate his
neighbors and friends. In need of their support, it seemed to me that Barron had to prove himself an effective leader with leadership qualities that have heretofore been unseen and untested.

Since Barron would be involved with the larger community in this leadership role in the future, I concluded that Barron had to "act like a leader". Along with other members of Brothers and Sisters, I understood that this leadership role would entail acceptance by the larger community in his new role as a public spokesperson for Brothers and Sisters, and as the head of a "successful" community effort. In a number of discussions, members acknowledged that Barron must be seen as someone the larger community wanted to and could deal with, and could call upon to use his expertise as a leader and law enforcement expert. Consequently, many members agreed that Barron had to demonstrate the capacity to fulfill these roles in the future with the larger community.

From organizational meetings, I observed that Barron's job as a Massachusetts trooper provided him with an in-depth understanding of the various illegal activities occurring at the Plaza, and the extent of the threat these activities posed to the welfare of the Common Square community and to participants in the project. In my estimation, Barron's training in law enforcement made him an expert in how the participants in the project should behave during the on-site activities planned for the project, the illegal activities, violations of laws and ways to interact with specific persons involved in these activities. According to my observations at various meetings, Barron demonstrated that he had the knowledge about the rights and restrictions that participants would have with regard to their actions at the Plaza. It seemed reasonable for me to infer that
Barron was also in a position to make decisions about those aspects of the project that dealt with public safety when confronting people engaged in criminal activities while under the influence of drugs, alcohol, and the like.

Members understood that the most important task for Barron in this regard was his ability to present the plan in a manner that demonstrated his expert understanding and full consideration of the important details of this project. They believed that Barron had to demonstrate not only that he had appropriate information that people needed to consider, but also the expertise and resources to cope with the complexities of the project. They also recognized that Barron needed to exercise his authority to advise people on certain aspects of the project that may be of considerable concern. Finally, most members agreed on Barron's need to demonstrate that he had access to appropriate people and agencies to carry out specialized aspects of the program, such as providing social and counseling services to the individuals at the Plaza.

To successfully accomplish the practical goals of garnering and solidifying support for the project, Brothers and Sisters agreed that Barron's expertise as a law enforcement officer provided a resource to validate his competence for deciding on certain aspects of the project. Operating on the assumption that participants at the meeting wanted to implement the project, Brothers and Sisters determined that Barron's expertise would function to allay many of the fears and concerns that people might have about the project's implementation. Even if objections were raised that might substantively change the project, they anticipated that Barron's expertise and informational sources of power would argue powerfully for the original plan.
Despite the fact that Barron's relationship with community leaders, agency heads and business persons had been either undefined or, generally positive, members were well aware of the implications of the implicit criticisms of prior efforts to resolve the conditions at the Plaza that this project raised. Given the project's present support and attention that signaled the emergence of Brothers and Sisters an important organization in the community, and the implied critique of their actions, Brothers and Sisters hoped that these agency heads would be more willing to at least appear to cooperate with the project.

According to several members' statements, the presence of participants at this meeting suggested approval of the overall thrust of the project. Specifically, they believed that this attendance implied that the participants present had made an implicit pact to collaborate with Brothers and Sisters to implement the project, and in that sense, had assumed a level of responsibility and accountability to each other that reflected the demands of the project. Given this assessment, it seemed to me that both the organization and the community have agreed to work out the programmatic details, and support each other by assuming the necessary roles to get the project done in accordance with Brothers and Sisters' plans. With Brothers and Sisters in the dominant position, this cooperative, but unequal relationship would benefit from the momentum established around this project, but also would require the evolution of this new relationship into a smoothly operating, practical working one.
On the basis of my observations and conversations, I concluded that Barron was an unproven and unknown entity as a leader to community residents and to most politicians and city bureaucrats. Primarily known as a state trooper, Barron's authority, status and expertise as a community leader had not been established. Since his political clout remained unclear, I anticipated that people would be somewhat wary of his leadership, but attentive to the impact of this project and his leadership of it. In general, politicians (city council member and state representative) were involved because they believe it to be a good political move to be knowledgeable about the issues in their district, to support and be a part of the community's efforts to address issues, and continue at least the appearance of leading rather than following on this hot topic.

The Setting

The second meeting of the project was held in the same meeting room at the same community center several days after the first meeting had taken place. The space orientation continued to be formal, with participant seating arranged to face in the same direction at varying distances from the focal point. However, the distribution of materials required audience participants to leave this formal arrangement from time to time in order to receive handouts, to ask specific questions of individuals and to talk with one another about the details of the meeting. This movement allowed for closer and more varied interaction between the speakers and other participants.

This public meeting followed procedures and expectations similar to the initial meeting. It was structured to provide a forum for Brothers and Sisters to coordinate and regulate the interactions that participants would have in the project. The
second meeting was held later in the evening to allow for a more extensive exchange among participants. The leader/participant structure allowed more give-and-take between the primary speakers and other participants who might have specific, pragmatic concerns about their involvement. Although Brothers and Sisters stated that it wanted to solicit more interaction with and input from the audience, it planned to continue to exert significantly greater influence during this meeting. Members who would be speaking stressed their willingness to handle the topic of this meeting with greater flexibility than the first meeting. That is, although the meeting would begin with a specific topic, references to sub-topics could be introduced by anyone at the meeting as long as they were relevant. Despite greater flexibility, the decision making process about implementation of the project would be based on Brothers and Sisters' proposal, and assessed on the basis of positive vocal reactions within the group. Specifically, Brothers and Sisters planned to listen to audience comments and questions to assess the degree of affirmation from the audience for each step of the project plans.

The pace of the meeting was designed to allow the speakers to move through a lot of detailed material in a relatively short period of time. However, Brothers and Sisters stated their intention not to allow this heavily task-oriented pace to overlook the importance of maintaining good relationships among the organization and the residents who had agreed to participate. According to members of Brothers and Sisters, a flexible time frame, allowing for some moderate variation between the set times and the actual times, would be used to accommodate the greater number of tasks planned for this meeting. The language choice was multilingual, with speakers using a mix of "common
language the majority of time interspersed with more official-sounding language to review the steps of the program.

Based on my observations, the more participatory, flexible nature of this meeting increased the extent of social activity among participants. A period of small talk preceded the formal portion of the meeting, allowing participants who were intending to work on the project to establish connections with each other within the context of this project. Since participants would be involved in this ongoing project, Brothers and Sisters thought it would be unacceptable to begin business without some level of social interaction factored into the meeting. This mixture of a work and social situation in which participants functioned as co-participants with organization members required informal and emotionally-responsive gestures within a context of achieving a specific task.

The Audience

The audience at the second meeting included Common Square residents, community and business leaders, politicians and the local media. According to comments from the audience, most had attended the first meeting, and were ready to implement the project. Among first-time attendees who had learned about the project from neighbors or through the media, a number had come to receive more information to more fully explore the possibility of participation. A much smaller number of people were observers of the entire process. Despite these differences, Brothers and Sisters believed that interest in the project was high and attendance was a valid indicator of people's willingness to seriously consider implementation of the organization's project.
In order to persuade people to transform their strongly held commitments about taking action into actual participation in activities to implement the first steps of the project, Brothers and Sisters needed to

- suggest a reasonable way to translate their commitment into direct action,
- clarify participants' responsibilities in this direct action,
- reassure people that the project was well-planned in terms of their safety and other important concerns, and
- stimulate immediate engagement in the project's implementation.

Convinced of the success of the first meeting, members of Brothers and Sisters' stated that their apprehension about this second meeting was relatively low. That is, they did not anticipate any undue resistance or opposition from the audience to their efforts. Although they recognized the possibility that some audience members could raise objections about specific aspects of the project, Brothers and Sisters concluded that the overall project would receive a significant degree of public support.

In discussing plans for the second meeting, some members pointed out that the major difference between the initial meeting and this second public gathering was the existence of a shared vision between the organization and the community about nature and goals of the project among participants. In their opinion, this shared perspective would serve to lessen possibilities for conflict. Members of Brothers and Sisters believed that the individuals who attended this meeting were primarily committed, that is, they were people who had accepted the organization's general definition of the problem and
were ready to hear the specific details of the plan. Brothers and Sisters understood that the varying interpretations needed to be integrated and refined, they were convinced that the project as the organization had conceptualized it would be acceptable. In essence, Brothers and Sisters anticipated a high level of solidarity among people who would attend the second meeting.

On the basis of the audience's tacit approval for Brothers and Sisters to play a dominant role in the project, most members concluded that the organization's power to organize interested participants and strategize about appropriate steps to take to implement the project had been confirmed. Specifically, they decided that the audience had given Brothers and Sisters approval to establish ground rules about how participants would interact with each other, negotiate the roles participants should play and encourage others to implement the prescribed steps as conceptualized by the organization. These efforts to set the direction of the project, make decisions and negotiate and authorize what people did were realized in my observations of Brothers and Sisters' attempt to control the structure and the process of the negotiations and the flow of information. In their estimation, the project stated that this control would help to ensure acceptance of and cooperation with project plans.

General support and interest from the audience underscored Brothers and Sisters' articulated belief in its right to ask participants to implement the program according to the organization's guidelines for the delegation of duties and responsibilities. However, members recognized that the audience also maintained the
right to oppose various aspects of the proposed project, and that this opposition may be based on several obstacles identified by some of the organization's members.

According to organization members' assessment, the major obstacles that Brothers and Sisters faced were:

- the complexity of the topic, leading to possible confusion and misunderstanding among audience members, and
- the lack of clarity about the actions required to implement the project.

While both constraints could result in resistance to support and follow-through with participation in the project, Brothers and Sisters' believed that their personal resources and interpersonal networks could offset audience apprehensions about the complexities of the project.

The following excerpt from Barron's remarks reflects his sense of the situational requirements of this second meeting:

“Our purpose today is to start an initiation portion of our program and prepare for the cleanup. We want to go over and address the issue on site -- which talks about the loitering, the obvious violations of the open bottle law and obvious drug dealing and drug usage and the like. We have a set of flyers that we want to take over and distribute amongst those persons. We want to encourage everyone that we're sensitive to their needs in terms of alternatives. We've representatives there to speak to those that are ready to make some changes in their lives. Make no bones about it. Our bottom line is that we've had it with this type of action and we're here to clean up our community. Again being sensitive, if they are ready to make some changes, we'll be more than glad to offer them alternatives, whether it's spiritual guidance that they need or the help they need with their addictions.”
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

TASK: Barron's task was based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and Verbal Response Mode intent (across forms).
### TABLE 2.1 - TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Category</th>
<th>Form and Intent N=144</th>
<th>Form N=72</th>
<th>Intent N=72</th>
<th>High/Low % N=144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>50 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td>45 (31%)</td>
<td>30 (42%)</td>
<td>15 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td>54 (37%)</td>
<td>19 (26%)</td>
<td>35 (49%)</td>
<td>94 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>40 (28%)</td>
<td>20 (28%)</td>
<td>20 (28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 2.1 indicated, Barron's presentation during the second meeting was, with some variation, similar to Lane's in terms of the predominance of Disclosures and Edifications. Like Lane, more than half of Barron's comments were dominated by Disclosures and Edifications (i.e., statements of subjective and objective information, respectively) in grammatical form and communicative intent as well. That is, Barron used first-person (Disclosure form) or third-person (Edification or information form) declarative sentences to talk about his own private experience (Disclosure intent) and about objective matters (Edification or information intent) 94 times or at a rate of 65% as compared to Lane's use of exposition 82% of the time. Also, in comparison to Lane's use of more Edifications than Disclosures in his utterances, Barron used the Disclosure mode more often than the Edification mode. The following examples demonstrate the similarities between Barron's use of Disclosures and Edifications and Lane's Verbal Response Modes.

20 Phase Two will take care of that problem. E(D)
21 We're over there to let them know that we're about to clean up that site, changing the image of our community while bringing about that positive change. C(D)
2  I'd like to address that real positive change. D(D)
23 Again, I must repeat D(D)
24 Our plan is the same. E(E)
25 Some of the toughest wars are won with the simplest plans. E(D)
26 We may do this phase once C(D)
27 We may do this phase twice C(D)
28 We may do it three times, C(D)
29 but we're going to do it until it works. C(D)

In the preceding excerpt, these examples show three different combinations of Disclosure and Edification forms and intents that Barron used frequently. In line 22, the subject was first person, so the form is Disclosure. The utterance communicated Barron's
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

private motives, that his experience, from his frame of reference, focused on himself. In my judgment, Barron is "on record" as revealing motives. The utterance on line 24 is a third person statement that gives objective information. That is, the statement concerns Barron's experience, requires no specific presumptions about the audience, and uses a neutral or objective frame of reference that is shared with the audience. This means that the truth of this statement could, in principle, be assessed by an external observer in the right place at the right time with the right skills and equipment. Although line 24 is written in the third person Edification form, the intent reveals Barron's private perceptions about war plans.

45 If the city is unable to do some of their promises, we will work with them and behind them to make sure this effort goes over. C(A).
46 We've already started that effort. D(E)
47 In terms of positive programs for the site, we've met with Reverend Harding of the Martin Luther King Church to plan a service in the third week in August.

On line 46, the final example of the use of exposition, Barron used the first person "we" that did not include the audience to describe observable behavior (Edification intent).

The next most frequently occurring Verbal Response Mode was Confirmation (agreements and disagreements), numbering 45 or 31%. Concerning the use of Confirmation, Barron used first-person plural (Confirmation form) where the referent includes the audience most often in order to talk about subjective matters (Disclosure intent) or C(D), or to attempt to guide behavior (Advisement intent), that is, C(A). Less
frequently, the Confirmation form was used to talk about objective matters (Edification or information intent). To illustrate,

59 They've committed to do a program on our site. E(E)
60 We have a gospel program in the plans for that site. E(E)
61 (It's) just a drop in the bucket folks, a drop in the bucket. E(D)
62 We have a long haul ahead, not a hard haul. C(D)
63 It's not hard work. E(D)
64 It's long work. E(D)
65 We can start right now. C(A)
66 And I'll tell you our next day's plan is Saturday. D(E)

In this excerpt, on line 62, Barron used the first-person plural ("we") that included the audience to reveal his own private perceptions of what is to be expected by participants in the project. In order to talk about his perception, Barron used his own experience, focused on his internal frame of reference. In doing so, he did not make specific presumptions about the audience's experience.

---

30 We're going to reclaim Common Square. C(D)
31 We have children in this community who are going to that school that is targeted for that area, if not that school, the Rebecca Johnson School. C(E)
32 And we want our community prepared for this. C(D)

In line 31, Barron used first person "we" that included the audience to convey objective information. The truth or objectivity of the information that participants at that meeting had children in the community could be validated in a number of ways. Thus, Barron used the Edification response mode for the intent of this remark.
Advisement and Interpretation, the two remaining Verbal Response Modes used in Barron's comments, comprised only 4% of all utterances. Also, none of the responses occurred in the Question, Acknowledgment or Reflection categories. Thus, Barron's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents, was the exchange of information regarding subjective and objective issues in Disclosures and Edifications (65%), with secondary, but noticeable emphasis upon comparing his own experiences with the audience through Confirmation (31%).

Like Lane's task in the first meeting, Barron's use of exposition was consonant with the general purpose of meetings as well as with the informational functions of social mobilization practices of community organizing. Also, the frequent occurrence of Disclosures underscores Barron's perception of his expository task as largely one that required revealing personal information to "announce" the details of project plans to the audience.

Drawing on Barron's description of his task as "announcing the plans" for the project suggested a certain perspective on his communicative behavior. Generally, announcing is an act which has to be performed in a certain characteristic manner. First of all, announcing is usually formulated in declarative sentences. Normally, announcing refers to forthcoming events, in particular, to intended actions. The association between announcing and decisions concerning future situations is strong. Some dictionaries account for this temporal nature of announcing by linking it with the idea of news, that is, to deliver news. The aspect of announcing that suggests that the speaker wants to say something that people couldn't know before now accounts for the fact that announcements
often do refer to intentions and future actions that no one can know unless the speaker tells
them.

Announcing is also a formal and official-sounding act, and the person who
announces something must have, or must assume a special role. This role doesn't have to
be official. It can be based simply on the fact that the speaker is, and must be, the only
person who has access to the information, or it can be an act by a person who is the only
one authorized to disclose it.

The special manner associated with announcing derives from the speaker's
intention of making some fact not only known but public, and also from her intention of
"putting it on record" as such. Normally announcing is done "loudly", clearly and openly.
While the details of the announcing are irrelevant, the speaker has to convey somehow
the attitude: "I want to say this in such a way that everyone here could come to know
this."

Announcing something is an official act, which somehow binds the audience,
obliging it to act on that basis. The speaker seems to be saying, "I assume you understand
that after I have said this, in this way, people can't say that they didn't know it." In
this respect, announce is similar to notify.

Finally, and most importantly, the purpose of announcing has something to do
with imparting knowledge, that is, the speaker implies, "I say this because I want to
cause you to know it". Rather than focusing on the addressee, announcing specifically is
focused on the message itself. When the addressee is mentioned, the phrase referring to her still has to convey a more peripheral position than the message. Thus, announce presents the speaker as vitally interested in the message itself, and in making it public and generally accessible. For this reason, the illocutionary purpose of announcing can be represented as "I say this because I want to cause it to become known", or "I say this because I want to cause people to know it." The person who announces something wants to prevent the impression that she wanted to keep the message secret, or that she neglected to publicize it. This focus on the message suggests that the speaker regards it as important.

The relationship of the speaker to the audience that is implied in the approach of announcing. The impositions of announcing seem congruent with the sense that the audience's attendance at this meeting signaled acceptance of the organization's authority to lead. However, this authority to lead is complicated by the requirement that Barron establish his position as a leader. Further examination of the use of Disclosures can clarify how Barron coped with these issues.

Within the context of the formality of this communicative approach of announcing, Barron's use of Disclosures personalized the information communicated in his introductory comments. First, in contrast to Lane's emphasis on conveying objective information, Barron's more frequent use of Disclosures reflected and promoted the increased acquaintance or involvement of the audience with Brothers and Sisters and its representative. While encouraging greater mutuality, the use of Disclosures also was problematic for Barron in this episode. The use of Disclosure was directive and restricted
the audience's freedom, in the sense that Disclosures control the audience's frame of reference by imposing Barron's own viewpoint on the interaction. In light of contextual information that indicates that Barron needed to establish his legitimate authority as a leader, these impositions not necessarily warranted.

However, like Lane's comments, the support that Disclosures provide to positive face balanced this imposition on the audience's freedom. Specifically, the I-statements of Disclosures fostered an atmosphere of solidarity or connection among people who were embarking on a collaborative project. Thus, Barron's use of Disclosures encouraged members of the audience to reciprocate with their own concerns and apprehensions about the project, and to feel more equal and in partnership with Barron.

Also, the frequent use of Confirmations capitalized on the audience's receptiveness to Barron's leadership. Although Confirmation presumes knowledge about the other, this imposition or threat to negative face wants are balanced by the solidarity and rapport, or support to positive face wants, that we-statements of this category convey. In this sense, the Confirmation mode helped Barron to reduce the differences between himself and the audience. Altogether, the use of Disclosures and Confirmations worked to neutralize the formality and imposition of announcing.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all Verbal Response Modes that made up Barron's task into the higher-order conceptual dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how these verbal response categories conveyed the role Barron's assumed in this episode. Overall indices and the
disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Barron's utterances appear in Table 2.2.

**TABLE 2.2 - ROLE DIMENSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of central experience</th>
<th>OVERALL N=144</th>
<th>FORM N=72</th>
<th>INTENT N=72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informative - Attentive</td>
<td>143 (99%)</td>
<td>71 (99%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Self-centered)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassuming - Presumptuous</td>
<td>94 (65%)</td>
<td>39 (54%)</td>
<td>55 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deferece)</td>
<td>50 (35%)</td>
<td>33 (46%)</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus or central topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive - Acquiescent</td>
<td>59 (41%)</td>
<td>22 (30%)</td>
<td>50 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control)</td>
<td>85 (59%)</td>
<td>50 (70%)</td>
<td>22 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame of reference or viewpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimension, the proportion of Barron's utterances whose source or central experience was the audience's thoughts, feelings, perceptions or intentional actions was negligible. Specifically, in a fashion similar to Lane's preceding utterances, a mere 1% of the total of form and intent of Barron's utterances were coded for the Attentive dimension of the verbal response mode of Interpretation. That is, 99% of the time, when
he spoke, the source or central experience that Barron conveyed was based on his own knowledge and experiences. This was displayed by the overwhelming frequency in the total number of Disclosure, Edification, Confirmation and Advisement response modes that Barron used. The virtually complete reliance on Barron's own thoughts, feelings, perceptions intentions and actions suggested that the impact of his utterances indicated extremely limited interest in, and therefore, involvement with the audience's knowledge and experiences. Like Lane's utterances, the egocentric focus of the informativeness of Barron's utterances did little to support the audiences positive face wants of concern and interest.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Barron's utterances in which the central topic was a focus on the knowledge of what the audience is, was, will be, or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending was indicated in the moderate but noticeable frequency (35%), of Confirmation, Advisement and Interpretation. Like Lane, Barron's utterances were characterized by a predominance of deference toward the audience, through the use of Disclosure and Edification. By contrast, however, Barron's use of Confirmation, Advisement and Interpretation was twice that of Lane's comments. That is, compared to Lane, Barron assumed a greater degree of presumptuousness in his role with the audience. While Barron assumed a role that generally tended to lessen the fact threats inherent in presumptuousness, he was decidedly less deferent in his communicative behavior than Lané. This difference in presumptuousness can be explained by changes in the relationship of the organization to the audience toward greater acquaintance at this
stage of the project, the audience's tacit sanction of the organization's authority to lead, and Barron's need to assert his leadership role.

Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control role dimension indicated that the proportion of utterances in which Barron represented what he was saying from a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with the audience through the use of Edification and Confirmation was 59%. That is, although slightly more of Barron's utterances conveyed his own frame of reference as displayed by more Disclosure and Advisement Verbal Response Modes, the difference was not dramatic. Similar to Lane's comments in which Acquiescence significantly exceeded Directiveness, this difference of 8% between Directiveness and Acquiescence in Barron's comments indicated that he tended to balance imposing his own will on the interaction with a significant number of utterances that allowed a shared viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. The support of positive face wants that typified this shared viewpoint offset the impositions that Directive utterances made on the audience's negative face wants for freedom and autonomy.

In conclusion, overall figures for the role dimensions indicated that Barron's comments appeared primarily objective, truthful and neutral to the audience. He accomplished this by being informative in the use of his own thoughts, feelings and intentions rather than the audience's knowledge and experiences as the source. Also, while Barron was largely unassuming, he somewhat more presumptuous than the Lane by more often making the central topic of his utterance what the audience's experience is, was, will or should be. Finally, Barron was slightly more acquiescent than directive.
Consequently, like Lane's comments, Barron's comments can be characterized by the set of role dimensions associated with Edification, that is, providing objective information. However, disaggregating overall indices into the form and intent indices for each of the role dimensions demonstrated that the form and intent of the deference (Unassuming-Presumptuous) and control (Directive-Acquiescent) dimensions each revealed discrepancies in Barron's communicative behavior.

The form index of the deference (Unassuming-Presumptuousness) dimension demonstrated that, unlike the overall indices, the literal meaning or the grammatical form of Barron's utterances were more presumptuous. Specifically, in comparison to Barron's overall intent to be unassuming 65% of the time according to overall figures, the form index of 54% indicated that Barron's was less unassuming and more presumptuous in the grammatical forms that he chose. This suggests that the social relationship that Barron had with the audience as a provider of information about the project, which constrained the form of his utterances, and the audience's tacit approval of this relationship, warranted the risk of greater presumptuousness.

By contrast, Barron's utterance intents indicated that he was unassuming 77% of the time, a larger percentage than for the form of Barron's utterances along this dimension. That is, contrary to outward appearances of being noticeably presumptuous approximately half the time as indicated by the form index, Barron had the implicit or latent intention, as constrained by the task of conveying information, to focus on his own knowledge of what the audience will be experiencing. This suggests that while Barron was constrained by the task of telling what he was thinking and perceiving, his social
relationship with the audience required him to tell his thoughts and perceptions in such a way that met expectations for establishing and asserting his leadership with the audience in this episode. In meeting this requirement, Barron exhibited more familiarity with the audience in the forms he chose for his utterances along the dimension of deference than the task called for.

Disaggregating the form and intent of the control (Directive - Acquiescent) dimensions revealed that the literal meaning or the grammatical form of the majority (70%) of Barron's utterances were non-directive or acquiescent. That is, since the grammatical forms that Barron used were constrained by his social relationship with the audience, this relationship prompted Barron to convey a shared viewpoint in his utterances, that is, one that expressed ideas and beliefs held in common with the audience.

However, the intent index for the control dimension was somewhat different. According to these data, Barron intended for more (69%) of his utterance intents, which were constrained by the task of conveying information to persuade the audience, to be directive or controlling. Therefore, in contrast to outward appearances of less directiveness, Barron actually more often intended to assert his own viewpoints more than ones shared or held in common with the audience. Thus, the literal meanings conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms were in opposition to Barron's Verbal Response Mode intents along the dimension of control.
Like the form and intent discrepancy in the deference dimension, the discrepancy between the form and intent along the control dimension can be explained in terms of interpersonal pressure that led Barron to adopt or accept, in the form of his utterances, a less directive relationship with the audience. Although Barron's task is to provide the audience with his own viewpoint on plans and expectations for this project, his social relationship with the audience indicates that he has to convince people that they agree with him on the way that project should be handled. The discrepancy between form and intent along the control dimension suggested that Barron faced the difficulty of balancing this task of imposing his own viewpoint on the project with a social relationship that required agreement or a shared sense of the project among participants. In order to balance these two requirements, the level of familiarity that Barron achieves should support these positive face concerns of solidarity and rapport with the necessity for imposing his own viewpoint upon the audience. In response to these pressures, Barron expressed his own perspective in forms that conveyed a shared viewpoint. This shared viewpoint would contribute to the solidarity and rapport that was needed for people to commit to the project, and at the same time, communicate his own viewpoint without revealing the impositions of directiveness.

In conclusion, Barron faced the task of claiming his status as a legitimate leader within a context of receptiveness to his leadership, and the absence of prior standing as a community leader. On both the deference and control dimensions, Lane perceived his task, that is, what he was doing as somewhat different from his social relationship with the audience, which in each dimension, warranted a different kind of interaction. Concerning the deference dimension, it seemed that Barron's intention to be
less presumptuous conflicted with his need to claim his status as a leader, at least in the form of his utterance. He was under pressure to risk the face threats to privacy associated with presuming knowledge of what the audience is, was, will be, or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending.

Also, it seemed that Barron's intention to be more controlling in his interaction with the audience conflicted with the need to continue to develop greater solidarity and rapport with the audience. He was under pressure to try to direct the audience's frame of reference or viewpoint without offending or imposing upon them.

RELATIONSHIP: The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index summarized Barron's identity claims of status and involvement in his relationship to the audience. The analysis of Barron's use of specific Verbal Response Mode categories ranked from high (a score of 8 or Advisement) to low (a score of 1 or Acknowledgment) familiarity is summarized in Table 2.3. Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs provide further indication of the strategies that made up Barron's communicative behavior.
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**TABLE 2.3 - RELATIONSHIP**

Familiarity Index : 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW RANKED MODES</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RANKED MODES</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C(D)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E(D)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. D(E)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. C(A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C(E)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURE MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. D(D)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E(E)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C(C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Confirmation  
D = Disclosure  
E = Edification  
A = Advisement

The mean rank of Barron’s 72 utterances scored for 144 form and intent response modes produced a Familiarity Index of 4.12. This Familiarity Index slightly exceeded
the midpoint of the familiarity hierarchy. A further analysis of this Familiarity Index indicated that 103 or 71% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the Disclosure and Edification categories, those modes ranked in the lower half of the familiarity hierarchy. The remaining 41 or 29% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the higher-ranked modes of Confirmation, Advisement and Interpretation.

This distribution of verbal response modes on the familiarity hierarchy was similar to Lane's utterances in the predominance of high ranked modes. In the majority of his utterances, the Familiarity Index indicated that, in terms of status and involvement, Barron exhibited a slightly higher level of familiar behavior with his audience than the speaker from the first meeting. However, like Lane, Barron's facework strategies indicated that he was aware of the tensions he had to resolve with regard to this level of familiarity. Therefore, this Familiarity Index cannot be adequately understood without a more complete analysis of the patterns of mixed and pure modes in Barron's utterances.

Out of the 72 form-intent combinations that made up Barron's utterances, 52 or 72% represented mixed modes or form-intent discrepancies. Of these 72 mixed modes, the Confirmation in service of Disclosure C(D) occurred in 21 of these mixed modes. The C(D) mixed mode represented the most frequently occurring category of the mixed modes.

On the one hand, Confirmations are presumptuous in the sense that they presume to know what the audience is, was or should be thinking, feeling or intending. On
the other hand, Disclosures are directive in the sense that they do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. In the C(D) mixed mode, Barron's Disclosures imposed upon the audience by restricting its freedom. When paired with the Confirmation form, however, which is higher on the familiarity hierarchy, Barron raised the lower-ranked Disclosure mode to the higher ranked, more imposing Confirmation form. In doing so, Barron made a trade-off of the controlling intent for a presumptuous form. However, he gained by using the Confirmation form because it reassured the audience with its demonstration of solidarity and rapport, and its use offset the presumptuousness inherent in this mode. To illustrate,

13 We're here to clean up the community. C(D)

This utterance is first-person (Confirmation form) declarative where the referent includes the audience. The form indicated that Barron statement was meant to join the audience with the speaker in a shared experience. In other words, the form of the utterance argued for its sincerity and empathy. Barron's experience must be accurately rendered, and he must know the meaning of that experience for the audience. Thus, Barron traded the imposition of control or directiveness of the Disclosure intent for the presumptuousness of the Confirmation form. However, the face threats involved in a higher, more face threatening tactic of familiarity, were offset by what he gained by reassuring the audience through the demonstration of solidarity and rapport with the audience's experience in the Confirmation form.

The next most frequently occurring form and intent modes, that is, D(E) and E(D), represented exposition. Together, these mixed modes comprised 19, approaching half of the 52 mixed modes. Eleven (11) of these exposition mixed modes were in the E(D)
category and represented the removal of the intent to control that characterized the higher-ranked Disclosure to a more acquiescent, low-ranked Edification form. To illustrate,

20 *Phase Two will take care of that problem.* E(D)

In the eight instances that represented the D(E) category, the Edification intent was raised or made more directive in the Disclosure form. This strategy seemed counterintuitive, given Barron's apparent concern to obscure his intention to be more controlling than he appeared to be. However, the very act of disclosing contributed to the sense of rapport or closeness that Barron was trying to establish in this episode. Thus, what Barron risked in appearing to be controlling with the Disclosure form, he gained in increasing the growth of his interpersonal relationship with the audience by deliberately sharing his own perceptions, feelings, opinions and ideas. The payoff was in the contributions of the Disclosure mode to the audience's increased involvement or reciprocity in revealing its own thoughts, feeling, and perceptions. To illustrate,

40 *We've met with the Mayor and representatives of the Springfield Redevelopment Association.* D(E)

In line 40, Barron used the Disclosure form, first person that does not include the audience, to convey objective data. The form gave the impression of an exchange of personal information that, in fact, was objective.

While a variety of other mixed modes were used, a slight trend in the direction of raising lower-ranked intents to higher-ranked forms was apparent. In instances in which the lower-ranked intent was raised to a high-ranked form, the imposition was offset by supportive or positive gains. In examples in which higher-ranked intents were paired with lower-ranked forms, the imposition of the higher-
ranked intent was mitigated by a less threatening form. That is, the low-ranked intent had been raised to a higher-ranked form, to allow Barron to claim the familiarity needed to achieve the objectives of the meeting. For example, the following utterance is an example of a low-ranked intent that has been raised to a high-ranked form:

68 We'll be back again on Saturday. C(E).

Although the Edification intent indicated Barron's deference to the audience while the Confirmation form is presumptuous by contrast, the Confirmation form is reassuring to the audience through its demonstration of solidarity and rapport with the audience's experience. It brought a level of familiarity with the audience that made a claim for more status and involvement.

Eighteen of the exposition modes represented pure modes. The use of pure modes in certain utterances suggested that Barron did not perceive any conflict between the task he was trying to do and his social relationship with the audience. He did not feel any pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

5 It's nice to see all the representatives. D(D)

In line 5, Barron used a first person declarative to convey his own feeling about seeing the representatives. In this example, Barron spoke about his own experience, from his frame of reference and the topic of focused on was what his own perception is.

24 Our plan is the same. E(E)

In the example on line 24, Barron used the first person declarative to convey objective information.
Conclusions

Barron's task, like Lane's, focused on exchanging subjective and objective information, a task that is common to all community organizers. Giving information through Disclosure and Edification, however, placed Barron in a dominant position relative to the audience and signaled the social distance between them. This dominance was both beneficial and disadvantageous for Barron in terms of the more frequent use of Disclosures.

For example, Barron's claim as a provider of information was emphasized more often through his frequent use of Disclosures. In providing subjective information, the directiveness or control inherent in Barron's Disclosures restricted the audience to Barron's viewpoint. Consequently, while Barron's use of Disclosure was not supportive of the audience's positive face wants, it also imposed his viewpoint on the audience. This imposition, however, risked resistance from the audience to Barron's thoughts and perceptions.

The situational description indicated that Barron and other members of Brothers and Sisters were aware of the implicit intention to accept the organization's leadership by most of the audience present at the second meeting. Therefore, the face threats of Disclosures to the audience's freedom and autonomy were risked to meet this expectation. However, this face threat, in addition to the lack of support Disclosures give to the positive face wants of attention and concern were offset by the contribution that the Disclosure mode made to the growth of interpersonal relationships. That is,
the mutuality and reciprocity that Barron's Disclosures conveyed to the audience facilitated the interchange between them.

Despite the presumptuousness of the verbal response mode of Confirmation, the frequent use of this category (31%) indicated shared experiences and agreement, and ultimately contributed to the solidarity and rapport between Barron and the audience that was essential to this phase of the project. Specifically, although Barron was more presumptuous in his comments, indicating the status of a person who could be less deferent, he simultaneously increased the level of connection with the audience through the Confirmation mode.

The role dimension of informativeness that Barron assumed was characterized by consistency between form and intent. However, with regard to the deference and control dimensions, the form of the utterances that Lane used, which gave the appearance of being somewhat less presumptuous and controlling, were at variance with the intents that indicated greater presumptuousness and control respectively. These discrepancies between the form and the intent on the dimensions of deference and control suggested that Barron experienced interpersonal pressure 1) to assert greater presumptuousness in his social relationship with the audience through the form of his utterances, while the intents were less presumptuous, and 2) to obscure the restrictions he was placing on the audience in his intent to direct the frame of reference in the interaction with them.
Conclusions

Finally, the distribution of Verbal Response Modes, and the resulting Familiarity Index, indicated that Barron adopted an intermediate degree of familiarity with the audience. The strategies Barron used in his communicative behavior to achieve this Familiarity Index were conveyed by the frequency and patterns of mixed and pure form and intent Verbal Response Mode combinations.

First, the frequency of mixed modes was higher than the occurrence of pure modes, indicating greater discrepancies between the of performing the task and the social relationship within which the task is to be performed. More often, the pattern in most mixed mode combinations was to raise or make more imposing lower ranked intents, which were constrained by the task at hand, with higher ranked forms, which were constrained by the social relationship. In other words, although the majority of Barron’s Verbal Response Mode intents conveyed low familiarity with the audience, his desired relationship with the audience prompted him to risk face threats with the impositions of more presumptuousness and control. Therefore, the presumptuousness associated with important impositions on negative face wants was warranted by the expectation from the audience that they would be directed by Brothers and Sisters on the project.

Second, the asymmetries indicated by the organization’s greater power in this second meeting in comparison to the first interaction confirmed Brothers and Sisters’ claim of greater familiarity in relation to the audience. These risks were required in order for Barron to establish the relationship that was necessary to get the job done. However, almost as often, Barron combined higher intents with lower forms in order to mitigate the impoliteness inherent in these verbal response modes. This higher level of
equality between raising and lowering intents suggests that Barron had to balance the need for greater familiarity with concurrent pressures to display less imposing behavior with the audience.

Reactions

During the meeting, several members of the audience expressed their concerns about both the plan of action and the organization. One person even questioned Barron's leadership role in the community. In addition, several representatives of other organizations were particularly pointed in their criticisms of the limitations of the project as conceived by Brothers and Sisters. Despite these criticisms, most questions and comments indicated a general acceptance of the plan of action for the project, and a willingness to work along with Brothers and Sisters in this effort. At the close of the meeting, most audience members picked up flyers and other information that was available and agreed to walk over to the Plaza to kick-off the official start of the project. Armed with brooms, shovels and garbage cans, about thirty people left the meeting and walked three blocks to the Monument Plaza and began to distribute the handouts to people on the site and remove the trash from the parking lot and surrounding buildings. For approximately one hour, these people removed trash and talked with people at the Plaza who were observing their activity about the project. Newspaper reporters interviewed individuals who were cleaning up the area, including the Black state representative and only minority city council member who had attended the meeting, several agency heads and business people, and other individuals who were observing the activity. A newspaper article about this activity was reported in the city paper the next day.
APPENDIX 2

The Second Common Square Meeting, July 24, 1990
Bruce Baron - Speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who were here on Thursday know of our program,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and we'll just recap for the people who are here for the first time.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We did some work in the community noticing a problem that we had, the site of Winchester Square Plaza.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And we talked to some people there in the community, residents from Burgess Circle, Indian Motor Cycle Building, as well as all other people who are represented here today.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's nice to see all the representatives from the contractors, elected officials, black educators from the Burgess Circle Project, Indian Motor Cycle Building, everyone.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our purpose today is to start an initiation portion of our program and prepare for the cleanup.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to go over and address the issue on site -- which talks about the loitering, the obvious violations of the open bottle law and obvious drug dealing and drug usage and the like.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a set of flyers that we want to take over and distribute amongst those persons.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to encourage everyone that we're sensitive to their needs in terms of alternatives,</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we've representatives there to speak to those that are ready to make some changes in their lives.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Make no bones about it, our bottom line is that we've had it with this type of action and we're here to clean up our community. Again being sensitive, if they are ready to make some changes, we'll be more than glad to offer them alternatives, whether it's spiritual guidance that they need or the help they need with their addictions. Friends of Arts program have outlined just a few things if you want to pass them around. I hope there's no in distributing flyers and talking with some of the persons on the site, if this flyer will give them some ideas about how to approach that, all well and good. The only thing we want to be sensitive to is that there are people on the site that may not want to hear what we have to say. We don't want to be bothered with them. Phase two will take care of that problem, we're over there to let them know what we're about, to clean up that site, changing the image of our community while bringing about some real positive change. And I'd like to address that real positive change. Again, I must repeat, our plan is the same, some of the toughest wars were won with the simplest of plans. Dedication and commitment, dedication and commitment --
we may do this phase once
we may do this phase twice,
we may do it three times,
but we're going to do it until it works.
We're going to reclaim Mason Square.
We have children in this community that are going to be going to the school that is targeted for that area, if not that school, the Rebecca Johnson School.
And we want our community prepared for this.
As you will see from the flyers, I think it is best said, one of the flyers we'll be asking you to pass around –
Don't be a fool, waste a school.
We don't want the school to clean up the property,
we want to clean up the property for the school.
There are several other messages that you'll see
and I hope that you have a few of your own.
In terms of the positive approach for those who don't know it, the cleanup is only a portion of our program.
We've met with the Mayor and representatives from SRA (Springfield Redevelopment)
and they have given us some positive input on what they're willing to do in terms of fencing the site and boarding up the property and helping us with the cleanup -- moving the bulk items.
But I must say the community has a responsibility to join in this effort
and I'm glad to see you here.

We're not going to let this effort fall short.

If the city is unable to do some of their promises, we will work with them and behind them to make sure this effort goes over.

We've already started in that effort.

In terms of positive programs for the site -- we've met with Reverend Harding, Martin Luther King Church, planning a service in the third week in August.

We're going to bring church services to the site.

This is what we call positive forces to our community.

We have commitments from contractors,

we're going to do some programs for our children on that site.

We're planning once the site is clean, a cook-out, a volleyball game,

we're planning an art function.

We have artists in our community who can do anything.

As I pointed out Thursday in our meeting, like the mural behind us, we're going to get those buildings boarded and whitewashed and repainted.

Something that our children can turn and point to with pride.

So they can walk with their heads up and not worry about somebody whistling from the corner as they go through.
Many of you folks here know that the Brother Chandler, a great friend, has been supporting our youth for years -- having fundraisers, track teams, and programs all year.

They've committed to do a program on our site, we have a gospel program in the plans for that site, just a drop in the bucket folks, a drop in the bucket.

Commitment and dedication.

We have a long haul ahead, not a hard haul, it's not hard work, it's long work.

Today, tomorrow, dedication.

We can start right now and I'll tell you our next day's plan is Saturday.

We don't want to get ahead of ourselves but I don't want anybody to miss.

We'll be back again Saturday at 1:00 o'clock doing the same thing -- delivering the hard message.

It's time to make a change.

We are people, we can do it.

It's time to make a change.
Episode 3: Brothers and Sisters' Letter to the City Council Subcommittee

Since the project's second meeting, I had observed that Brothers and Sisters had been relatively successful in rallying widespread support and publicity for its project. Not only had the organization demonstrated its ability to appeal to residents in the Common Square area to become involved in the project, but it also had generated a substantial level of favorable support from community leaders, city government, and state and local politicians as well. From the beginning, general interest in the project among all of these constituencies had not lost momentum. Since the second meeting, participation in the project from these various groups had steadily increased. Also, several steps in the project had been implemented and completed successfully. Finally, the media continued to keep the city informed about the activities and progress of the project.

Although the Project had received a substantial degree of media attention and support from different sources, some members of Brothers and Sisters realized that participation by important stakeholders was not universal. Involving these stakeholders in the project, and thus extending the organization's influence as a leading community organization in the city, continued to be of primary concern for the organization.

In this regard, Brothers and Sisters was particularly concerned about the City Council's Subcommittee's Subcommittee on Public Safety as an important stakeholder and a major player in the upkeep of city property. Brothers and Sisters believed that the Public Safety Sub-committee could have a direct impact on the
Project through its support in resources and influence with other city agencies. Without the Subcommittee's public commitment, the organization believed that the project might suffer from the absence of these resources and influences.

The Overall Goal

Based on this assessment, Brothers and Sisters defined one of its important objectives of changing the Subcommittee's perception of both the project and its responsibilities toward the Common Square community. First, Brothers and Sisters wanted to intensify the verbal commitment of the supportive Subcommittee members to actual involvement and participation. However, in recognition of their perception that most Subcommittee members did not support the project, Brothers and Sisters wanted to change these Subcommittee members' perceptions by creating ambivalence about their lack of involvement in the project. To this end, Brothers and Sisters planned to provide information that would increase Subcommittee members' limited sense of the possibilities for their participation and support.

If Brothers and Sisters was successful in convincing the committee to support the project, it would confirm the organization's influential effectiveness. By exerting its influence over this important group, Brothers and Sisters could change the power relationship between itself and the Subcommittee from the Subcommittee's dominance to more equality between them. Also, by successfully convincing the Subcommittee to reconsider its lack of support for the project, Brothers and Sisters hoped to acquire
additional important support and resources for the project, and demonstrate its continued effectiveness in garnering support for the project.
The Strategy

The organization realized that it had to overcome the perception among city bureaucrats that ordinary citizens did not understand the intricacies of city bureaucracy (red tape) or the time, energy and resources that must be mobilized in order for the city to get things done. Members of Brothers and Sisters decided a formal letter from the organization specifying conditions at the Plaza was the most appropriate and effective means of communicating with and encouraging the Subcommittee to support the project. According to Brothers and Sisters, the purpose of this letter was to provide the committee with a different perspective on its responsibilities and the possibilities for the subcommittee making a contribution to the project.

The Organizational Representative

Bruce Barron wrote to the Subcommittee as the official representative of Brothers and Sisters on this project. He had been at the forefront of the project since its inception, and under his leadership, the project had successfully mobilized a diverse group of participants on a relatively complex project. Barron and the project had received favorable coverage in the media and, through his leadership, several influential officials of city government had committed their interest and support of the project. In writing to the Subcommittee, Barron must function as a committed community resident and represent their situation powerfully and fairly, but he must also as a community leader interact and gain the support of the Subcommittee members. He must be politically savvy to maneuver both roles successfully.
Brothers and Sisters had several thoughts about what it wanted to accomplish. First, it hoped that city government colleagues of the Subcommittee who had provided public support for the project would place pressure on the Subcommittee to respond to the organization's request. Second, Brothers and Sisters indicated that it was attempting to extend its sphere of influence by bringing other allies with resources to the project. Recognizing that the Subcommittee members probably would respond positively to a letter that did not directly implicate them, most members were in favor of avoiding unnecessarily alienating Subcommittee members.

The majority of Subcommittee members were unfamiliar with Brothers and Sisters and its representatives. Brothers and Sisters agreed that the Subcommittee had been asked to support a project about which it felt a substantial amount of ambivalence and opposition by a group that was unknown to them. Brothers and Sisters' thought that its request might be seen as a hostile reminder of the Subcommittee's lack of interest in and activity on behalf of an important sector of the minority community. They also speculated that the request highlighted the indifference with which the Subcommittee pursued its responsibilities in the Common Square community.

The Letter

A letter from a concerned citizen's group to elected officials is a traditional vehicle for expressing concerns. The advantages of a written document is that it is a concrete expressions of ideas, propositions, and the like in a manner that is more lasting than a verbal exchange such as a conversation or an oral presentation. In contrast to verbal exchanges, a written document is a permanent record that is harder to ignore.
Also, a written channel can be far-reaching in the sense that with the message's consistency among people, more people can be reached with a "lasting" message. Anyone else with a direct or indirect interest in or responsibility for the topic of interest can receive this message and think about it and respond to it as well.

Finally, in terms of formality, a written message appears to be a more formal undertaking. This appearance of formality can make the information it is communicating seem more important and serious. A formally written message usually causes people to take notice. A written message stands on its own merit and not on the direct tangible personal qualities of the messenger.

Through its written letter to the Subcommittee, Brothers and Sisters planned to present its point of view. Convention requires a formal response from the Subcommittee. By writing to the Subcommittee, Brothers and Sisters controlled the topic in advance and, through the use of written channel, the organization is closed off to the possibility of the Subcommittee's on-line modification of its response.

The language choice for the letter was formal and typical language for conducting business. The official document represented a practical work situation where members of the Subcommittee were treated as functionaries whose attitudes and behaviors were relevant to achieving a specific task or goal.
Although members of Brothers and Sisters knew some members of the Subcommittee personally, the choice of an impersonal, formal letter to Subcommittee members formalized the nature of their relationship with the organization. For the purposes at hand, members of the Subcommittee were treated as strangers. The letter stood as a representative of Brothers and Sisters and did not act as a statement of any individual member of the organization.

Citizen letters to elected representative is a common practice in this country. They tend to be short, succinct and to the point so as to be read by busy politicians and taken seriously. The topic of this letter carried particular weight for the Subcommittee. It identified a set of problems under the Subcommittee's jurisdiction, one upon which the Subcommittee could have a direct and immediate impact. The letter was phrased not as a demand for the Subcommittee to act, but as a informational document to help Subcommittee members decided how to execute their responsibilities and duties with regard to this issue.

Through this letter, Brothers and Sisters made the statement that conditions at the Winchester Shopping Plaza were of significant magnitude and importance that required a formal letter to officials who needed to know about these conditions and respond.

The Audience

Until recently, Brothers and Sisters had been a relatively new organization in the process of establishing its power base primarily within the Common Square
community. Prior to this project, most members of Brothers and Sisters and members of the Subcommittee had not been personally or formally acquainted with each other. According to one member of Brothers and Sisters, the basis for a relationship between Brothers and Sisters and the Subcommittee was each group’s professional concern and responsibility for addressing the conditions identified at the Plaza. It was clear to this member that the future of any relationship between Brothers and Sisters and the Subcommittee would be defined by interactions around this project.

To this end, the organization wanted to change the Subcommittee’s behavior from benign neglect of the Common Square community and the project to active involvement and support. In order to persuade Subcommittee members to change their attitudes about the Plaza, their beliefs about appropriate change mechanisms, and their behavior regarding the Plaza in some observable way, Brothers and Sisters decided that it needed to

change Subcommittee members awareness of conditions at the Plaza,

alter their sense of their obligations for addressing these problems,

suggest the role the Subcommittee might play in addressing these problems, and

stimulate immediate involvement in the change process.

As city taxpayers and concerned residents of Common Square, Brothers and Sisters believed in its right to request that the subcommittee honor its legal responsibility to the Plaza. Based on an assessment of its influence with the
community, Brothers and Sisters expressed a great deal of confidence in exercising this right in order to get an immediate response from the Subcommittee.

Brothers and Sisters was prepared to encounter resistance from the Subcommittee. Brothers and Sisters agreed that the Subcommittee had been asked to support a project about which they felt a substantial amount of ambivalence and opposition by a group that was unknown to them. Brothers and Sisters' thought that its request might be seen as a hostile reminder of the lack of interest in and activity on behalf of a minority community. They also speculated that the request highlighted the indifference with which the Subcommittee pursued its responsibilities in the Common Square community.

The organization speculated that this resistance would be manifested in the Subcommittee's tendency to place responsibility for the problems Plaza on the Common Square community, to assert that, given the lack of resources, the Subcommittee had already met its responsibilities, and that the construction of the new school would resolve the problem.

Brothers and Sisters agreed that the most important element of resistance would be based on the project's implied critique of its past efforts and fulfillment of their responsibilities. The organization speculated that the Subcommittee might believe that it didn't operate in a manner conducive to a community-based program. For this reason, Brothers and Sisters inferred that the Subcommittee might be committed to other approaches to resolving these conditions.
By bringing this issue to the Subcommittee within the context of other public statements and media coverage of activities associated with this project, Brothers and Sisters had set the terms for their exchange by defining the topic and the nature of the Subcommittees' response. Although Brothers and Sisters asserted the Subcommittee's responsibility for conditions at the Plaza and its obligation to support the project, the Subcommittee's indifference to the situation and to the project pointed to the political structures of inequality. The Subcommittee maintained a position of higher status in relation to Brothers and Sisters.

The Subcommittee was not easily accessible and had differential resources and skills and access to information regarding the status of the property on which the Plaza sits. Although development proposals had been negotiated by the city for the disposition of properties at the Plaza, Brothers and Sisters pointed out that this information had not been shared with the Common Square community. Specifically, members of Brothers and Sisters reported that the Common Square community had not been involved in any recent decisions around the economic future and development of the Plaza.

Brothers and Sisters' believed that its past success with project had demonstrated its ability to command public attention and loyalty among the Common Square community. In the organization's estimation, this success had indirectly reflected negatively on the Subcommittee's inattention to problems at the Plaza by publicly calling into question the Subcommittee's motives for not addressing the
problem more efficaciously. Brothers and Sisters realized that public discussion of the
Subcommittee's lack of support of the project could influence a constituency of voters in
the Common Square area. According to some members of Brothers and Sisters, this
influence could extend to voting decisions in the upcoming elections, and in that sense,
could help to restructure existing political relations between the Common Square
community and elected officials. Also, since members of the Subcommittee were elected
by the entire city, Brothers and Sisters realized that the perceived lack of support or
interest in the Common Square constituency could jeopardize reelection of some
Subcommittee members to a Subcommittee seat.

Brothers and Sisters' apprehension was relatively low due to widespread
support from others. Other branches of city government had provided support to the
project. Brothers and Sisters believed that the participation of political colleagues
would be an influential factor in the Subcommittee's decision to become involved. If
other members of city government, including colleagues in city government were
supporting the project, Brothers and Sisters believed that uncommitted Subcommittee
members might be pressured to conform in order not to suffer negatively by contrast.
Although some members of Brothers and Sisters believed this unintended negative
consequence of the project could constrain the relationship with the Subcommittee, they
also believed that the Subcommittee's should be encouraged to provide its support.

The following excerpt is representative of the language used in the letter.

"The Winchester Square Plaza located on State Street
across from the Indian Motorcycle Building is City owned
property that has been in disrepair for over the past fifteen
years. Specifically, the unoccupied buildings are not
secured and are full of trash and debris, the grounds are littered with glass, hypodermic needles, and dangerous items are strewn everywhere. In addition, there is a pile of junk consisting of stoves, couches, chairs, refrigerators and other bulk goods.

This property is currently used by drug dealers and users, violators of the open bottle law and the homeless. Moreover, because the property is not enclosed with fencing many of the residents use it as a short-cut passage. Worse, children can often be found playing in the lot.

The dangers are obvious, the condemned building could collapse at anytime, children could become infected by the needles or the rusted bulk items. On July 23, 1990 the junk pile of bulk items caught fire and burned for approximately four hours. Had the heat from the fire interacted with the carcinogens located in the capacitors of the refrigerators a disaster of magnanimous proportions could have resulted. Also, on July 27, 1990, three men were stabbed in two separate incidents on the site. The physical condition of the lot lends itself for lawless behavior and human suffering."
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

**TASK:** Barron's task was based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and Verbal Response Mode intents (across forms).
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Category</th>
<th>Form/Intent N=52</th>
<th>Form N=26</th>
<th>Intent N=26</th>
<th>High/Low % N=52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
<td>50 (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>38 (73%)</td>
<td>20 (77%)</td>
<td>18 (69%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3.1 indicated, Barron's letter was dominated by Edifications (i.e., statements of objective information) and Disclosures (i.e., statements of subjective information) respectively, in grammatical form and communicative intent. That is, Barron used third-person (Edification or information form) declarative sentences to talk objective (Edification or information intent) and subjective (Disclosure intent), and first person Disclosure form to talk about objective (Edification or information intent) matters. These are represented by the E(E), E(D) and the D(E) modes. The two categories of Edification and Disclosures accounted for 48 or 92% of all utterances. However, within these two categories, Edification was used a total of 38 times, or 73%, compared to the total of 10 times, or 19%, that Disclosures were used. To illustrate this frequent use of Edification:

1  Dear Councilors,  K(K)
2  The Winchester Square Plaza located on State Street across from the Indian Motorcycle Building is City-owned property that has been in disrepair for over the past fifteen years. E(E)
3  Specifically, the unoccupied building are not secured. E(E)
4  And (they) are full of trash and debris E(E).

The subjects in lines 2 through 4 are third person, so the form is Edification. With regard to the intent in each of these lines, the central experience was Barron's observations. However, the frame of reference was neutral, or objective. That is, each assertion's truth or falsity could, in principle, have been determined without access to either Barron's or the audience's private experience. That is, the truth of each statement could be checked by any other person's observation. Therefore, the intent in lines 2 through 4, was Edification, specifically to convey objective information.
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

To a lesser extent, Barron used third-person (Edification or information for) declarative sentences to talk about subjective matters (Disclosure intent), and first-person (Disclosure form) declarative sentences to talk about objective matters (Edification or information intent). To illustrate:

10 Worse, children can often be found playing in the lot. E(E)
11 The dangers are obvious. E(D)
12 The Condemned building could collapse at any time. E(D)

In lines 11 and 12, Barron was talking about his perceptions of conditions at the Plaza. On both lines, the subject is third person, so the form is Edification. The intent in each was to communicate Barron's thoughts, as he viewed them, without presuming knowledge about the audience. These utterances clearly reported Barron's private thinking on the visibility of problems at the Plaza (line 11), and what may happen immediately as a result of these problems.

20 The Mayor stated that she would have Mr. Sarno price the boarding of the building, the fencing of the lot, increased lighting, and the removal of bulk items. E(E)
21 We believe that the city will work with the community. D(E)
22 and (we believe that the city) will work with the Community to correct it. (D(E)

Immediately prior to line 21, Barron talked about statements that the Mayor had made. After describing her statement, he proceeded to describe his own thoughts about what the city's intentions. Line 21 used the first person (not including the audience) form to convey observable or factual information about something that the City was already doing, that is, working with the organization. Since the fact of
the city working with the organization was observable, the intent of this line was to assert a fact.

The next most frequently occurring Verbal Response Modes were Advisements (attempts to guide behavior), and Acknowledgments (conveying receipt of or receptiveness to communication). However, these two categories, which together occurred only 4 times, comprised the remaining 8% of the utterances. In one instance, Barron used second-person (Advisement form) with an imperative verb to attempt to guide behavior. To illustrate,

25 We understand clearly that both the City and the Community have a responsibility, a liability and a benefit to gain if the lot is cleaned and used for positive initiatives.

26 Please reply to P. O. Box 90811 of your intentions and involvement relative to this matter. (A)

27 Sincerely, (K)

In line 26, Barron's use of the verb "reply" is imperative with the "you" understood, and is therefore coded Advisement. The intent imposes Barron's idea on the audience by suggesting that the Subcommittee respond to the letter.

The taxonomy's other four modes (Confirmation, Question, Interpretation and Reflection) did not appear in Barron's letter at all. Thus, Barron's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents, was the exchange of information primarily regarding objective issues, and, to a lesser extent, subjective issues, with an extremely limited attempt to guide or direct behavior.
The Verbal Response Mode analysis of Barron's task of exchanging information, like the first two episodes, was consonant with Forester's analysis of the information power of planning practice and with the expository focus of Friedmann's dialogical analysis of the social mobilization techniques used in community organizing. In addition, the frequent use of exposition in Barron's letter also conforms to the highly informational discourse of professional letters.

Non-narrative in their purposes, professional letters are designed for the straightforward and concise packaging of information. Professional letters are usually opinionated and intended to persuade the reader. Often they are argumentative in that they consider several different possibilities, but seek to convince the reader of the advisability or likelihood of one of them. The information that is presented in professional letters tends to be non-abstract and specific with considerable time being spent on their execution in terms of highly explicit and elaborated reference. Thus, the Verbal Response Modes appeared to have successfully quantified the broad outlines of this particular written episode in a manner congruent with the informational and involved aspects of the production of professional letters, their marked non-narrative concerns and explicit and elaborated reference, an emphasis on non-abstract information, persuasiveness and a high use of on-line informational elaboration. However, persuading the Subcommittee to change its attitudes and behavior can be characterized by Barron's approach of urging the Subcommittee.

Urging is an attempt to get the addressee to do something. To that extent, it is similar to ask, request, order, command and many other verbs. However, it doesn't
imply that the speaker is seeking a benefit for himself, or that the speaker has power over the addressee.

The attitude of an urging person is pressing and forceful, but since he has no power over the addressee, the only kind of pressure he can exercise is psychological. The person who urges would want to endow his utterance with a inherent force, but he can't. All he can do is to try to infect the addressee with his own conviction that action of the kind indicated is necessary. Urging as a speech act is an attempt to implant in the addressee's mind the idea of an 'irresistible' must.

Thus, the position of the urging person is that of powerlessness, not of power. And yet the powerless speaker is trying to impose his will on the addressee, even though he perceives or anticipates unwillingness or lack of response on the addressee's part. He is trying to achieve this goal partly by trying to convey to the addressee his own sense of urgency, his own conviction that the action is imperative, and also by implying that he won't take 'no' for an answer, that he will not give up easily. The urging person does not see himself as someone who tries to impose his will on the addressee. Rather, he sees himself as someone who tries to impose his own (superior) understanding of the situation. Limited contact between the Subcommittee and the organization and its representative and the greater status and power that the Subcommittee maintained relative to Brothers and Sisters in terms of political clout and materials resources confirm the sense that Barron's letter is an attempt to urge and not direct the Subcommittee to become involved.
Finally, there is usually, in urging, some sense of urgency. That is, the speaker wants the addressee to respond, and to respond now. However, it is not necessarily an external action which the speaker wants and expects to follow swiftly. Rather, it is a psychological response that he seeks: a feeling that the addressee has to do what the speaker says he should do. Urging is in fact an attempt to influence the addressee, even though it is presented as a matter of the speaker's judgment rather than will. The hierarchical differences in the legitimate authority and power of the Subcommittee in relation to Brothers and Sisters explains Barron's overall approach of urging.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all Verbal Response Modes that made up Barron's task into the higher-order conceptual dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how these verbal response categories conveyed his perception of the role he assumed in this episode. Overall indices and the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Barron's utterances appear in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2 - Role Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall N=52</th>
<th>Form N=26</th>
<th>Intent N=26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative - Attentive (Self-centered)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of central experience</td>
<td>50 2</td>
<td>25 1</td>
<td>25 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unassuming - Presumptuous (Deference)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus or central topic</td>
<td>50 2</td>
<td>25 1</td>
<td>25 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
<td>(96%) (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directive - Acquiescent (Control)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame of reference or viewpoint</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>5 21</td>
<td>8 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%) (77%)</td>
<td>(19%) (81%)</td>
<td>(31%) (69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimension, the proportion of utterances whose source or central experience was derived from the audience's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentional actions in the category of Acknowledgment remained small. Specifically less than 5% of the total of the form and intent modes were coded for the attentive mode of Acknowledgment. The overwhelming majority of Barron's utterances were informative or self-centered; that is, 96% of the time, when he wrote, the source or central experience that Barron expressed was based on his own thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions and behavior. This was displayed by the frequency of the total number of
Edification, Disclosure and Advisement response modes that Barron used. These data suggest that the impact of Barron's utterances was lack of interest in, and therefore, involvement with the audience's knowledge and experiences. This informativeness was limited in its support of the audience's positive face wants of interest and concern. Thus, Barron was concerned with giving the Subcommittee his own thoughts and feelings.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Barron's utterances in which the central topic focused on the knowledge of what the audience is, was, will be, or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending, was indicated by the very low frequency (4%) of Advisement or presumptuous Verbal Response Modes. Instead, Barron's utterances were characterized by a predominance of deference toward the Subcommittee as displayed by the overwhelming use of Edification, Disclosure and Acknowledgment response modes. That is 96% of the time, Barron did not impose his own experiences on Subcommittee members by presuming knowledge about them.

By taking on a deferent attitude toward the Subcommittee, Barron avoided assuming the most familiar and, and therefore most intrusive, role dimension of presumptuousness in terms of status and involvement. Assuming this role of deference nearly eliminated the threat that presumptuousness posed to the audience's negative face by choosing communicative behavior that contradicted the power asymmetries and unsanctioned intimacy inherent in presumptuous behavior.
Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control role dimension indicated that the proportion of Barron's utterances in which he represented what he was saying from a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with audience, through the use of Edification and Acknowledgment, was 77%. That is, three-fourths of the time, Barron did not impose his own will on the interaction to direct the verbal exchange. Instead, more of his utterances were acquiescent rather than controlling and allowed a neutral viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. The less frequent use of Disclosure and Advisement response modes (23%), which conveyed Barron's own frame of reference or viewpoint, confirmed his acquiescence to that common perspective, and limited impositions on the freedom and autonomy of the Subcommittee.

In conclusion, overall figures for the role dimensions indicated that Barron appeared objective in his letter to the Subcommittee. He accomplished this by being primarily 1) informative in using his own thoughts, feelings and intentions rather than the Subcommittee's knowledge and experiences as the source, and 2) unassuming by making the central topic what his own and not the Subcommittee's behavior is, was, will or should be. Finally, the majority of the time, Barron acceded to a shared set of ideas, memories, and the like for giving meaning to Conditions at the Plaza. Consequently, Barron's encounter with the Subcommittee can be characterized primarily as Edification or providing objective information.

While the overall indices and the form and intent indices for both self-centeredness and deference are congruent, a disaggregation of the overall indices into
the form and intent indices for the control (Directive-Acquiescent) dimension revealed a slight discrepancy between the control form and intent indices. The form index for the control indicated that the literal meaning of the majority (81%) of Barron's utterances was non-directive or acquiescent. Specifically, the grammatical forms that Barron used were constrained by the nature of his social relationship with the audience. This relationship prompted Barron to convey a shared viewpoint in his utterances, that is, one that was held in common with the audience.

By contrast, however, the intent index for the control dimension indicated a slightly different situation. According to these data, Barron only intended for 69% of his utterance intents, which were constrained by his task, to be non-directive. That is, Barron intended for a larger proportion (31%) of his utterances to be controlling, as opposed to the form indices that indicated only 19%. This somewhat larger percentage of directiveness in intent in comparison to directiveness in form suggested Barron obscured his intention to control the viewpoint, thus avoiding the intrusiveness of controlling behavior. Specifically, a small number of Barron's utterance intents were too directive for his relationship with the Subcommittee. In response, Barron adopted politeness strategies to conform to this relationship. Barron's politeness strategies for mitigating this small number of imposing, directive intents with non-directive, more polite forms can be understood in terms of the relationship of Brothers and sisters to Subcommittee members.

In conclusion, what Barron was doing as slightly different from his social relationship with the Subcommittee on the dimension of control. His intention to take
a more controlling role in his interaction with the Subcommittee conflicted with the implicit norms suggesting that his relationship with this group did not warrant more directive behavior.

**RELATIONSHIP:** The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index was used as an overall measure of Barron's identity claims of status and involvement with the audience. The analysis of Barron's use of specific Verbal Response Mode categories ranked from high (a score of 8 or Advisement) to low (a score of 1 or Acknowledgment) familiarity is detailed in Table 3.3. Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs provide further indication of the strategies that made up Barron's communicative behavior.
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

TABLE 3.3 - RELATIONSHIP

Familiarity Index : 2.58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW RANKED MODES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RANKED MODES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. E(D)  
2. D(E)  
3. D(A)  
4.  
5.  
6.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURE MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. E(E)  
2. K(K)  
3. A(A)  

The mean rank of Barron's 26 utterances scored for 56 form and intent response modes produced a relatively low Familiarity index of 2.58. A further analysis of this familiarity Index indicated that 49 or 94% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the Edification, Disclosure and Acknowledgment categories, those modes ranked lower on the familiarity hierarchy. The remaining 3 or
6% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the high-ranked modes of Advisement.

This distribution of low-ranked and high-ranked Verbal Response Modes on the familiarity hierarchy indicated that in almost all of his utterances, Barron assumed a position of very low status and involvement in relation to the Subcommittee. Barron’s communicative approach of claiming low status and involvement can be further explained by an analysis of the patterns of use of mixed and pure modes.

Out of the 26 form-intent combinations that made up Barron’s letter, 16 or 62% of the utterances were comprised of pure modes in which the form-intent combination matched. The use of pure modes in the majority of the utterances suggested that Barron did not perceive a conflict between what he is trying to do and his social relationship with the audience in the majority of his utterances. That is, he did not feel any interpersonal pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

10  Worse, children can often be found playing in the lot  E(E)

This third person declarative transmits objective information, scored edification intent.

To illustrate another pure mode combination,

26  Please reply to P. O. Box 90811.  A(A)

This is imperative in form -- with “you” as the understood subject -- coded Advisement. Barron presumed to impose an experience on the audience. Thus the source of experience and frame of reference were Barron’s, but the focus was on the other, that is, Advisement intent.
In a final example of the pure mode combination,

1. **Dear Councilors, K(K)**

the form was a term of address or salutation where intent was to convey Barron's receptiveness to the Subcommittee.

The remaining 10 or 38% represented mixed modes or form and intent discrepancies. Of these 10 mixed modes, the Edification in service of Disclosure or E(D) mixed modes occurred in 6 or 60% of the mixed modes. Edification is one of the least impolite Verbal Response Mode. Edifications concern the speaker's experience, require no specific presumptions about the other that intrude on privacy, and use a neutral frame of reference that is shared with the other, and do not restrict the other's freedom.

Barron's use of Disclosure, however, did impose upon the audience by restricting its freedom. That is, disclosures do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. However, when the intent to Disclose was paired with the Edification form, which is lower on the familiarity hierarchy, Barron lowered or mitigated the Disclosure's controlling intent, and thus attempted to indirectly control without explicitly appearing to do so. To illustrate,

12. **The condemned building could collapse at any time.**

   *E(D)*

This utterance is third-person (Edification form) declarative that talks about objective data. The form indicated that Barron's statement was neutral or objective and was shared with other people. In other words, the form of the utterance argued for its veracity. Most would agree to its truth. In fact, Barron's intention was to
communicate his own thoughts and feelings about the buildings at the Plaza. Deciding the truth of any aspect of this statement would require seeing into Barron’s mind. By lowering the Disclosure intent with the Edification form, Barron avoided the appearance of imposing his own point of view, or opinions and feelings on the audience. In this mixed mode combination, Barron appeared to accede to the audience through an utterance representing a view shared or held in common with the audience, when, in fact, he was imposing his will on the interaction.

The next frequently occurring mixed mode, Disclosure in service of Edification D(E) occurred in 3 or 30% of the mixed modes. An illustration of this mixed mode is in the following example:
We understand clearly that both the city and the community have a responsibility. D(E)

In line 25, the Edification intent was raised or made more directive in the Disclosure form, which was different from Barron's overall strategy to avoid the imposition of directiveness. However, the Disclosure response mode near the middle of the hierarchy lessens the intensity of existing disagreements about the Plaza between Brothers and Sisters and Subcommittee members.
Conclusions

Barron's task of exchanging primarily objective and, to a much lesser extent, subjective information conformed to the practical, goal-oriented purpose of professional letters. Giving information through written Edification and Disclosure, however, placed Barron in a dominant position relative to the Subcommittee and asserted a hierarchy in which Barron assumed higher familiarity. This dominance was problematic for Barron in the sense that his relationship with the Subcommittee did not warrant this level of familiarity. Barron and the organization had not established its legitimate authority to guide the Subcommittee's behavior, and almost fact of extremely limited contact between them in professional capacities limited Barron's right to make demands on the Subcommittee.

First, Barron coped with this unwarranted status and involvement by urging, rather than demanding or ordering the Subcommittee to change its attitudes and beliefs. In urging, Barron implicitly mitigated the hierarchy of dominance of the information-giver. His objective was to minimize the Subcommittee's existing resistance from and lack of involvement in the Plaza project.

Also, further opposition to Barron's status as a provider of information was lessened by the predominant use of Edification. On a hierarchy of familiarity, Edification is one of the lowest response modes and as such, poses the least face threats to the audience in terms of both privacy and freedom. The result of the use of Edification was strengthening Barron's position by its dependence upon objectively verified facts of the situation.
Conclusions

In providing objective information, Barron's Edifications were unassuming and acquiescent. However, these Edifications did not demonstrate interest in the Subcommittee's experience. Consequently, while the Edification response mode was not particularly threatening to the Subcommittee's negative face wants, it was not supportive of the audience's positive face wants or recognition either.

On the other hand, in providing subjective information, the directiveness or control inherent in the small number of Disclosures Barron's used restricted the Subcommittee to Barron's viewpoint. Consequently, while Barron's use of Disclosure, like Edification, was not supportive of the audience's positive face wants, it also imposed Lane's viewpoint on the Subcommittee. The imposition of greater familiarity through Disclosure, however, had one important advantage. Disclosures lessened the intensity of the underlying disagreements that seemed to exist between Brothers and Sisters and the Subcommittee. On this basis, I concluded that Barron initiated greater familiarity through the use of Disclosure in order to mitigate existing disagreements between the Subcommittee and Barron, as the organizational representative of the project.

The two role dimensions of informativeness and deference that Barron assumed were each characterized by consistency between form and intent. However, the control dimension was slightly problematic for Barron in the sense that he was slightly more controlling in his utterances while using literal meanings or forms that were more non-directive or acquiescent. However, the occurrence of these discrepancies
was small in comparison to the high degree of congruence between the forms and intents in the overwhelming majority of his utterances.

Finally, the distribution of Verbal Response Modes, and the resulting Familiarity Index indicated that Barron adopted a relatively low degree of familiarity with the Subcommittee. The strategies Lane used in his communicative behavior to achieve this Familiarity Index were conveyed by the frequency and patterns of mixed and pure mode form and intent Verbal Response Mode combinations.

First, the frequency of pure modes was higher than the occurrence of mixed modes. The pure modes occurred almost exclusively in the Edification in service of Edification, E(E), combination. This combination indicted that Barron did not perceive a discrepancy between the task of providing objective information and his social relationship with the Subcommittee. This predominance of this pure mode combination conveyed minimal impositions on the Subcommittee's face wants for freedom from control and autonomy.

The pattern in most mixed mode form and intent combinations was to mitigate or lower high ranked intents, which were constrained by the task at hand, with low ranked forms, which were constrained by the social relationship. In other words, although a few of Barron's Verbal Response Mode intents conveyed greater familiarity with the audience, his actual relationship with the Subcommittee prompted him to redress or make these intents less serious. The objective of Barron's politeness strategies to redress these intents was to mitigate the impositions of informativeness and control.
Reactions

Two days later, five members from the City Council Subcommittee met with members of Brothers and Sisters about conditions at the Plaza at the Common Square Development Corporation offices to decide how they could support the project. During their negotiations, city council members expressed surprise and concern about present conditions, and verbally committed resources from their staffs to support project activities. After approximately one hour of confirming the Subcommittee's intention to support the project with city resources, the members of the Subcommittee toured the Plaza. The City Council's tour of the Monument Plaza, and interviews with local media were broadcast on the evening news.
APPENDIX 3

August 1, 1990 - Brothers and Sisters' Letter to City Council Subcommittee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text of Letter</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Dear Councilors;</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  The Monument Square Plaza located on State Street across from the Indian Motorcycle Building is City owned property that has been in disrepair for over the past fifteen years.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Specifically, the unoccupied buildings are not secured</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  and are full of trash and debris,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  the grounds are littered with glass, hypodermic needles,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  and dangerous items are strewn everywhere.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  In addition, there is a pile junk consisting of stoves, couches, chairs, refrigerators and other bulk goods.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  This property is currently used by drug dealers and users, violators of the open bottle law and the homeless.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Moreover, because the property is not enclosed with fencing many of the residents use it as a short-cut passage.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Worse, children can often be found playing in the lot.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The dangers are obvious,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 the condemned building could collapse at anytime,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 children could become infected by the needles or the rusted bulk items.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On July 23, 1990 the junk pile of bulk items caught fire and burned for approximately four hours.

Had the heat from the fire interacted with the carcinogens located in the capacitors of the refrigerators a disaster of magnanimous proportions could have resulted.

Also, on July 27, 1990, three men were stabbed in two separate incidents on the site.

The physical condition of the lot lends itself for lawless behavior and human suffering.

At a meeting on July 12, 1990, Domenic Sarno, Director, Eastern City Redevelopment Authority, Claude Lane, Mayoral Aide, Mayor Mary E. Hurley and representatives of VOICES met to discuss the aforementioned issues.

The Mayor stated, she would have Mr. Sarno price the boarding of the building, the fencing of the lot, increased lighting, the removal of bulk items

We believe that the City is truly concerned about the situation,

and will work with the Community to correct it.

We are hereby notifying the Public Safety Sub-Committee of the City Council in an effort to incorporate your support concerning this matter.

The Mason Square community has committed to addressing this matter by sweeping the lot, providing counseling and supportive services for the people who loiter there, development of a beatification project for the area, and development of positive events on the site.

We understand clearly that both the City and the Community have a responsibility, a liability and a benefit to gain if the lot is cleaned and used for positives initiatives.
Dear Councilors:

The Monument Square Plaza located on State Street across from the Indian Motorcycle Building is city owned property that has been in disrepair for over the past fifteen years. Specifically, the unoccupied buildings are not secured and are full of trash and debris, the grounds are littered with glass, hypodermic needles, and dangerous items are strewn everywhere. In addition, there is a pile of junk consisting of stoves, couches, chairs, refrigerators and other bulk goods.

This property is currently used by drug dealers and users, violators of the open bottle law and the homeless. Moreover, because the property is not enclosed with fencing many of the residents use it as a short-cut passage. Worse, children can often be found playing in the lot.

The dangers are obvious, the condemned building could collapse at anytime, children could become infected by the needles or the rusted bulk items. On July 23, 1990, the junk pile of bulk items caught fire and burned for approximately four hours. Had the heat from the fire interacted with the carcinogens located in the capacitors of the refrigerators a disaster of magnanimous proportions could have resulted. also, on July 27, 1990, three men were stabbed in two separate incidents on the site. The physical condition of the lot lends itself for lawless behavior and human suffering.

At a meeting on July 12, 1990, Domenic Sarno, Director, Eastern City Redevelopment Authority, Claude Lane, Mayoral Aide, Mayor Mary E. Hurley and representatives of Brothers and Sisters met to discuss the aforementioned issues. The Mayor stated, she would have Mr. Sarno price the boarding up of the building, the fencing of the lot, increased lighting, the removal of bulk items. We believe that the city is truly concerned about the situation, and will work with the Community to correct it. We are hereby notifying the Public Safety Sub-Committee of the city Council in an effort to incorporate your support concerning this matter.

The Common Square community has committed to addressing this matter by sweeping the lot, providing counseling and supportive services for the people who loiter there, development of a beautification project for the area and development of positive events on the site.

We understand clearly that both the City and the Community have a responsibility, a liability and a benefit to gain if the lot is cleaned and used for positives initiatives. Please reply to P.O. Box 90811, Eastern, Massachusetts of your intentions and involvement relative to this matter.
Sincerely,

Bruce Barron
Chairperson
Brothers and Sisters

cc: Mayor Hurley
    Domenic Sarno
THE UNITY COALITION AT THE TOWN MEETING:
Managing Interorganizational Interdependence

Episode 4: The Unity Coalition's Recommendations

The Situation

Common Square, like other urban minority communities, suffers from an array of social, political and economic problems. My conversations with residents indicated that the social and physical deterioration of the Common Square community had been a familiar, frequently discussed topic among residents and concerned citizens. Individuals mentioned frequently that the social and economic resources for meeting community needs had been weakened by cutbacks in local, state and private funding over the years. I also learned that businesses that once supported the economic base of this community had downsized or relocated to other parts of the city and suburbs. In my conversations with people in Common Square, some people mentioned that the negative impact of diminished social and economic resources has been exacerbated by ineffective collaboration among and use of remaining resources to meet the needs of the Common Square community.

Although my experiences suggested that neighborhood groups and agencies were traditionally designed to offer specialized services and assistance, in my estimation, a growing number of local problems required a more comprehensive approach for their solution. On this basis, I inferred that any single organization would be limited in effectively addressing the complex issues that the Common Square community faces. Therefore, collaboration and partnerships among diverse groups and organizations should be an essential feature of community-based social change.
In our conversations, residents reported that, in the past, the failure of community groups to collaborate effectively on solving local problems had jeopardized the viability of the Common Square community. Residents conveyed the general feeling that established organizations were limited in their ability to serve the needs and goals of the community. In response to this information, I concluded that viable leadership within the Common Square community must effectively intervene to redirect current resources and enhance and extend the impact of their individual efforts and resources for the benefit of the community.

The Effort

In September, 1990, a group of Common Square community leaders, known as the Community Change Planning Council, initiated a series of monthly community meetings. The goal of this group is to provide a forum for the Common Square community to discuss critical community issues and problems, and identify appropriate resources for their resolution. The primary topic discussed at the September meeting was the availability and use of community resources to alleviate the declining social and physical conditions of this community.

At that meeting, I observed that the level of public concern about dwindling community resources and the sense among residents that community groups had responded inadequately to this problem was extremely high. At the meeting, members of the Community Change Planning Council volunteered to gather responses from Common Square organizations and social service agencies on ways to address this issue. The Planning Council agreed to report to the community on the responses it received at
the October meeting. The Unity Coalition was one of the local organizations asked by the Planning Council to respond to the issues raised at the September meeting.

The Organization

The **Unity Coalition** was established in 1989, as a "a voluntary group of community residents, social agency directors and concerned citizens which serves as a mechanism for Eastern City's African American community to take proactive steps to insure its inclusion in all areas of community interest." from *The Unity Coalition Mission Statement* 1989

As a self-proclaimed umbrella organization for the Common Square community, the range of Unity activities included regularly scheduled weekly board meetings, rallies, fund raising activities, an annual conference, and collaborative partnerships with city government, the private sector, the judiciary and other human service agencies.

At the time that the Planning Council requested recommendations from Unity, I was aware that Unity had struggled for more than a year to establish its reputation as an effective leadership organization. Although Unity members shared the history of failure of past attempts to coordinate the resources of a variety of community leaders for the benefit of the community, the organization continued to pursue this difficult task as a vital part of its mission. Despite its efforts, however, Unity acknowledged that it had been relatively unsuccessful in capturing the loyalty and interest of community leaders and residents.
The Overall Goals

In the past, Unity had observed the tendency for diverse groups and organizations to allow social, organizational and political barriers to supersede the achievement of larger goals of community welfare. Unity determined that this behavior was due, at least in part, to the absence of collaborative guidelines and procedures. The organization wanted to reduce the impact of this major obstacle by prescribing actions for groups and organizations to take to coordinate their efforts.

The recommendations that Unity provided reflected its sense that any single group working independently could not successfully address the problem of community resources. The solution proposed by Unity required the collaboration of a variety of local groups and organizations working together to maximize their impact. Implicitly, I concluded that the recommendations served as a demonstration of the possibilities and advantages of collaborative action.

In fulfilling these goals, Unity needed to prescribe what must be done by whom and how. Members of the organization were aware of the importance of a cooperative versus combative approach to the audience. They understood that antagonizing these individuals might result in further criticism from the community. Yet, members realized that in order to fully promote Unity's recommendations and directions, the needed to make a strong statement in support of their efficacy.

Members of Unity also talked about the difference between reality versus myth as a critical consideration in prescribing what must be done by whom and how,
and in altering the self perception of some of the members of the audience that Unity was addressing. In prescribing, Unity needed to assess realistically these issues as well as the resources available for overcoming them. Myths about the audience's power to deal with these issues may be at variance with realistic assumptions. The organization had to decide whether and to what extent these myths should be used in the contents of what he chooses to say.

Unity hoped that its success in encouraging groups and organizations to follow its recommendations, would serve the larger goals of defusing or neutralizing hostility toward Unity by casting enough doubt on negative feelings to create ambivalent, and converting people who may be on the fence to become active supporters of Unity.

Clearly, the Common Square community would benefit from ways to mobilize its resources for its own benefit. However, Unity's reputation and image would benefit from the acceptance of its recommendations. Unity's response was part of a larger effort to alter Common Square residents' perceptions of themselves as members of as a viable community by demonstrating the availability and utility of existing community resources.

An important personal goal for Unity was altering negative perceptions of what Unity has done in the past and what it can do presently. Although my experience was that informal criticism of Unity was commonplace, I discovered that Unity's ineffectiveness had never been a topic of discussion in a public forum. Although my
participation in Unity pointed that Unity members were aware of these criticisms, the organization had never publicly challenged or defended the organization against these criticisms. In my estimation, a response from Unity to its critics would provide an opportunity to state the ways in which Unity has been an effective organization.

After a year of internal and external pressure criticizing its ineffectiveness, Unity wanted to set the stage for the reinstatement of Unity as a leading community organization. According to many members, its response would stand as a counterstatement to the idea that Unity had not provided the critical leadership and direction that the community needs. That is, Unity's response could indirectly portray the organization as competent, knowledgeable, committed, interested, and respectful of the needs of the community.
The Strategy

The Unity Coalition responded to the Planning Council's request with a list recommendations on how the Planning Council and other groups could pool their resources and manpower to address the specific concerns raised at the September meeting.

The Organizational Representative

Carter, an Eastern City native, had been a radio personality and small business entrepreneur in the city for a number of years. He was a former administrative aide to the only Black state representative from Eastern City, and recently assumed the position of employment director of Eastern City's Urban League. These positions reflected expansions in the kind of work that Carter was pursuing and changes in his role as a public figure, at least within the Black community.

As administrative aide, some people felt that Carter had to overcome his association with the state representative's mixed reputation within Eastern City's Black community. In that sense, Unity and Carter’s leadership were seen by a number of individuals as an extension of the state representative’s political machine. Consequently, I concluded that Carter’s relationship with the state representative was viewed negatively by some community members because of the stereotypes they hold about politicians in general and of this politician in particular. On the other hand, Unity's acknowledgment of the importance of the issues raised at the meeting, and its willingness to continue to struggle with community issues was recognized by several residents as an indication of the organization's goodwill.
In my analysis of the communicative situation, Carter was the head of an organization addressing another head of an organization using a formula prescribed by the business world for formal communication. As head of Unity, I observed that Carter responded to the Planning Council as an equal in status as a community leader. My understanding of both Unity and Carter's position in the community suggested the need for Carter to present himself as having all of the rights and responsibilities of community leaders. I concluded that in exercising his status as a leader, Carter would emerge as more than an ordinary member of the community. His memorandum would provide a vehicle for conveying his authority and equality as an agency head and offset his powerless position as a mere citizen.

As the official organizational representative, Carter stated that the memorandum provided another official organizational representative with the information that her organization has requested. The decision to write a memo formalizes the informality of the communication of issues articulated at the September meeting.

According to Carter, Unity's recommendations incorporated the resources of a number of Coalition members who are well-respected community leaders, "experts" on the issues raised at the meeting. He described actively soliciting assistance from Unity members, and incorporated their thinking into the memorandum. Thus, although the memorandum formally was from Carter, it reflected the work of several influential Unity members.
The Setting

Carter's memorandum responded to a request from the Planning Council to address issues raised by Common Square residents at the September meeting. A memorandum is a document relating to a recognized social transaction, namely the exchange of information. It is a formulaic text used by an individual in a formal, businesslike way of addressing another. It is written to be used as a guide to specific information.

The memo followed an outline format which facilitated easy identification of the issues and the recommendations. This formalization of an informal process of communication enhanced the metacommunication of Unity's concern for and the importance of the issues. Writing the memo meant that not only would the Planning Council receive a copy of Unity's recommendations, but people who attended the meeting also would have access to them as well. This permanent record of recommendations would confirm Unity's the importance that he has placed on the community's concerns. The formal nature of the memo made it applicable to a number of anticipated and unanticipated subaudiences, such as the press or media, or politicians or others in positions of power that are complementary or adversarial to Unity.

Carter followed the general format of a memorandum which maintained a level of formality with the Planning Council, and underscored his position as the head of an organization. Carter has made the memorandum brief, to the point and clearly written in anticipation of the possibility that its wide circulation will 'stand-in' for
him as a permanent record of his work. The memo did not make specific reference to Unity's less explicit motives for writing the memo. The content of the recommendations and directions was relegated to the specific issues and did not express any personal ideologies or values that might contradict the calls for action, access and control that came out of the September meeting.

Unity's memo on these issues affirmed the existence, importance and validity of these issues in the eyes of Unity. The memorandum also confirmed Unity's obligation and ability to respond to the Planning Council. Essentially, the memorandum was making the social statement that these issues were important and must be addressed.

The Audience

In discussions of its response to the Planning Council's request, Unity members determined that the immediate meeting audience who would hear its recommendations included the Planning Council, Common Square residents, community leaders, heads of organizations, politicians, invited expert panelists and other concerned citizens. Unity recognized that most of the audience would be acquainted with one another professionally or personally, and would have first-hand familiarity with the Common Square community and the issues it faced. The larger audiences for the meeting included the Black community at-large and the general population of Eastern City.
In order to encourage the Common Square community to adopt its recommendations, Unity wanted people to become more aware of the need for multiparty cooperation to solve community problems suggest how groups could pool their resources to address specific problems, and stimulate groups and organizations to become immediately involved in collaborative efforts.

During my participation in Unity, I learned that most members of both Unity and Planning Council have known each other for a considerable amount of time, not only as friends, neighbors, and longtime residents of Eastern City, but also professional colleagues and community leaders. Unity members pointed out that the most influential members of these organizations had attained leadership positions within the Common Square community, and through their activities within their respective organizations, had become recognized as leaders to other segments of the Eastern City community as well.

On the basis of mission statements from both organizations, I determined that Unity and the Planning Council both wanted to advise the Common Square community. They shared a vision of empowering the Common Square community, and both claimed to be an umbrella organization for coordinating other organizations. In reviewing the work that both groups had sponsored over the year, I determined that Unity and the Planning Council competed for the loyalty of residents and other community organizations. On the basis of my review, I arrived at several conclusions.
First, both organizations maintained varying and contending definitions of values, rights and impacts in coordinating the Common Square community. Second, while the positions that each group maintained about the appropriate way to function in this capacity were varied and contested, my observations and conversations suggested that the Planning Council was stronger than Unity in terms of its established leadership in the community. The groups had differential resources, skills and status, and maintained ideological and structural differences in their respective definition of the issues of coordination. The Planning Council was better positioned to anticipate and counteract Unity's desire to assert its own agenda. Consequently, the preeminence of the Planning Council in this leadership role created a relationship of political inequality with Unity.

With respect to the monthly meetings, I determined that the Planning Council's dominance over Unity would be realized in several important ways. First, according to residents, the Planning Council was comprised of a number of influential members upon whose evaluations and judgments of other organizations many residents depended. Also, as the group designated to collect and report on organizational recommendations at the October meeting, the Planning Council would control how Unity's recommendations would be presented and subsequently accepted. On this basis, I concluded that the Planning Council would exert a profound influence on community responses to Unity's recommendations.
Also, as the convener of the October meeting, the Planning Council shaped the nature of and participation in the discussions of and decisions about issues on the agenda. By approaching Unity, I inferred that the Planning Council had determined that Unity had the ability and responsibility to respond to the issues raised at the September meeting. In response, Unity commented that it responded to the Planning Council's request, in part to remain on a collegial basis with that organization. Essentially, Unity viewed its response as confirmation of the importance of the Planning Council's work and its acknowledgment of its obligation to respond to their request. In that sense that Unity was providing information, I considered the possibility that Unity's position was not exclusively subordinate to the Planning Council, but exhibited some status in this situation as well.

Both Unity and the Planning Council depended on organizational representatives to speak on behalf of their groups at the community meeting. The role relationship of these organizations were determined on the basis of general social matters. That is, as official representatives of community organizations, their responses and positions in the hierarchy of giver and receiver of information were determined by the nature of the communicative activity in which they were involved.

As representatives of community organizations and longtime residents of the Common Square community, Carter noted that the informal and personal contact and interaction between the individuals speaking for each organization in this communicative situation was frequent. According to Carter, the extent of the relationship between him as Unity representative and the Chair of the Planning
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Council was long-standing. However, Carter pointed out that his recent emergence as a community leader, and interaction with the Chair of the Planning Council as an official organizational representative was relatively new for both. In his assessment, the frequency of contact and the extent of this new relationship, the social distance between the participants as organizational leaders was maximal. Although Carter reported that he and the Chair of the Planning Council routinely related to one another in a wide range of personal contexts, the orientation in this interaction was primarily task-oriented. He believed that the hierarchical nature of this new relationship, along with the low frequency and extent of this particular episode of interaction indicated an official, impersonal interaction. He recognized that the specific power and contact choices that he and the Chair of the Planning Council would make in this interaction would be realized in the relatively new and untested nature of this individual episode.

In general, residents reported that their awareness of resources, agencies and their relationships to one another was highest about those agencies and organizations with whom they interfaced most frequently. By extension, less frequently used resources, services and organizations were less familiar. Thus, I inferred that residents required more information about these resources and the possibilities for their use in order to judge adequately the value Unity's recommendations. Despite this general lack of extensive information among residents, most people agreed in the need for coordinating efforts to address community issues.
On the other hand, I assumed that community groups and leaders were more knowledgeable in the sense that they knew their own resources and those maintained by other groups and organizations and, and the possibilities for past collaborative efforts. However, my observations confirmed that these groups and leaders had been limited in the extent to which they had coordinated their collaborative efforts to serve the community and their vision of such work may be limiting these possibilities. However, Unity reported a willingness on the part of other organizations seriously consider suggestions for collaborative partnerships with one another. The severity of community problems would encourage residents, leaders and community groups to entertain suggestions for new directions and evaluate proposals in an equitable fashion.

My observations indicated that audience members at the monthly meetings believed that organizations had an obligation to serve the community effectively. In their opinion, organizations existed because of the community and had to prove their worth and establish their effectiveness or risk elimination. Residents believed that organizational responses to problems should be efficient, effective and proactive, that is, aimed at getting things done. Most people felt that the community was the ultimate owner of community organizations. The general consensus among audience members was that the Common Square community must exert more control over these issues as they related to this community. Carter seems compelled to echo these sentiments in his recommendations and directions, and stressed the immediacy of implementing these recommendations as soon as possible.
I believed that the level of apprehension was high within Unity because this organization was aware of its damaged reputation in the community. Members of Unity felt that among audience members, the expectation would be that Unity would "fail" once again to pass the test of leadership. I concluded that the pressure was on the organization and its representative to be effective in this situation.

An excerpt from Carter's response to the Council's request consisted of some of the following types of statements:

"The Coalition recommends that a committee be selected by Town Meeting Coordinators to take the lead in negotiating this issue.

Schedule a meeting with Superintendent Negroni to indicate the concerns of the Community.

Call a meeting of the community to determine the services warranted by community residents. (i.e., athletic facilities, daycare and after school programs, evening adult basic educational programs, dance classes, space for workshops, etc.)

THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE SELECTED IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCHOOL."
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES

TASK: Carter's task is based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and each Verbal Response Mode intent (across forms).
**TABLE 4.1 - UNITY'S TASK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Category</th>
<th>Form and Intent N=16</th>
<th>Form N=8</th>
<th>Intent N=8</th>
<th>High and Low % N=16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
<td>3 (37%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>5 (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4.1 indicated, Carter's memorandum to the Planning Council was dominated by Advisement and Edification, that is, attempts to guide the audience's behavior and statements of objective information. The Advisement category accounted for 11 or 69% of all utterances, while the remaining five Verbal Response Modes of Edification, represented 31% of the Verbal Response Modes in this memorandum.

Essentially, Carter used third person (Edification form) declarative, and second person with verb of permission, prohibition, or obligation (Advisement form) in attempts to guide behavior, (Advisement intent). To illustrate:

1. Please find below comments of Unity relative to issues raised at the previous Community Change meeting. \(A(A)\)
2. Unity recommends that a committee be selected by Planning Council coordinators to take the lead in negotiating this issue. \(E(A)\)
3. Schedule a meeting with Supt. Negroni. \(A(A)\)
4. Call a meeting of the community to determine the services warranted by community residents \(A(A)\)

In line 2, the subject is Unity -- third person -- so the form is Edification. This utterance seems to be presuming some knowledge of what Council's experience ought to be (focus on other), and it is clearly expressing the writer's viewpoint. This narrowed the choice to Interpretation or Advisement intent, depending on whether this utterance concerned the reader's experience or behavior or the speaker's idea of what the other ought to do. This judgment depended on context. I knew that the goal of Carter's memorandum was to recommend what the community should do, so I judged that this directive was on-record. Therefore, the utterance was intended to advise the community on its future behavior. Therefore, I coded the intent Advisement.
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In line 3, the subject "you" is understood, so the form is Advisement. Similar to line 2, this utterance seemed to be presuming some knowledge of the community's future experience (focus on other), and it was clearly expressing the writer's viewpoint. This narrowed the choice to Interpretation of Advisement intent, depending on whether this utterance concerned the reader's experience or behavior or the speaker's idea of what the other ought to do. This judgment would depend on context. I knew that Carter was making recommendations, so I judged that the directive was on-record. On that basis, the utterance was intended to direct what the community should do. Therefore, I coded the intent Advisement.

The taxonomy's other six Verbal Response Modes of Question, Acknowledgment, Interpretation, Disclosure, Reflection and Confirmation were not used at all. Thus, Carter's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents, was attempts to guide behavior through suggestions and commands (69%), with secondary emphasis upon the exchange of objective information (31%).

While the secondary emphasis on the exchange of information is consonant with professional letters and with the expository purposes of community organization, the extensive use of Advisements, however, appears to be at odds with the notion that community organizers, like other planners, lack a legitimate claim to the level of familiarity inherent in the use of Advisements. This high frequency of status-claiming Advisements within a context of questioned authority and involvement can be explained by several aspects of Unity's response.
Unity had been asked by the Planning Council to respond to several important issues that had been raised at the September meeting. As a giver of information, Unity's written response to the Planning Council's request suggested a hierarchical relationship in which the Unity, as the provider of information, assumed a position of dominance over the general community, or the receiver of the information. That is, Unity had more control over the community in this communicative situation. Overall, I concluded that this degree of control or power that the Unity had relative to the community was derived from Unity's expertise, authority and dominance as an organization relative to other residents and concerned citizens.

However, I also recognized that members of the community maintained a degree of power and control in this situation. Specifically, although the community carried a subordinate hierarchic role in this situation, its ability to evaluate Unity's recommendations, was not necessarily submissive. These potential for a shift in dominance is a relevant factor in Unity's approach of recommending.

In recommending, the speaker thinks that he can guide the addressee's future actions in some way, and that the addressee would welcome this. This means that the speaker expresses his view concerning the addressee's future actions in response to the addressee's actual or imagined invitation for him to do so. Several aspects of recommending and recommendations require further examination.
First, recommendations imply superior knowledge (in the given area). That is, when someone recommends something to us, he implies that he knows a good deal about the area in question, probably more than the addressee. Further, recommending seems to aim at saying what would be good for the addressee. The implication is recommending is that the action would be beneficial to the person who acts. Also, the use of Edification form with Advisement suggested that the information that formed the basis of the recommendations in the memorandum was true and objective.

Usually, a person recommends objects which views as reliable means of obtaining satisfaction or relief. This stress on an object or an action as a source of satisfaction is reflected in the fact that the direct object of this verb refers usually to a thing or action rather than to the addressee.

Finally, when a person recommends something, he usually adopts the less presumptuous stand of someone who wants to cause the addressee to know what the speaker thinks it would be good for the addressee to do. The person recommending something doesn't know if the address will do it, reflecting the greater tentativeness of recommending. The tentative quality of the memorandum is reflected in the mutual power that Unity and the Common Square community could exert on one another.

Also, a second factor that affected Unity's response was Unity's past success in bring community people and organizations together. Based on the community's assessment of Unity's ability to facilitate collaborative efforts, it seem clear to me that the Planning Council had begun to supersede Unity's accomplishments in the arena. For
example, residents were quite clear in their sentiments that the coordinators of the Planning Council were universally well-respected and established leaders in the community. By contrast, their comments indicated that the Chair of Unity was a relative newcomer to the political scene who had yet to prove himself a legitimate member of the established leadership elite. Over time, I concluded that Unity was trying to exert its authority in an arena in which it has been less than successful. Without a constituency, and a crumbling mandate to lead the community, the organization had failed to become a part of the leadership of the community.

Given the past history of criticism, Unity stated that it would have to convince audience members of its authority and competence through the style and content of its memorandum. Since Unity had fallen from grace over its history of existence, Carter was aware that the organization's leadership might very well be rejected by the community. The use of recommendations in its memorandum was a tentative way of exerting Unity's right to assume a higher relative status and involvement with the community.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all Verbal Response Modes that made up Carter's task into the higher-order conceptual dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how these verbal response categories conveyed Carter's perception of the role he assumed in this memorandum. Overall indices and the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Carter's utterances appear in Table 4.2.
According to the overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimension, Carter's was not concerned about the audience's experiences or knowledge. Specifically, none of the utterances were coded as Question, Acknowledgment, Interpretation or Reflection. In 100% of the memorandum, the source or central experience that Carter expressed when he wrote was based on his own thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentional behavior. This was displayed by the exclusive use of Advisement and Edification response modes that Carter used. The impact of Carter's lack of interest in, and therefore, involvement with the community's
knowledge and experiences was nonsupport of the audience's positive face wants of interest and concern.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Carter's utterances in which the central topic focused on knowledge of what the audience should be intending was indicated by the relatively substantial frequency (69%) of Advisement or presumptuous Verbal Response Modes. That is, Carter's utterances were characterized by a predominance of presumptuousness toward the audience as displayed by the more modest (31%) use of the Edification. Most of the time, Carter imposed his own experience on the audience by presuming to know what it should do.

As stated earlier, presumptuousness has the greatest degree of familiarity on the dimensions of status and involvement, and consequently, poses the greatest impositions on an audience's negative face. The analysis of Carter's memorandum indicated that most often Carter assumed a role that underscored the threats that presumptuousness poses to negative face by choosing communicative behavior to heighten the power asymmetries inherent in presumptuous behavior.

Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control dimension indicated that the proportion of utterances in which Carter represented what he was saying from a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with the audience through the use of Edification was noticeable at 31%. That is, although the majority of the time (69%), Carter imposed his will on the interaction
in order to direct the verbal exchange, he was noticeably acquiescent in a number of his utterances at the same time. Most of his utterances were controlling in the sense that they did not allow a shared viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. The relatively higher frequency of Advisement response modes (69%) that conveyed Carter's own frame of reference confirmed Carter's noticeable level of control and, in turn, the increased impositions on the freedom of the audience.

In conclusion, overall figures for the role dimensions indicated that Carter perceived his role in this episode as one generally of imposing on audience's negative face in terms of its privacy and freedom. He accomplished this by being totally informative, that is, revealing his own thoughts, feelings and intentions exclusively as opposed to using the audience's knowledge and experiences as the source and largely presumptuous by making the central focus what the audience's and not his own behavior should be. Finally, Carter was predominantly controlling of the course of the conversation by using his own set of ideas, memories, meanings, and the like for giving meaning to the experience, although he was noticeably acquiescent at times. Consequently, these three overall role dimensions that characterize Carter's memorandum reflect the source, focus and frame of Advisement or assuming the authority or expertise to direct the audience's behavior.

By disaggregating overall index into the form and intent indices for the role dimension of informativeness, it is apparent that the form and intent indices along this dimension are congruent with the overall indices on this role dimension. That is, Carter was totally consistent in how he perceived his role in terms of the task and his social
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relationship with the audience on the source of the experience. Carter played the role of someone whose task was primarily informative and whose social relationship required that he lessen the impositions on or threats to the audience's negative face wants as much as possible in providing that information. This required Carter to talk about his own knowledge and experiences rather than the audience's knowledge and experiences. However, disaggregating the deference (Unassuming-Presumptuous) and the control (Directive - Acquiescent) dimensions into their form and intent indices revealed a much more complex picture of what Carter was doing.

The form index for the deference dimension indicated that the literal meaning, or the grammatical form, of most of Carter's utterances (63%) were unassuming. That is, the grammatical forms that Carter used indicated that more than half of the time, he was not presuming knowledge about the audience. By contrast, however, the index for the intent of the deference dimension indicated that Carter intended for 100% of his utterances to be presumptuous. According to these data, contrary to outward appearances, Carter had a greater implicit or latent intention to presume knowledge of what the audience's experience should be. The literal meaning conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms were a distinct contrast to the intentions Carter realized. This discrepancy between the form and intent of many of Lane's utterances along the deference dimension can be explained in terms of the interpersonal pressures in his relationship with the audience that caused Carter to attempt to obscure what he was really up to. It seemed that Carter's intention to be presumptuous in his interaction with the audience conflicted with implicit norms that suggested the impropriety of Carter displaying his intention to invade the audience's privacy by
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presuming to know what they should do. This conflict created interpersonal pressure on Carter to adopt greater deference in the form of some of his utterances.

The form and intent of the control dimensions indicated that Carter was also experiencing a significant degree of interpersonal pressure to conceal his intention to direct the audience's frame of reference. The form index for the control dimension indicated that the literal meanings of the majority (63%) of Carter's utterances were non-directive. However, the intent index for the control dimension indicated that Carter intended for none of his utterances to be directive. The literal meaning conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms conveyed a level of presumptuousness that was approximately one-third of the presumptuousness realized in his intentions. In other words, Carter's task of controlling the meanings linked to the suggested future behavior of the community through Advisement was different from his social relationship with the audience which warranted a less intrusive kind of interaction. This discrepancy between the form and intent of many of Carter's utterances, and the manner in which they obscured what was going on linguistically can be explained further by Unity's failure to establish itself as a leadership organization, and by Carter's own personal limitations as its leader.

RELATIONSHIP: The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form basis for the Familiarity Index. This index was used as an overall measure of Carter's identity claims of status and involvement in his relationship to the audience. The analysis of Carter's use of specific Verbal Response Mode categories ranked from high to low familiarity in his communicative behavior is
summarized in Table 4.3. Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs provide further indication of the strategies that made up Carter's communicative behavior in the memorandum.

**TABLE 4.3 - RELATIONSHIP**

Familiarity Index : 6.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW RANKED MODES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RANKED MODES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(A)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURE MODES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = Edification     A = Advisement

The mean rank of Carter's 8 utterances scored for 16 form and intent response modes produced a relatively high Familiarity index of 6.50. A further analysis of this Familiarity Index indicated that 11 or 69% of the Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the high-ranked Advisement mode. The remaining 5 or
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31% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the low-ranked mode of Edification.

This distribution of low and high ranked Verbal Response Modes on the familiarity hierarchy was consonant with Carter's assumption of a position of higher status and involvement in relation to the audience inherent in the task of directing other people's behavior. Specifically, Carter resolved the tension he felt between his intention to claim higher status and greater involvement by guiding behavior and his hesitancy about displaying these intentions directly with specific patterns of form-intent combinations.

Out of the 8 mixed and pure mode form-intent combinations that made up Carter's memorandum, 5 or 63% represented mixed modes or form and intent discrepancies. The Edification in service of Advisement or E(A) combination comprised all of the mixed modes. This higher number of mixed modes as compared to pure modes indicated the interpersonal pressures that Carter experienced exerting a high level of familiarity within a very tenuous situation social relationship with the community.

Specifically, Advisements do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation, or what its experience should be. Carter's Advisements, that is, attempts to guide behavior through suggestions and commands, imposed upon the audience by invading its privacy and restricting its freedom. These impositions were not warranted by Carter's relationship with the community. However, when paired with the Edification form, which is lower on the familiarity
hierarchy, Carter lowered or mitigated the controlling intent, and thus attempted to indirectly presume and control without explicitly appearing to do so. To illustrate,

5. *This Committee should be selected immediately.*

E(A)

This utterance is third-person (Edification form) declarative that talks about objective data. The form indicated that Carter is making a statement that is focused on the audience and used the audience's frame of reference. In fact, Carter's intention was to suggest or direct the audience's future actions. By lowering the Advisement intent with the Edification form, Carter avoided the face threat of imposing his own point of view on the audience, or presuming to know what the audience should do. On the surface, Carter's appeared to be acceding to the audience through an utterance that, in form, represented a view that was neutral and shared in common with the audience. In face, in this utterance, Carter was imposing his will on the interaction. The overall pattern throughout the memorandum was to lower or mitigate the higher-ranked intent of Advisement with the lower-ranked Edification form.

The remaining 3 utterances were pure modes in which the form-intent combination matched. The use of pure modes in certain utterances suggested that Carter did not perceive any conflict between what he was trying to do and his social relationship with the audience. Specifically, Carter did not feel pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

4. *Call a meeting of the community.* A(A)
This is imperative in form -- with "you" as the understood subject -- coded Advisement. In this utterance, Carter presumed to impose an experience on the audience. Thus the source of experience and frame of reference are Carter's, but the focus is on the other, that is, Advisement intent.
Conclusions

Carter's task in this episode was directing the audience's behavior. This highest level of familiarity with or imposition on the audience was problematic in the sense that neither Carter nor the Unity Coalition had definitively established their "right" to assume a position of leadership that warranted directing people's behavior. As a result of this relationship between Carter, Unity and the audience, the recommendations that Carter made risked the possibility of rejection and opposition. However, in making recommendations in response to the Planning Council's request, Carter accomplished two important but paradoxical objectives. While recommending indicates a position of higher status and involvement relative to the audience, it also conveys a certain degree of tentativeness, and thus flexibility, in this claim to the status and involvement to direct.

In using Advisement to direct the community's future behavior, Carter used the most presumptuousness, and therefore, the most imposing of all Verbal Response Modes. The result of this high level of imposition could be resistance and hostility from the audience to Unity's directives. However, Carter and the organization believed that the potential benefits of validation of its authority from the audience was worth the risk of imposing upon the audience and generating its opposition. Carter and other members of Unity believed that the disintegrating mandate for the organization's leadership had to be rescued before the organization was totally discredited. A positive demonstration of leadership could strengthen the audience's acceptance of that mandate.
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Carter assumed the role of being completely informative, extremely presumptuous, and significantly controlling. While the dimension of informativeness is characterized by consistency between its form and intents, the two role dimensions of presumptuousness and directiveness indicated discrepancies. That is, while Carter intended to be presumptuous and controlling in his utterance intents, some of the grammatical forms chosen were less so on both dimensions. This discrepancy between the form and the intent on these two dimensions suggested that Lane experienced interpersonal pressure in his social relationship with the community to obscure tasks of claiming status and involvement in terms of the focus and the frame of reference that he was using. These tensions were further reflected in the form-intent discrepancies that appeared in the majority of his utterances.

The distribution of Verbal Response Modes and the resulting Familiarity Index indicated that Carter adopted a relatively high degree of familiarity with the audience. The strategies Carter used to achieve this level of familiarity in his communicative behavior were conveyed in the pattern of mixed and pure form and intent Verbal Response Mode combinations.

The frequency of mixed modes was higher than the occurrence of pure modes. The pattern in most mixed mode form and intent combinations was to mitigate or lower higher ranked intents, which were constrained by the task at hand, with low ranked forms, which were constrained by the social relationship. In other words, although Lane intended to be more presumptuous and controlling with the audience, his existing relationship with them prompted him to avoid incurring face threats that
would heighten existing problems in their relationship. These form and intent discrepancies mitigated Carter's intention to control the audience's frame of reference in specific ways without imposing upon or offending them. The objective of these politeness strategies was to redress or make these intent less serious.
**APPENDIX 4**

**Memorandum to Planning Council**

**October 5, 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text of Memorandum</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please find below comments of The Unity Coalition relative to issues raised at the previous Town Meeting.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PUBLIC ACCESS - REBECCA JOHNSON MAGNET SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coalition recommends that a committee be selected by Town Meeting Coordinators to take the lead in negotiating this issue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule a meeting with Superintendent Negroni to indicate the concerns of the Community.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call a meeting of the community to determine the services warranted by community residents. (i.e., athletic facilities, daycare and after school programs, evening adult basic educational programs, dance classes, space for workshops, etc.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE SELECTED IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCHOOL.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION - MALES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coalition recommends that the Equal Opportunity Administrator for the City develop an alliance network across the country to solicit for African American Male teachers.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. CHAPTER ONE - limited funding for preschool children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7 The Coalition recommends that:
   1) Alternative teaching programs be established.

2 Alternative teaching certification and curriculum be established.

3) The Black educators play a significant role.

D. MINORITY BUSINESSES

8 The Coalition recommends:

1) Purchase goods and services from African Americans.

2) Patronize the Wells Credit Union

3) Educational workshops on getting to business and staying in business be presented on a routine basis.

4) Revise the Upper State Street Development Corporation and The Primus Mason CDC.

Text of Memorandum to Planning Council

To: Carol Adams
   Town Meeting Coordinator

From: Carter
   Chairman / Unity Coalition

Date: October 5, 1990

Please find below comments of The Unity Coalition relative to issues raised at the previous Town Meeting.

A. PUBLIC ACCESS - REBECCA JOHNSON MAGNET SCHOOL

The Coalition recommends that a committee be selected by Town Meeting Coordinators to take the lead in negotiating this issue.

Schedule a meeting with Superintendent Negroni to indicate the concerns of the Community.
Call a meeting of the community to determine the services warranted by community residents. (i.e., athletic facilities, daycare and after school programs, evening adult basic educational programs, dance classes, space for workshops, etc.)

THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE SELECTED IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCHOOL.

B. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION - MALES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The Coalition recommends that the Equal Opportunity Administrator for the City develop an alliance network across the country to solicit for African American Male teachers.

C. CHAPTER ONE - limited funding for preschool children

The Coalition recommends that:
1) Alternative teaching programs be established.
2) Alternative teaching certification and curriculum be established.
3) The Black educators play a significant role.

D. MINORITY BUSINESSES

The Coalition recommends:
1) Purchase goods and services from African Americans.
2) Patronize the Wells Credit Union
3) Educational workshops on getting to business and staying in business be presented on a routine basis.
4) Revise the Upper State Street Development Corporation and The Primus Mason CDC.
Episode 5: The October Community Meeting

The General Situation

Community organizations undergo constant criticism by and opposition from competing groups and organizations. Community organizations take public opposition seriously because of the importance of public support and allegiance for these organizations. If community organizations do not respond in public ways, they run the risk of losing present and future support for their activities. In order for groups that are challenged to maintain their viability, they must adequately resolve these conflicts and preserve their integrity among their constituencies. A particularly difficult area of interaction among collaborating organizations is responding to and critiquing contributions to the collaborative effort. These evaluations or judgments are affected by a variety of social, organizational and psychological barriers to successful partnerships.

First, the collaboration may be incompatible with existing norms that provide stability and behavioral guidelines for participants. Second, collaborative efforts may be viewed as threats to the power and influence of various individuals and groups. Third, existing authority patterns, channels of communication, division of labor, rules and procedures within and among participating groups and organizations may be incompatible with collaboration. Last, collaborators may agree on the problems, but disagree on its nature and causes, and hence have different perceptions of how to remedy the problem.
Although self-evaluation is critical to the ultimate success of any collaborative effort, providing and responding to criticism constructively is required to maintain the viability of the collaborative relationship.

The Specific Situation

The Unity Coalition had been asked to respond to issues from the September meeting and submitted its recommendations to the Community Change Planning Council. In preparation for the discussion of its recommendations, Unity attended the meeting to respond to questions or comments about its recommendations.

At the October community meeting, a Council member opened the discussion focusing specifically on Unity's written response to these issues and concerns raised in September. In these remarks, the Planning Council member criticized Unity for making recommendations to others for future action rather than stating explicitly what Unity itself was prepared to do to implement its recommendations.

The Overall Goals

Faced with the Planning Council's public criticism, Carter later stated that, at the time, he felt an obligation to defend Unity's recommendations by convincing other audience members that the Planning Council's criticisms were inappropriately handled. Although he understood that the Planning Council's specific critique was directed at Unity, Carter also believed that other organizations and leaders could be subjected public to similar unfounded criticisms. While Carter acknowledged the need for careful deliberation about and evaluation of the work of
community groups, Carter felt that the Planning Council's behavior had violated the spirit and intent of the community meeting, and would be detrimental to future attempts at collaborative efforts among community groups.

In general, I concluded that members of the audience had the power to confer legitimacy on the work that was being presented at the meeting. Since their support was critical to the adoption of recommendations, I believed that Unity had to justify its request. On the other hand, the coalition represents a consortium of agencies that in their own right are powerful.

In my judgment, Unity, in its position as a leading community organization, had a different sense than many residents of the constraints and standards for evaluating organizational effectiveness and accomplishments. Carter recognized that challenging Unity's critics required the management of complex and controversial data about the organization's past efforts. He realized the possibility of failing to convince the audience of his position and further jeopardize Unity's standing in the community. Carter expressed the need to challenge in a way that generated sympathy and support for its past failures, while avoiding the appearance of being ineffectual. Carter indicated his awareness that his challenge could bring direct about resistance from the Planning Council and its attempt to persuade the audience that its objections were not valid.

Carter, viewed the benefits of successfully challenging the Planning Council in the form of
better information for the community upon which to judge the Unity’s efforts and the Planning Council’s evaluation of it, and

the enhancement a deteriorating, negative relationship between Unity and the Planning Council.
The Strategy

At the beginning of the meeting, the Planning Council had criticized Unity's recommendations. After some time had elapsed, Carter entered the discussion, speaking on behalf of the organization. Instead of responding directly to the Planning Council's criticisms, Carter responded indirectly by trying to change the focus of attention from Unity to flaws in some of the work of the Planning Council.

The Organizational Representative

As the Chair of Unity, Carter was aware that he was trying to exert the organization's authority in an arena in which it has been less than successful. The communicative exchange took place between members of the Planning Council who had convened and chaired the meeting, and the Carter, who, during the meeting was a member of the audience. As indicated earlier, both Unity and the Planning Council were leadership organizations in the Common Square community and Carter and members of the Planning Council attempted to claim status and authority as heads of organizations, and political expertise relative to community residents.

The Setting

Modeled after the traditional New England town meeting, the monthly community meeting format required active involvement of all people who attended, promoting a greater sense of community involvement by opening the process to anyone who wanted to be involved. The goal was to get issues on the table for public debate and negotiation, and to make decisions about potential actions and solutions.
The practices that guided and dominated this town meeting effort required experts and professionals, that is, people with formal training and skills, to participate in decision-making on an equal basis with other members of the community. Unlike past relationships between experts and clients, professionals provided technical assistance to facilitate the implementation of the needs and wishes voiced by community residents. These experts were responsible for providing technical assistance to recommendations and plans that were discussed and adopted. Their work required the approval of the general body before they are adopted for implementation.

According to several community leaders who provided professional, "expert" technical assistance at these meetings, they believed their role as one of operationalizing the issues raised by the community. They perceived their role as, in part, giving voice to community perceptions and unarticulated feelings. In that sense, these community leaders believed that their work should not be biased unnecessarily in favor of their own particular personal or professional values and objectives. Also, they opposed abusing the power inherent in their access various kinds of information, resources and skills within the community.

These community leaders also expected that their work would be presented to the public. On this basis, they agreed that their presentations must be succinct, clear and to the point, and free of technical jargon. They realized that they were subject to immediate public reactions in the community meeting, and accepted that in these community meeting their work would critiqued and evaluated in public, receiving on-the-spot acceptance or rejection.
In terms of the discussion at the October meeting, I observed several important characteristics. First, the discussion involved a group of people in dialogue with one another, taking turns at offering their views on a range of topics. Second, the discussion provided opportunities for widespread, active involvement through discussion. Third, debate seemed to be the norm for discussion and negotiation was a technique for sorting through issues and coming to agreement.

I concluded that these participatory democratic processes would have several important effects on the community meeting. First, no individual or group would come to the discussion with an upper hand because each participant had an opportunity to prove her expertise, knowledge and wisdom. Second, equal consideration was given to all ideas, and participants were expected to seriously and sincerely weight ideas, providing each perspective that is presented with a fair hearing. Finally, unethical exercises of power and authority through position, expertise, information, were unacceptable in the community meeting and subject to censure by participants.

This exchange was marked by several major situational parameters that distinguish typical speaking. In speaking, the addressee is an active, individual listener. In typical speaking situations, the listener has unique opportunities to respond directly. Also, the speaker's knowledge about the listener's background (personalities, beliefs, knowledge, interests, etc.) is variable, although often intimate. Speaking also allows on-going negotiation of purpose and topic, with communication crucially
dependent on the establishment and subsequent maintenance of a focused social
relationship between participants. Finally, the extent of shared cultural background
knowledge is in general greater in speech because the addressee interacts directly with
the speaker.

The Audience

During our conversation about the October meeting, Carter indicated that
his main objectives were to make the audience aware of Unity's perspective of the
Planning Council's inappropriate activities, and to persuade the Planning Council to
provide criticism that was more supportive of the collaborative effort. In order to begin
to achieve these objectives, Carter decided to challenge the Planning Council's
comments to Common Square residents and other community groups and organizations in
attendance at the October community meeting. He believed changing negative
impressions about Unity and generating support required

shaping new beliefs and attitudes toward Unity,

terminating or neutralizing hostile feelings toward the organization,

creating doubts among those holding negative attitudes toward Unity,

and converting those who may be ambivalent in their thinking
about Unity because of conflicting ideas.

The relatively recent, short-term existence of the community meetings and
Carter's position as a newcomer to this level of political activity in the Common Square
Community suggested to me that the frequency and extent of interaction in this specific
type of communicative situation was new for Carter. Without a track record of interaction in this situation, I concluded that the interaction between Carter and the Planning Council members during this meeting was based in large part on their frequent and multiple contact outside of this context. As a subordinate in an unequal power relation, Carter attempted to minimize the affect of his comments to prevent offending the 'superior' Council member.

This particular conversational exchange between Carter and the Planning Council was characterized by inequality, with Carter in a position of deference to the Planning Council members. The Council had called the meeting and decided on the manner and format for presenting the responses to the community. Essentially, Carter was following the Planning Council's lead for handling the topic and responses. In my estimation, the discussion, whose topic and structure had been chosen by the Planning Council, contributed to that relationship of inequality between Unity and the Planning Council members. Thus, in this hierarchical relationship, Unity's subordinate role as an audience member relative to the Planning Council's dominant role as chair of the meeting had been institutionalized in the specific social activity of the meeting.

As a subordinate in the exchange, I observed that Carter was responding to the controlling actions of the Planning Council and to the critical content of the Planning Council's comments about Unity. In responding, Carter explained that he was defending Unity as a viable community organization. He discussed his belief that he had the right to challenge the criticisms made by the Planning Council in its opening remarks. By contrast, Carter also was aware that the Planning Council had the right
to oppose Unity's objections. He hoped that by speaking he would provide the audience with more balanced for evaluate both organizations.

On the basis of my observations and conversations, I concluded that most residents viewed Council members as the leaders whose status and expertise exceeded Carter's leadership of Unity. It seemed reasonable for me to infer that members of the Planning Council had exerted this status and authority by creating a community forum. In many people's estimation, the Planning Council's was a more effective organization.

In critiquing Unity's recommendation, I believed that the Council had set the facts of Unity's "problem" in a certain way and was proceeding according to its own ideological definitions of the situation and the issues. It was common knowledge within Unity and throughout the Common Square community that Unity had not been at the forefront of community affairs for several months. On the basis of its ineffectiveness, I speculated that the Planning Council believed that Unity deserved public criticism for its ineffectiveness, and, like some people, agreed that the organization should be replaced unable to serve the community. In that sense, I inferred that Council felt entitled to suggest, control and direct because of its newfound status and the ineffectiveness of Unity.

According to the decision made at the September meeting, Common Square residents' agreed to allow interpretations and ideas of the Planning Council and Unity to dominate the community's response to several issues. While residents reported having their own opinions about what needed to happen, they agreed to adhere to the assessments from others with more expertise and competence in these areas. I concluded
that this informational influence significantly impacted the decisions that residents eventually would make.

The high level of attendance at the October meeting indicated to me that interest was high among residents and groups who anticipated hearing new approaches to resolving local problems and issues. Given the degree familiarity of audience members with the problems, I inferred that the audience held conflicting attitudes about these problems and their resolution. That is, I believed that although residents had less information and expertise, their high level of interest would prompt them to listen and carefully weigh the evidence that was presented. On the other hand, I anticipated that community groups attending the October meeting were quite sophisticated in terms of determining the effectiveness of recommendations presented at the meeting.

Some of Carter's comments during the meeting are contained in the following excerpt:

"Yes, I guess one of the purposes of this kind of forum is for community residents to get their concerns. Now is the last meeting there were several issues that were raised in regard to what M____ expounded upon ____. And I'd like to know what has happened from the last meeting to this meeting in regards to those concerns."
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

TASK: Carter's task is based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and Verbal Response Mode intents (across forms).
### TABLE 5.1 - TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Category</th>
<th>Form and Intent N=30</th>
<th>Form N=15</th>
<th>Intent N=15</th>
<th>High and Low % N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td>(46%)</td>
<td>(46%)</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 5.1 indicated, Carter's comments during the October Town meeting were dominated by Disclosures and Edifications, that is, statements of subjective and objective information, respectively, in grammatical form and communicative intent. Essentially, Carter used first-person (Disclosure form) or third-person (edification or information form) declarative sentences to talk about his own private experience (Disclosure intent) and about objective matters (Edification or information intent). These are represented by E(E), D(D) and D(E) modes. Carter also used first-person Disclosure form) declaratives to attempt to guide behavior (Advisement intent) and third-person (Edification or information form) declaratives to explain or label the audience's behavior (Interpretation intent). These are represented by D(A) and D(I) modes. These two categories of Disclosure and Edification accounted for 24 or 80% of all utterances.

To illustrate:

5 The other issue is Representative Jordan's suggestion that the entire Common Square community should shut down ... November 6th I think he indicated. E(E)

6 I think we have all of the heads of the organizations that are present tonight that could really make that commitment to shut down their organization on November 6th so that we can vote on Questions 3, 2 and

5. D(D)

On line 5, the subject is "the other issue" -- third person --, so the form is Edification. With regard to intent, this utterance concerns the Carter's experience and is focused on the speaker with no presumption required. This narrows the choice of intent to Edification or Disclosure depending upon whether Carter's intent is to reveal...
himself or to provide data. I imagined that if an observer in the right place at the
time with the right skills could determine the truth or falsity of Carter's
statement. Therefore, I coded the intent of the utterance Edification because it conveys
objective information.

On line 6, the subject is I -- first person declarative -- so the form is
Disclosure. With regard to intent, this utterance seems to concerns Carter's own
experiences and it is focused on Carter without presuming knowledge of the audience's
experience or intentional behavior. This narrow the choice to Edification of Disclosure.
I imagined that I could not determine the truth or falsity of the statement as well as
Carter could. I am dealing with Carter's private perceptions, and since I cannot read
his mind, I would have a difficult time verifying his statement. On that basis, I coded
the intent as Disclosure.

1   Yes   K(K)
2   I guess one of the purposes of this kind
    of forum is for community residents to get their
    concerns.    D(E)
3   Now in the last meeting, there were several
    issues that were raised in regard to what
    Martin expounded upon.   E(E)
4   And I'd like to know what has hap-
    pened from the last meeting to this
    meeting in regards to those con-
    cerns.    D(A)

On line 2, the subject is first person declarative, so the form is Disclosure. In
my opinion, the truth or falsity of this statement could be checked or verified by
consulting the mission of the Community Change Planning Council. Therefore, the
viewpoint is one that is shared or held in common with other people. Therefore, I coded the intent as Edification.

On line 4, the subject is "I" -- first person declarative -- so the form is Disclosure. This utterance seems to be presuming some knowledge of the Council's or intention behavior and it is clearly expressing the speaker's viewpoint. This narrows the choice to Interpretation or Advisement intent, depending on whether this utterance concerned the Council's experience or behavior (i.e., something the Council has already done) or the speaker's idea of what the Council ought to do. Based on context, I judged that there was a directive on record for directing the Council behavior, that is, to impose an experience on the Council. Therefore, I coded the intent as Advisement.

9 I think that something specific can be done this evening since we have all the players here. D(D)
10 And it seems we can never get any kind of action out of these kinds of meetings. E(D)
11 [What] I mean [is that] we need something to happen, something to happen. E(D)
12 Last month there were petitions raised. E(E)
13 I think that something should have been done at this meeting to at least let people know what you have been doing. D(I)
14 [What] I mean [is that] we started the meeting with a brand new set of issues. E(I)

Line 10 was Carter's subjective experience reported in a third person form. Line 13 was Carter's labeling of the Council's behavior reported in a first person
declarative form. Line 14 also was Carter's labeling of the Council's behavior; however, the subject was third person, so the form was coded Edification.

The next most frequently occurring Verbal Response Modes included three Interpretations (judgments and evaluations), two Acknowledgments (receptiveness or salutations), and one Confirmation. Together, these 6 categories accounted for 20% of the Verbal Response Mode categories. The Verbal Response Modes of Question and Reflection were absent from Carter's remarks.

Thus, Carter's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents was the exchange of information regarding subjective and objective issues (80%), with a slight secondary emphasis upon judgments and evaluations (10%), and receptiveness to the Council (7%). While these data indicate that Carter's responses were consonant with the informational purposes of meetings and the expositional purposes of community organizing, Carter's comments also indicated his concern with providing judgments and evaluations that typify the act of criticizing.

Criticism is directed at people for their behavior, their acts, their choices, their words, their work and their products. Criticisms always contain some reference to a person's doings, and a negative assessment of some aspect of these doings. Thus, whatever it is that is criticized directly, there is always, in the background, if not in the foreground, the image of a person or persons doing something.
In criticizing someone or something, the speaker is expressing a personal opinion. The reason why the critic is expressing his negative opinion is that he assumes people would want to know it. But criticizing someone's acts involves more than expressing a negative opinion about them: the critic expresses his opinion because he wants it to be known, and the reason why he wants it to be known is that he would want to influence people's future acts. We criticize in order to exert influence, or at least having in mind a possibility of exerting influence.

On behalf of Unity, Carter described several objectives that he wanted to meet by speaking at the meeting. Overall, he wanted to change the negative impression that the Planning Council had created regarding the Unity's recommendations. He wanted to bring this change about by casting doubt on the work that Council itself had been doing. He hoped that by successfully critiquing the Planning Council's work, Unity would encourage the audience toward greater respect of Unity and it's efforts. Carter added that he also spoke at the meeting in support of the larger cause of maintaining Unity as a viable organization in the community's eyes. He believed that an important way of managing its image was by generating respect among community members. Although the frequent use of Disclosure conveyed Carter's control of the frame of reference for the audience in changing their beliefs and attitudes, these same Disclosures brought the benefit of lessening the impact of the disagreements with the Planning Council that the content of Carter's comments conveyed.

In conclusion, Carter's task, like the first four episodes, primarily was one of exchanging subjective and objective information, an inherently status claiming activity. This claim was further emphasized by Carter's choice of criticism as the
means for conveying information. In claiming the familiarity of information-giver, Carter often used the Verbal Response Mode of Disclosure to control the audience's frame of reference. While this directiveness of Disclosure brought the disadvantages of imposing on the audience's freedom, this Verbal Response Mode also served to lessen the impact of the disagreements inherent in Carter's comments.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all Verbal Response Modes that made up Carter's task into the higher-order conceptual dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how these verbal response categories conveyed Carter's perception of the role he assumed in this episode. Overall indices and the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Carter's utterances appear in Table 5.2.
TABLE 5.2 - ROLE DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OVERALL N = 30</th>
<th>FORM N = 15</th>
<th>INTENT N = 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informative -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive (Self-centered)</td>
<td>25  5</td>
<td>14  1</td>
<td>11  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83%) (17%)</td>
<td>(93%) (7%)</td>
<td>(73%) (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassuming -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumptuous (Deferece)</td>
<td>26  4</td>
<td>14  1</td>
<td>12  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87%) (13%)</td>
<td>(93%) (7%)</td>
<td>(80%) (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiescent (Control)</td>
<td>16  14</td>
<td>8  7</td>
<td>10  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53%) (47%)</td>
<td>(53%) (47%)</td>
<td>(67%) (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimensions, the proportion of utterances whose source or central experience was derived from the audience's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentional acts relatively low. Specifically, 17% of the total of the form and intent modes were coded for the attentive modes Interpretation and Acknowledgment. The majority of Carter's utterances were informative or self-centered, that is, 83% of the time, the source or central experience of Carter's responses were based on his own experiences and knowledge. This was displayed by the higher frequency of Disclosure, Edification, Advisement and Confirmation. These data suggest Carter's utterances, like the speakers in the four preceding episodes, conveyed a general lack of interest in, and therefore, involvement with the audience's knowledge and experiences. As was true of
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the four preceding episodes, the egocentric focus of the informativeness of Carter's utterances did little to support the audience's positive face wants of interest and concern.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Carter's utterances in which the central topic focused on knowledge of what the audience is, was, will be or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending, was indicated by the low frequency (13%) of Confirmation, Advisement and Confirmation, or presumptuous Verbal Response Modes. Instead, his utterances were characterized by a predominance of deference toward the audience as displayed by the more frequent use of Disclosure, Edification and Acknowledgment response modes. That is, 87% of the time, Lane did not impose his own experience on the audience by presuming to know about them. This data indicated that most often Carter assumed a role that lessened the threat that presumptuousness poses to negative face by choosing communicative behavior that contradicted the power asymmetries inherent in presumptuous behavior.

Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control role dimension indicated that the proportion of utterances in which Carter represented what he was saying from a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with the Council was 47%. That is, slightly less than half the time, Carter did not impose his own will on the interaction in order to direct the verbal exchange. Instead, slightly more than half of his utterances controlled the course of the discussion. The more frequent use of Disclosure, Interpretation and Advisement response modes (53%) that conveyed his own frame of reference confirmed Carter's assertion of
In conclusion, overall figures for the role dimensions indicated that generally Carter conveyed personal subjectivity with the audience. He accomplished this primarily by being informative in using his own thoughts, feelings and intentions rather than the audience's knowledge and experiences as the source, and largely deferent or unassuming by making the central topic what his own and not the audience's experience is, was, will or should be. Finally, slightly more often than not, Carter controlled the frame of reference by asserting his own viewpoint to direct the interaction. This set of role dimensions are associated with the Disclosure mode, thus Carter's role primarily was one of providing subjective information.

By disaggregating overall indices into the form and intent indices for each of the role dimensions, the form and intent indices for informativeness and deference reveal some slight discrepancies with the overall pattern of indices. By contrast, the form and intent of the control (Directive - Acquiescent) dimension revealed a more significant discrepancy between Carter's perception of the task and his social relationship with the Council.

The form index for the control dimension indicated that the literal meaning or the grammatical form of a slight majority (53%) of Carter's utterances were non-directive or acquiescent. Specifically, the grammatical forms that Carter used were constrained by his social relationship with the audience. This relationship prompted
Lane to convey, on the surface, a shared viewpoint in his utterances, that is, one that was held in common with the community.

By contrast, however, the intent index for the control dimension indicated that Carter intended a somewhat higher number of his utterances to be controlling (67%). That is, more often that was obvious, Carter had the implicit or latent intention to represent more of the experiences he was talking about from his own viewpoint. The literal meanings conveyed in the Verbal Response mode forms were less prominent than the controlling intentions in Carter’s utterances. This discrepancy between the form and intent of some of his utterances along the control dimension suggests that these utterance intents were too directive for Carter’s relationship with the audience. In response, Carter adopted politeness strategies to conform to this relationship. His politeness strategies for mitigating directive intents with non-directive forms can be understood in terms of several aspects of the communicative context.

Carter chose the act of criticizing the Council as a way for accomplishing several objectives. He acknowledged that unmitigated criticism could invoke the Council’s active resistance of and objections to his critique. The face threatening act of criticizing, coupled with Carter’s position of subordination in the exchange and the complexities of negotiating a spoiled identity for himself and the organization that he represented, created a situation that could prompt intense arguments and disagreements. Although Carter did criticize the Council, the use of the Disclosure response mode was an important strategy for lessening the intensity of his criticisms. Despite the fact that Carter used the Disclosure mode to control of the frame of
reference in the verbal exchange, Disclosures reduced the threat and competitiveness of adversarial relationships.

In conclusion, it seemed that Carter's intention to be more controlling in his interaction with the Planning Council conflicted with the implicit norms suggesting that his relative status and involvement with them did not warrant this controlling behavior. In addition, Carter's negative evaluations of the Council that were being conveyed in the act of criticizing also increased the possibility of arguments with many disagreements between the Carter and the Planning Council. In recognition of these complexities, Carter used Disclosures and Edifications as a means of lessening the intensity of his criticisms and mitigating the impositions of directiveness in the role he assumed.

**RELATIONSHIP:** The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index was used as an overall measure of Carter's identity claims of status and involvement in his relationship with the audience. The analysis of Carter's specific Verbal Response Mode categories ranked from high to low familiarity in his communicative behavior is summarized in Table 5.3. Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs were calculated to provide further indication of the strategies that made up Carter's familiarity behavior.
TABLE 5.3 - RELATIONSHIP

Familiarity Index : 3.50

| LOW RANKED MODES | 26 | 83% |
| HIGH RANKED MODES | 4 | 17% |
| TOTAL | 30 | 100% |

| MIXED MODES | NUMBER | PERCENTAGE |
| TOTAL | 7 | 47% |
| 1. E(D) | 2 | |
| 2. D(A) | 2 | |
| 3. D(E) | 1 | |
| 4. E (I) | 1 | |
| 5. C (I) | 1 | |

| PURE MODES | TOTAL | 8 | 53% |
| TOTAL | 8 | 53% |
| 1. E(E) | 3 | |
| 2. D(D) | 4 | |
| 3. K(K) | 1 | |

E = Edification  D = Disclosure  A = Advisement  C = Confirmation  I = Interpretation  K = Acknowledgment

The mean rank of Carter's 15 utterances scored for 30 form and intent on a scale of 1 (low) to 8 (high) produced a mid-range Familiarity Index of 3.50. A further analysis of this familiarity Index indicated that 26 or 83% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the low-ranked modes of Disclosure,
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Edification and Acknowledgments. The remaining 4 or 17% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the high-ranked modes of Advisement, Interpretation and Confirmation.

This distribution of low-ranked and high-ranked Verbal Response Modes on the familiarity hierarchy was consonant with the calculated Familiarity Index. The Familiarity Index indicated that in the majority of his utterances, Carter assumed a position of lower status and involvement in relation to the Council. Specifically, Carter resolved the tensions between the face threatening act of criticizing which suggested greater familiarity, and the need to mitigate these face threats with specific patterns of discrepant form-intent combinations. Carter's relationship with the Planning Council can be further explained by an analysis of specific patterns of use of mixed and pure modes.

Out of the 15 form and intent combinations that made up Carter's utterances, eight or 53% of the remaining form-intent combinations consisted of pure modes in which the form and intent of Carter's utterances matched. The use of pure modes suggested congruence between Carter's perception of the task and his social relationship with the Council. This congruence suggested that slightly more than half of the time, Carter did not experience any interpersonal pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

3  Now in the last meeting there were several issues
that
upon. were raised in regard to what Martin expounded
E(E)
This third person declarative transmitted objective information, scored edification intent.

In another example of pure mixed mode,

7 And I think they can make that commitment here tonight. D(D)

In line 7, the subject is first person, so the form is Disclosure. The utterance communicated Carter's private thoughts, that is, his intention to say what he believed to be true. It reflected Carter's experience, from his frame of reference, and was focused on himself.

Finally, the K(K) form-intent combination was realized with the utterance

1 "Yes"

This acknowledgment indicated Carter's receipt of the preceding speaker's recognition of his turn to talk.

In the remaining, 7 or 47% represented mixed modes or form-intent discrepancies. Of these seven mixed-modes, two were Edification in service of Disclosure E(D) and Disclosure in service of Advisement D(A). In the E(D) examples, Carter's Disclosures imposed upon the audience by restricting its freedom. That is, Disclosures do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. When paired with the Edification form, which is lower on the familiarity hierarchy, Carter lowered or mitigated the controlling intent, and thus attempted to indirectly control without explicitly appearing to do so. To illustrate,

10 It seems we can never get any kind of action out of these meetings. E(D)
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This utterance is third-person (Edification form) declarative that talks about objective data. The form indicated that Carter's statement is neutral or objective and is shared with other people. In other words, the form of the utterance argued for its veracity. Most would agree to its truth. In fact, Carter's intention was to communicate his own thoughts and feelings about the meeting. Deciding the truth (sincerity) of any aspect of this statement would require seeing into Carter's mind. By lowering the Disclosure intent with the Edification form, Carter avoided the appearance of imposing his own point of view, or opinions and feelings on the Council. On the surface, he seemed to be acceding to the Council through utterance that appears to represent a view that is shared or held in common with the audience, when, in fact, he is imposing his will on the interaction.

In the D(A) examples, the Advisement form is the most presumptuous in its impositions on the audience's freedom and privacy. When paired with the Disclosure form, which is lower on the familiarity hierarchy, Carter mitigated the presumptuousness of the Advisement intent. While the imposition of directiveness remains, the Disclosure form serves to lessen the intensity of the argument that Carter is making against the Planning Council. To illustrate,

4 And I'd like to know what has happened from the last meeting to this meeting in regards to those concerns. D(A)

In line 4, the utterance is first person declarative to suggest what the Planning Council's should do.
In three different instances, mixed modes occurred in the combination of a lower form with the relatively high-ranked Interpretation intent. To illustrate,

15. *And the other issues we just like swept under the rug.* 

In line 15, the subject is first person plural ("we") where the referent included the Council. The form is Confirmation. However, Carter’s intention was not to compare his experience with the Council’s. In his role as critic, Carter was trying to provide a negative evaluation of the Council’s behavior. In judging and labeling the Council, Carter was concerned with source the Council’s behavior and he presumed knowledge of what the behavior was, and placed this in his own frame of reference or personal viewpoint that provided that behavior with meaning. Therefore, I coded the intent as Interpretation.

While Carter used several other single instances of mixed modes, his overall strategy in all but two of the seven mixed modes was to lower or mitigate higher-ranked intents with lower-ranked forms. In the single instance in which Carter raised the lower-ranked intent to a high-ranked form, the imposition or face threat was offset by a positive gains. To illustrate:

2. *I guess one of the purposes of this kind of forum is for community residents to get their concerns heard.*

Although the less familiar Edification intent conveyed objective information, the Disclosure form, more directive and intrusive by contrast, also served to mitigate the source of Carter’s disagreement with the Council, that is, the Council’s failure to give Unity’s concerns a fair hearing. That is, if the Council objected to
Carter's implied criticism, Carter could fall back on the explanation that he was mistaken in his perception.
Conclusions

Carter’s task was exchanging subjective and objective information. Giving information, however placed Carter in a dominant position relative to the audience. This status was problematic given the nature of the roles that both the Planning and Carter were playing in the exchange, and Carter’s challenge to this role-relationship.

Throughout the meeting, Unity was the secondary actor, following the Planning Council’s lead. The Planning Council members set the field and topic of the discussion, controlled the floor and the way in which the audience responded. I encoded Unity’s position as secondary actor in the following motif:

'There you are, the authority (in relation to me) in this conversation and the expert (who has information that some people do not have) with status (as one of the chairs of this meeting). Here I am, a subordinate as a member of the audience, who must go along with and respond to the field and topic that you have initiated in this conversation.

However, Carter’s verbal interaction in this meeting, which consisted of one three-turn exchange with a Council member to exert Unity’s leadership, and, at a much later at the meeting, an explicit critique of how the Planning Council had handled the meeting, indicated his attempt to change the power differential from on in which Unity was subordinate to one in which it assumed more dominance.

In the three-turn exchange that was initiated by Carter, he made comments that were responded to by the Planning Council. Carter immediately acknowledged the Planning Council’s response and made a suggestion. This sequence signaled a subtle shift in the relationship between the Planning Council member and Carter.
Carter's response to the Planning Council member's answer continued to suggest that his position remained subordinate. However, by initiating a question to the Planning Council, Carter shifted the power in the role relationships toward more control for himself. Carter made the most of this shift by exercising his authority and expertise in several ways.

First, through his role in this exchange Carter placed himself in the position of saying whether the Planning Council member's response was adequate. Carter's "OK" in response to the Council's answer indicated Carter's claim of the dominant position of legitimizing what the Planning Council had said. He tried further to control the Planning Council member's response by saying, 'I don't want you to...'. In this sense, Carter responded in an evaluative way more directly to what the Planning Council member had said. His claim of status to respond in this way was encoded in the simultaneous support to the positive face wants of concern and threats to the negative face wants for freedom and privacy that attentiveness toward the Planning Council's response entailed. Also, the improprieties of controlling the viewpoint by which the directiveness and presumptuousness were evident in the ways in which Carter attempted to obscure what he was doing. The objective of this exchange was for Carter to claim his identity as an authority in relation to the Planning Council member.

After several minutes of discussion, the audience tabled Carter's suggestion. After another period of discussion, Carter joins the discussion once again. In these final
comments, Carter indicated his dissatisfaction with how the Planning Council had handled the community meeting. Although Carter was still in an subordinate position in relation to the Planning Council member when he made his final comments, his comments did not indicate an attitude of submissiveness. Once again, Carter was attempting to shift the role relationship with the Planning Council by establishing the direction of the discussion.

Aware of his disagreement with the Planning Council's critique of Unity's recommendations, and his attempt to change the balance of power in favor of Unity, Carter used Disclosure to provide subjective information as a means for lessening these disagreements and the intensity of the conflict between Unity and the Planning Council during the meeting.

The two role dimensions of informativeness and deference that Carter assumed were each characterized by a degree of consistency between form and intent. However, on the control dimension, the form of the utterances that Carter used, which were slightly more acquiescent, were at greater variance with the intentions that indicated greater directiveness than the other two role dimensions. This discrepancy between form and intent on the control dimension suggested that Carter experienced interpersonal pressure to obscure the restrictions he was placing on the audience by directing the frame of reference in the interaction. It seemed that Carter's lack of status and involvement with the Planning Council did not warrant this imposing behavior.
Finally, the distribution of verbal response modes, and the resulting Familiarity Index, indicated that Carter adopted a relatively moderate degree of familiarity with the audience. The strategies Lane used in his communicative behavior were conveyed by the patterns of mixed and pure verbal response mode combinations.

The frequency of pure modes was slightly higher than the occurrence of mixed modes. With the exception of one mixed mode instance, the pattern in all mixed mode form and intent combinations was to mitigate or lower high ranked intents with low ranked forms. In others words, although Carter’s Verbal Response Mode intents conveyed greater familiarity with the audience, his existing relationship with the Planning Council and other audience members prompted him to redress or make these intents less serious. The objective of Carter’s politeness strategies was to mitigate Carter’s the impositions of control of the audience’s frame of reference.

Reactions

At the close of the meeting, Carter expressed, in private, his dissatisfaction with the meeting to some Unity members who also had attended the meeting. He called an emergency meeting of the Coalition to discuss his dissatisfaction further and to present his written response to the Planning Council’s behavior. At this meeting, most members expressed anger about the Planning Council’s handling of the Coalition’s recommendations. While they were unanimous in their feeling about the Council’s behavior, different reactions of Carter’s decision to write a formal letter to the Council were expressed. Several members thought that a formal letter would be an
affront to the Council and suggested that a meeting with the Planning Council would be more appropriate. They were of the opinion that a letter would only escalate what already seemed to be competition and disagreement between the Council and the Coalition. Others supported Carter’s letter and even indicated that it was not strong enough in its wording. The meeting ended with agreement that Carter should consider the advantages and disadvantages of sending a formal response and make a decision on the basis of his deliberations.
APPENDIX 5

October Town Meeting Transcript

Introductory Remarks

Council Member:

The purpose of this meeting is to give to you information about what's happening in your town and hear from you what you'd like to do about it. Um...Mr. ____ is going to give you an opening commentary, letting you know what happened last meeting, what we did about ____ last meeting, and then we'll go into this meeting. Let me say thank you to all of you. ____

Council Member:

In the course of the evening this microphone and I are going to part. I want to make sure everybody can hear me. Can you hear me in the back corner there? A lot sooner than we had anticipated. I thank you all for coming out this evening and...raise the issue frequently I walk around with ___ this is a calendar and not a bible. I'm not going to read scriptures to you. I'll leave that to someone else more qualified. I do want to thank you all for coming out this evening on behalf of the town meeting planning council. We appreciate your being here. On behalf of the community. We appreciate your being here. And as Carol mentioned, there are a number of things I've been charged with saying, and I'm going to make sure that I try to ah, stay within my allotted time frame. I promise not to overrun that time frame by more than 2 or 300 percent, but.

In terms of items at the last town meeting. One of the criticisms or comments about the last town meeting was that in the handouts there was an awful lot of information. People didn't have enough time to digest it, understand it, ore appreciate what it was. Ah, the intent and thought behind that was simply to give you some information to begin with. To begin your thought process, your challenging process, etc. Ah, and as you then start to digest that information, decide what is it that, in there that's meaningful, what interests you, what concerns you, and what involves this community. The expectation is that you would individually, collectively, any means, by any means you choose, to step forward and speak to those individuals
accountable and responsible for that information, to get whatever information you feel you might want. Coming out of the last town meeting were several issues. And those issues were forwarded to various organizations for response. One of the items you talked about...let me go through the items...the issues themselves. And, one of the issues that was left out... from last meeting was this grouping one a committee with the power of open access to the new school. The Rebecca Johnson Magnet School scheduled for the middle of this community, for the heart of this community. Constructions is going to begin on, allegedly sometime in the fourth quarter of this year, which would be any day now. Um...secondly there was a great deal of concern about funds for pre-school education, chapter one funds. Thirdly, there was a major concern about providing assistance for small businesses. Getting started, staying running, understanding the process, what to do with it. Um...Thirdly...fourthly, excuse me. The question was, what about strategies for combating drugs? Where do we go with that? How do we get involved? How do we embrace those particular strategies as well as put those strategies forth?

Then last but not least there was an issue and a concern relative to minority involvement in the construction in the new magnet school. As I said, the Rebecca Johnson School. My understanding is that the school has already been named Rebecca Johnson School. Um...if that is incorrect, please somebody correct me. I don't want to tell you falsehoods. Certainly all those issues were indeed forwarded to the African-American coalition, which meets, as I understand it, the Steering Committee, or a lack of...because I don't know the current terms...the term they ended up, the actual planning/functioning committee meets on Thursday mornings, on Thursday evenings. The African-American coalition is open to the public for everybody to attend and participate in the session. They meet generally in the Urban League building. And I don't want to mislead you. The Thursday morning meetings as I understand it are also open to the public or they were. However, recognizing that most people have difficulty with their work schedules to make a meeting Thursday morning. The intention was to have an opportunity for everybody to make the meeting on Thursday evenings. Those issues and concerns were forwarded to the African-American coalition for response. I have here a response from the African-American coalition. However, I will not read that response to you. The reason I won't read the response to you in its entirety is because the heart or the preamble essentially
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says, "the coalition recommends the following." There's a
problem here folks. The town meeting, this grouping is
coming up with issues and concerns looking to pass them off.
The African-American coalition was viewed as a vehicle or
an organization or a mechanism to help address these
issues. But what they did was, they came back with a set
of recommendations. In my mind there's a problem there
because we still do not have the linkage for who's going to
do what. Who's going to make something happen? Those
of you interested in seeing a copy of this letter, I only have
one copy...if it's o.k. with you Ms. ____ , I'll ask to stop by
the credit union and pick up a copy if you like. For my
money, from my perspective...somebody, whether it be the
African-American coalition, whether it be um...town
meeting planning council, whether it be elected officials,
somebody needs to pick up his ___ and run with the ball.
I'm not in a position to identify an individual or group or
whomever, but I would ask you collectively to let your
voices be heard and determine who you think ought to be
running with it and then go charge those people with that.

---------

Cade's First Comments (Approximately one hour into the
two-hour meeting)

Cade:  
1  Yes K K 1
2  I guess one of the purposes of this kind of forum is K
d for community residents to get their concerns.
3  Now is the last meeting there were several issues E 2
   that were raised in regard to what M__ expounded upon ___.
4  And I'd like to know what has happened from D 4
   the last meeting to this meeting in regards to
   those concerns.

Planning Council: As far as the concerns on the school, the
new school, I spoke with the two school committee persons.
They have assured me that they will be going to the
school, ___ the school committee, and demanding that we
do have a...committee running the school with ___. Ken
Slopes is putting together three different proposals of
different methods that've been used. What's being done at
the new North School. They have access to that school everyday until 9 or 10 at night. She's also looking into the model that was used for Central High that evidently did not work. And she's looking into another model. She'll be bringing three models back to a town meeting, hopefully the next one, for us to hear and vote on. Which one do we want?

And she has assured me an ah...Committeeman McCullen has also assured me that once this group decides that that's the model that they want, they will go downtown and push for it.

Cade:

5 The other issue is, Rep. Jordan the entire Mason Square community should shut down um, November 6 I think he indicated.

6 I think we have all of the heads of the organizations that are present tonight that could really make that commitment to shut down that organization on November 6 so that we can for the on question 3, 2 and 5.

7 And I think they can make that commitment here tonight .

Planning Council:

____ you want to respond to that?

Audience Member:

I think that's not as easy as it sounds to shut down. We can be creative in terms of support but there's some legal issues involving around providing support in a . And um, but, there's always ways to um...to get around, to get around .

Cade's Second Comments (Toward the end of the two-hour meeting)

Planning Council: Do you want you question answered or

Cade:

8 No not specifically.

9 I think that something specific can't be done this evening, since we have all the players here.
And it seems that we can never get any kind of action out of these kinds of meetings.

[What] I mean [is that] we need something to happen, something to happen —

last month there were petitions raised.

I think that something should have been done at this meeting, to at least let people know what you been doing.

[What] I mean [is that] we started the meeting with a brand new set of issues.

And the other issues we just like swept under the rug.

Planning Council:

Mr. Cade I think that to answer that question. I'll take full responsibility for that. Number 1, at the last meeting, I thought the town meeting people that you could tell us what you wanted, and I took it to a leadership group and expected it to be resolved. It came back not unresolved but in a form of recommendations. So, yes Mr. Cade, you are right. And I won't make that mistake again. What we need this meeting, the issues that have been brought up, I will look for people to help me to solve them, conclusively and not give you back a list of recommendations versus an action plan or something else. Those of us, and I put myself in there, who call ourselves leaders of this community, are responsible to come back to you with concrete answers. Ok. And I say to you, I apologize for only being able to tell you what I did with the school committee people, but I also promise you do wish to come back to the next town meeting, and I'm going to close out because I promised you you could leave at 7:30.
Episode 6: The Coalition Letter to the City Council

Although Carter had responded to criticisms from the Planning Council during the October meeting, he believed that his comments at the meeting had insufficiently conveyed the extent of his negative assessment of the Council's criticisms of Unity's recommendations. At the meeting, the Planning Council's response to Carter was to defend its criticisms. Although I observed comments from a number of people during the meeting and afterward indicating their sense of the Planning Council's unfair treatment of Unity's recommendations, public support in defense of Unity had not been forthcoming. Carter concluded that meeting represented further confirmation of Unity's fall from grace. In Carter's estimation, the Planning Council had solidified its preeminence as the most effective and appropriate community group to lead the rest of the community at the expense of Unity's reputation. He believed that a stronger response was needed to resolve the situation.

The Overall Goals

Carter understood that a convincing argument must include a public challenge to the Planning Council's actions, a defense of Unity's recommendations and a demand that the Planning Council formally acknowledge its inappropriate behavior, and agree to act more appropriately toward Unity in the future.

In our conversations about this issue, Carter identified several goals for an argument from Unity to protest the Planning Council's behavior must include in order to prompt support from the community and elicit a public apology from the Planning Council. First, Carter stated the need to alter perceptions of the past meeting, of the Planning
Carter and what they did. He also wanted to gain support from opinion leaders and legitimizers in opposition of Unity's public mistreatment at the hands of the Planning Council. Finally, Carter wanted to prescribe how the Planning Council could rectify their wrongdoing. According to Carter, the overall goal was to maintain the viability of Unity in the eyes of colleagues and the community.
The Strategy

By responding to the public criticisms that members of the Community Change Planning Council made about Unity's recommendations, Carter's hoped to emphasize that the serious and public nature of these criticisms warranted a formal response. Most people who received this letter, including the Community Change Planning Council members, have known Carter for a number of years, and his role and position within the community has shifted. According to one individual, Carter had to overcome negative past impressions about him.

Carter acknowledged that Unity had to fight against a damaged reputation. He was well aware that criticism within and outside the organization had been directed against him for the organization's inability to rally and maintain support over time. Several Unity members pointed out that Carter's past personal history was working against him; that is, some people found it difficult to let go of previous history and "give him a chance."

In our conversations, Carter seemed aware that as a relatively "new" leader, he had to counteract these "outdated" perceptions about him. He anticipated that this letter provided not only an opportunity to address the Planning Council's criticisms, but also a chance to establish a new identity primarily as a community leader.

As a new community leader, Carter believed that a prompt and firm response to the challenges of Planning Council members was critical in establishing the kind of professional relationship that he wishes to have with them. Since this was Carter's first
the public interaction with the Planning Council in a professional capacity, Carter wanted to set some ground rules that eliminate the hierarchy of power and status that the Planning Council seemed to be establishing. Carter believed that his political survival and the integrity of Unity are at stake.

As the author of the letter, Carter was acting in the capacity of the head of an organization addressing another head of an organization. As a giver of information, Carter performed a role that was unequal to the role of receiver of information. This inequality suggested a hierarchical relationship in which the giver of information has dominance over the receiver. This degree of control or power that Carter had relative to the Planning Council derived several sources.

Carter was responding to the events of the previous town meeting in which the Planning Council members had more control over the conversational exchange. During that meeting, Carter used several strategies to shift the control from the Planning Council members to himself with limited success. The linguistic features of his comments during this meeting suggested a struggle with being in a position of deference while trying to change the power balance. This letter seemed to be a part of Carter's effort to change the power of balance that was established at the October meeting.

In making that transition from the powerless respondent to the Planning Council to a more powerful definer and controller, Carter had chosen a medium that facilitates this change. As a written document, Carter had more control over the "floor" in the sense that he does not have to deal with direct challenges to his rights as a speaker. He had defined the topic and targeted his message to those people who needed to hear it. Since he was
writing, Carter did not run the risk of immediate challenges that characterized the discussion at the town meeting. The written document enabled him to think about and fashion his response in the most powerful way without the pressures of immediate, on-line, face-to-face interaction. Also, this written protest constituted a permanent record of Carter's response to the Planning Council.

In responding to the criticism, Carter had to establish that his reasons for speaking extended beyond personal concerns and were addressed to the larger concerns of the community and its organizations. I observed that Carter did not directly say that he was personally bothered, but spoke on behalf of Unity which seemed to me to give his statements more "authority." He spoke specifically about how the criticisms were not well-founded and unfair and focused on this topic by addressing it in several different ways.

The affect of this communicative exchange clearly was negative. Carter communicated a strong negative attitude toward recent events and stated his feelings without many reservations. It was less clear whether the negative affect of this message would be permanent in terms of future interactions between Unity and the Planning Council, or whether the effect would be relegated to this individual episode.

Carter's response was the first public response to criticisms and he was not limited by any previous responses to other criticisms that have been evident for several months. He acknowledged the need to be careful to respond in such a way that his protest challenges did not turn public opinion against him and the organization. It seemed to me that Carter
was walking a tightrope between defending Unity but not closing any doors because the very people that he was defending Unity against were the same people who Unity depended on for its success. My experience suggested that censuring "one of your own" is tricky business. It seemed to me that Carter had to be sure that he did not cut off his rhetorical nose to spite his face.

Some believe that the criticism made at the October town meeting were justified and do not require a response by Unity. Others perceive Unity's reputation and work as being maligned by the Planning Council. Carter's choice of response at the town meeting did not receive unanimous confirmation by members of Unity, particularly those who advocate a direct and forceful defense in order to prevent similar future occurrences. In their minds, an immediate formal rebuttal was in order.

Carter identified several demands and pressures that affect what he said. First, Carter believed that he must be careful that the need to portray Unity as a powerful group did not compromise the values that Unity held in terms of fair treatment. He also agreed that Unity must appear genuinely wronged and not manipulative in terms of what it wanted to accomplish. Choosing between cooperativeness and combativeness was an important choice for Carter, and responses to both may differ in terms of the particular audience that he was addressing. Carter understood that to Unity members, it is important that Carter defend its honor. To others colleagues, he believed that the appearance of unnecessary combativeness would not score Unity too many points. Although Carter wanted to respond to the Planning Council, he also recognized that need for working together sometimes overrode the need for redress for verbal slights. Finally, in portraying Unity as
the organization to do the job, Carter was aware of the importance not appearing to be what he is not. Carter realized that most people in the community were aware of Unity’s accomplishments and despite all that Unity had done, it remained subject to a substantial degree of criticism. In announcing its past record and future promise, Carter must strive for a realistic portrayal buoyed with hope for the future.

Carter and I agreed that protest is a tricky business. The validity of his letter rested on Carter's ability to state clearly and accurately his perceptions of the events that caused the grievance, and in relating those events, provide enough appropriate detail to justify his protest. Carter believed that his portrayal should stick to the issues and be supported by logical, reasoned arguments. Although Carter recognized that his protest was emotionally-charged, he hoped to fashion an argument appeared to more reasoned than passionate.

The Setting

A professional business letter is a document relating to a recognized social transaction, namely the exchange of information. It is a formulaic text used by an individual as a formal, businesslike way of addressing another. It is written to be used as a guide to specific information. This text is a formal business document that can be used when someone is corresponding with others concerning business matters. The format marked the document as a business letter. A written document is a public, irreversible, binding record of the event, and as such, has to withstand public scrutiny and evaluation by all readers of the text.
By responding in writing, Carter was elevating his criticisms from a less formal verbal exchange to a more formal exchange. The letter emphasized the serious nature of the criticisms in Unity's opinion. It also made a public record of Unity's position and perception of this exchange. The written modality enhanced the authority of Unity because it formally censured the Planning Council and called upon other community members for support of its censure. Carter felt strongly enough to make this a matter of public record.

The communication in the letter was not just between the Planning Council and Carter, but was matter that should be known and addressed by other community leaders as well. The kind of language that Carter used was formal as well. He had to carefully choose his words because they were being written in stone so to speak. He couldn't say that he was not understood because what he said was in writing in a way that he can make that claim if he speaks. He also cannot say the same things he might have said if he spoke to the Planning Council verbally.

Carter addressed several audiences in addition to the immediate one: Unity members themselves will see this response and it may engender feelings of power, of being attacked in ways that they have not felt before. The community leaders who may or may not have attended the community meeting and heard the criticisms may change their opinions about the validity of these criticisms when they hear the other side of the story and they may revise their opinions about the seriousness of these criticisms not only for Unity but for themselves and their organizations and for the community at large. The topic
must take precedence over the speaker or the audience. If it becomes personal, then Carter loses credibility with his audience.

Carter tries to respond as immediately as possible after the Planning Council's criticism. To allow a great deal of time to exist between the attack and his defense is to leave people with the impression that the criticisms are correct, that Unity is ineffective in even responding and to let the criticisms validate themselves because they exist without any counterstatement. He also has to "tell his side of the story" so that people will have timely information about what really happened. Another community meeting is planned for the first Friday in November and Carter has to make this the subject for debate before this next Town Meeting in order to maintain Unity's credibility and to deal with this before the next forum. If the topic comes up again at the next meeting, other things may have developed that will change the tenor of the discussion. Carter must prevent a repeat of this occurring at any other meetings.

Carter is speaking on behalf of the organization and is speaking on a sensitive issue that has occurred recently. The letter is relatively long with a complex structure. Ideological rhetoric is included throughout the text and Carter is making strong arguments in favor of the perspectives he is presenting.

Carter has chosen to respond in writing rather than verbally. The written message heightens the sense of the serious nature of the Planning Council's offense and provides a more formal context in which to tell the story.
The Audience

The immediate audience to whom Carter submitted his protests consisted of the two Planning Council members directly responsible for delivering the public critique. Carter indicated that members of the Planning Council should implement the changes that he was calling for in his response. In his estimation, they were appropriately responsible for correcting, changing or revising their criticisms. Carter believed that as a fellow community leader, he deserved the same degree of respect and support that Council members granted to other community leaders, and he maintained his right to demand that treatment.

In order to achieve these goals, Unity wanted to

inform the Planning Council that behavior was offensive and damaging to Unity specifically, and to the viability of the collaborative effort in general

suggest what redressive action could remedy this breach, and

stimulate the Planning Council's immediate engagement in redressive action.

Carter also recognized that Planning Council members have an interest in maintaining their status in the community as a pace setter, able to make judgments and evaluations that others will follow; to keep audience coming to the meeting, participating in their forum. He anticipated that any attempt to cast a shadow on the Planning Council's activities could be met by hostility from Council members.

Also, Carter reported working with Unity members to review the letter before sending it out to the Planning Council. Since Carter was representing Unity in this protest, he considered Unity members as part of the larger audience as well. Carter believed that
his response to the Planning Council represented a signal to Unity members that he was able to take care of the matter in a way that will benefit the organization. He wanted to make clear to Unity members that his motivation for protesting the Planning Council's criticisms was in support of the larger cause of improving Unity's relationship with other community groups, restoring Unity's reputation in the eyes of the community and preventing similar actions by other groups in the future.

Although Carter had chosen to address the response directly to the chief coordinator of the Planning Council and other Planning Council members, he also indicated his intention to directly reach a much larger audience of her peers. Carter's designated a list of professional peers who to receive Unity's indicated to me that these individuals also were part of the immediate audience.

In his letter, Carter included a long list of community leaders to receive copies of this letter. I concluded that this action implied that although the Chair and members of the Planning Council were the nominal recipients of this letter, Carter wanted the letter receive wide circulation. In my opinion, Carter seemed to be approximating the public forum that the Planning Council enjoyed at the October Town Meeting. He targeted his audience to make his letter have greater impact.

Carter recognized the need to reach these other community groups and leaders because he wanted to influence the varying opinions that existed about the events at the October meeting. Although Carter realized that some groups and leaders felt conflicted about the Planning Council's actions, and others agreed with the Planning Council's actions, he was convinced that presenting its case to both groups was critical.
In sending copies to a number of community leaders, Carter stated his goal as one of affirming that he is "one of them." By pointing out the issues that he was raising, Carter hoped that implicitly he would convey to other community leaders the sense that "we are all subject to these indiscretions and should support each other against such aggressions".

Most people who will receive the letter were present at or at least aware of the situation that it documents. Some heads of organizations identify with the kind of criticisms that have plagued Unity since its inception. They either have or realize that they too are vulnerable to the same treatment. In that sense, they support Unity's response. However, they are also aware of the dangers of formally responding to these events. It runs the risk of alienating the Planning Council in the same way that the Planning Council alienated Unity, and my ultimately jeopardize the future collaboration between the two organizations.

Carter was also directing his message toward the Common Square community at large. Recognizing that his ability to lead was related to those who followed, Carter affirmed his intention to include residents in the deliberations with through his letter to the Planning Council.

The following excerpt from the letter provides a sense of Carter's remarks:

"You were absolutely correct, Carol, when you indicated that the document forwarded was a list of recommendations. (What did you want...a list of solutions? These recommendations were structured to be readily transformed into action steps relative to each individual issue."
Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community. You neglected to share UC's information. I am positive that the document would have at least stimulated a thought and discussion process for further investigation. Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document. During the October meeting, you did not even acknowledge UC's effort in compiling the list of recommendations. You leave me no other recourse but to conclude that you viewed the document as worthless."
ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR

Task: Carter's task was based on the frequency of each Verbal Response Mode form (across intents) and Verbal Response Mode intents (across forms).
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

TABLE 6.1 - TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity Rank</th>
<th>Verbal Response Mode Category</th>
<th>Form and Intent N = 60</th>
<th>Form N=30</th>
<th>Intent N=30</th>
<th>High and Low % N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advisement (A)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interpretation (I)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Confirmation (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reflection (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disclosure (D)</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>44 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question (Q)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edification (E)</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledgment (K)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.1 indicated, Carter's letter to the Planning Council was dominated by Edifications and Disclosures (i.e., statements of objective and subjective information, respectively) in grammatical form and communicative intent. That is, Carter used third-person (Edification or information form) or first-person (Disclosure form) declarative sentences to talk about his own private experience (Disclosure intent) and about objective matters (Edification or information intent). These are represented by D(D), E(D), E(E) and D(E) modes. The two categories of Edification and Disclosure accounted for 36 or 60% of all utterances. To illustrate:

14 Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community. E(D)
15 You neglected to share Unity's information. I(1)
16 I am positive that the document would have at least stimulated a thought and discussion. D(D)
17 Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document. I(E)

The subject is first person, so the form is Disclosure. The utterance communicated Carter's private perceptions, that is, Carter's experience, from his own frame of reference, focused on himself. In my judgment, Carter was on record as revealing his own thinking about the recommendations.

11 What did you want? Q(I)
12 [Did you want] a list of solutions? Q(I)
13 These recommendations were structured to be readily transformed into action steps. E(D)
14 Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community. E(D)
In line 13, the subject is third person ("it"), so the form is Edification. The intent revealed the private perceptions that Carter had of the recommendations; therefore, the intent was coded Disclosure.

Previously, you requested Unity's input relative to four major issues raised during the September Community Meeting.

These issues were:
- Public access - Rebecca Johnson School
- Lack of Males in the Eastern City Public School system
- African American Businesses in our community
- Limited funding for preschool children

Immediately, Unity acted on your request.

Considerable time during two Unity meetings focused on the aforementioned issue.

In line 5, the subject is third person, so the form is Edification. The topic was Carter's report (writer's experience), no specific knowledge of the Council's experience was necessary (focus on writer). The frame of reference was neutral, or objective, in relation to both Carter and the Council; the assertion's truth or falsity could, in principle, be determined without access to either's private experience. Thus the intent was Edification.

but [Unity] will continue to address and develop solutions to the problems created by the socio-political environment as well as those which occur as a result of the pathological beliefs held by far too many individuals who interact with the community.

I can be reached at Unity's office number D(E)
Verbal Response Mode Analysis

In line 30, the first person, form of Disclosure was used to write about objective information.

In a slightly different fashion, Carter used second person (Interpretation form) implying an attribute or ability of the audience to talk about objective matters. To illustrate:

17 Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document. I(E)
18 *During the October meeting, you didn't even acknowledge the Carter's effort.* I(E)
19 You leave me no other recourse but to conclude that you viewed the document as worthless. I(D)

He also used first-person (Disclosure form) declarative to attempt to guide the Council's behavior:

24 We feel that a formal public apology is in order. D(D)
25 *We respectfully request this to take place.* D(A)
26 You indicated that you were looking for someone to take charge.

The next most frequently occurring Verbal Response Modes were Interpretations (evaluations or judgments), numbering 13 or 22%, and Acknowledgments (salutations or receptiveness), numbering 6 or 10%. As indicated earlier, Carter used Interpretation form to talk about objective matters. He also used second-person (Interpretation) to explain or evaluate the Planning Council's behavior. To illustrate:

14 Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community.
15 *You neglected to share Carter's information.* I(I)
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16  I am positive that the document would have  
at least stimulated a thought and discussion  
process for further investigation. D(D)

In line 15, the subject is second person ("you"), so the form is Interpretation. The  
utterance presumed some knowledge of the Council's intentional behavior (focus on other),  
and it was clearly expressing Carter's viewpoint (speaker's frame of reference). This  
narrowed the choice to Interpretation or Advisement intent. I understood the utterance the  
utterance to be a way of labeling that behavior (speakers experience/behavior).  
Therefore, I coded the intent Interpretation.

Less frequently, Carter uses the inverted subject-order (Question form)  
interrogative to explain or judge the audience's behavior:

9    Carol  K(K)  
10   you were absolutely correct when you in-
dicated that the document forwarded was  
a list of recommendations. I(I)  
11   What did you want? Q(I)  
12   [Did you want] a list of solutions?  
     Q(I)

Line 11 is an interrogative with an inverted subject-verb order, so the form is  
Question. Along with the presumption of some knowledge of the Council's behavior and its  
expression of the Carter's viewpoint, I understood the utterance to be a way of labeling that  
behavior. I coded the intent as Interpretation.

Terms of address or salutations (Acknowledgment form) used to convey simple  
acceptance or salutation (Acknowledgment) also appeared several times in the letter.  
1    Dear Carol   K(K)
The Advisement mode comprised 5% of all utterances. In addition to instances of the Disclosure in service of Advisement, the second-person (Advisement form) imperative was used to guide behavior (Advisement intent).

24 We feel that a formal public apology is in order. D(D)
25 *We respectfully request this to take place at the next scheduled Community meeting.* D(A)
26 You indicated that you were looking for someone to take charge. I(E)

In line 25, the subject is first person, so the form is Disclosure. This utterance presumes some knowledge of what the Council's behavior should be (focus on the other), and it is clearly expressing Carter's viewpoint of what this behavior should be (speaker's frame of reference). This narrows the choice to Interpretation or Advisement intent, depending on whether this utterance concerned the Council's experience or behavior or Carter's idea of what the Council ought to do. Since I judged that there was an on-record attempt by Carter to guide the Council's behavior, I coded the intent as Advisement.

27 Well K(K)
28 *...rest assured that Unity will not only take charge,* A(A)

In line 28, an imperative with the second person ('you') implied is used to guide the Council's behavior.

Finally, the Question mode constituted 3% of all utterances. Confirmations and Reflections were not represented in any of the utterances. Thus, Carter's task, as indicated by the frequency of Verbal Response Modes calculated across forms and intents was the exchange of information regarding objective and subjective issues (60%), with secondary
emphasis upon explaining and evaluating the Council's behavior (22%), and, to a much smaller degree, attempting to guide and direct behavior (5%).

Clearly, this distribution of Verbal Response Modes was consonant with the general purposes of professional letters and with the expository purposes of social mobilization techniques in community organizing. However, the emphasis on labeling and judging the Council's behavior pointed out Carter's desire to provide a different interpretation of the Council's behavior at the October meeting. His approach was to protest this behavior and the position of vulnerability and disrespect that this behavior confirmed about Unity in relation to the rest of the community. The act of protesting contains several implications for Carter's claims of status and involvement.

In the act of protesting, the speaker expresses his negative view about somebody else's action. He opposes (i.e., actively resists) the action and regards his opposition as having a strong and legitimate basis. In protesting, the speaker focuses on the action and not on the agent. Protest seems intuitively strong in the sense that is used in matters regarded as very serious. Moreover, the protester is confident that what he says is clearly and self-evidently right.

Furthermore, protest can apply to an ongoing action, it can also apply to a past action. Sometimes, the protesting person thinks that he can stop the ongoing action or undo a past one. In other cases, the speaker realizes that he cannot stop or undo that particular action which has provoked his protest, but he still does more than merely express his negative view of that action. He shows that he regards that action as an instance of a more general pattern of behavior, behavior which could be repeated. Protest always has the
view that the particular action which provoked one's protest as an instance of a mode of action which one regards as bade and which one tries to oppose. That is, one protests against "such things" in general.

A person protests because he wants something not to be done. We may protest even when we are aware of the futility of our protests -- simply because we feel the need to register our opposition to a bad action.

**ROLE DIMENSIONS:** Aggregating the frequency of all Verbal response Modes that made up Carter's task into the higher-order conceptual dimensions of informativeness, deference and control indicated how the these verbal response categories conveyed Carter's perception of the role he assumed in this episode. Overall indices and the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions embodied in Carter's utterances appear in Table 6.2.
According to the overall figures for the Informative-Attentive or self-centered role dimension, the proportion of utterances that concerned the Council's experience (Question, Acknowledgment, and Interpretation) was noticeable at 35%. While the majority of his utterances (65%) were informative or self-centered, that is, concerned with his own experience, Carter did demonstrate a noticeable degree of interest in the Council's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentional actions. This was displayed by the mixture of informative (Disclosure, Edification, Advisement or Confirmation) and attentive (Acknowledgment, Interpretation, Question) response modes. While Carter demonstrated a predominantly egocentric emphasis on his thoughts and perceptions, in contrast to the five
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preceding episodes, he also demonstrated a considerable interest in the Planning Council's intentional behavior.

On the Unassuming-Presumptuous or deference role dimension, the proportion of Carter's utterances in which the central topic focused on the knowledge of what the Council is, was, will be, or should be thinking, feeling, perceiving or intending was indicated by the frequency (27%) of Advisement and Interpretation response modes. While the majority of Carter's utterances were characterized by a predominance of deference toward the Council as displayed by the more frequent use of Edification, Disclosure, Acknowledgment and Question response modes, Carter noticeably presumed knowledge about the Council in his letter. That is, almost one-third of the time, Lane imposed his own experience on the Council by presuming knowledge about them. This analysis indicates that while most often Carter assumed a role that lessened the threat that presumptuousness poses to the audience's negative face wants, close to one-third of the time he chose behavior that heightened the power asymmetries inherent in presumptuous behavior.

Finally, the overall figures for the Directive-Acquiescent or control role dimension indicated that the proportion of utterances in which Carter represented what he was saying from a frame of reference or viewpoint that was shared or held in common with the audience through the use of Edification and Acknowledgment was 43%. That is, slightly less than half the time, Carter did not impose his own will in the letter in order to direct the verbal exchange. Instead, more of his utterances prevented the Council's viewpoint from determining the course of the communication. Therefore, the more frequent use of Disclosure, Interpretation, Advisement and Question response modes (57%) that
conveyed Carter's own frame of reference confirmed his general adherence to his own personal viewpoint, and increased the potential for impositions on the freedom of the audience. However, he used enough acquiescent forms to convey the considerable degree of sharing a neutral or objective viewpoint.

In conclusion, overall figures for the three role dimensions indicated that Carter appeared subjective. He accomplished this by being informative while indicating attentiveness to the Council's thoughts, feelings and intentions, largely deferent with indications of presumptuousness by focusing on the Council's behavior, and more often than not his own viewpoint for giving meaning to the experience.

By disaggregating overall indices into the form and intent indices for the self-centered (Informative-Attentive) and the control (Directive-Acquiescent) dimensions, it is apparent along these two dimension, Carter's communicative behavior indicated a slight conflict in his perception of the task and his social relationship with the Council. On the self-centered dimension, the form index indicated that the literal meanings of 57% of Carter's utterances were informative. That is, the grammatical forms used conveyed Carter's own knowledge and experiences. By comparison, the intent index for self-centeredness indicated that Carter intended for 73%, or a larger proportion of his utterances to be attentive. Specifically, Carter emphasized attention to the Council's thoughts, feelings, perceptions and intentional actions in his intents more often than this attentiveness appeared in the Verbal Response mode forms. Consequently, the literal meaning conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms only modestly reflected the intentions Carter was realizing through his utterances. This difference between the form
and intent of many of Carter's utterances can be explained in terms of the previously mentioned contextual circumstances that have determined Unity's relationship with the Council.

On the control dimension, the form index indicated that the literal meaning or the grammatical form of 63% of Carter's utterances was directive or controlling. That is, the grammatical forms that Carter used generally conveyed his own personal viewpoint. By contrast, however, the intent index indicated that Carter intended for 50%, or a smaller proportion of his utterances to be controlling. Specifically, Carter intended to control the Council's viewpoint less often than the forms indicated. The literal meaning of directiveness conveyed in the Verbal Response Mode forms exceeded the controlling intentions in Carter's utterances. This difference between the form and intent of many of Carter's utterances along both the informative and the control dimensions suggests that Carter exerted status and involvement in his social relationship with the Planning Council by directing the frame of reference. The task was to convey some conventional restrictions that prohibited the Council's behavior; however, the social relationship between Carter and the Council required that Carter state them in a way that expressed Unity's own personal disagreement with the Council's actions.

RELATIONSHIP: The frequency of Verbal Response Modes and their aggregation into role dimensions form the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index was used as an overall measure of Carter's identity claims of status and involvement in his relationship with the audience. The analysis of Carter's use of specific Verbal Response Mode
categories ranked from high to low familiarity in communicative behavior is summarized in Table 6.3.

**TABLE 6.3 - RELATIONSHIP**

Familiarity Index : 3.85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW RANKED MODES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH RANKED MODES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I(E)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E(D)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. D(E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q(I)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I(D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. D(A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURE MODES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E(E)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D(D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I(I)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. K(K)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A(A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The mean rank of the form and intent of Carter’s 30 utterances scored for 60 form and intent response modes produced a mid-range Familiarity Index of 3.85. A further analysis of this Familiarity Index indicated that 44 or 73% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the low-ranked modes of Disclosure, Edification, Acknowledgments and Question. The remaining 16 or 17% of Verbal Response Modes across form and intent combined occurred in the high-ranked modes of Interpretation and Advisement.

This distribution of low and high ranked Verbal Response Modes on the familiarity hierarchy indicated that, in the majority of his utterances, Carter assumed a position of lower status and involvement in relation to the Council. Specifically, Carter negotiated this lower level of familiarity with attempts to exert a higher status and greater involvement with several specific patterns of form-intent combinations.

Out of the 30 form and intent utterances that made up Carter’s letter, 16 utterances were comprised of pure modes in which the form-intent combination matched. The use of pure modes in certain utterances suggested that Carter did not perceive any conflict between what he was trying to do and his social relationship with the audience. That is, he did not perceive pressure to obscure what was happening linguistically. To illustrate,

5  Immediately, Unity acted upon your request. E(E)

This third person declarative transmitted objective information, scored edification intent.

A different example illustrates a match between the form and intent:

16  I am positive that the document would have at least stimulated a thought and discussion. D(D)
In line 16, the subject was first person, so the form was Disclosure. The utterance communicated Carter's private thought, that is, his intention to say what he perceived to be true. It reflected Carter's experience, from his frame of reference, and was focused on himself.

28...rest assured that Unity will not only take charge,
   A(A)
   
   This utterance was imperative in form -- with "you" as the understood subject -- coded Advisement. Carter presumed to impose an experience on the audience. Thus the source of experience and frame of reference were Carter's, but the focus was on the other, that is, Advisement intent.

9 You were absolutely correct...I(I)
The form is a second-person (Interpretation form) that implied an attribute of the audience. The intent was to indicate that Carter knew the Council's experience, and that he wanted to control the frame the experience, and was focused on the other.

Finally, an example of the Acknowledgment in service of Acknowledgment mode is

10...Carol,...K(K)
On line 10, the term of address was used as a salutation within the text of the letter.

The remaining 14 represented mixed modes or form and intent discrepancies. Interpretation in service of Edification I(E) modes occurred in 4 of the 14 mixed modes. Edifications are characterized as informative, unassuming and acquiescent. This mode indicates a very low level of relative status and intimacy. Carter, however, wanted to exert a higher degree of familiarity with the Council. Therefore, he raised this low-
ranked intention with a higher-ranked form that was focused on the other, presumptuous and controlling. To illustrate,

17 Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document. I(E)

This utterance used a second-person (Interpretation form) evaluation to convey objective data. The form indicated that Carter's statement was an evaluation or judgment of the audience's behavior. By raising the Edification intent with the Interpretation form, Carter imposed his own point of view to judge what the Council did rather than accede to the a shared frame of reference that may suggest that the Council's behavior was justified.

Next in frequency were 3 mixed modes representing Edification in service of Disclosure E(D), and 3 mixed modes representing Disclosure in service of Edification D(E).

In the E(D) mode, Carter's Disclosures imposed upon the audience by restricting its freedom. That is, Disclosures do not allow the audience's viewpoint to determine the course of the conversation. When paired with the Edification form, which is lower on the familiarity hierarchy, Carter lowered or mitigated the controlling intent, and thus attempted to indirectly control without explicitly appearing to do so. To illustrate,

20 Apparently, there was a general oversight in your communication process. E(D)

This utterance used third-person (Edification form) declarative that talked about objective data. The form indicated that Carter's statement was neutral or objective and was shared with other people. In other words, the form of the utterance argued for its veracity. Most would agree to its truth. In fact, Carter's intention was to communicate his own thoughts and feelings about the Council's behavior. Deciding the truth (sincerity) of any aspect of this statement would require seeing into Carter's mind. By lowering the
Disclosure intent with the Edification form, Carter avoided the appearance of imposing his own point of view, or opinions and feelings on the audience. That is, Carter's appeared to be acceding to the audience through utterance that represented a view that was shared or held in common with the audience, when, in fact, he was imposing his will on the interaction.

Disclosure in service of Edification D(E) is illustrated in the following example:

30 I can be reached at the coalition's office number to discuss this matter further. D(E)

The Edification intent was raised or made more directive in the Disclosure form. This strategy seemed counterintuitive, given Carter's apparent concern to mask the intention to be more controlling than he appeared to be. However, by raising the low-ranked Edification intent to a higher-ranked Disclosure form, Carter exerted his right to be more controlling.

While a variety of other mixed modes were used, Carter's overall strategy was to raise lower-ranked intents with higher-ranked forms. Instances in which the higher-ranked intent was lowered with a low-ranked form, the effect of mitigating lowered the impositions that accompanied the higher-ranked intents. For example, the following utterance is an example of a high-ranked intent that had been lowered with a low-ranked form:

12 (Did you want)...a list of solutions? Q(I)

Although the Interpretation intent was presumptuous, the Question form, by contrast, did not presume to know what the Council wanted. While both Interpretation and Question are
directive and attentive, the Question avoided the presumptuousness that characterizes the Interpretation mode.
Conclusions

Carter's task of conveying objective and subjective information conformed to the practical, goal oriented of organizational communication through professional letters. Giving information through Edification and Disclosure placed Carter in a dominant position relative to the Planning Council and signaled the social distance between them along this hierarchy of status and involvement. This dominance was beneficial to Carter in several important ways.

If successful in protesting the Council's behavior, Carter's assumption of a position of dominance could be validated. Also, by asserting a greater degree of social distance between himself and the Planning Council, Carter could provide a better contrast between the good deeds of Unity and the bad deeds of the Planning Council. Carter accomplished this both by being informative but significantly attentive to the Planning Council's behavior, generally deferent but noticeably presumptuous in assuming knowledge about the Planning Council's thoughts and behavior, and slightly more controlling than non-directive in asserting his own viewpoint on the interaction.

The informative-attentive dimension is somewhat problematic for Carter in the sense that he intends to be more informative in his utterances, but the grammatical forms focused on the Planning Council's behavior. This is reflected in the form-intent differences that appear in some of his utterances. These discrepancies indicate a conflict between Carter's understanding of the need to emphasize what the Planning did by focusing on its behavior, at the same time that he recognizes the need to stress his own experiences as the source of experiences for the letter.
Also, the differences in the control dimension, in which the intent is slightly less directive, suggest Carter's desire to be more assertive in the interaction. He accomplished this by using Verbal Response Modes that did not accede to the audience's viewpoint.

Finally, the distribution of Verbal Response Modes, and the resulting Familiarity Index indicated that Carter adopted a relatively moderate degree of familiarity with the Planning Council. The strategies Lane used in his communicative behavior to achieve this Familiarity Index were conveyed by the frequency and patterns of pure and mixed form and intent Verbal Response modes.

The frequency of pure modes was slightly higher than the occurrence of mixed modes. The pattern in most mixed modes form and intent combinations was more often to raise or make more imposing lower ranked intents, which were constrained by the task at hand, with higher ranked forms, which were constrained by the social relationship. In other words, although Carter's Verbal Response mode intents generally conveyed low familiarity with the Planning Council, his existing relationship with the Council prompted him to make these intents more serious. The objective of Carter's imposing strategies was to claim his right to control the ideas that give meaning to the Planning Council's behavior.

Reactions

Carter decided to send the letter to the head of the Planning Council. Upon receipt of the letter, the head of the Planning Council requested a meeting with Carter to discuss the content of the letter. Although she insisted that Carter and other members of Unity
had misunderstood the Planning Council’s response to Unity’s recommendations, she
apologized for the unintentional misunderstanding and negative feelings that had occurred
as a result. She and Carter agreed to work more productively together in the future.
Dear Carol:

I would like to express the Unity Coalition's (UC) acute dissatisfaction with the extremely disrespectful manner in which the Unity Coalition of Greater Eastern City was portrayed by both you and your Assistant Coordinator, Morris Hill, at the October 12, 1990, Town Meeting held at Wesley United Methodist Church.

Previously, you requested the UC's input relative to four (4) major issues raised during the September Town Meeting.

These issues were: 1) Public Access - Rebecca Johnson School  2) Lack of Males in the Eastern City Public School System  3) African American Businesses in our community  4) Limited funding for preschool children

Immediately, the UC acted on your request.

Considerable time during two (2) UC meetings focused specifically on the aforementioned issues.

Recommendations were developed relative to each issue.

A copy of these deliberations were forwarded to you.

You were absolutely correct, when you indicated that the document forwarded was a list of recommendations.

Carol,

(What did you want?).

[Did you want] a list of solutions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>These recommendations were structured to be readily transformed into action steps relative to each individual issue.</td>
<td>E D 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community.</td>
<td>E D 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>You neglected to share UC's information.</td>
<td>I I 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am positive that the document would have at least stimulated a thought and discussion process for further investigation.</td>
<td>D D 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document.</td>
<td>I E 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>During the October meeting, you did not even acknowledge UC's effort in compiling the list of recommendations.</td>
<td>I E 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You leave me no other recourse but to conclude that you viewed the document as worthless.</td>
<td>I D 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Apparently, there was a general oversight in your communication process in making the information request.</td>
<td>E D 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I would be curious as to how many individuals, organizations, etc., even responded to this request.</td>
<td>D D 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>If there were others, you failed to acknowledge their input also.</td>
<td>I E 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The UC is highly insulted by your unprofessional demeanor in handling this situation.</td>
<td>D D 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>We feel that a formal public apology is in order.</td>
<td>D D 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We respectfully request this to take place at the next scheduled Town Meeting.</td>
<td>D A 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>You indicated that you were looking for someone to take charge.</td>
<td>I E 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Well,</td>
<td>K K 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rest assured that the UC will not only take charge,

but will continue to address and develop solutions to the problems created by the socio-political environment as well as those which occur as a result of the pathological beliefs held by far too many individuals, who interact with our community.

I can be reached at the Coalition's office number to discuss this matter further.

Text of Carter's Letter to the Planning Council

October 19, 1990

Dear Carol:

I would like to express the Unity Coalition's (UC) acute dissatisfaction with the extremely disrespectful manner in which the Unity Coalition of Greater Eastern City was portrayed by both you and your Assistant Coordinator, Morris Hill, at the October 12, 1990, Town Meeting held at Wesley United Methodist Church.

Previously, you requested the UC's input relative to four (4) major issues raised during the September Town Meeting. These issues were:

1) Public Access - Rebecca Johnson School
2) Lack of Males in the Eastern City Public School System
3) African American Businesses in our community
4) Limited funding for preschool children

Immediately, the UC acted on your request. Considerable time during two (2) UC meetings focused specifically on the aforementioned issues. Recommendations were developed relative to each issue. A copy of these deliberations were forwarded to you.

You were absolutely correct, when you indicated that the document forwarded was a list of recommendations. Carol, What did you want a list of solutions? These recommendations were structured to be readily transformed into action steps relative to each individual issue.

Sharing information is an essential ingredient in confronting many of the problems which plague our community. You neglected to share UC's information. I am positive that the
document would have at least stimulated a thought and discussion process for further investigation. Furthermore, you didn't even disseminate copies of the document. During the October meeting, you did not even acknowledge UC's effort in compiling the list of recommendations. You leave me no other recourse but to conclude that you viewed the document as worthless.

Apparently, there was a general oversight in your communication process in making the information request. I would be curious as to how many individuals, organizations, etc., even responded to this request. If there were others, you failed to acknowledge their input also.

The UC is highly insulted by your unprofessional demeanor in handling this situation. We feel that a formal public apology is in order. We respectfully request this to take place at the next scheduled Town Meeting.

You indicated that you were looking for someone to take charge. Well, rest assured that the UC will not only take charge, but will continue to address and develop solutions to the problems created by the socio-political environment as well as those which occur as a result of the pathological beliefs held by far too many individuals, who interact with our community.

I can be reached at the Coalition's office number to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

Carter
Chairperson
The Unity Coalition of Greater Eastern City
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

An analysis of the facework tactics and strategies in each of the six episodes of community organizing illustrated the following consistencies and variations.

Task

The community organizers' tasks were determined by the frequency and percentage of each form and intent of every utterance in each episode of community organizing. A review of the frequency of each verbal response mode form (across intents) and verbal response mode intent (across forms) for all six episodes indicated that in five of the episodes each community organizer was fundamentally concerned with exposition, that is, with providing objective and subjective information to his various publics. While the community organizer's used Edification, or objective information, in these episodes as one of the means for conveying information, they also frequently used the Disclosure mode, or subjective, personal information, for exposition as well. In only two of these episodes did the total number other verbal response modes exceed the Edification and Disclosure modes. By contrast, in Episode 4 the community organizer was primarily concerned with directing the audience's behavior. This accounts for the larger number of Advisements used. However, a large number of Edification response were present in this episode, indicating the organizer's concern with exposition as well.

However, the ways in which each community organizer achieved the task of providing information were significantly different, depending on a variety of relevant antecedent or emerging situational and contextual factors. Based on factors such as whether the community organizer expositional objective was to convey neutrality and truthfulness
more than sincerity and openness, the occasion, the history of the relationship between the community organizer and the audience, and the like, community organizers used different frequencies of Edification and Disclosure within individual episodes, and different approaches to giving information in all of the episodes. These differences in frequencies of verbal response mode usage, and in approaches to the task of giving information reflected the identity claims of status and involvement in the six episodes. These consistencies and variations in community organizers' tasks appear in Table 7.1.
With the exception of Carter's memo (Episode 4), this task of exposition involved the use of Edifications or objective information in combination with Disclosures or subjective information. Specifically, the combined percentages of the Edification and Disclosure modes in Episodes 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 made up more than 50% of the total number of verbal response modes. Thus, despite situational differences among the organizations, the issues being addressed, the community organizers' goals and objectives, and in the nature of
the social action taking place, who participated, and the functions of language in the episode, the task as each community organizer accomplished it was dominated by exposition.

Despite the overall strategy of exchanging information, the community organizers' identity claims of status and involvement varied, depending on whether they emphasized Edification as opposed to Disclosure. For example, in Lane's comments (Episode 1), the frequency of Edification (49%) was higher than the frequency of Disclosure (33%). In this instance, the community organizer appeared objective more often than he conveyed a personal or intimate face. On the other hand, in Barron's comments (Episode 2), the frequency of Disclosure (37%) exceeded the frequency of Edification (28%). By providing information in this way, Barron claimed an identity or face of involvement more often than he conveyed an objective appearance. A closer examination of the use of Edifications and Disclosures in these episodes provides a more complete understanding of the task of exposition in relation to these identity claims of status and involvement.

Edifications, that is, statements of objective information in grammatical form and communicative intent, were consistent with the community organizers' goals of the identity claims of appearing objective by conveying factual information. In Episode 1, 3 and 6, the Edification mode occurred more frequently, with a varied range of proportions, than any of the other seven verbal response modes. Also, the proportion of Edification varied widely among these episodes. For example, the proportion of Edifications in Episode 1 was 49%, in Episode 3, 73% and in Episode 6, 33%. These variations can be traced to the
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community organizers' response to specific situational and contextual variables mentioned in the case studies.

Generally, however, the frequent use of Edification suggested that the community organizer was reporting information that fit the objective facts. Therefore, as community organizers stated objective information, their use of Edification implicitly asserted their claim of trustworthiness by reporting the truth, and their legitimacy as a knowledgeable persons. The frequent use of Edification in these episodes could become an asset in establishing a resource base of informational power for community organizers that would support the goals of gaining legitimate authority through the identity claims of status.

In a similar fashion, these community organizers also accomplished their expositional task through the frequent use of subjective information or Disclosures, which reveal thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions and the like. The use of Disclosures also responded to the identity claims of status and involvement. In Episodes 2 and 5, the Disclosure mode occurred more frequently than any other verbal response mode category. As the second most frequently occurring verbal response mode, the pattern of giving subjective information also confirms that a major portion of community organizers' task is exposition.

Revealing subjective information in Disclosures suggested sincerity, specifically, that the community organizers' actually had experience with the revealed meaning. Although higher in familiarity than Edification, and thus imposing greater face
threats to the audience's sense of freedom than Edification, the Disclosure mode had the
important advantage of supporting the audiences' positive face concerns.

Disclosure often was used by community organizers as a medium of exchange in
the growth of interpersonal relationships. For example, the high percentage of Disclosures
in Barron's comments (Episode 2) reflected and promoted increased involvement or
connection with the audience. Also, very intense interactions (arguments with many
disagreements, evaluations of the audience and gratuitous suggestions) were made less
intense through the use of Disclosures. In illustration, Carter's public exchange with
Planning Council members (Episode 5) was critical of some of the Council's work. Carter
used a high number of Disclosures to mitigate or soften the impositions involved in making
those criticisms.
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In conclusion, despite the variation in the functions of the information exchanged in Edification (objective information to appear factual) and in Disclosure (subjective information to appear personal), the fundamental purpose and character of both is expositional. In combination, the predominant pattern in community organizers' communicative behavior in all of but one of the six episodes, was giving information through Edification and Disclosure. And, even in Carter's memo (Episode 4) in which the majority of forms and intents were in the Advisement category (69%), the next highest number of forms and intents occurred in the Edification mode. While community organizers often used these Edification and Disclosure modes, their usage was problematic throughout.

The act of giving information implies a hierarchical relationship in which the community organizers' claimed greater status and involvement than they may have felt entitled to. When giving information, the addressee is placed in an inferior position as the recipient of needed information from the speaker. If it were not needed, the assumption is that it would not be offered. In fact, the very act of giving information claims the status and involvement of the one who gives information in relation to those who receive information. A 'reading' of the situational and contextual factors (general and specific cultural and situational knowledge, the history of the relationship, the community organizer's goals, immediately preceding comments, tone of voice, and the occasion, participants involved, and medium of interaction, and the like) that helped to define the claim made by the community organizers revealed distinctions in the ways in which the community organizers approached issues of hierarchy inherent in their expositional tasks.
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Based on an analysis of these antecedent and emergent situational and contextual features that influenced the strategies community organizers used in each episode, only Barron's letter to the city council (Episode 3) approached the task of exposition in a manner that a low status and involvement. In this episode, the difference between Barron's low level of legitimate authority in comparison to the City Council's higher level of legitimate authority was substantial. In addition, Barron's contact with City Council members was lower in this episode than in the contact between the speakers and audiences in any of the other episodes. In fact, Barron and members of the City Council Subcommittee had established no contact with each other in their present community organizer-public relationship prior to this interaction. Thus, Barron's approach of urging reflected his claim of low familiarity based on his recognition of the situational constraints of his relationship to City Council members.

By contrast, in Barron's comments (Episode 2) and in Carter's memo (Episode 4), conversation (Episode 5), and letter (Episode 6), the community organizers approached the task of exposition in a manner that claimed a higher level of familiarity than they felt entitled to under the circumstances. For example, in Barron's comments (Episode 2), situational and contextual features indicated that this community organizer framed his task as the act of announcing. The very nature of announcing conveyed a hierarchical relationship in which the community organizer claimed his authority to provide the audience with much needed information. By announcing, Barron asserted his status and expertise in the matters under discussion. In another example, Carter's letter (Episode 6), the community organizer's expositional task was realized by the strategy of protesting. This act of protesting claimed the community organizer's authority to critique the Planning
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Council, and in the expression of his authority, created social distance via a hierarchical ranking between himself and the audience.

Finally, in Episode 1, Lane's approach of talking with the audience indicated a sense of reciprocity and equal exchange designed to encourage the audience's involvement in a conversation with the community organizer as an equal partner. In this dialogical exchange, Lane did not claim a position of hierarchical dominance over the audience.

Role Dimensions

Aggregating the frequency of all of the verbal response modes that made up each community organizer's task into the higher-order conceptual role dimensions of informativeness, deference and control illustrated the role that community organizers assumed in each episode. Overall indices were compared to the disaggregated form and intent indices for each of the three role dimensions in all six episodes.

To summarize, five of the episodes were more similar in terms of the three dimensions that made up the community organizers' roles in each. Specifically, in Lane's comments, and in Barron's comments and in his letter, the predominant pattern of communicative behavior was informativeness, deference and acquiescence. These three role dimensions correspond to the source, focus and frame associated with the verbal response mode of Edification. Thus, in these three episodes, the speakers claimed objectivity, which characterizes Edification.
In a slightly different fashion, the predominant pattern of communicative behavior in Carter's conversation and in his letter was informativeness, deference and directiveness, the role dimensions associated with Disclosure. In these two episodes, the speaker claimed subjectivity. By contrast, in Carter's memo, the pattern of communicative behavior was informativeness, presumptuousness and directiveness. Associated with the Advisement verbal response mode, this pattern claimed the speaker's authority and competence to given directions.

Disaggregating these overall roles into form and intent indices, however revealed varying degrees of incongruency between the form and intent indices in all six episodes along the three dimensions of informativeness, deference and control. The incongruencies suggest that in all six episodes the three community organizers faced the difficulty of managing mismatches between their social relationships and their tasks in one or more of all three role dimensions. That is, they were faced with a task that was not warranted by the relationship that they had established with the audience prior to this interaction. The incongruencies might display the following mismatches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Dimensions</th>
<th>Types of Incongruencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>High form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>High form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>High form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Specifically, the Informative-Attentive dimension, or self-centeredness, had the smallest number of discrepancies between form and intent, with incongruencies in two out of six episodes. The Presumptuous-Unassuming or deference dimension had a slightly larger number of discrepancies with incongruencies in three out of the six episodes. The Acquiescence-Directive or control dimension had the highest number of discrepancies between form and intent, with incongruencies in all episodes. This suggests that the control dimension was the most problematic of all three role dimensions for all of these organizers.

With few exceptions, most form and intent discrepancies reflected a pattern of balancing the higher proportions of the imposing or face threatening role dimensions (self-centeredness, presumptuousness and directiveness) in the intents of the utterances with lower proportions of these imposing or face threatening role dimensions in the forms of the utterances community organizers used. This information confirms that, in general, the intent of community organizers' utterances to claim an high level of status and involvement that was not necessarily warranted or sanctioned by their social relationship with the audience. These patterns are outlined in Table 7.2.
### Table 7.2 - Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Face Implications of Roles</th>
<th>Form and Intent Discrepancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane's Comments</td>
<td>Informative (97%) Deferent (84%) Acquiescent (63%)</td>
<td>Appearing objective, neutral and truthful (Edification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron's Comments</td>
<td>Informative (99%) Deferent (65%) Acquiescent (59%)</td>
<td>Appearing objective, truthful and neutral (Edification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron's Letter</td>
<td>Informative (96%) Deferent (96%) Acquiescent (77%)</td>
<td>Appearing objective, neutral and truthful (Edification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter's Memo</td>
<td>Informative (100%) Presumptuous (69%) Directive (69%)</td>
<td>Appearing authoritative and competent (Advisement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter's Conversation</td>
<td>Informative (83%) Deferent (87%) Directive (53%)</td>
<td>Appearing subjective, sincere and personally involved (Disclosure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter's Letter</td>
<td>Informative (65%) Deferent (73%) Directive (57%)</td>
<td>Appearing subjective, sincere and personally involved (Disclosure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the overall indices for the three role dimensions for each episode indicates that the organizer's role in Lane's comments, Baron's letter, and Carter's letter (Episodes 1, 2, and 3) was informative or self-centered in the source of the topic or
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experience, deferent in the focus of the central topic, and acquiescent in viewpoint or frame of reference. By contrast, the organizer’s role in Barron’s comments and Carter’s conversation (Episodes 5 and 6) was informative, deferent and directive. Finally, the organizer’s role in Carter’s memo (Episode 4) could be characterized by the overall role dimensions of informativeness, presumptuousness and control.

Informativeness: Consistently, in all six episodes, more than half of the total number of the community organizers’ utterances were focused on their own thoughts, feelings, perceptions, intentions and behavior rather than the audience’s knowledge and experiences as the central source of the topic or experience, with proportions ranging from 65% to 100%. This high proportion of self-centeredness throughout the six episodes conveyed a noticeable lack of interest among community organizers in attending to their audiences’ experiences or knowledge. The proportion of self-centeredness displayed in the overall indices of the episodes was consistent with the form and intent indices in all episodes with the exception of Carter’s Conversation (Episode 5) and Carter’s letter (Episode 6). This information indicated that, with the exception of these episodes, most community organizers did not perceive a discrepancy between their social relationship with the audience and the task being performed in terms of making their own thoughts, feelings, behaviors and intentions the source of the experience. And, even in Episodes 5 and 6 in which discrepancies were revealed, the degree of incongruence was not dramatic.

Specifically, in Carter’s conversation with the Council, this incongruity indicated that Carter felt that his more impolite and imposing task of criticizing by making the Council’s behavior the topic conflicted with his identity of low status and
involvement which did not warrant these impositions. Likewise, in Carter's memo (Episode 6), the form and intent discrepancy on the informative dimension indicated a conflict between protesting the Council's behavior, and thus, in making it the topic, and a social relationship that did not support Carter's claim of familiarity that sanctioned this attentiveness.

Deference: With the exception of Carter's memo (Episode 4), five of the episodes indicated that the community organizers were deferent and did not presume knowledge about what the audiences' experience is, was, will or should be. The impact of community organizers' pattern of low presumptuousness was to avoid impositions on the audiences' privacy in terms of their own experiences. On the other hand, Carter's memo indicated a pattern of high presumptuous that risked impositions on the audience's negative face. Despite these overwhelming similarities in overall deference, three of these episodes had form and intent discrepancies. These discrepancies indicated that the speakers experienced a mismatch between their social relationships and their tasks on this dimension. The form and intent discrepancies in Barron's comments (Episode 2), Carter's memo (Episode 4) and in his conversation (Episode 5) will illustrate the nature of this mismatch.

In Barron's comments, for example, the speaker's social relationship with the audience required him to claim a high level of familiarity in his remarks. Although the task was to convey his own knowledge and ideas about the what the audience's experiences are and will be, and not presume to know the audience, Barron chose forms that were more
presumptuous than his intents as a means for claiming his higher status as a leader vis-à-vis the audience.

In Carter's memo, the writer's task was to tell the audience what to do. However, Carter's social relationship with this audience did not warrant the presumptuousness inherent in the act of 'recommending' in this particular situation. Thus, Carter's response to this problem was to choose some forms that lowered the impoliteness of some of his intents.

Finally, in Carter's conversation, the form of Carter's utterances were overwhelmingly unassuming. This index reflects the lower familiarity that Carter held with the Council in general, as well as in this particular exchange. However, Carter's task of criticizing required presuming to know what the Council was and should be doing. This imposition was not sanctioned by their social relation, and thus, Carter chose to make these intentions less imposing, at least on the surface, in the forms he used.

Carter's presumption of making recommendations to this particular audience about what it was and should be was not fully warranted by his social relationship with that audience either. As pointed out in the earlier situational description of this episode, Carter and the organization had to reestablish Unity's credibility with the Common Square community. Generally, making recommendations imposes upon an audience's negative face wants by claiming a higher level of familiarity for the speaker in relation to listeners. If this level of familiarity is warranted, these impositions may not be problematic. However, considering the circumstances surrounding Carter's relationship
with this particular audience, the greater familiarity of his recommendations conflicted
with the absence of Carter's right to impose. Thus, in making recommendations, Carter
faced a critical dilemma, and resolved it by form and intent discrepancies.

Control: In three of the six episodes, the pattern of communicative behavior in
the overall indices for the role dimension of control was acquiescent. In the remaining
three, the pattern of communicative behavior was directive. The range of the proportions
of acquiescence was between 59% and 77%, while the range of the proportions of
directiveness in these overall figures was between 57% and 69%. Altogether, neither
acquiescence nor directiveness was more evident among the episode.

In contrast to the occurrence of incongruencies in the informative and deferent
role dimensions, incongruencies between the form and intent indices were evident along the
control dimension in all of the episodes. All of these discrepancies were characterized by
the speaker's attempt to cover up his intent to control the interaction with superficial forms
that suggested agreement and harmony. The high frequency of discrepancies on the control
dimension, and the pattern of mitigation or politeness strategies on this dimension
suggested that, in general, assuming the role of directiveness consistently was more
problematic for community organizers than either of the other role dimensions of
informativeness and deference. Specifically, along the control dimension, community
organizers experienced the greatest frequency of discrepancies, and these discrepancies
reflected tension between their social relationships with the particular audiences and the
tasks they performed in relation to these audiences.
Results 338

Relationships

The frequency of verbal response modes and their aggregation into role dimensions formed the basis for the Familiarity Index. This index provided an overall measure of how each community organizer's realized his relationship to the audience in terms of the identity claims of status and involvement. In addition to the number and percentage of low and high ranked modes, the specific strategies that comprised each speaker's overall Familiarity Index and that indicated how speaker's coped with interpersonal pressures of these relationships are revealed in the proportions and in the various combinations of mixed and pure modes. With some variation, most community organizers coped with these interpersonal pressures with a moderate level of familiarity and by primarily lowering high ranked intents with lower ranked forms.

In every mixed mode, the form systematically modifies the utterance's force specifically to resemble the force of the form - to be more unassuming or presumptuous, acquiescent or directive, and attentive or informative. Whenever social requirements differ from task requirements on any of these dimensions it may be expected that people will tend to use mixed modes, with the forms constrained by social relationships and the intents constrained by the task at hand. For example, lecturers whose task constrains them to present facts (i.e., Edification intents) may at times use presumptuous forms as a way of expressing their higher status vis-a-vis their audience. Table 7.3 provides further illustration of patterns of consistency and variation in these strategies.
### Table 7.3 - Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Episode 1 Lane's Comments</th>
<th>Episode 2 Barron's Comments</th>
<th>Episode 3 Barron's Letter</th>
<th>Episode 4 Carter's Memo</th>
<th>Episode 5 Carter's Conversation</th>
<th>Episode 6 Carter's Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Ranked Modes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Ranked Modes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Modes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Mode Patterns</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>E(D)</td>
<td>C(D)</td>
<td>E(D)</td>
<td>E(A)</td>
<td>E(D)</td>
<td>I(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower high intents</td>
<td>About equal between lowering high intents and raising low intents</td>
<td>Lower high intents</td>
<td>Lower high intents</td>
<td>Lower high intents</td>
<td>About equal between lowering high intents and raising low intents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure Modes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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First, in four of the six episodes, community organizers' overall familiarity had an index close to 4, which is the midpoint of the familiarity hierarchy. In the remaining episodes, one index was below 3 which is relatively low, and the other index was above six, relatively high for these episodes. These indexes reflected the predominance of low ranked modes in five of the episodes.

Second, the discrepancies between form and intent modes of the role dimensions in all of the episodes was reflected in the percentages of mixed modes in each episode. The proportion of mixed modes in all six episodes ranged from a low of 38% to a high of 72%. And, in all of the episodes, the tendency to lower high intents with less impolite forms was evident. Specifically, in four of the episodes (Lane's comments, Barron's letter, Carter's memo and his conversation), the clear tendency was for the speakers to lower high intents. In the remaining two episodes, while this strategy was important, the speakers also raised low intents with higher forms almost as often.

With the exception of two episodes, one with a comparatively low Familiarity Index of 2.58 and one with a relatively high Familiarity Index of 6.50, the remaining Familiarity Indices were concentrated in the 3 to 4 range. This 3 - 4 range of most of the Familiarity indices reflected the predominance of verbal response modes in seven of the episodes in the low ranked modes of 4 and below. This information indicated that community organizers generally claimed a low to modest level of familiarity with their community organizing activities.
Also, the distribution of mixed or incongruent and pure or congruent verbal response form and intent pairs indicated the specific communicative tactics and strategies that made up each community organizer's identity claims. First, the data indicated that all episodes used a combination of mixed and pure modes. With regard to mixed modes, the most frequently occurring mixed mode combinations in the seven of the six episodes were Edification in service of Disclosure, that is, E(D), and Disclosure in service of Edification, or D(E). With regard to the pure mode combinations, the most frequently occurring pure mode pairs in all of the episodes were Edification in service of Edification or E(E), and Disclosure in service of Disclosure or D(D).

Second, although mixed modes occurred in all six episodes, community organizers used more mixed than pure mode form and intent combinations in only Episodes 1, 2 and 4. This indicates that in half of the episodes, community organizers perceived more discrepancies than congruencies between their tasks and their social relationships with their audiences. The predominance of pure modes in the remaining three episodes indicated that community organizers perceived congruency between their tasks and their social relationships.

Third, the pattern of form and intent combinations in four episodes was to lower or mitigate imposing intentions with politeness strategies that lessened face threats to the audience. This pattern of politeness strategies low to moderate level of status and involvement with the audience. In the remaining two episodes, community organizers' raised low ranked intents with higher ranked forms almost as often as they lowered high ranked intents. By raising the low ranked intents with high ranked forms, community
organizers conveyed more imposing or face threatening behavior. However, the "risks" involved in these face threats were offset by 1) potential gains in the growth of their relationships with the audience, and 2) less conflict and argument with the audience.

In summary, the results from this analysis consisted of the following patterns of communicative tactics and strategies for status and involvement. First, the frequency and percentage of each form and intent of every utterance in all six episodes of talk and writing were dominated by exposition, with substantial variation among the six episodes in each organizer's approach to this task. Second, the aggregation of the frequencies into the higher-order conceptual role dimensions of informativeness, deference and control showed that the three organizers generally assumed an informative, deferent role with their audiences, with greater variation among them in directiveness or control. Third, form and intent discrepancies occurred on all three role dimensions, most frequently along the control dimension. Fourth, the overall measure of the identity claims of status and involvement for the majority of the six episodes approximated the Disclosure mode, which is associated with a mid-range Familiarity Index of 4. Finally, in addition to a general pattern of higher proportions of low ranked modes in comparison to high ranked modes in most episodes, the three community organizers often used indirectness and politeness strategies to mitigate or lower the impositions of unwarranted claims for status and involvement.
DISCUSSION

The results of this study illustrated the facework tactics and strategies that community organizers used to claim their status and involvement with public audiences. The results of the different frequencies, aggregations and combinations confirmed the central point that community organizers' tactics and strategies accomplished the goals of their identity claims for status and involvement that were driven by the needs for independence and connection. Overall, facework tactics and strategies indicated a general trend toward indirectness, politeness and modest claims status and involvement in relation to the public. The consequences of these tactics and strategies for community organizers will be discussed in terms of the tasks they accomplished and the role-relationships that they established with their audiences.

First, the tasks that community organizers performed in relation to their public audiences revealed an overwhelming pattern of exposition, or of providing objective and subjective information. The predominance in all six episodes of this expositional task concurs with Forester's and others depiction of planning [18, 24], and the related future-oriented activity of community organizing, as that of providing information. Although these results support this idea of community organizing as primarily expositional, this study provides a more fine-grained analysis of this activity.

While the case has been made for the expositional focus of community organizing, the intuitively compelling arguments in support of this conceptualization gloss over some important variations in the types of information given (Edification versus Disclosure), and approaches to giving information (urging versus discussing) that have
important implications for understanding community organizing. By actually delineating and counting communicative behaviors, and determining the frequency of the occurrence of various dimensions of information-giving behavior in relation to other communicative behaviors, this study provides a way of understanding this fundamental function that is grounded less in intuition and more in directly observable behavioral data.

Overall, the consequences of the task of providing information through Edification and Disclosure involved minimal interactional difficulty with the audience. This expositional strategy allowed the community organizers to avoid confrontation because of its less intrusive form. In addition to minimizing confrontation, providing subjective, personal information contributed to the growth of the relationship of the community organizer to the audience. Specifically, the openness and niceness expressed by the Disclosure mode facilitated the interchange and increased the rapport and solidarity felt between participants. But, giving information had two important disadvantages.

First, giving information also placed the audience in an inferior position as the recipient of needed information from the more superior/competent community organizer. This prompted community organizers to make adjustments in other aspects of their interaction (tone of voice, delivery and the like) to compensate for this imposition. Second, the self-centeredness inherent in providing information signaled the importance of the community organizers' experiences at the expense of attention to the audience's. This lack of attention suggests the community organizers' lack of involvement and, through its absence, risked detracting from the solidarity that depended, in part, on the audience's need to be appreciated and noticed.
In a different fashion, the Advisement strategy used in Episode 4 set up a sharp power imbalance between the community organizer and the audience. In this instance, the consequences of claiming the right to direct someone's behavior and asserting the competence of knowing what the audience should and could do jeopardized future interactions with some members of Planning Council as evidenced by their overwhelmingly negative reaction to Carter's recommendations.

The roles that community organizers enacted with the audience were characterized by indirectness or the avoidance of confrontational, imposing illocutionary intents by using less intrusive forms. While minimizing the potential for conflict, this approach risked the unintended consequence of loss of clarity and understanding for the audience. Specifically, while obscuring the intent of face threatening illocutionary acts serves the social obligation of avoiding "...infringing on manners or taste, or actually or potentially hurting other people" [6], this strategy of covering up what was happening linguistically also limited the degree and quality of valid information that community organizers shared with their audiences. Sharing information that is clear and accurate serves the socially important need for understanding. Thus, the loss of clarity that accompanied these distortions of communication risked misunderstanding and mistrust among listeners. In addition, the mixed messages that inevitably seeped through these attempts to obscure what was happening also risked conveying the impression that the speaker was dishonest, indecisive and ineffectual.

In a similar fashion, the occurrence of mixed modes also reflected the overall trend toward indirectness through the politeness strategies that they embodied. The use of
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mixed modes in which high ranked intents were softened or mitigated by lower ranked forms served as a conflict-reducing politeness strategy. These strategies had the effect of preserving at least the semblance of harmony and cohesion. On the other hand, mixed modes in which low ranked intents were made more imposing by higher ranked forms had the potential for violating this cultural imperative for politeness in order to establish the speaker’s status and communicate greater solidarity and shared purpose with the audience. Throughout most of these episodes however, the relatively limited initial status and involvement were responded to by the community organizers with politeness strategies that inadvertently manipulated and controlled covertly other people and the situation. These covert strategies are characteristic of less powerful people who are attempting to persuade others with more power and influence.

Also, some issues and problems associated with the identity claims of status and involvement were a part of the very nature of the tasks being performed, and therefore were unavoidable. For example, providing information inevitably sets up a hierarchy of dominance. As such, the advantages and disadvantages of this hierarchy were inevitable, and community organizers responded in ways to either minimize the problems or exploit the benefits of exposition for their claims of status and involvement.

In a different way, however, obscuring what a person is up to linguistically by creating discrepancies in form and intent, can, in certain instances, be criticized for unnecessarily contributing to interpersonal manipulation. Distinguishing between communicative problems that are ad hoc and inevitable, and those that are unnecessary
may help community organizers to understand the ethical dimensions and implications of their verbal strategies. [18]

Although in most episodes the community organizers were able to persuade their audiences to do what they wanted them to do, I wonder at what and whose expense. When the organizing goal of local empowerment is considered within the context of the risks of loss of clarity and intelligibility, misunderstanding and manipulation, serious reservations can be raised not only about the means that have accomplished these ends, but also about the value of the outcomes for the people involved. That is, who is really being empowered?

In PLANNERS AND PUBLIC EXPECTATIONS [12], Baum's interviews revealed planners' widespread perceptions of critical limitations on their abilities to exercise power in their professional roles. Although the results of the present study on community organizers generally confirmed Baum's findings about the constraints planners coped with in exercising power, this analysis also reveal those areas of power that these community organizers, and by extension other planners, actually do possess and use. This informational resource base for this power and influence is explained by Forester's research on planning and power.

In PLANNING IN THE FACE OF POWER, Forester argues that planning operates within a highly politicized arena [18]. For planners, who are an integral part of this process of contending interests, issues of power are manifested in contrasting ways. In one sense, Forester, like Baum, asserts that planners may not be powerful in relation to
important stakeholders in the planning enterprise. Since planners represent interests of various sorts, they are compelled to respond to the imperatives and initiatives mandated by the governmental agencies, corporations and institutions that employ them, on the one hand, and pressures from organized community groups and agencies on the other.

In another sense, however, contrary to what Baum's interviews seem to suggest, planners are not merely pawns and tools who are subject to the demands and pressures from more powerful parties. In fact, planners generally have access to and control over levels and types of critical information that can be used to establish and maintain a base of power for themselves. As Alexander [28] points out, this informational power is significant because, as interpreters and communicators of reality, planners have the ability to change people's realities, and thus critically affect the course of planning efforts.

The communicative tactics and strategies that the three African American community organizers used reflect the unacknowledged micropolitics of the differential exercise of power and control. While attempting to empower themselves and their communities, these community organizers themselves were not without power. As they attempted to form certain kinds of relationships with their audiences by claiming their authority and status as leaders and a sense of trust stemming from shared views or values, these community organizers were, as Lakoff [6] argues, using language to exercise power. For example, Lane and Barron exercised informational social power as they explained and advocated for the Common Square Reclamation Project.
However, the relational and interpersonal dynamics of this exercise of power and influence were tacit, and as such, remained unacknowledged by these community organizers, even though these micropolitics shaped and guided their behavior and oftentimes produce unintended results. The most obvious example was the Planning Council's reaction to Carter's memorandum. In our conversation after the October meeting, Carter acknowledge the political aspects of the Planning Council's behavior, but he was blind to his own attempts to gain and power and influence during that episode. In another example, Brothers and sisters were aware of the city's plans to tear down the Monument Plaza to make way for the new school shortly after their project was to begin. However, they did not recognized the politics involved in not sharing this information, and the impact of this manipulation of information on persuading people to join their project. While certain benefits accrued for the community by participating on the project, hiding this information had implications for the micropolitics of informational power.

Too often, research and writing on African American community organizing concentrates on the external, macropolitical, societal contexts and effects of power and influence imposed on this community from the larger society. A greater awareness of the micropolitics of African American community organizing can alert these organizers to the ways in which their practices may unintentionally reproduce, on an interpersonal level, some of the aspects of the larger-scale, societal inequities that they work to overcome.

Clearly, the extent to which community organizers are able to claim social identities of status and involvement that result in positive responses to them is essential to their success of community organizing activities. While these instrumental goals of
community organizing are important, the social and interpersonal implications of tactics and strategies used to achieve these goals of these identity claims is equally important. On the one hand, if community organizers are unable to claim favorable identities for themselves, they may not be able to get people to do what they want them do. However, if they rely on methods that maintain certain interpersonal inequities, any cooperation that they obtain may be short-lived or tenuous at best. What can and should they do?

Basically, community organizers can begin to think more systematically and clearly about their work as an exercise in micro-politics in which they use linguistic forms to gain the political ends of getting other people to see the world or some piece of in their way. It is a political process in which community organizers ultimately want people to act as they would like them to act. By reflecting on the ways in which these micropolitics emerge from the needs of independence and connection, and can result in unintended consequences, such as manipulation and misunderstanding, community organizers can anticipate some of the risks and effects of their communicative practices. As important however, African American community organizers must recognize that, as they oppose the inequities they experience through racism and inequality, they, along with other community organizers and planners, are as subject to these same abuses of power as those whom they oppose.

An important initial step in achieving this level of awareness about and improving the micropolitics of community organizing is to make its exercise explicit by learning how the identity claims status and involvement are assigned and determined through linguistic structure,
anticipating some of the risks involved in claiming status and involvement in particular ways,

determining which communicative tactics and strategies for accomplishing the goals of status and involvement are equitable and which are less so,

distinguishing between ad hoc and unavoidable power and influence relationships and differentials assumed and created by communicative tactics and strategies, and those that are socially unnecessary.

Thus, for example, when community organizers use politeness strategies to minimize the potential for conflict through the semblance of harmony and cohesion, to what extent do these strategies reflect and reproduce larger-scale social relations in which valid information about controversial issues such as race and racism are replaced with less confrontational rhetoric in the form of euphemisms? What are the implications for "hiding the bad news"? Misrepresentation? Misunderstanding? Loss of trust? Diminished competence? In same vein, is the use of indirectness as a strategy to influence people in a particular situation an equitable use of linguistic power? Or by limiting access to valid information, does indirectness create unnecessary and destructive power differentials or inequality among different groups of people?

While this study has established a new focus for research in community organizing, several areas for future investigation have been identified. Although this analysis illustrates the facework tactics and strategies that the community organizers used, the picture that is provides is static. Accepting this static characterization of community organizing as information-giving, for example, overlooks other important communicative behaviors that frequently emerge in response to different sets of situational
Discussion and contextual circumstances, and variations throughout an individual episode in response to contextual cues and task requirements. A review of the facework tactics and strategies in any given episode reflects a more dynamic view of change over time.

For example, in Episode 4, the expositional task was realized primarily through Advisements rather than primarily through either Edification or Disclosure. Also, in two other Episodes, the Confirmation and Interpretation categories were noticeably present. Finally, different sections of a given episode emphasize different patterns of verbal response modes. For example, the beginning of Episode 2, which emphasizes Edification and Disclosure are different from the other sequences of utterances which stressed the Confirmation response mode. Future studies of facework strategies should examine how these tactics and strategies change within a particular utterance, over the course of a particular activity and across several episodes within the same community organizing effort.

Also, while this approach to discourse analysis provides a in-depth account of what language does, it's narrow focus on the intersubjective aspects of utterances acts ignores other equally important aspects of verbal interaction, such as content or paralinguistic cues. Triangulating different kinds of verbal and non-verbal interactional data with this focus of discourse analysis can produce a much richer sense of the drama of community organizing.

Finally, the integration of the ethnographic data contained in the situational and contextual descriptions should be more fully integrated into future analyses of the community organizers' facework. For example, the same organizer may say the same things
to different audiences, or different things to the same audience and get similar or different responses depending on variations in situational circumstances, such as the timing of remarks or the particular stage of community organizing activities. In the same vein, different organizers may say the same things to the same or different audiences or they may say different things to the same or different audiences causing variations in audience responses that cannot be fully understood without considering situational variables. Research that makes more substantive connections between these variables and their direct and indirect impact on the community organizers' effectiveness can also enrich our understanding of the responses that the public makes to community organizers.

Although this study contributes to an understanding of the expressive dimensions of community organizing, issues of its application to the improvement of this practice need to be addressed. As a reflective study that attempts to understand the relationship between what community organizers do in their facework, and the meanings that flow from and inform these strategies, this study constructs my own individual perspective on these matters as an outsider to these community organizers' activities. While this story adheres to my personal sense of the relevance of interpersonal, communicative theories to community organizing, this story does not meet the demands of rigor and relevance that are possible through its application to organizers' work. [33].

For example, although my observations indicate that the community organizers' primary task is expositional, a community organizer might question whether this version of community organizing resonates with her own perceptions and experiences. Specifically, do community organizers recognize themselves and their practice in this
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If not, what contending narratives can community organizers tell of their work? Also, what are the advantages and limitations of the underlying story of the relationship between discourse and identity for understanding community organizing from community organizers' perspective? These and other questions cannot be answered adequately without the additional step of validating the manifest and underlying stories of organizing practice that I have constructed along with community organizers in applied action-learning contexts. Incorporating this level of analysis into future research can establish greater rigor and relevance in this type of investigation, and contribute to the goal of improving community organizing practice.

In conclusion, by redefining the key issues requiring study in community organizing, this study confirms the importance of studying the relationship between communicative practices and situated social identity. It demonstrates that face, those identity claims that people make in social situations are created through the communicative tactics and strategies of facework. This analysis takes seriously the ever-present competitive aspects of interaction as well as the way the election of tactics and accomplish the goals of the identity claims of status and involvement in the community organizer-public. It demonstrates how this process is driven by the competing, and conflicting needs of independence and involvement. Finally, and perhaps more importantly, this study extends the line of reasoning that the very possibility of self-concept, is "inextricably dependent on the linguistic practices used in everyday life to make sense of our own and others actions" [1]. Indeed, it confirms that discourse is an important way to get at situated identity, and elaborated notions of identity are critical to any interesting study of discourse.
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