ED 300 860   CS 506 472

AUTHOR   Schnell, James A.
TITLE   Applied Interpersonal Communication in a
              Cross-Cultural Context: The Use of Interpreters as an
              Interrogation Technique When Interviewing Spanish
              Speaking Individuals.
PUB DATE   88
NOTE   12p.; Best copy available.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints
              (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Cultural Awareness; Cultural Context; Foreign
              Countries; *Interpersonal Communication;
              *Interpreters; *Questioning Techniques; *Spanish
              Speaking
IDENTIFIERS   Central America; *Interrogation Techniques

ABSTRACT
              Interrogation of Spanish speaking sources by English
speaking interrogators continues to be a realistic scenario due to
continued United States involvement in Central America. The use of
bilingual interpreters, when applied correctly, enhances applied
interpersonal communication in this cross-cultural context. Analysis
of the interrogation situation evidences the need for interpersonal
sensitivity by the interrogator. There are verbal and nonverbal
communication elements which are central to a successful
interrogation using an interpreter. A primary verbal concern deals
with the approach used by the interpreter to convey interrogator
statements. Nonverbal concerns deal with vocalic (tone of voice,
inflection, and intent), proxemic (the physical arrangement of the
three individuals), eye contact, and kinesic (body movements)
considerations. The interpreter needs to serve as a bridge of
understanding, verbally and nonverbally, between the interrogator and
source. (MM)

APPLIED INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION IN A CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT: THE USE OF INTERPRETERS AS AN INTERROGATION TECHNIQUE WHEN INTERVIEWING SPANISH SPEAKING INDIVIDUALS

James A. Schnell

Assistant Professor

University of Cincinnati

The author is an Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at the
University of Cincinnati and is a Captain in the U.S. Air Force
Intelligence Service (Reserves).

2

APPLIED INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION IN A CROSS-CULTURAL
CONTEXT: THE USE OF INTERPRETERS AS AN INTERROGATION
TECHNIQUE WHEN INTERVIEWING SPANISH SPEAKING INDIVIDUALS

The intelligence community of the United States military collects
information in a variety of ways. This paper will focus on the
collection of information from human sources. Specifically, sources
who require the use of a spanish speaking interpreter. Application
with spanish speaking sources is of particular concern due to U.S.
involvement in Central America. However, the dynamics to be covered
would be relevant with a source speaking any foreign language.

While the term interrogation sometimes conjures visions of
physical coercion, this paper will deal with the process as applied
interpersonal communication in a cross-cultural context (as approved
by the Geneva Conventions). The primary source of information used in
this paper is Field Manual 34-52, Intelligence Interrogation. It was
published by the Department of the Army (May, 1987). Information
presented is unclassified and is approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

The author is a Captain in the U.S. Air Force Intelligence
Service (Reserve) and has completed the Basic Interrogation Course
offered by the Department of the Army. He has also received additional
interrogation training in Human Relations Intelligence (HUMINT) from
the Air Force. It will be helpful to describe primary considerations
in the interrogation process before addressing the specific use of an
interpreter. This discussion will provide a relevant backdrop for
interpreter use issues.

Interrogation is "the art of questioning and examining a source

3

to obtain the maximum amount of usable information." Sources may be civilian internees, insurgents, defectors, refugees, displaced persons, and agents or suspected agents. The goal of any interrogation is "to obtain usable and reliable information, in a lawful manner and in the least amount of time, which meets intelligence requirements of any echelon of command." The interrogation should produce information which is "timely, complete, clear, and accurate."[1]

There are five principles of interrogation: initiative, accuracy, prohibition against force, and security. These principles apply to any type of intelligence interrogation.

Each interrogation has a definite objective. This objective is based on the collection of information which will satisfy the intelligence needs of the supported unit's mission. The interrogation must regard this objective as primary. It will serve as a basis for planning and conducting the interrogation.

Initiative is emphasized as the interrogator must remain in charge throughout the interrogation. If the source is able to take control of the interrogation this can have a direct negative impact on the information gathering process.

The interrogator must show concern for obtaining accurate information from the source. A common procedure is to repeat questions at varying intervals. However, the interrogator should not try to act as an analyst. His/her primary mission is to collect information, but not evaluate it.

The use of force is prohibited at all times in the interrogation process. It is prohibited by law and is neither authorized nor condoned by the United States government. The use of force is also

inefficient as it can force the source to say whatever he/she thinks the interrogator wants to hear.

The interrogator must be aware of security issues relevant to his/her position. He/she works with a great deal of classified information and must be careful not to reveal such information to sources. He/she must also be sensitive to any attempts by sources to illicit information.

The aforementioned principles of interrogation provide general areas which the interrogator must be concerned with as he/she works to conduct a successful interrogation. Additionally, there are five primary interrogation phases which emphasize more specific detail regarding the collection of information: planning and preparation, approach, questioning, termination, and reporting.

The planning and preparation phase lays the groundwork for the interrogation process. Considerations in this procedure include the source's mental and physical condition, the source's background, the objective of the interrogation, and the interrelationship of source and interrogator personalities. The questioning of guards, for example, helps the interrogator learn about the source before meeting him/her face to face.

The approach phase is unique to each interrogation but all approaches share a number of common purposes. These include: establish and maintain control, establish and maintain rapport, and manipulation of the source's emotions and weaknesses to gain his/her willing cooperation. This phase is based on appropriate source assessment, smooth transitions, and recognition of source breaking point.

The questioning phase usually begins when the source starts to

answer questions relevant to specific interrogation objectives,
although he/she may have already answered less pertinent questions.
There are many areas of emphasis in this phase, such as the use of
direct questions, appropriate follow-up questions, repeating questions
to insure accuracy, and avoidance of ambiguous or leading questions.
Map tracking (using a map to pinpoint specific locations and progress-
ions) is helpful in insuring consistency, accuracy, and understanding
in this phase.

The termination phase can be initiated for a variety of reasons,
such as the source is uncooperative, all pertinent information has been
obtained, time constraints, etc. This phase should be conducted
without any loss of rapport since the source may be questioned again
by the same interrogator or a different interrogator. He/she should
be told his/her information will be checked for truthfulness and a
final opportunity to change or add any information should be offered.

The final phase involves reporting information of intelligence
value to the appropriate agency. Each military branch dictates the
types of forms and procedures used in this phase. Regardless,
reporting information should not be confused with evaluating information.

If the interrogator does not speak the source's language then
an interpreter must be used. Thus, the interrogation process becomes
applied interpersonal communication in a cross-cultural context involving
a third party. The third party being fluent in the languages spoke
by the interrogator and the source.

Interrogation of spanish speaking sources by english speaking
interrogators, using bilingual (english-spanish) interpreters, continues
to be a realistic scenario due to continued U.S. involvement in Central

America. Analysis of this interrogation situation evidences the need for interpersonal sensitivity by the interrogator.

Using an interpreter is a lengthy process since the interpreter must repeat everything said by the interrogator and the source. This requires considerable understanding between the interrogator and the interpreter.

There are verbal and nonverbal communication elements which are central to a successful interrogation using an interpreter. A primary verbal concern deals with the approach used by the interpreter to convey interrogator statements. Nonverbal concerns deals with vocalics, prexemics, ecculesic, and kinesic considerations. The interpreter needs to serve as a bridge of understanding, verbally and nonverbally, between interrogator and source.

A fundamental tenet of this process dictates the source must understand the interrogator, not the interpreter, is in charge. This receives equal emphasis in the verbal and nonverbal areas.

There are two methods of interpretation: simultaneous and alternate. Using the simultaneous method, the interpreter listens and translates at the same time the interrogator speaks. Using the alternate method, the interpreter listens to an entire phrase (paragraph, etc.) and periodically translates during natural pauses. The simultaneous method should be used only if the sentence structure of the source language is parallel to english, the interpreter can easily imitate the interrogator's tone and attitude, and the interpreter is very fluent in both languages.

Vocalic considerations emphasize the interpreter needs to use interrogation content, tone of voice, inflection, and intent. He/she

should not inject any of his/her own personality or ideas.

Prexemic concerns focus on the physical arrangement of the three individuals. The preferred arrangement is to have the interrogator and source facing each ether with the interpreter behind the source. This improves the interrogator's control as he/she can simultaneously interact with the source and interpreter. This also discourages the source from fixating on the interpreter as a person.

When the interrogator first meets with the source, the source should be instructed to maintain eye contact with the interrogator. Eye contact (ecculesics) helps build a strong base of rapport between interrogator and source.

Kinesics deals with various types of body movements. Kinesics is especially important in situations when the source must look at the interpreter, such as map tracking for instance. During such times, the interpreter should imitate the kinesic behaviors of the interrogator as closely as possible. Otherwise, contradictory messages can be sent.

Prior to the interrogation, the interrogator should learn as much as possible about the nonverbal behavior norms of the source's home country. Knowledge of source nonverbal behaviors can become very important since nonverbal norms are uniquely grounded in each culture. Thus, the interrogator who is insensitive to source nonverbal norms may unknowingly send contradictory meanings.

Physical distance, body gestures, eye contact, pauses, and clothing, for instance, affect the nonverbal climate within which the interrogation takes place. Thus, the informed interrogator should be aware of prexemic, kinesic, ecculesic, vocalic, and objectic norms

of the source's native country.

There are over twenty approaches which can be used when constructing the question sequence and desired interpersonal climate of the interrogation. Each approach dictates definite behaviors which must be communicated, verbally and nonverbally, by the interrogator (and through his/her interpreter).

The most common, and most successful approach, is called the "direct approach". Ironically, the direct approach is frequently referred to as no approach at all. It merely involves asking questions in a straight forward manner. Due to its effectiveness, and simplicity, the direct approach should be used first.

Beyond the direct approach, the approaches vary considerably in intensity and complexity. The variety of approaches are exemplified in some of the following descriptions.

The "incentive approach" involve, rewarding the source for his/her cooperation. It is important to ensure the rewards serve to reinforce positive behavior.

The "emotional hate approach" focuses on the source's bitter feelings towards his/her superiors, fellow soldiers, unit or country. For example, this approach might be effective with a source who has been conscripted and forced into battle.

The "pride and ego down approach" is based on the interrogator attacking the source's sense of personal worth. For instance, questioning his/her ability as a soldier for letting him/herself be captured and how he/she might have negatively affected his/her unit and fellow soldiers.

The "file and dossier approach" is when the interrogator convinces

the source he/she already knows everything about the source. and just needs to find out some minor details. This approach is based on strategic exaggeration and manipulation of what little information the interrogator might have about the source.

Again, there are a wide variety of approaches and the aforementioned exemplify some of the common approaches. Each approach dictates different emphasis on interpersonal communication variables.

The interrogation process is a very complicated form of inter-personal communication. The process is further complicated when the interrogator and source are from different countries and do not share common communication norms. The process becomes even more complicated when the interrogator and source do not speak the same language and a third party is introduced to interpret. Such a situation is exemplified today with continued U.S. involvement in Central America.

The use of bilingual (english-spanish) interpreters, when used correctly, definitely enhances applied interpersonal communication in this cross-cultural context. As a professor of interpersonal communication, the author feels study of such interaction is beneficial as it serves to ground interpersonal theory in concrete terms (causes and effects). This type of application enhances his teaching and research efforts. The examples discussed in this paper are especially unique due to the complexity of the interpersonal exchanges described.

Notes

1. Field Manual 34-52, Intelligence Interrogation. Department of the
   Army (May, 1987), p. 1-0.

References

Boas, V. Language, Race and Culture. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

Brislin, R.W. Cross Cultural Encounters. New York: Pergamon Press, 1981.

Carrol, J.B. Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Casmir, F.L., ed. Intercultural and International Communication. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Casse, P. Training for the Cross Cultural Mind. Yarmouth: International Press, Inc., 1981

Gittler, J. Understanding Minority Groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1956.

Gudykunst, W.B. and Kim, Y.Y. Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication. Reading: Addison Wesley, 1984.

Hoijer, H. Language in Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Kohls, L.R. Developing Intercultural Awareness. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press Inc., 1981.

Mead, G.H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Porter, R.E. and Samovar, L.A. Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982.

Ruhly, S. Intercultural Communication. Chicago: Science Research Association, 1982.

Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E. and Jain, N.C. Understanding Intercultural Communication. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1981

Singer, M.R. Intercultural Communication: A Perceptual Approach. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987.

Smith, A.G., ed. Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.

Stewart, E.C. American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1972.

Gordon, 1985), and that people who are higher in instrumental (masculire) sex-role orientation are higher in trait argumentativeness than those who are high in expressive (feminine), androgynous, or undifferentiated sex-roles (Rancer & Die. is-Stewart, 1985). Recently Onyekwere, Rubin, and Infante (1987) found that high argumentatives are perceived as more competent communicators than low argumentatives, that there is greater communication satisfaction when interacting with high argumentatives, that high argumentatives are seen as more trustworthy, and that the situational factor of ego-involvement with the topic increases the motivation to argue of both high and low argumentatives.

Onyekwere, Rubin, and Infante also note that high argumentatives were "perceived as more appropriate and effective" possibly "due to higher motivational tendencies which often result in better performance, higher complexity of thought, and more appropriate social behaviors" (p. 22). The authors wisely note, however, that this conclusion is limited to argumentative situations, and cite Rubin (1985) in suggesting that in non-argumentative situations, "argumentative performance would be perceived as inappropriate or unrelated to the context" (p. 23). Consistent witn this interpretation, Waggenspack and Hensley (1987) found that "people seem to prefer associating with a nonargumentative person in situations which are low in conflict and nonaggressive" and that both men and women share preferences to "associate with argumentative or nonargumentative persons in various interpersonal situations (p. 1). Precisely what makes a situation argumentative or nonargumentative, however, is not indicated very clearly by either set of authors. Indeed, it is questionable that any situation is really nonargumentative. Analysis of conversational argumentation (Jacobs & Jackson, 1981, 1982; Jackson &

Jacobs, 1980, 1981; Jackson, Jacobs, Burrell, & Allen, 1986; Trapp and Hoff,
1985; Trapp, 1986), analysis of children's argumentation (O'Keefe and Benoit,
1982; Benoit, 1983, 1986), investigation of argument at the cognitive level
("argument$_0$": Hample, 1980, 1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1985, 1986), and contemporary
analysis of the nature of argumentation by argumentation theorists (Toulmin
(1958; Toulmin, Rieke, & Janik, 1984; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969;
Willard, 1983) all indicate that argumentation is pervasive throughout human
communication, not being limited to clear and obvious arguments since arguments
may be presented in a largely nonverbal fashion, they are characterized by an
understanding by the participants that they are engaged in an argument as much
or more than by their form or situation, and they are present in on-going
cognitive processing. This points out not just the difficulty in distinguishing
a n nargumentative situation from an argumentative one, it also indicates the
difficulty of maintaining a clear distinction between content oriented and
relationally oriented argumentation since argument is not always identified
by traditional logical forms.

Infante, Rancer, and their colleagues have done some interesting and in
many ways exemplary research which has yielded very intriguing results.
Unfortunately, however, their research is based on a very traditional and
questionable view of argumentation that stresses logic and stems from Cartesian
assumptions and dichotomies, rather than being based on an understanding of
contemporary argumentation theory and research. They seem to view argument
as formal and clearly distinct from relational aspects and situations in
communication, although they fail to clarify precisely what they mean by
"argument." Since a number of theoretical articles have worked to clarify

a number of senses of "argument," and extensive research has been done on
informal and cognitive aspects of argumentation, this lack of attention to
theoretical grounding in argumentation theory has been unfortunate. The
general direction that argumentation as a field has been taking roughly
fits Delia's (1970) argument that reasoning be "understood as based on
the natural tendency of the psychological field to maintain a coherent and
harmonious relationship among its affective, cognitive, and behavioral
elements" (p. 144). Although the research has taken varied directions, it
has largely followed Delia's call for rejection of Cartesian dichotomies
and categorization that separates cognition and emotion. The research on
argumentativeness clearly defies this trend, and by so doing yields
normative, pedagogical, and theoretical implications that are important
to critically examine.

NORMATIVE AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The preceding description and anal＿.＿ of the conceptualization and
research on argumentativeness has indicated a number of normative and
pedagogical implications: (1) success or failure of argumentation lies in
the perception of the arguer (2) argumentativeness apparently is a learned
skill as well as a trait (a theoretical paradox to be considered later)
(3) high trait argumentativeness is desirable in that it is correlated with
many positive attributes such as flexibility, interest, expertise, dynamism,
willingness to argue, argumentative skill, resistance to provocation to use
verbal aggression, motivation to argue, superiority as supervisors, competency
as communicators, producing of more communication satisfaction, being seen
as more trustworthy, and being more appropriate and effective in argumentative

situations (4) high trait argumentativeness has only a few undesirable

correlations such as verbosity and possibly limited desirability and

effectiveness in nonargumentative situations (although, importantly, the

research has not investigated this line of inquiry) and (5) high argumentative-

ness is associated with people having a masculine (instrumental) sex-role

orientation. All of this suggests that high argumentativeness is a very

desirable trait which people can acquire through training. Indeed, Infante's

new textbook (1988) appears to be an attempt to develop pedagogical materials

to provide such training.

Normative and pedagogical implications also are emerging from closely

related research on verbal aggressiveness (Infante & Wigley, 1986), which is

conceived of as having either a constructive or a destructive form (p. 62).

The conceptualization is that assertiveness and argumentativeness constitute a

constructive aggressiveness that produces satisfaction and enhancement of

interpersonal relationships, while hostility and verbal aggressiveness

constitute a destructive aggressiveness that produces interpersonal dissatisfac-

tion and relational deterioration (p. 62). Thus persons high in argumentative-

ness are thought to promote relational development and satisfaction, while

those high in verbal aggressiveness promote relational deterioration and

dissatisfaction.

Thus a value system for certain kinds of communicative behavior emerges

out of the descriptive research on argumentativeness and verbal aggression.

This value system also provides a pedagogical incentive to "correct" "bad"

communication behavior, which also happens to be largely non-masculine

behavior. On its surface it appears that "objective inquiry" has led to

descriptive results which in turn suggest normative and pedagogical implications. The line of inquiry into argumentativeness thus serves as an exemplar of how the field derives "ought" from "is" (see Searle, 1969, pp. 175-198; White, 1981; Johnson, 1987, pp. 205-212). The apparent value of these normative and pedagogical implications is that they appear to be based on an "objective inquiry" into communication.

At least two things are disturbing about the ability to derive normative implications from the descriptive research on argumentativeness. First, this suggests that the clear separation of "is" and "ought" breaks down, and with it any traditional notion of objectivity along with the rest of the Cartesian dichotomies (Searle, 1969; White, 1981; Johnson, 1987). Second, if the distinction breaks down in the "is" to "ought" direction, it may also break down in the "ought" to "is" direction. In large part our descriptive research results may stem from normative and pedagogical assumptions. We would be especially advised to critically examine research when it yields results which the field would desire, as does argumentativeness research. There is a strong possibility that underlying normative and pedagogical assumptions have influenced the conceptualization, measurement, and research which in turn yields results that "objectively" confirm the underlying normative and pedagogical assumptions. This cycle from normative to descriptive and back to normative appears to have occurred in argumentativeness research.

How and why argumentativeness research has generated normative/pedagogical implications is instructive. One reason the research has generated its normative/pedagogical implications is due to the choice of basing the conceptualization of argumentativeness on the traditional view of argumentation as something which is logical. Underlying the inquiry is a set of traditional

normative assumptions about argumentation that see it as positive, logical,
formal, issue-oriented, and separate from emotion and interpersonal relation-
ships: the presupposed clear boundaries between content and relationship,
logic-reason and emotion, and argument and personal attack function to protect
the positive, valued nature of argumentation. These normative assumptions
induce researchers to ignore questions about whether and how argumentation
and relational-emotional communication can interact. Whether argument can be
used to establish relational dominance and thereby attack the other person's
self-concept is a question that never arises given the inquiry's normative
assumptions, and the study of people who tend to respond to argumentative
situations in a relational-emotional way is bound to generate negative
evaluations of such a trait. A more fruitful line of inquiry might have been
to explore how people differ in the degree to which they see and use connected-
ness of content and relational issues in arguing. Such a line of inquiry would
of course have its own normative assumptions, but ones which would be based on
contemporary argumentation theory. The choice is not whether to have normative
assumptions that deeply underlie the basis for inquiry, but which normative
assumptions appear most reasonable and acceptable as starting points for inquiry.

A second reason for the inquiry's normative/pedagogical implications is due
to the assumption that argumentativeness can be seen as both trait and state
while remaining consistent with traditional argumentation assumptions. The
traditional argumentation assumptions clearly differentiate content (issue
oriented) communicative behavior from relational (personal verbal attack)
communication. The assumption that argumentativeness is a trait leads to an
inquiry into whether people differ in their tendency to respond to communicative
situations in an issue oriented, content way. Given the content/relationship

dichotomy, those with a low issue orientation are seen as failing to be able to argue effectively and having to resort to relational communication (personal attack), which is seen as illegitimate and ineffective argumentation. The apparent viability of the dichotomy and the view of the nature and value of the trait is strengthened by the view of argumentativeness as also being a state, recognizing that whether individuals approach arguments in specific situations is at least partially dependent on the individuals' perceptions of the probability and importance of success in that situation. Consequently, the observation that in various specific situations high argumentatives avoid argument or use relational-emotional communication to respond to argumentative situations cannot effectively be used to refute the dichotomy and trait claims. The inclusion of argumentativeness as a state, combined with the assumption that "legitimate" arguments do not attack the credibility of the source of opposition arguments (which is based on the assumption that argumentation is logical) functions to protect the content/relationship dichotomy and the view of argumentativeness as a trait and serves to generate negative evaluations of those who frequently respond relationally to argumentative situations.

A third reason for the inquiry's normative/pedagogical implications is the assumption that argumentativeness can be both a trait and a learned skill. Underlying the inquiry are two inconsistent metaphors: a mechanistic metaphor which informs the trait perspective and an organic, developmental metaphor which informs the skills perspective. Both of the basic metaphors of functionalist research are employed in the inquiry, and this results in an inconsistency (see Putnam, 1982). Adding the organic, developmental metaphor to the mechanistic metaphor enables the inquiry to more readily generate pedagogical implications even though there is considerable tension between the view of argumentativeness as a stable personality trait and argumentativeness as a skill which can be

developed.

Although research on argumentativeness appears to confirm the centuries-old "commonsense knowledge" that successful arguers enjoy arguing and are adept at remaining "cool and rational" during an argument, while others do not share this inclination and suffer the consequences of "emotion and irrationality" when unable to avoid an argument, the empirical research itself is based on normative assumptions that underlie this Cartesian "commonsense knowledge." Thus normative judgements have been used which inform the direction of inquiry and the results of descriptive research which in turn support and extend the original normative judgements. This is not a criticism unique to argumentativeness research, however. Because the Cartesian separation of organism and environment, of objectivity and subjectivity, of mind and body, of reason and emotion, etc., breaks down, this interpenetration of the descriptive and the normative/pedagogical exists to varying degrees in all empirical (and non-empirical) research.[2] Our task is to employ careful criticism to uncover its existence and question underlying normative/pedagogical assumptions in order to continue inquiry with the most reasonable and acceptable normative assumptions available to our contemporary understanding.[3]

NOTES

[1]Indeed, in developing the content/relationship distinction Watzlawick,
Beavin, and Jackson (1967, pp. 51-54) note the interrelationship of content
and relationship, with relational communication performing a metacommunicative
function for content communication.

[2]See Johnson (1987), Lakoff (1987) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980) for an
emerging epistemology that combines realism and pragmatism while rejecting
Cartesian assumptions. As Johnson notes (pp. 205-212), however, the rejection
of Cartesian objectivism does not mean the rejection of realism.

[3]I want to thank Joe Scudder for helpful comments on an earlier version of
this paper.

18

21

REFERENCES

Benoit, P.J. (1984). Extended arguments in children's discourse. Journal of
    the American Forensic Association, 20, 72-89.

Benoit, P.J. (in press). Relationship arguments: An interactionist elaboration
    of speech acts. Argumentation: An international journal on reasoning.

Delia, J.G. (1970). The logic fallacy, cognitive theory, and the enthymeme:
    A search for the foundations of reasoned discourse. Quarterly journal
    of speech, 56, 140-148.

Frost, J.H., & Wilmot, W.W. (1978). Interpersonal conflict. Dubuque, IA:
    Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

Hample, D. (1980). A cognitive view of argument. Journal of the American
    Forensic Association, 16, 151-158.

Hample, D. (1981). The cognitive context of argument. Western journal of
    speech communication, 45, 148-158.

Hample, D. (1982a). Dual coding, reasoning and fallacies. Journal of the
    American Forensic Association, 19, 59-78.

Hample, D. (1982b). Modeling argument. In J.R. Cox and C.A. Willard,(Eds.),
    Advances in argumentation theory and research. Carbondale, IL: Southern
    Illinois University Press.

Hample, D. (1985). Refinements on the cognitive model of argument: Concreteness,
    involvement and group scores. Western journal of speech communication, 49,
    267-285.

Hample, D. (1986). Logic, conscious and unconscious. Western journal of
    speech communication, 50, 24-40.

Infante, D.A. (1981). Trait argumentativeness as a predictor of communicative
    behavior in situations requiring argument. Central states speech journal,
    32, 265-272.

Infante, D.A. (1982). The argumentative student in the speech communication
    classroom: An investigation and implications. Communication education,
    31, 141-148.

Infante, D.A. (1985). Inducing women to be argumentative: Source credibility
    effects. Journal of applied communication research, 13, 33-44.

Infante, D.A. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and
    measure. Communication monographs, 53, 61-69.

Infante, D.A. (1988). Arguing constructively. Prospect Heights, IL:
    Waveland Press, Inc.

Infante, D.A., & Gorden, W.I. (1985). Superiors' argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness as predictors of subordinates' satisfaction. Human communication research, 12, 117-125.

Infante, D.A., & Rancer, A.S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. Journal of personality assessment, 46, 72-80.

Infante, D.A., Treoing, J.D., Shepherd, P.E., & Seeds, D.E. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. Southern speech communication journal, 50, 67-77.

Infante, D.A., & Wigley, C.J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. Communication monographs, 53, 61-69.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1980). Structure of conversational argument: Pragmatic bases for the enthymeme. Quarterly journal of speech, 66, 251-265.

Jackson, S. & Jacobs, S. (1981). The collaborative production of proposals in conversational argument and persuasion: A study of disagreement regulation. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18, 77-90.

Jackson, S., Jacobs, S., Burrell, N., & Allen, A. (1986). Characterizing ordinary argument: Substantive and methodological issues. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23, 42-57.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1981). Argument as a natural category: The routine grounds for arguing in conversation. Western journal of speech communication, 45, 118-132.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1982). Conversational argument: A discourse analytic approach. In J.R. Cox and C.A. Willard (Eds.), Advances in argumentation theory and research. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lanigan, R.L. (1982). Semiotic phenomenology: A theory of human communication praxis. Journal of applied communication research, 10, 62-73.

O'Keefe, B.J., & Benoit, P.J. (1982). Children's arguments. In J.R. Cox and C.A. Willard (Eds.), Advances in argumentation theory and research. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

O'Keefe, D.J. (1977). Two concepts of argument. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 13, 121-128.

21

O'Keefe, D.J. (1982). The concepts of argument and arguing. In J.R. Cox and
    C.A. Willard (Eds.), <u>Advances in argumentation theory and research</u>.
    Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Onyekwere, E.O., Rubin, R.B., & Infante, D.A. (1987, Nov.). Communication
    competence in arguments as a function of argumentativeness and ego-involvement.
    Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association,
    Boston, MA.

Pearson, J.C. (1985). <u>Gender and communication</u>. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). <u>The new rhetoric: A treatise on
    argumentation</u> (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, trans.). Notre Dame, IN: University
    of Notre Dame Press (Original work published in 1958).

Putnam, L.L. (1982). Paradigms for organizational communication research:
    An overview and synthesis. <u>Western journal of speech communication</u>, 46,
    192-206.

Rancer, A.S., Baukus, R.A., & Infante, D.A. (1985). Relations between
    argumentativeness and belief structures about arguing. <u>Communication
    education</u>, 34, 37-47.

Rancer, A.S., & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1985). The influence of sex and sex-role
    orientation on trait argumentativeness. <u>Journal of personality assessment</u>,
    49, 69-70.

Rancer, A.S., & Infante, D.A. (1981). Relations between motivation to argue
    and the argumentativeness of adversaries. <u>Communication quarterly</u>, 33,
    209-218.

Rubin, R.B. (1985). The validity of the communication competency assessment
    instrument. <u>Communication monographs</u>, 52, 173-185.

Schultz, B. (1982). Argumentativeness: Its effect in group decision-making and
    its role in leadership perception. <u>Communication quarterly</u>, 30, 368-375.

Searle, J.R. (1969). <u>Speech acts</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S.E. (1958). <u>The uses of argument</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University
    Press.

Toulmin, S.E., Rieke, R., & Janik, A. (1984). <u>An introduction to reasoning</u>.
    New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Trapp, R. (1986). The role of disagreement in interactional argument. <u>Journal
    of the American Forensic Association</u>, 23, 23-41.

Trapp, R., & Hoff, N. (1985). A model of serial argument in interpersonal
    relationships. <u>Journal of the American Forensic Association</u>, 22, 1-11.

22

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J.H., & Jackson, D.D. (1967). <u>Pragmacics of human communication</u>. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Waggenspack, B.M., & Hensley, W.E. (1987, Nov.). Influence of the argumentativeness trait in interpersonal relationship situations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Wenzel, J.W. (1979). Three senses of argument. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association.

White, M. (1981). <u>What is and ought to be done: An essay on ethics and epistemology</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willard, C.A. (1983). <u>Argumentation and the social grounds of knowledge</u>. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.