

THE DIRECTIVE AS A BASIS OF ALL COMMUNICATION: A SURVEY AND
ANALYSIS OF SELECTED LITERATURE

by 149

NADYNE A. HENGEN

B. A. E., Wayne State College, 1963

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2603
R 4
1967
H 371
C. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	3
Need for the Study	4
DEFINITION BY STRUCTURE	6
Traditional Grammar	6
Structural Grammar	9
Transformational Grammar	12
DEFINITION BY INTENTION	16
Verbal Suggestion	17
Explicit Directive	20
Implicit Directive	24
Positive or Negative Directives	28
Counter Directives	32
DEFINITION BY RESPONSE	35
The Demand	35
The Mand	43
CONDITIONS FOR PHRASING THE DIRECTIVE	50
Conditions for Suggestion	50
Conditions for Each Category	55
ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	64
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	71
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

INTRODUCTION

One of the major hypotheses of this paper has been the belief expressed by men such as Campbell and Hepler that inherent in all communication is an element of persuasion. The fundamental test of the degree of persuasion existent in a communication situation would be how nearly the receiver modifies or strengthens his behavior to conform to the expectations of the source. When some relevant change in behavior occurs, persuasion has taken place.¹ The process of persuasion has been considered a receiver-centered process; consequently, sensitive writers and speakers attempt to predict possible responses to their messages. The problem of determining how a receiver will react to a message has intrigued scholars from classical times. "In Greece, rules for successful oratory and persuasion were formulated; in Rome, the effects of political oratory were studied on a somewhat orderly fashion"; and in the Middle Ages religious leaders pondered the impact of language.²

According to Campbell and Hepler any communicator presumably should be concerned with determining what responses are most likely to occur. Often the reactions which the source predicts most likely to occur are not the ones he wants to occur. As a result, the source must try to change these responses. He should do this by selecting and ordering his message in an attempt to increase the probability of a preferred response. They explain that as the source becomes more concerned with predicting the receiver's

¹James H. Campbell and Hal W. Hepler, ed., Dimensions in Communications (Belmont, California, 1965), pp. 1-4.

²William Albig, Modern Public Opinion (New York, 1956), p. 96.

response, the communication will likely become more persuasive.³

Although the communicator may believe that he should be sincere, he will also want to be deliberate and analytical in his attempt to communicate effectively with others. Whether a communicator is ethical or unethical as he adopts certain means of communication is a moral problem which is beyond the scope of this paper.

Although the problem may not be consciously faced in many communication situations, a major problem for a communicator is the phrasing of his message so that it will increase the likelihood that the receiver's response will be the preferred one. One aspect of this problem is message structure, the syntactical problem of obtaining the desired response.

Verbal messages, of course, may vary from a single utterance to an extended discourse of many related utterances. It has generally been assumed by those analyzing messages that complex messages may be reduced to single utterances or statements. As Ogilvie explains, such "reduced messages" are frequently referred to as the central idea, main assertion, statement of the question, thesis, etc. The syntactical arrangement of these reduced messages has varied from imperative to declarative to interrogative forms.⁴

If there is an element of persuasion in any communication, then the basic syntactical arrangement of a "reduced message" would be the directive or imperative form of utterance. Welden has taken the position that a communicator may phrase his intent to effect "as a directive—an order to

³Campbell and Hepler, p. 1.

⁴Mardel Ogilvie, Teaching Speech in the High School: Principles and Practices (New York, 1961), p. 126.

behave in some specific way."⁵ However, he points out that "a relatively small proportion of messages are phrased as orders or directives."⁶ Instead, the directive is usually implicit within an assertive or interrogative form of the message.

Purpose of Study

The tentative hypothesis for this study was developed from this theoretical perspective. Namely, it is hypothesized that within any communication there is a directive, either explicit or implicit. That is to say, that as a source seeks to modify behavior, it has been hypothesized that he has a certain "directive" "in mind." If he intends to affect behavior, his message contains an order, a directive which has the structure of the imperative sentence when it is explicit.

Having made this hypothesis about communication, it then becomes essential to arrive at an understanding of what the literature acknowledges about the directive in messages. Therefore, the purposes of this study are: (1) to provide a classification and general description of the definitions of the "directive" that are found in selected literature, and (2) to provide information about the conditions to be considered when phrasing the directive.

To accomplish this study, a review of selected literature contained in the library of Kansas State University was conducted. Much literature was also obtained from numerous libraries in Nebraska by means of interlibrary

⁵Terry Welden, "Communication Decisions" (paper read at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, Summer 1966), p. 3.

⁶Welden, p. 2.

loans. This study deals with specific treatments of the directive found in selected literature on interpersonal communications. The literature reviewed might be classified as: (1) grammar literature, (2) persuasion literature, (3) general speech literature, (4) psychology literature and (5) other relevant literature. The last four types have been combined to provide greater clarity of definition. The sources selected for use in this study were identified primarily through the card catalogue, various prepared bibliographies, cross references, and available indexes to speech journals such as the Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech.

Need for the Study

Although some of the literature does acknowledge and discuss the use of the directive in messages, these discussions contain considerable variation in the definitions of the directive. Along with the need for a description of the definitions is the need to determine what this literature reveals about the conditions calling for a particular structure in phrasing the directive. In order to satisfy these needs, this paper proposes to answer the following questions: (1) How do the authors of the literature reviewed define the directive? (2) What common link, if any exists among these definitions? (3) What are the conditions to be considered in giving the directive?

It is hoped that some of the answers to these questions will benefit persons attempting to improve communication. For after all, persuasion often inspires men to progress and to use new ideas and truths. An example of this is the story of penicillin. Although Dr. Alexander Fleming discovered the drug in 1928, it was never used until a dozen years later when Dr.

Fleming was flown to Cairo where he saved Winston Churchill, who had a severe case of pneumonia. It is possible that thousands might have been saved if someone had aroused an interest in penicillin when it was first discovered. "No incident can more dramatically portray the great positive function which should be served by men skilled in the art of persuasion."⁷

People in many areas of communication are involved in various aspects of analyzing the process of communication. There are many needs for study and research in communication. One need, at the present time, is for a review and analysis of the literature describing the directive as one possible aspect of communication. There is a need to know about the descriptions of the directive, and the conditions calling for a particular phrasing of the directive. This type of study will possibly reveal a field fertile for empirical research to discover more about the relationships of the directive to communication.

⁷Robert T. Oliver and Rupert L. Cortright, New Training for Effective Speech (New York, 1958), p. 436.

DEFINITION BY STRUCTURE

According to the hypothesis of this paper, a persuasive message is based on a directive, an order for a particular kind of response. This hypothesis then implies that a command, an order, or request underlies all communication. This chapter is limited to a consideration of the various descriptions of the types of sentences and their relationships to directives as used in the English language to give verbal messages. The information deals with the various points of view presented in the grammar literature where sentence structure is discussed.

Since there has been considerable upheaval and change in what is conventionally considered to be grammar, it is useful to compare and contrast some of the various grammars. There are three main types that shall be distinguished: traditional grammar, structural grammar, and transformational grammar.

Traditional Grammar

Most people are familiar with the first type. The traditional grammar dates back two thousand years to the time when a description of Latin was made. In 100 B. C. Dionysius Thrax wrote his influential Grammar, which is a description of Greek. Remmius Palaemon in the first century A. D. translated this work into Latin. This grammar and Priscian's Latin grammar in the sixth century A. D. have become two of the models for the order and terminology of prescriptive grammar right up to the present time. During the thirteenth century Roger Bacon wrote a grammar in which the grammar of all languages was considered nearly the same. Then during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries languages, such as English, French, Italian, etc.,

were also described by rules imposed from Latin. English grammarians such as Bishop Lowth and Campbell who subscribed to these views defined the character of English grammar.⁸ Because traditional grammar tended to latinize, it was not able to cope with many things in English. Latin had six overt tense markers, but in English there are only two tenses, present and past. In Latin an infinitive could not be split because it was one word. However, in English the infinitive has two words and often has been split. In Latin, "I didn't see nobody," literally meant, "I saw somebody." In other words, two negatives made a positive, but in English this has not necessarily been true.⁹

Essentially, traditional grammar prescribes rules for the language. These rules often seem to rely on intuition or whim. Roberts maintains that much of what is still presented is largely contradictory and often absurd. He says that often pupils are not able to understand the grammar because it is not understandable.¹⁰

Traditionally, four main sentence types have been defined. It is important to note that the idea or meaning of the sentence provides the basis for determining all four of these traditional definitions. Following is the traditional classification of the four types: (1) Imperative sentence. "The imperative, . . . , embodies command; its subject is usually unexpressed

⁸ Francis P. Dinneen, An Introduction to General Linguistics (New York, 1967), pp. 94-166.

⁹ Max Smith (Notes from class in Modern English Grammar, Summer 1967).

¹⁰ Paul Roberts, The Roberts English Series, A Linguistic Program (New York, 1966), p. 17.

but understood."¹¹ In other words, an imperative sentence, e.g., "Run," "Stop," will have only a single verb and the subject is understood as you.

In some imperative sentences you is expressed as the subject. These are some examples of possible imperative forms: "Study," "Study your math now, please," "Jane, study now," and "You study your math Jane, please." Bryant also explains that a "sentence may be imperative in idea while not conforming to the imperative pattern."¹² She gives an example something like this: "Will you please water the lawn?"

(2) Exclamatory sentence. "The exclamatory sentence expresses strong emotion in the form of an exclamation or cry."¹³ One example is, "What a good speaker she is!" A sentence can become exclamatory by the intonation in spoken English and by the exclamation mark used in written English.

(3) Interrogative sentence. "The interrogative sentence asks a question."¹⁴ Normally, this sentence is followed by a question mark. Some examples are: "What shall I do?" "Which student won the prize?"

(4) Declarative sentence. "The declarative sentence states a fact."¹⁵ Most sentences which are written are declarative and usually end with a period. The sentences defining the declarative sentence are examples of this type.

¹¹ Margaret M. Bryant, A Functional English Grammar (Boston, 1959), p. 99.

¹² Bryant, p. 100.

¹³ Bryant, p. 100.

¹⁴ Bryant, p. 101.

¹⁵ Bryant, p. 101.

Structural Grammar

Because of many weaknesses, traditional grammar was a fairly easy prey for the linguists who became more interested in the structure of grammar around 1910. As the linguists turned their attention to the structure of present-day languages, they worked out a grammar often called structural grammar.¹⁶

Structural grammar is presented in books by linguists such as Archibald Hill, Charles C. Fries, George Yegor, and Henry Lea Smith. These men emphasize that spoken English is the language basis which must be represented by letters of some sort. Grammar then essentially becomes a description of the phonology, the morphology, and the syntax of English, i.e., sounds and ways of combining them. These men also have a different idea about correctness. The earlier grammarians seem to believe that correctness can be determined by reason and logic; that it is absolute in some way. But the structuralists usually accept any structure as correct if it is generally accepted by a particular dialect area.

The linguists have exposed many contradictions and weaknesses of the traditional categories and definitions. They have pointed out the weakness of basing definitions on meaning or presumed meaning. According to Fries, "the more one works with the records of actual speech the more impossible it appears to describe the requirements of sentences (for example) in terms of meaning content."¹⁷

¹⁶Robarts, p. T7.

¹⁷Charles C. Fries, "Meaning and Linguistic Analysis," Readings in Applied English Linguistics, ed. Harold Byron Allen (New York, 1964), p. 102.

Frequently, traditional grammar makes the assumption that an utterance must contain a subject and a predicate to be a sentence. This definition actually excludes the type of sentence classified as imperative. However, as indicated above traditionalists usually insist that the subject, you, is understood. But, "we can assume ellipsis only when there is no doubt about what has been omitted."¹⁸ There are no criteria available in such a definition to determine what the ellipsis would be in "Shut the door." These are some possibilities:

(You must) shut the door.

(You may catch cold if you do not) shut the door.

(You should have) shut the door.

(You might) shut the door.

Therefore, Fries claims "that a sentence is a single free utterance minimum or expanded; i.e., that it is 'free' in the sense that it is not included in any larger structure by means of any grammatical device."¹⁹

Then Fries classifies utterances according to the response made to these independent utterances. By means of this type of analysis he derives three categories for sentences.

(1) Greetings, Calls, Questions. These utterances are followed only by oral responses. Greetings are regularly followed by a repetition of the preceding utterance, such as: (utterance) "Good morning," (response) "Good morning." The calls evoke a limited list of replies consisting of a single word or a short word group. Here is an example: (utterance) "Mom!"

¹⁸ Paul Roberts, Understanding Grammar (New York, 1954), p. 25.

¹⁹ Charles Carpenter Fries, The Structure of English (New York, 1952), p. 25.

(response) "What?" Questions, which usually elicit some form of oral response, make up the largest group in this category.²⁰

(2) Requests or Commands. These utterances are followed by some action response so regularly "that they can be said to be directed to eliciting that kind of response."²¹ Oral responses are very infrequent.

(3) Statements. This category consists of "sentences that are regularly directed to eliciting attention to continuous discourse, . . ."²² Sometimes an oral response follows, but the response is very limited and the placement of the response is highly unpredictable.

These utterances are analyzed in terms of sentence patterns. Norman Stageberg lists the basic sentence patterns most frequently used in a structural study of syntax. These patterns and examples of each are as follows:

- Pattern 1: N be Adj
The school is new.
- Pattern 2: N be UW
John is here.
- Pattern 3: N¹ be N¹
My mother is a teacher.
- Pattern 4: N InV
Cats purr.
- Pattern 5: N¹ TrV N²
He bought a gun.
- Pattern 6: N¹ TrV N² N³
He sold the girl a ticket.
- Pattern 7: N¹ TrV N² N²
They chose Cathy leader.

²⁰Fries, pp. 42-47.

²¹Fries, p. 47.

²²Fries, p. 50.

Pattern 8: N LV Adj.
The dog seems old.

Pattern 9: N¹ LV N¹
My brother became a teacher.²³

Although structural grammar made other contributions which are not so relevant to this paper it had some shortcomings, too. Roberts explains that it set up rules that made it hopelessly complex; therefore, it could not solve the problems of language description and language learning.²⁴ For example, Chomsky points out three cases in which phrase structure grammars proved to be inadequate. He discusses the case of conjunction, discontinuous elements, and the active-passive relationship.²⁵ Another limitation of the structural grammar was the frequent failure to recognize when the traditional grammar was basically sound.

Transformational Grammar

So an inevitable reaction against the structural linguistics came during the 1950's in the form of a transformational grammar. Many bitter disputes took place between these two groups; and, as a result, much of the common ground they shared was overlooked. Transformationalists supported the criticisms of traditional grammar mentioned previously, but they considered these obvious.²⁶

Instead they attempted to determine what the structure of language was

²³ An Introductory English Grammar (New York, 1965), pp. 168-186.

²⁴ Roberts, The Roberts English Series, p. T8.

²⁵ Noam A. Chomsky, Syntactic Structures (The Netherlands, 1957), pp. 41-48.

²⁶ Roberts, The Roberts English Series, p. T8.

that it could be learned. They point out that people do not memorize sentences to use. Many of the sentences given have never been used before. However, these new sentences can easily be understood. How can people produce these sentences?

The transformationalists argue that humans obviously learn a way for generating sentences according to their needs. Thus, grammar is a procedure for creating new sentences.²⁷

In Syntactic Structures, Chomsky explains that supplementary rules must be added to the phrase structure rules. These rules he calls transformational rules, which are to operate "on a given string or set of strings with a given constituent structure and convert it into a new string with a new, derived constituent structure."²⁸ So now, to the transformationalists the grammar of English is thought to be a small finite set of basic phrase structures called kernel sentences. Every other sentence of the language can be derived by performing one or more transformations upon the underlying strings of the kernel sentences. Transformational grammar consists of three parts: (1) Phrase structure rules, (2) Transformational rules, and (3) Morphophonemic rules.

According to Chomsky, through this transformational grammar "we find that the kernel consists of simple, declarative, active sentences . . . , and that all other sentences can be described more simply as transforms."²⁹ Ralph Goodman explains that one or more of the following functions can be

²⁷Roberts, The Roberts English Series, pp. T8-T9.

²⁸Chomsky, pp. 41-48.

²⁹Chomsky, p. 80.

performed by a transformation: (a) "It may rearrange elements in a string." (b) "It may add elements to a string." (c) "It may delete elements."

Example: you + will + V = You will go. Transform: V = Go. (You and will are deleted.)³⁰

This example of the transform of a kernel sentence into an imperative sentence provides us with a new concept. As stated previously, the traditional definition of the imperative contained a subject, you, that was understood. This has already been shown to be a misleading way to describe the structure of the sentence. However, Lees states that this intuitive perception of the imperative form was correct in quite a literal sense at that. According to his articles, it has been convenient to formulate the rule for generating an imperative from a modal sentence containing will. This would make it simple also to generate such an echo-question sentence as: "Open the window, will you?" The actual transformation which generates the imperative operates only upon will-sentences. The modal is simply deleted, thus: You will open the window --- You open the window. A later optional rule allows you to delete the subject.³¹

From this discussion of transformational grammar, comes the necessary information about the structure of the three sentence types which transformationalists consider more central to the structure of the language. The declarative sentence may be a kernel sentence or a transform of a kernel sentence. Interrogative and imperative sentences are generated from kernel

³⁰ Ralph Goodman, "Transformational Grammar," An Introductory English Grammar, by Norman C. Stageberg (New York, 1965), pp. 348-349.

³¹ Robert B. Lees, "Transformation Grammar and the Fries Framework," and "Some Neglected Aspects of Parsing," Readings in Applied English Linguistics, ed. Harold Bryon Allen (New York, 1964), pp. 141-142, p. 152.

sentences, too. Previous discussion has explained how the imperative is derived from kernel sentences. For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to indicate the transformations necessary to derive various interrogative sentences. The traditional definition provides a satisfactory method of identifying the interrogative sentences.

This has completed a review of three grammars, the reasons for subsequent change, and their respective treatment of sentence types. Although their means of analyzing sentence structure differ, they seem to complement each other significantly. We need to draw together the following definitions about the imperative: (1) Traditionally, the imperative expresses a command or request. The subject, *you*, is usually understood. (2) Structurally, Fries defines the request as "those single free utterances that are regularly followed by 'action' responses."³² (3) The transformational grammar demonstrates that the imperative or request is derived from kernel sentences.

As mentioned previously, definitions one and three express similar views about the way to describe the structure of the imperative sentence. In a sentence such as "Open the door," they would explain respectively that the subject you is either understood or has been deleted. Consequently, both definitions would produce the same related sentence, "You open the door." However, definition two by Fries presents a different point of view. He explains that a sentence can only be labeled imperative if it is followed consistently by action responses.

³²Fries, p. 47.

DEFINITION BY INTENTION

This chapter presents relevant material pertaining to definitions of the directive that are based on the intentions of the speaker. As the source prepares his message, he ought to investigate ways to persuade the receiver to accept his message and make the preferred response. As he prepares his message, many authors advocate that he should analyze the usefulness of suggestion. At this point, the term suggestion will be summarized as an effort to induce the receiver to make an immediate and perhaps uncritical response. This method of winning a desired response seems to depend primarily on the purposes or intentions of the speaker. It is one means of directing behavior that is frequently discussed in the general speech and persuasion literature, and other relevant literature.

In much of the selected speech and persuasion literature verbal suggestion is divided into four categories: direct, indirect, positive or negative, and counter. Both the direct or explicit category and the indirect or implicit category are then commonly subdivided into positive or negative suggestion. For purposes of clarity, the direct and indirect categories will be discussed separately from positive or negative categories. Statements found in the literature about the directive as a means of suggestion will be recorded in an appropriate category. After the information has been accumulated and categorized, all of the statements in one division will be described and analyzed. This categorization should clarify what the literature says about the directive in direct suggestion, the directive in indirect suggestion, and the directive in counter suggestion. Within that description sometimes it will be possible to determine what grammatical structures are used in the literature to give the directive.

Verbal Suggestion

At this point, suggestion as a possible means of persuasion will be examined by means of some descriptions offered in the literature. Much of the later understanding about the process of suggestion seems to stem from the early work of Leonard Doob. In 1935, he made a distinction between direct, indirect, positive, and negative suggestion. In his early book, Propaganda; its Psychology and Technique, he attributes some of his conclusions about the categories of suggestion to the classic work of Boris Sidis, The Psychology of Suggestion. However, Doob points out that the earlier distinction between direct and indirect suggestion is not quite the same as the one he advocates. Instead "immediate" suggestion as defined by Sidis resembles Doob's concept of direct suggestion.³³

Doob defines suggestion from a psychological point of view. He explains that when objects or persons stimulate a person in some way, this becomes a stimulus-situation for that person. Then he goes on to explain suggestion in the following way:

Suggestion results from the manipulation of stimulus-situations in such a way that, through the consequent arousal of pre-existing related attitudes there occurs within the mental field a new integration which would not have occurred under different stimulus-situations.³⁴

Young defines suggestion "as a form of symbol-communication by words, pictures, or some similar medium inducing acceptance of the symbol without any self-evident or logical ground for its acceptance."³⁵ Minnick defines

³³New York, 1935, pp. 55-59.

³⁴Doob, Propaganda, pp. 52-54.

³⁵Kimball Young, Social Psychology (New York, 1944), p. 110.

suggestion as "the effort to induce a person to respond without reflection. It is aimed at setting off emotional impulses or habits."³⁶ Oliver offers a similar definition. Suggestion means "that an idea is stated in such a manner that its acceptance is sought without analysis or consideration."³⁷ In order to reach their conclusion about suggestion, Brembeck and Howell use the definitions stated by Doob and Young. They emphasize "that pre-existing attitudes and the proper manipulation of stimulus-situations are of major importance in suggestion and that suggestion tends to short-circuit the more critical and logical considerations of the problem."³⁸

Although Dunlap does not specifically define suggestion, he does explain that a person must be made to think an idea without conflict, before he can be made to accept that idea.³⁹

Bryant and Wallace claim that "suggestion is the process in which a stimulus or an idea works in the margin of attention and provokes a response—the acceptance of an idea or action."⁴⁰ They discuss the idea that suggestions can be given through materials and language. One method of giving the suggestion through language deals specifically with the directive. They describe the directive as "a method of suggestion in which

³⁶ Wayne C. Minnick, The Art of Persuasion (Boston, 1957), p. 60.

³⁷ Robert Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech (New York, 1957), p. 141.

³⁸ Winston Lamont Brembeck and William S. Howell, Persuasion: A Means of Social Control (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1952), p. 166.

³⁹ Knight Dunlap, Civilized Life: The Principles and Applications of Social Psychology (Baltimore, 1934), p. 356.

⁴⁰ Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (New York, 1953), p. 337.

a speaker explicitly tells his audience what ideas to accept or reject and what conduct to follow or avoid. He may give the directive in two ways, directly or obliquely."⁴¹

This definition seems to be somewhat inconsistent because it claims that the speaker explicitly states what to accept or reject. Then it goes on to state that this explicit directive may be given directly or obliquely. As stated previously, this paper generally assumes that a directive can be given directly or indirectly. It does not seem logical for the source to be explicit and still give the directive indirectly or obliquely. According to the other literature, it would be feasible to give the directive directly and still be explicit, but it does not seem possible to give the directive obliquely if the suggestion must remain explicit.

Another author, Winans, explains that when a person acts without reflection because of an external prompting, he is acting upon suggestion. He states that the term implies both direct and indirect language. "In technical usage a direct command is considered suggestion."⁴²

As Crocker discusses persuasion, he claims that persuasion is accomplished either by suggestion or by deliberation. He explains suggestion in the following way:

We are told by psychologists that every idea of an action will result in that action unless hindered by an impeding idea or physical action. Suggestion is based on this law. We may suggest to the listener an idea which will result in an action unless deliberation takes place. It is impossible

⁴¹ Bryent and Wallace, p. 337.

⁴² James A. Winans, Speech-Making (New York, 1938), p. 286.

for us to wait for proof in many situations; we have to take someone's word that what we are going to do will be all right. Suggestion usually results in immediate action.⁴³

Dietrich and Brooks describe suggestion "as the process of establishing an idea more or less indirectly, usually in the margin or fringes of attention."⁴⁴ This definition emphasizes the indirectness of the process of establishing an idea in the marginal fields of attention of the receiver so that habitual responses can be set off. If an idea is directly established, they apparently would not define it as suggestion.

In summary, these definitions of suggestion seem to consistently describe suggestion in one principal way. Suggestion is frequently described from a psychological point of view. In other words, the speaker needs to manipulate the stimulus-situation in such a way that only related attitudes are aroused. This controlled situation is then said to be likely to induce acceptance. When using suggestion an idea is stated in such a way that contrary thoughts are excluded from consideration in the mind of the receiver. This process leads the receiver to the desired response with little analytical consideration. However, two of these descriptions insist that suggestion can be only an indirect process, rather than direct or indirect.

Explicit Directive

As the literature focuses on the intentions of the speaker using

⁴³ Lionel Crocker, Public Speaking for College Students (New York, 1941), p. 319.

⁴⁴ John E. Dietrich and Keith Brooks, Practical Speaking for the Technical Man (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958), p. 173.

suggestion, it separates verbal suggestion into the five classifications of suggestion mentioned previously; direct, indirect, positive, negative, and counter. Information describing the first category will be presented at this point.

Direct suggestion, according to Brembeck and Howell, is quite explicit and usually seeks immediate action.

This enables the individual to perceive the suggestor's immediate aim, for it comes in an explicit, straight-forward manner. It says "Buy war bonds," "See America first," "Let's put an end to the pilfering along the Potomac," "Drive safely, for the life you save may be your own," and so on. Usually couched in "loaded words," the direct suggestion generally seeks acceptance in a more immediate manner than does the more lengthy logical considerations of courses of action or grounds for belief.⁴⁵

Oliver also considers direct suggestion as an explicit command designed to elicit action or win belief by inducing the receiver to instantly make the desired response.

Direct suggestion is explicit command. It is an order to be obeyed, such as: "Halt!" "Forward, march!" or "Shoulder arms!" The teacher says, "Copy the questions"; the parent says, "Pick up your toys"; the persuasive speaker says: "Turn the rascals out!" "Pay as you go!" . . .⁴⁶

In The Art of Persuasion, Minnick claims that "when one addresses a straight-forward plea to an intensely preoccupied audience, the communication is called direct suggestion."⁴⁷ To clarify his assumption, he explains that when a revivalist pleads, "Won't you come forward and acknowledge your

⁴⁵ Brembeck and Howell, p. 168.

⁴⁶ Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, p. 144.

⁴⁷ Minnick, p. 61.

God, and ask forgiveness for your sins?" he is using direct suggestion.⁴⁸

Bryant and Wallace state that the usual form of the direct suggestion is the command. They claim that the forthright directive should be used when the receiver is ready to hear it. Some of their examples are: "Accept this," "Reject that."⁴⁹ When the audience is set for the action, the suggestion might be given immediately and directly. Winans gives this example of suggestion: "Sign here." He explains that the less resistance on the part of the hearer, the more direct may be the suggestion.⁵⁰ Crocker explains that action may be suggested directly to the listeners. Then he gives examples such as; "Go to the corner drugstore and buy a bottle of Blister's Mouthwash." He goes on to explain that a speaker can use direct suggestion on himself to master stage fright by telling himself, "I have nothing to be afraid of," "I have a good speech."⁵¹

Young explains that direct suggestion may often be found in advertising, where such things as status, sex, or thrift are obviously appealed to.⁵² This category is discussed as direct statements, devoid of argument by Dunlap.⁵³

Doob defines direct suggestion as a situation in which a listener realizes the immediate aim of the source. When this type of suggestion is

⁴⁸ Minnick, p. 61.

⁴⁹ Bryant and Wallace, p. 337.

⁵⁰ Winans, pp. 286-303.

⁵¹ Crocker, pp. 320-330.

⁵² Young, pp. 110-111.

⁵³ Dunlap, pp. 357-358.

successful, the listener will be aware of the aim and related attitudes which are aroused. This stimulus-situation may or may not result in the desired response.⁵⁴

In Public Opinion and Propaganda Doob elaborates on the effects of the various categories of propaganda which must be designed to win action. To indicate the action they seek, propagandists often give a straight-forward command. Some possible commands are: "Buy bonds," "Vote the straight Republican ticket," or "Ask for Peter's Pills." Often the action indicated must be accompanied by explicit instructions for performing the action if this is not common knowledge. This type of propaganda was termed revealed because the propagandee would be likely to recognize the desired aim immediately.⁵⁵

Because of their respective definitions of suggestion, several authors do not include descriptions of the category termed direct suggestion. However, an examination of the statements that are made in the literature about this category reveals that direct suggestion or explicit directive is consistently defined as a forthright command or specific indication of the desired response. The speaker's intentions are clear. Many of the sentences which are used as examples of direct suggestion meet the requirements of the three definitions of the imperative sentence. However, sentences such as the example by Minnick satisfy only the definition by Fries. Therefore, there is not complete agreement in this literature about the structure of the explicit directive.

⁵⁴Doob, Propaganda, p. 52.

⁵⁵Leonard W. Doob, Public Opinion and Propaganda (New York, 1948), pp. 397-407.

Implicit Directive

This section deals with the second category of verbal suggestion, indirect suggestion. In this section the descriptions indicate a difference in the intentions of the speaker.

Brembeck and Howell claim that the receiver has more difficulty detecting the aim of the source; consequently, it is more subtle. Persuaders use this means of suggestion if they want their purposes to remain concealed. They use Shakespeare's villain, Iago, in Othello as an example.⁵⁶

According to Oliver this is a more valuable and widely used form of suggestion. An idea is implanted in the mind of a receiver, but he is not aware of it. He seems to come to the conclusion by himself. Conclusions are frequently hinted, but never explicitly stated.⁵⁷

Indirect suggestion works by the positive emotionally attractive statement of an antecedent proposition in such a manner that the necessary conclusion will occur to the listener. It operates best when the subject's thinking is dissociated; that is, when his thought processes are so fully occupied with an irrelevant problem that the speaker's point can slip through without critical examination.⁵⁸

He uses the following statements as examples of indirect suggestion:

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread," meaning, "You had better abandon the plan you have in mind."; or "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," meaning, "If I were you, I'd observe some precautionary measures

⁵⁶ Brembeck and Howell, p. 168.

⁵⁷ Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, p. 145.

⁵⁸ Oliver, pp. 145-146.

before acting."⁵⁹

Although the definition of suggestion by Bryant and Wallace does not seem to allow for an indirect category, it does claim that this directive can be given obliquely. Consequently, the assumption might be made that this is synonymous with the category specified as indirect suggestion. To clarify this means of giving the suggestion, Bryant and Wallace explain that it might take the form of the rhetorical question which Mark Antony used to show that Caesar was not ambitious. Antony would cite an example and then ask, "Was this ambition?" This type of questioning leads the listener to provide his own answer and thus become committed to the idea without knowing it.⁶⁰ Some of their other examples of oblique suggestion are, "I believe we all agree that . . .," "We can accept this as a fact," and "We now come to the most important step of all."⁶¹ Winans states that it is usually better to temper suggestion with phrases such as, "Why not do this?" "I submit this plan for your approval," and "It has been suggested." This type of suggestion enables the audience to feel that the desired conclusion is their own.⁶²

Often it is considered advantageous to suggest ideas indirectly because a direct suggestion might have an opposite effect. Crocker explains how indirect suggestions are sometimes given. A man might have his friends campaign for him. Frequently, people use illustrations or parables to

⁵⁹ Oliver, pp. 145-146.

⁶⁰ Bryant and Wallace, p. 338.

⁶¹ Bryant and Wallace, p. 337.

⁶² Winans, pp. 286-303.

obtain the desired action without offending others. Sometimes, a person hints or throws out many suggestions hoping that someone will then make a direct suggestion about the action to be taken. Popeye has sold a lot of spinach because children have eaten it with the hopes of becoming strong like him.⁶³

Dietrich and Brooks assume that all suggestion is more or less indirect. They use one of the same examples Minnick uses as an example of indirect, positive suggestion. When the filling station attendant asks, "Fill 'er up?" a suggestion to buy a full tank of gas is made. Normally, the person buys the gas unless a conflicting idea arises. At this point the problem leaves the margins of attention and the listener stops to think.⁶⁴

The coauthors, Sarett and Foster, also define suggestion as a process of establishing an idea indirectly. They then went on to emphasize that the desired actions must be familiar forms of behavior. If the behavior is unfamiliar, the suggested idea might become the center of attention. They give the following detailed example of indirect suggestion:

The salesman of the Speedway 8 says: "Test this car thoroughly. Please! Anybody with a glib tongue can puff a car, but the test is on the road. The Speedway 8 is the fastest car in its class. Don't accept our word for it; try it. If it isn't the fastest car, we'll give you the car." All this is said quietly, confidently, and with control of the fundamentals of speech. Apparently the salesman is trying to induce the prospective buyer not to take his word for anything. Actually, indirectly, he is reaching the fringes of attention with these thoughts: "This must be a good car, the man has such faith in it! And he wants me to test it. The statements are all true: he wouldn't dare to say so, if they

⁶³Crocker, pp. 320-330.

⁶⁴Dietrich and Brooks, p. 173.

were not. Why go to the trouble of testing?" So the buyer may do the very thing the salesman told him not to do: he may take the salesman's word for it.⁶⁵

As Minnick discusses this form of suggestion, he contends that it conceals the intent of the speaker. Then he includes Sarett and Foster's definition which has just been stated. His example involves an advertisement for Sunkist oranges. Since unwritten agreements among companies do not permit explicit attacks on another product, the advertisement attacks canned orange juice indirectly. Part of the caption below a round orange is, "Fresh orange juice comes only in this round package." The reader indirectly receives the suggestion that canned juice is not fresh.⁶⁶

Young states that indirect suggestion is found in propaganda which has the aim to destroy a value or create a new one.⁶⁷ Dunlap explains that indirect statements also make the hearer believe that the desired conclusion was his already. Consequently, indirect statements are considered more effective because of their double advantage. He explains that indirection is used in advertising. Humor is also considered a form of indirection.⁶⁸

According to Doob, if an indirect suggestion is given, the listener will not be aware of the immediate aim of the suggester. He stresses that auxiliary and related attitudes should be sought by the source in order to make the suggestion successful.⁶⁹

⁶⁵Sarett and Foster, pp. 307-311.

⁶⁶Minnick, p. 63.

⁶⁷Young, pp. 110-111.

⁶⁸Dunlap, pp. 357-359.

⁶⁹Doob, Propaganda, pp. 52-55.

In his other book he explains that sometimes people will react negatively when the path of action is directly indicated. Then concealed or delayed revealed propaganda becomes necessary. During the war, sabotage was encouraged by the British and American Chiefs of Staff. The message was directed toward American patriots throughout Europe. Direct commands were rarely given from the U. S. because it was felt that patriots would resent advice from people living safely, so far from the awful war. Therefore, "The Voice of America" reported incidents of sabotage from elsewhere in Europe. By this means, the need for action was suggested without actually saying so. Although this concealed propaganda possesses many psychological advantages because its objective is concealed, many risks of obtaining no desired response are run.⁷⁰

The authors all seem to agree that this form of suggestion intentionally keeps the speaker's desired response concealed. As a result, the receiver must draw his own conclusions either consciously or unconsciously. The message intent remains implicit. The examples of indirect suggestion had no particular sentence type in common. It seems, that according to this literature, no particular structure is essential in giving an implicit directive.

Positive or Negative Directives

At this point, the third and fourth categories of verbal suggestion will be described. As mentioned previously, positive or negative suggestions are subdivisions of direct or indirect suggestions. It is advantageous to keep

⁷⁰Doob, Public Opinion, pp. 407-409.

this relationship in mind in the following discussion.

Brembeck and Howell, Oliver, and Minnick specifically agree that suggestions may be phrased either positively or negatively. As Minnick says, "a positively phrased suggestion entreats the listener to do or to believe something; a negative suggestion pleads with him not to do or not to believe something."⁷¹ All of these authors use examples of positive suggestion such as the following: "Thou shalt," "You will come home immediately after school today," "Vote Democrat," or "Buy tomatoes."

Minnick also claims that a filling station attendant uses positive suggestion when he asks, "Fill 'er up?"⁷²

These authors also give the same type of examples of negative suggestion except for the words do, not, or don't. Some of the examples are: "Do not open until Christmas," "You don't want it filled up, do you?" "Don't be a blebbermouth," or "Don't walk on the grass."

Bryant and Wallace, and Crocker make no mention of these categories. Little mention is made by Winans either, except for the statement that "suggestion in positive form is more likely to be responded to than negative suggestion."⁷³

Positive suggestion, according to Dietrich and Brooks, is giving a suggestion positively so that the listener will be encouraged to do something. When the listener is encouraged not to do something, negative suggestion is being used. Don't seems to be the key word to negative suggestion.

⁷¹Minnick, p. 64.

⁷²Minnick, p. 64.

⁷³Winans, pp. 286-303.

The following sentences utilize positive suggestion: "John, drop that stone," "Put the tools away," or "Hold your hand this way." These make use of negative suggestion: "John, don't you dare throw that stone," "Don't neglect the tools," or "Don't hold your hand that way."

Positive suggestion, Young claims, causes a person to act immediately; such as a slogan used in advertising, "Eventually, why not now?" However, negative suggestion encourages the listener to avoid an act or thought. Campaigns for public safety are given as examples. These two can be combined, as the advertisements selling deodorant, toothpaste, and life insurance often do.⁷⁴ Only positive suggestion is discussed by Dunlap. He claims that positive assertions must be unqualified and free from alternative ideas or probabilities. His example of a positive statement is "accept this religious dogma or you will be damned eternally." Frequently, people will accept this statement without support because of their desire to be saved.⁷⁵

According to Eisenson, positive suggestion is a stimulus designed to win a rather automatic response. He believes this is possible because humans prefer being passive rather than active. To accept suggestion would require very little analysis, but to doubt would be more difficult because it demands analytical thought.⁷⁶

The definition of positive suggestion given by Sarett and Foster is almost identical to their definition of suggestion. In this category they give the same example mentioned previously in this paper by Minnick,

⁷⁴Young, pp. 110-111.

⁷⁵Dunlap, pp. 358-359.

⁷⁶Jon Eisenson, J. Jeffery Auer, and John V. Irwin, The Psychology of Communication (New York, 1963), p. 249.

Dietrich and Foster. Once again "Fill 'er up?" is used to clarify indirect, positive suggestion. Their definition of negative suggestion differs from the definition commonly found in many textbooks.⁷⁷ They use the term in the same manner as the category of "contra suggestion" or "counter suggestion." They refer specifically to contra suggestion, which is defined by McDougall as "the mode of action of one individual on another which results in the second accepting, in the absence of adequate logical grounds, the contrary of the proposition asserted or implied by the agent."⁷⁸

Then they go on to state that negative suggestion means touching off habitual responses that the speaker does not intend and does not wish to touch off, because they move in directions unfavorable to him and to his purpose. Examples are then given of negative suggestion in the selection of subject matter and words, and also in speech manner. The first means of giving a negative suggestion has relevance for this paper. They explain that when a mother says "Now, William, don't you dare go skating after school on the thin ice," it is possible that she gives her son an idea she does not want him to have. It would have been better if she had said: "William, right after school you are going to walk straight home."

Doob claims that when the integration resulting from the environment is oriented toward a stimulus-situation, the suggestion can be called positive. If it is away from the stimulus-situation, a negative suggestion is being used. Indirectly, a negative suggestion indicates a positive suggestion, either direct or indirect. "Keep off the grass," is a direct, negative

⁷⁷ Sarett and Foster, p. 311.

⁷⁸ William McDougall, Social Psychology (Boston, 1918), p. 104.

suggestion, but indirectly it refers to a positive suggestion to stay on the path. At the conclusion of his discussion of this topic, Doob states that positive suggestion is more likely to produce the desired response.⁷⁹

In summary, positive suggestion is considered to be a form of giving a suggestion directly or indirectly in such a way that the listener wants to do something as opposed to negative suggestion which encourages the listener not to do something. On the other hand, Sarett and Foster, treat negative suggestion almost synonymously with the category of counter suggestion. Once again the three sentence types have been used by these authors to give positive or negative suggestion. Minnick gives one rather unique example, "Fill 'er up?" Traditionally, this group of words would probably not be classified as a sentence. However, if the structural definition is used it seems that this utterance might be categorized as a question.

Many of the sentences given as examples of positive or negative suggestion have the structure of the imperative sentence; therefore, these might be considered "direct" positive or negative suggestions. The examples which have the structure of the statement or question would possibly be classified as "indirect" positive or negative suggestions.

Counter Directives

Several of the authors include descriptions of the category frequently designated as counter suggestion. Sarett and Foster, as indicated previously, treat negative suggestion almost synonymously with this category by claiming that negative suggestion frequently brings about the opposite action.

⁷⁹ Doob, Propaganda, pp. 52-54.

Oliver, Brembeck and Howell discuss this category. Both books explain that this should be used in the attempt to obtain an opposite response. They recommend this approach with people who usually do just the opposite of what has been advised. Oliver implies that this suggestion should be worded negatively "in the hope that it will be rejected."⁸⁰ Brembeck and Howell explain that it would be positive or negative suggestion. They claim that to tell a boy, "'You aren't big enough to help get the hay into the barn,' may be the very technique needed to get him to help do a tiring job."⁸¹

Winans says that such signs as "Keep off the Grass," frequently seem to drive us to deliberate disobedience. Therefore, a need arises occasionally to use "a suggestion that provokes a reaction contrary to its apparent intent, . . ."⁸² This is the kind of suggestion Tom Sawyer used to get his aunt's fence whitewashed.

Crocker makes the point that certain people are persistently stubborn. They do not do what anyone suggests. Children often are controlled by counter-suggestion. Perhaps someone has said to you, "If I were you, I would not do that." When you do that, it might well be what the source hoped for.⁸³

Dietrich and Brooks, and Sarett and Foster agree on the meaning of counter-suggestion. When a person is against the desired response, he might

⁸⁰ Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, p. 147.

⁸¹ Brembeck and Howell, p. 170.

⁸² Winans, pp. 286-303.

⁸³ Crocker, pp. 319-334.

be handled by negative suggestion. This should bring about the desired action.

The literature generally describes counter-suggestion as a means of provoking people to do just the opposite of what is stated. This seems to be an attempt to convince people who seldom do what others suggest. Some of the literature indicates that only negative suggestion will obtain an opposite response, while the other literature does not limit counter suggestion to either negative or positive suggestion.

DEFINITION BY RESPONSE

This part of the analysis deals with an examination of some of the pertinent literature that contains a discussion of definitions of the directive as a basis of persuasion or of all communication. These definitions place emphasis on obtaining the desired response. Various terms are assigned to the concept of the directive. Two of the common terms used by various authors are: the demand, and the mand.

The Demand

In 1919 Charles Woolbert wrote an article titled "Persuasion: Principles and Method." As far as this writer can ascertain, Woolbert is the earliest author to discuss the directive as the basis of persuasion. However, this call for action, the directive, is termed a demand.

He states that persuasion involves the selection and arrangement of propositions in order to obtain the desired action. The persuader, by means of analysis, is to determine the exact nature of the situation and what propositions would be useful to secure the desired result from the specific audience.⁸⁴

First, the speaker determines exactly what action he desires. The speaker is to consider what responses could reasonably be expected from a particular audience. A wise choice would be the precise action which seems possible for a specific group at a specific time.

"The speaker is always an asker, a seeker; he desires, requests, calls

⁸⁴ Charles Woolbert, "Persuasion: Principles and Method," QJS, V (March, 1919), pp. 101-102.

for, demands."⁸⁵ Woolbert then explains that demands is the most comprehensive term. This means that the speaker has a demand to make. "Hence the second step in his analysis of his intentions is to phrase his desire into an imperative sentence which reveals a demand growing straight from the action."⁸⁶ One example might be to obtain a vote. Phrase a demand for it; such as, "Vote for the man from Kansas."

In this discussion Woolbert stresses the importance of phrasing the demand as specifically as possible. The occasion or time and the audience should determine the aim of the speaker. He then lists the following classes, which he claims are generalizations of all the possible demands for action:

Observe, Perceive clearly, Think this over, Accept this doctrine, Renew your faith, Strengthen your determination, Change your mind, Reverse your attitude, Prepare yourself for future action, Ally yourself, Take an active part, Subscribe, Join, Buy, Pay, Vote, Go, Give, Give all, Die if need be.⁸⁷

The third important step to take is to phrase a proposition always derived straight from the speaker's demand. The speaker needs to do more than tell people what he wants them to do. Since Woolbert believes that people act when they accept the propositions of a speech, this part of the analysis is considered very important. A proposition is to be found that would be likely to be accepted and thus produce the desired response. He points out that every demand for action could be stated as a proposition. If this proposition is worded just right for the particular audience

⁸⁵ Woolbert, p. 103.

⁸⁶ Woolbert, p. 103.

⁸⁷ Woolbert, p. 104.

addressed, the acceptance of it will possibly be equivalent to the action sought. For instance, the demand, "Accept my theory of a lasting peace," can be turned into propositional form, "This theory of a lasting peace is the only one that fits the known facts," or "If you accept this theory you will be able most satisfactorily to meet your ethical and social problems."⁸⁸

Apparently Woolbert believes that the imperative sentence is the form of the command which underlies the propositions usually given. He does not specifically state what structure the proposition ought to take. It is only possible to surmise from his examples that these would usually be declarative sentences.

Two of the next authors wrote books in which this assumption is discussed, and then they wrote about it in a later book. All of this material will be presented chronologically according to copyright dates. However, material discovered in books by the same author will be included consecutively.

The first pertinent information located by the writer was published by Brigance and Immel in 1938, about nineteen years after Woolbert's article was published. Then in 1953 Brigance wrote another similar book in which he also discusses this assumption.

In the first book Brigance and Immel divide speech into four purposes, but they still specify that one of the early steps involved in giving any speech is that of phrasing a demand for the desired response. From this demand an impelling proposition is to be worded. They explain that the central proposition should be directly related to the specific response

⁸⁸ Woolbert, pp. 104-105.

desired.⁸⁹

In the early book they state that the proposition can usually be phrased as an outright demand. But they point out that the proposition should be phrased in a way that will cause the listeners to want to accept it. The actual phrasing of the proposition is not thought to be the only important consideration. More important is the means by which the speaker prepares the audience for the demand or proposition.⁹⁰

In his later book Brigance refers to the seven lamps of speech development. There seems to be considerable similarity between his lamps and Woolbert's seven steps. However, it appears that Woolbert considers these steps vital only to persuasive speech while Brigance includes them in all four of the commonly discussed types of speech.

His first lamp or step like Woolbert's instructs the speaker to determine precisely what response he desires. This is to be his demand for the desired response. The second lamp is also very similar to Woolbert's second step. The speaker is then advised to "phrase the demand for his desired response in the form of an impelling proposition which, 'if accepted as true, brings the action (response) the speaker desires.'"⁹¹ These propositions are to be single and impelling.

He illustrates by a hypothetical example of his campaign for Senator Jones. He wants people to vote for this man but his demand, "Vote for Jones," offers little or no inducement (step one). Therefore, he proceeds

⁸⁹William Brigance and Ray Keeslar Immel, Speechmaking: Principles and Practice (New York, 1938), pp. 264-265.

⁹⁰Brigance and Immel, pp. 266-281.

⁹¹William N. Brigance, Speech Composition (New York, 1953), pp. 4-5.

to step two and seeks a proposition which will bring the desired response if accepted as true. Then he words his demand for a vote into an impelling proposition such as: "A vote for Senator Jones will be a vote for less government control." If his proposition is accepted as true, the listeners are likely to perform the desired response.⁹²

After the speaker chooses the general purpose, his speech should be centered upon the important step of choosing a particular response that is possible for the audience. A well chosen action provides a good chance for success.

Because this step might frequently point the speech to failure or success, he gives a specific example of the fine shades of action which might be possible for a speech on the United Nations. The ones he lists are as follows:

- (1) Ally yourself with our organization which helps keep the people informed on UN activities.
- (2) Give money to our organization.
- (3) Get others to give money.
- (4) Be patient when UN progress seems to be slow.
- (5) Don't expect it to solve all world problems.
- (6) Accept my proposition that veto power should be abolished in the Security Council.
- (7) Make up your mind that some day the present UN must be turned into a World Federation.
- (8) Don't ever expect the UN to succeed.
- (9) Even if you don't like the UN, remember that it is the UN or world chaos.⁹³

One of these demands for action would possibly fit the specific purpose of a speech in a particular situation. He warns against attempting to use several of these demands in one speech in an attempt to hit something. This technique will not be likely to succeed he explains. At this point he also

⁹²Brigance, p. 5.

⁹³Brigance, p. 64.

lists the groups of demands Woolbert lists as generalizations of demands for all possible actions.

His four purposes of speech are to interest, to inform, to stimulate, and to convince. He suggests that the demand in a speech to interest, although not so important, might be phrased as "Enjoy my stories about our speaker." The proposition in a speech to inform becomes more important he claims. A suitable proposition, for example, might be "I want you to understand the current trends in the teaching of English."

The greatest care must be taken to phrase the propositions of speeches to stimulate and to convince. His example involves a speech to farmers on the subject of convincing the farmers that the European war debts should not be paid. The suggested proposition is "'The payment of this Allied debt through the next fifty years will injure the American farm market in Europe.'"⁹⁴

After an examination of the discussions in both of his books, it appears that Brigrance distinguishes between the structure of the demand and the proposition. The demand seems to have the structure of the imperative sentence as it has been defined earlier. On the other hand, the structure of the proposition generally seems to have the structure of a declarative sentence.

In 1947 Thonssen and Gilkinson also discuss the matter of the demand and a related dominant proposition. However, they consider this as only a problem of persuasion. They also explain that a speaker must determine what he can expect his listeners to believe or do. This is the demand the

⁹⁴ Brigrance, p. 86.

speaker makes of his audience. Then he needs to choose a related idea which might eventually be acceptable to the audience. This is then supposed to give them a reason to believe or do what the speaker desires. Some examples of demands and their related propositions which might be effective in a particular situation are then listed.

Demand	Dominant Proposition
Insulate your house.	It will reduce your heating bill.
Vote for Senator ____.	He has your interest at heart.
Buy insurance.	It will protect your family.
Go to college.	College graduates earn more.
Buy land.	Values are certain to rise.
Buy <u>Irresistible</u> Perfume.	Movie actress ____ uses it.
Support Progressive Education.	It's progressive.
Free trade is necessary.	We must have foreign markets.
Lend money to Britain.	A strong Britain increases our security.
Oust the Japanese Emperor.	He is a front for Japanese militarism.
Restrict immigration.	It increases unemployment.
He is guilty.	His fingerprints were found at the scene of the crime. ⁹⁵

All of the sentences above given as examples of the demand are imperative structures except for two of them. "He is guilty," and "Free trade is necessary," have the structure of a declarative sentence. This arouses a question of whether these authors actually make a distinction between the structure of the demand and the dominant proposition. However, since most of the examples of the demand are imperative sentences, it seems fairly safe to assume that these authors wish to make that distinction.

These authors then explain that effective persuasion consists primarily in choosing a dominant proposition which is carefully related to the demand and which appeals to the attitudes or motives of the listeners. Because

⁹⁵Lester Thonssen and Harold Gilkinson, Basic Training in Speech (Boston, 1947), p. 496.

they emphasize both logical and emotional considerations in the selection of the dominant proposition, they stress the fact that these reactions are commonly thought of as functioning together. Many of the problems people have in life involve questions of fact and value. A demand to "Buy insurance," would have a related proposition involving a question of fact and value.⁹⁶

The next author under consideration first wrote about directive and suggestive persuasion in a book published in 1955. At that time Brown explained that statements have varying degrees of persuasive qualities. The sentences he called "directive" statements were supposed to give the audience no alternative. The "suggestive" statements, on the other hand, would give the listeners various degrees of freedom. A statement containing a threat to the listener, if compliance was not obtained, was considered the most powerful form of persuasion. Personal examples were considered the weakest form of persuasion, because the speaker only attempted to make the listener appraise his own behavior in the matter.⁹⁷

Following will be a list of the varieties of persuasion he discussed. They will be listed from what Brown in 1955 considered the most commanding to the least commanding.

- | | |
|------------|--|
| | 1. If you are late again, I shall take appropriate measures. |
| | 2. Don't say that! |
| Directive | 3. I shall expect you at two. |
| Persuasion | 4. The record proves that recent legislation is opposed to the best interests of the farmer. |
| | 5. The Civil War stimulated industrialization in America. |

⁹⁶Thonssen and Gilkinson, pp. 498-499.

⁹⁷Charles T. Brown, Introduction to Speech (New York, 1955), p. 144.

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Suggestive
Persuasion | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are you going to take the job? 2. What do you think we ought to do about labor legislation? 3. You'll make an "A" if you work hard for the rest of the semester. 4. You'd make a good doctor. 5. I'm going to study for that exam.⁹⁸ |
|--------------------------|--|

An examination of these sentences makes it evident that Brown did not acknowledge any structural difference between the demand or directive and the assertion. All of his sentences, even those he considered directive, are either declarative, interrogative, or exclamatory. Only one sentence "Don't say that!" would be considered imperative in structure. In fact he gives no guidelines that help determine the differences between directive and suggestive persuasion.

The Mand

In the last few years, Brown and Van Riper have collaborated on a book published in 1966. In Speech and Man they explain speech, in general, as a power tool which people use to manipulate others. Using the approach of Skinner, the famous psychologist, they explain that as children people learn to use speech to direct, order, and command others to do what they want. Children's first words are often commands such as: "Up!" "Drink!" "Out!"

Skinner divides all communicatively intended speech into two categories. Mands are all utterances used to control. Tacts would then be all other forms of speaking which are not designed to control. More information about mand speech will be presented in an examination of the pertinent material from Skinner's book in the last part of this chapter.

⁹⁸ Brown, p. 144.

Brown and Van Riper explain that people even control themselves to a certain extent by using mand speech. Although they are not usually aware of these inner commands to control their own behavior, they are always present. Sometimes mand speech becomes so unpleasant that a person cannot use it, even to control himself. Without the power of mand speaking even ordinary pursuits of existence would be impossible for humans. A mere pencil is the result of many commands.⁹⁹

Since childhood everyone has been exposed to many commands and directions. These models are never forgotten. A child's early learning relies largely on identification; therefore, if the commands he has heard are often given in angry tones, he may later speak harshly even when saying, "Please pass the meat."¹⁰⁰

Brown and Van Riper emphasize that all leaders ought to be able to verbalize the needs of the group. They should be able to describe and to justify whatever action will satisfy those needs. Inherent in every leader's speech is the command: "This is what we must do."

They explain that anyone who wishes to lead or command needs to be able to phrase clear, attractive, directives. Officers in the service are taught that short commands are more likely to be understood or obeyed. Repetition is considered necessary and short, familiar words are used. The command is given with an intonation pattern demonstrating that the speaker expects the order will be obeyed. A strong voice is frequently used with some signal

⁹⁹ Charles T. Brown and Charles Van Riper, Speech and Man (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966), pp. 77-81.

¹⁰⁰ Brown and Van Riper, pp. 77-81.

such as "Attention!" preceding the command.¹⁰¹

Naturally, these requirements usually need to be modified in civilian life. They explain that a more subtle approach becomes necessary. A signal such as "Please," will bring quicker cooperation than a short, loud command. Often, it is considered wiser to call the person by his first name before requesting something. "I think we'd better clean the house," will probably be more productive than "Clean the house!" Often a person only implies the threat which underlies perhaps every command by saying, "It would be nice if you'd . . ." "Nevertheless, requests, directions, or orders must be phrased clearly, simply, and strongly if they are to be fulfilled."¹⁰²

They explain that the parts of a directive ought to be given in order, to eliminate confusion. Repetitions of commands is also very important in order to control.

These authors describe two simple basic steps in the process of speech for control. First the speaker might simply explain what desired response he wants; "Let's go fishing," "Did you know that Mary tells lies?" If the listener performs the desired response, the speaker has satisfied his urge to control. If not the speaker usually tries harder to persuade. He then will try to stir the people by appeals designed to cause dissatisfaction so that they are attracted to some other condition. In order to do this a speaker learns that he should understand the needs of others. This ability is essential to even the least of us, because even the child seems to be able to determine to what extent he can boss around his elders. According

¹⁰¹Brown and Van Riper, pp. 81-90.

¹⁰²Brown and Van Riper, pp. 81-90.

to Brown and Van Riper the great leaders have been able to empathize with those they wish to control. Anyone wishing to control must persist until the others experience a change, that ultimately leads to new perceptions.

Frequently, people are stirred by a threat which warns of possible punishment or injury. Threats can be given in three ways: (1) "They will hurt you." (2) "You are going to hurt yourself." (3) "I will hurt you. I am your enemy. Either you do as I say or else." Threats easily change behavior, but seldom result in favorable beliefs and attitudes.¹⁰³

In his book, Verbal Behavior, Skinner explains that certain utterances are usually followed by certain occurrences. Hurry! is usually followed by someone's hurrying and Sh-h! by silence. Although these consequences are not inevitable, one is usually found to occur oftener than another. In order to avoid confusion, it is helpful to note that Skinner refers to the utterances made by the speaker as responses.

He claims that "the response Quiet! is reinforced through the reduction of an aversive condition, and we can increase the probability of its occurrence by creating such a condition—that is, by making a noise."¹⁰⁴ These forms of behavior become characteristic of people through operant conditioning. Verbal, operant conditioning occurs when an utterance or response is usually reinforced in a certain way; consequently, the speaker will probably make that response if there is a severe condition of deprivation.

Skinner uses the term "mand" for the name of this type of verbal operant. He then defines a "mand as a verbal operant in which the response is

¹⁰³ Brown and Van Riper, pp. 90-97.

¹⁰⁴ Burrhus F. Skinner, Verbal Behavior (New York, 1957), p. 35.

reinforced by a characteristic consequence and is therefore under the functional control of relevant conditions of deprivation or aversive stimulation."¹⁰⁵

Some mands specify only the behavior of the listener. Say no!, Walk!, Go! Others such as Meet!, or More gravy! specify the ultimate reinforcement. Both the action and the reinforcement are specified in Pass the bread!

Nine kinds of mands are identified in his book. These are considered possible ways to change the probability that the receiver would respond in the desired manner. (1) Request. "Meet, please." This type of response indicates that the source wants what the receiver already feels able to give. (2) Command. "Hands up!" It will specify the desired action and carries a threat which may be implied by intonation or be made explicit. (3) Prayer or entreaty. An emotional feeling is created which promotes the desired reinforcement. (4) Question. "What's your name?" This mand calls for verbal action. The behavior of the receiver allows this utterance to be categorized as a request, a command, or a prayer.¹⁰⁶

Many other mands are identified in terms of the action of the listener. Sometimes the listener will enjoy certain consequences which do not directly affect the speaker but which still are reinforcing to him. (5) Advice. "Go west!" The listener will enjoy a positive reinforcement. (6) Warning. "Watch out!" If the receiver performs the specified behavior, he will escape from an aversive stimulation. (7) Permission. "Go ahead!" This mand removes the threat, perhaps, and the listener is able to act in the way

¹⁰⁵ Skinner, p. 35.

¹⁰⁶ Skinner, pp. 38-39.

he was inclined. (8) Offer. "Take a free sample!" The speaker offers the listener a gratifying reinforcement for the desired behavior. (9) Call. Usually the source will perform other actions which may be a reinforcement for the listener.¹⁰⁷

Skinner classifies these demands in terms of the subsequent behavior of the listener. This classification can certainly be distinguished from the traditional way of defining utterances according to the intentions of the speaker. It seems that Skinner might be likely to agree with the method of analysis used by Fries who, as explained previously, classifies utterances according to the response utterances. Skinner explains his view point in the following way:

Apart from questions of semantics, the formulation of the mand carries some of the burden of grammar and syntax in dealing with the dynamic properties of verbal behavior. The mand obviously suggests the imperative mood, but interrogatives are also mands, as are most interjections and vocatives, and some subjunctives and optatives. The traditional classifications suffer from a mixture of levels of analysis. In particular they show the influence of formal descriptive systems in which sentences are classified with little or no reference to the behavior of the speaker. It is here that the shortcomings of grammar and syntax in a causal analysis are most obvious.¹⁰⁸

His discussion makes it quite clear that Skinner believes that an utterance can not be identified as a mand only by its form. The situation in which the utterance arises generally must be known. However, he points out that some utterances are probably mands because of their formal properties.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Skinner, p. 40.

¹⁰⁸ Skinner, p. 44.

¹⁰⁹ Skinner, p. 36.

One other author, Meerloo, emphasizes that people need to control others or to be controlled by them. People attempt to persuade others to accept their thoughts. He believes that people try to convince others of what they themselves are not sure. According to him, this need is satisfied in the following five ways:

1. attempts to evoke word-or-deed reaction in the listener, the need to induce cooperation in the other.
2. direct command.
3. assertion of opinion.
4. withholding of words; reservation of opinion.
5. magic strategy—naming of things and persons to reduce their mysterious and hence threatening aspects.¹¹⁰

In summary, this chapter presents descriptions of the demand and the command. Although Wolbert only seems to consider the demand as a basis of all persuasion, he does support Walden's position that the directive is basic when persuasion takes place. Brigance and Lumel, and Thonssen and Gilkinson describe the demand or directive in the same manner. Another point of view is explored by Skinner. Mand speech is described as the speech designed to control others. This type of speech is to be recognized by response rather than syntactical structure. In general, Brown and Van Riper also use Skinner's approach.

¹¹⁰Joost Meerloo, Conversation and Communication (New York, 1952), pp. 85-86.

CONDITIONS FOR PHRASING THE DIRECTIVE

This chapter deals with conditions which are presently considered to be significant in the phrasing of the directive. The literature frequently lists several generalizations about the nature of suggestion, which seems to be influenced by many variables.

Conditions for Suggestion

Eisenson offers a list of generalizations which discuss certain variables that supposedly influence the effective operation of suggestion.

The following list is the one he offers:

- a. Suggestion operates most effectively when it is directed toward an existent response-pattern.
- b. Suggestion operates most effectively when it encounters a receptive attitude; there must be no other suggestions that set off stronger or better established response patterns.
- c. Suggestion is increased when there is a lack of adequate knowledge concerning the subject at hand.
- d. Suggestion is increased by the prestige of the person making it.
- e. Suggestion is increased when it is related to desire—a fundamental want, drive, or belief.
- f. Suggestion is increased by excitement which is usually accompanied by a relaxation of reason.
- g. Suggestion is usually increased by group situations.¹¹¹

Minnick includes some tentative generalizations about verbal suggestions. These generalizations also discuss some variables that are supposed to help determine the effectiveness of suggestion. These tentative generalizations are:

1. Verbal suggestions are more effective the more sharply focused is the attention of the audience.

¹¹¹Eisenson, p. 249.

2. The greater the prestige of the speaker, the stronger will be the power of his suggestions.
3. Direct and indirect suggestions are most effective when they receive one or more repetitions in the position of last impression.
4. Indirect suggestions, since they are insinuated obliquely in the marginal fields of attention, are probably more successful than direct suggestions when the ideas suggested are likely to be repugnant to the audience.
5. Positive suggestions are generally more effective than negative ones unless the suggestion deals with avoidance needs.
6. Suggestions, since they aim to elicit immediate, uncritical response, are most effective when aimed at habitual response patterns associated with the audience's persistent needs and wants.¹¹²

Dietrich and Brooks also list some specific methods of suggestion. These are quite similar to the generalizations listed by other authors.

- a. Let your manner suggest confidence. (personal prestige)
- b. Plant suggestions casually. Keep suggestion in the margins of attention.
- c. Avoid crystallizing contrary ideas. Avoid negative suggestion.
- d. Suggest ideas that fit the listener's drives.
- e. Use positively loaded words.
- f. Use symbols. flag, cross, etc.
- g. Please and satisfy the listener. 'A pleased man is a man half persuaded.'¹¹³

Blenkenship, who does not discuss the categories of suggestion, does list Schramm's rules about where a suggestion for change should occur.¹¹⁴

At this point, Schramm's suggestions for attitude change will be listed because he has some important conclusions about the effective accomplishment of attitude change through the use of suggestion. The generalizations end the discussion of each follows:

¹¹²Minnick, p. 65.

¹¹³Dietrich and Brooks, pp. 173-176.

¹¹⁴Jane Blenkenship, Public Speaking: A Rhetorical Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966), pp. 92-93.

1. To accomplish attitude change, a suggestion for change must first be received and accepted. The import of the research evidence on this point is that persons will tend to avoid communications unsympathetic to their existing attitudes, or forget the unsympathetic communications once received, or recast them to fit the existing frame of reference.
2. The suggestion will be more likely to be accepted if it meets existing personality needs and drives. A considerable amount of clinical data supports the belief that persons who feel socially inadequate, frustrated, or depressed, are more 'suggestible.' Hovland sums this up by suggesting the hypothesis that persons with 'low self-esteem' are more suggestible.
3. The suggestion will be more likely to be accepted if it is in harmony with valued group norms and loyalties. The conclusion from this evidence is that, as Krech and Crutchfield said, if a suggestion can be phrased 'so as to be congruent with the need of people to identify with or be in harmony with other people . . . (it) . . . will be more readily accepted than one that does not draw upon such social support.'
4. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the source is perceived as trustworthy or expert. Osgood and Tannenbaum make the point that an individual tends to handle a suggestion in such a way as to make the source and concept congruent--that is, favorable, sources associated positively with favorable concepts, etc. Hovland and Weiss, in this and other work, have advanced evidence to the effect that persons are as likely to learn material from a source perceived as untrustworthy as from one perceived as trustworthy (if they will listen to the message at all), but that the perceived trustworthiness of the source has a powerful effect on the amount of attitude change. In a few weeks, with the process of forgetting, one tends to disassociate source and concept. It sometimes happens, therefore, that after some weeks there is no more attitude change from the 'trustworthy' than from the 'untrustworthy' source. If at any time, however, the individual is reminded of the source, then the influence of the source reasserts itself on his attitudes. This has important implications for propaganda.
5. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the message follows certain rules of 'rhetoric' for attitude-changing communication.
 - a. There is often an advantage in stating the desired conclusion specifically and positively. The import of the research evidence is that 'letting the facts

speak for themselves' is usually not enough, and it is not safe to let the audience draw the conclusion for itself, except in the case of a highly intelligent audience. There is also some evidence that a concept is more likely to be learned when stated positively rather than negatively.

b. Sometimes it is better to state both sides of an issue; other times, to state only one side. This is not a simple choice, and the literature is to some degree conflicting. The simplest conclusion to draw from the evidence is that one can almost always accomplish more immediate attitude change with a one-sided presentation, and this should be used when one does not have to worry about his audience hearing later conflicting arguments, and especially when the audience is already favorable to the point of view one is advocating. But if one has reason to expect that the audience will later hear competing arguments, then he will be wise to use a two-sided presentation. By so doing, he will accomplish less at first, but probably more in the long run; because he will be cushioning the audience against the later opposition.

c. Repeat with variation.

d. Use simplifying labels and slogans where appropriate. More intelligent audiences might be repelled by these though.

e. Make use, where possible, of audience participation.

f. Fit the strength of the emotional appeal to the desired result.

g. Organize the message to take advantage of primacy and recency. Here evidence is conflicting. Hovland, Janis, and Kelley have suggested two apparently sound and useful propositions, however. Where the audience is familiar with the subject, and deep concern is felt over it, then, they suggest, there seems to be good reason for climax order—that is, for leading up to the main point at the end. On the other hand, if the audience is unfamiliar with the subject, or uninterested, there may be good reason to introduce the main point first. By so doing, the communicator will be most likely to gain the audience's attention and interest.

6. A suggestion carried by mass media plus face-to-face reinforcement is more likely to be accepted than a suggestion carried by either alone, other things being equal.

7. Change in attitude is more likely to occur if the suggestion is accompanied by change in other factors underlying belief and attitude. It stands to reason that the more completely we can make the environment support the desired change, the more likelihood there is of the change taking place.¹¹⁵

The earliest list of generalizations was written in 1935. In his book *Hollingsworth formulates and illustrates seven general laws of suggestion*. They are supposed to be effective in winning an audience or an individual to the desired response. Many of these principles are frequently restated by authors attempting to explain the effectiveness of suggestion. Here these principles are presented as Hollingsworth states them.

1. The strength of a suggestion depends in part on the degree to which it seems to be of spontaneous origin, an act of the individual's own initiative. Arrogance and domination are at once and instinctively resented and resisted. The more indirect the suggestion, the more it can be made to be an original determination or plan or conclusion on the part of the listener, the greater its dynamic power.
2. Within the limits of the law just indicated, the dynamic power of a suggestion will be the greater, the more forcefully and vividly it is presented. This is especially true when the suggested act is in harmony with the pre-established habits and tendencies. When the suggestion violates life-long habits and instincts, attempts to be forceful and vigorous usually lapse into arrogance and thereby defeat their own purpose.
3. It is more effective to suggest the desired response directly than it is to argue against a response that is not desired. Suggestion is most active at its positive pole, and the negative suggestion tends to defeat its own purpose. The Old Covenant with its own 'Thou Shalt Not' was readily displaced by the New Covenant with its simple, positive 'Thou Shalt.'

¹¹⁵ Wilbur Schramm, ed., The Process and Effects of Mass Communication (Urbana, 1954), pp. 209-214.

4. The action power of a suggestion varies directly with the prestige of its source. The more we revere a speaker, for any reason whatsoever, the greater confidence we tend to place in any thing he may say, and the more prone we are to imitate him and to adopt his suggestions, even when they are unsupported by sufficient reason.
5. The strength of a suggestion will be determined in part by the degree of internal resistance it encounters. That suggestion will be most effective which can call to its aid or appropriate the dynamic force of some other impulse that is already active or latent. Suggestions to violate life-long habits, firmly fixed moral feelings, and sacred relationships are impotent, even during the pronounced suggestibility of the hypnotic trance.
6. The strength of a suggestion varies with the frequency with which it is met. But mere mechanical repetition avails little unless the repeated suggestion is attended to with interest. Experiment shows that repetition of advertising appeals is twice as effective when the form, style, and expression is varied, with constant theme, as when exact duplication of previous appeals is used. Repetition accompanied by sufficient variety to lend interest but with sufficient uniformity to acquire a constant meaning, produces a genuine cumulative effect.
7. In appealing over the short circuit for a specific line of action, no interference, substitute, rival idea, or opposing action should be suggested. Such an idea merely impedes the action power of the first suggestion, by inviting comparison and thus involves deliberate choice and hesitation.¹¹⁶

Conditions for Each Category

Many of the authors write more specifically about conditions calling for one certain category of suggestion. These will be discussed in the same order as they were in Chapter Three, direct, indirect, positive or negative, and counter.

As a general rule, the authors who include the category of direct

¹¹⁶ Harry L. Hollingworth, The Psychology of the Audience (New York, 1935), pp. 141-144.

suggestion state that the form of the command should be used discriminately. Bryant and Wallace discuss the idea that only when the hearer is ready should the suggestion be direct. Sometimes this form of suggestion invites the listener to be critical, stubborn, and perverse. When this happens, it backfires. However, if genuine interest and enthusiasm was aroused, the receivers must be given something definite to do.¹¹⁷

Oliver distinguishes between various situations pertaining to the audience and the speaker as a means of determining when to use direct or indirect suggestion.

Use Direct Suggestion

1. When audience is polarized.
2. When audience feels inferior intellectually, etc.
3. When speaker's prestige is high.
4. When addressing youthful audience.
5. When some immediate, definite, precise form of action is required.
6. When the speaker is completely master of the speech situation.¹¹⁸

Doob explains that under most circumstances revealed propaganda can be used when the cause or propagandist are of good repute. Prestige is considered important in this respect.¹¹⁹

Nearly all of the authors agree that it is ordinarily better to give suggestions indirectly. In fact, two of the authors give the impression that this is the only form possible for a suggestion. Indirect suggestion is considered particularly effective when the speaker wants the audience to feel that the desired conclusion is their own.

¹¹⁷ Bryant and Wallace, pp. 337-338.

¹¹⁸ Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, p. 147.

¹¹⁹ Doob, Propaganda, p. 54.

As he discusses indirect suggestion, Oliver also lists six points which are simply the opposite of his list of situations that lend themselves to the use of direct suggestion. These situations are:

Use Indirect Suggestion

1. When audience is mentally alert.
2. When audience feels superior intellectually, etc.
3. When speaker's prestige is low.
4. When addressing adults.
5. When the aim is to create an attitude or a belief which may lead to a future action.
6. When the speaker is comparatively unskilled.¹²⁰

Brown offers some suggestions about different kinds of audiences, which help the speaker determine whether to be commanding or implicit. These deserve some consideration.

He explains that many audiences are in agreement with the speaker. Under these circumstances the speaker should use the command and will be expected to do so. If the audience is indifferent, they must be appealed to, because they cannot be commanded. In this type of situation the speech must be very stimulating and motivating. When the audience knows little about the topic, they are uninitiated. Then the speech should be primarily informational. An audience which is neutral usually will be very intelligent. They will need considerable evidence, but many may resist if the reasoning is too confining. It should not be necessary to give explicit commands. A critical audience strongly opposes the convictions of the speaker. In order to remove the hostility, all possible common ground should be explored. Under these circumstances it is suggested that a two-sided presentation be made. It would also be wise to give the purpose only

¹²⁰ Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, p. 147.

implicitly in the beginning. At the end of the presentation it might be stated explicitly.¹²¹

Much of the persuasion literature deals with the conclusions obtained from some studies about such things as explicit and implicit procedures. These studies examine the conditions under which more opinion change can be obtained in the desired direction.

The consensus is that there will probably be more opinion change in the desired direction when the audience hears the conclusions than when they drew their own conclusions, especially if the communication deals with complicated issues. In the study by Hovland and Mandell, more than "twice as many subjects changed their opinions in the direction advocated by the communicator when the conclusion was explicitly drawn as did when it was left to the audience."¹²² Abelson explains that it is often thought that people will perform the desired action more easily if they think they reach the conclusion themselves. However, he explains that often this does not work, because it is frequently difficult even for intelligent audiences to be aware of the implications behind the propositions and facts.¹²³

When the communication deals with highly personal matters, the non-directive approach might be more effective. These techniques are often

¹²¹Brown, pp. 145-146.

¹²²Carl I. Hovland and W. Mandell, "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and by the Audience," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581-588.

¹²³Herbert Abelson, Persuasion: How Opinions and Attitudes Are Changed (New York, 1959), pp. 10-13.

advocated for psycho-therapy.¹²⁴ When the audience is suspicious or hostile they might consider explicit conclusions as "propaganda." A very sophisticated audience might feel that stated conclusions are an insult to their intelligence. If the issues are quite simple, it does not seem to matter whether conclusions are stated or not.¹²⁵

Because as Young states, "the essential psychological element in propaganda is suggestion," the conclusions of some studies of propaganda have direct relevance to this category.¹²⁶

The U. S. government has also handled the problem of explicit versus implicit argument. This policy directive during World War II advised the propagandist to argue implicitly when:

There was a possibility that the audience might by itself stumble on the conclusion.

The validity of an explicit argument might be questioned.

You are asking the audience to take risks, and they might resent a forthright request.

The consequences of your argument are not known, and you do not want to take full responsibility for them.¹²⁷

Doob believes that when the reputation of the propagandist or his cause is poor, it would be better to use delayed revealed propaganda or concealed.¹²⁸ Most of the authors believe that positive suggestion should

¹²⁴ Carl L. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven, 1953), p. 104.

¹²⁵ Abelson, pp. 10-13.

¹²⁶ Young, p. 507.

¹²⁷ Richard H. S. Crossman, "Standing Directive for Psychological Warfare Against Members of the German Armed Forces," Propaganda in War and Crisis, ed. David Lerner (New York, 1951), pp. 257-258.

¹²⁸ Doob, Propaganda, pp. 54-59.

be used whenever possible.

Oliver, Brembeck and Howell and other authors emphasized that positive suggestion should be widely used because it is decisive and confident. However, negative suggestion is regarded as valuable to reformers and advertisers who sometimes state more clearly what they are against than what they are for.¹²⁹

Dietrich and Brooks list two reasons for using positive suggestion whenever possible. "First we are inclined to respond to suggestion; therefore, it is better to ask the listener to act rather than to ask him not to act. Secondly, negative suggestion may plant the positive act in the listener's mind."¹³⁰ One exception to this rule was the man against anything. This kind of person was to be handled by negative suggestion.

Very little is written about conditions which call for counter suggestion, except for occasional comments about its usefulness with people who refuse to do as they are told. However, some books warn that if counter suggestion does not work, the opposite of what is desired will be accomplished.

Not as much information is available about conditions calling for the demand-proposition or for the mand. However, most of the conditions already mentioned in this paper might also apply to the phrasing of the demand or mand. Brigance and Immel ask a question about where the proposition should be given to the audience. They answer this question in the following ways:

¹²⁹Oliver, p. 147; Brembeck and Howell, p. 169; Minnick, p. 64.

¹³⁰Dietrich and Brooks, pp. 173-176.

1. If the proposition is well known and not objectionable to the audience, it may be stated early in the speech. This is the usual and natural way, to set forth one's opinions and then to expound the reasons for them. It lets the audience know definitely and early where the speaker is going and it enables them to follow him easily.
2. If the proposition is new and unexpected or different to understand, or if it would be confusing if stated before it had been elaborated, the speaker may at the beginning introduce the proposition in the form of a question or indefinite statement, but withhold the speaker's viewpoint until later in the speech. He then assumes to some extent the character of an investigator and makes the speech something of 'an adventure in cooperative thinking' between speaker and audience, in which they together unfold the proposition by installments and advance gradually to its full statement.
3. If the proposition would arouse the hearer's opposition, even when stated in its most impelling form, it is often advisable to withhold entirely any statement of it, even in question form, until the audience is prepared to receive it. Here the speaker will ordinarily start first on common ground between himself and the audience and attempt to move slowly toward his goal, meanwhile carrying the audience as far along the way as they will go.¹³¹

Skinner discusses some points about using the mand effectively. He states that a listener is likely to revolt against repeated commands. He believes this is true because mands are given mainly for the benefit of the source.

He also explains how people usually soften or try to conceal the mand. Certain responses are more likely to be successful than others.

The response Water! is not so likely to be successful as I'm thirsty, . . . , or May I have some water?, which appears to specify only the less burdensome act of saying Yes. (The pretense is exposed if the listener simply says Yes.) Would you mind getting me a drink? also specifies merely a verbal response (No, not at all), but the implied

¹³¹Brigance and Immel, p. 281.

mand may be affective because of the suggested deference to the inclination of the listener. Explicit deference appears in tags such as if you don't mind, if you please, or simply please. When emphasized, these may convert a mere request into the stronger entreaty.¹³²

Listeners are also more likely to respond favorably by intensifying the response with praise or flattery. "Get me a drink, you wonderful mother." The praise or gratitude is often withheld until the listener responds. There are many supplementary techniques frequently used to reinforce the mand.

Certain listeners will respond appropriately to simple mands because they are accustomed to obeying orders. Other people react more readily to softened forms. Hesitant or weak mands are the least likely to be reinforced. This is where the speaker's prestige or authority becomes important.¹³³

In a different article, Herz stresses the importance of remembering that if a person is expected to do something of which he is incapable, he is likely to develop strong hostility toward the person making the demand.¹³⁴ In fact this is one of the conditions Lerner lists as essential for effective propaganda. He summarizes and explains these necessary conditions in the following way:

These conditions seem obvious upon statement. To persuade a man to do what you tell him, you must first get him to listen to you. Once you have his attention, you must first get him to believe what you say if he is to take

¹³² Skinner, p. 40.

¹³³ Skinner, pp. 42-43.

¹³⁴ Martin F. Herz, "Some Psychological Lessons from Leaflet Propaganda in World War II," Public Opinion Quarterly, XIII (1949), 471-486.

your message seriously. His credence gained, what you tell him to believe must be within the realm of his existing pre-dispositional structure of expectations and aspirations. It is a waste of words to try to persuade a loyal citizen that he would rather see his nation lose a war than win it; no such alternative preference is possible within his pre-dispositional set. But it may be quite possible to persuade the same man, once you have his attention and credence to believe that the nation is going to lose a war.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ Herz, pp. 471-486.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The second chapter of this paper deals with various descriptions of sentence types. Although the three grammars tend to analyze sentence structure differently, the three definitions of the imperative sentence might all result in a structure such as "Close the door." However, Fries presents a different point of view, because he only labels utterances as imperative if they are consistently followed by action responses. As a result, it is conceivable, according to his definition, that a declarative or interrogative sentence might also be labeled imperative. Therefore, only the traditional and the transformational definitions unqualifiedly support one part of the hypothesis that the imperative sentence is the structure of the explicit directive or command.

The major part of the hypothesis of this paper is that the directive or command exists in all communication. This hypothesis implies the imperative sentence is the basic structure of the English language from which other structures may be derived. The work of transformationalists, particularly Chomsky, appears to reject this hypothesis. Instead transformationalists operate on the hypothesis that kernel sentences which are declarative are the basis of the language. Other sentences, such as the imperative, are transformed from the declarative, kernel sentences.

This difference of opinion about the structure basic to the language might be explained by two separate views of language. People concerned with persuasion and communication probably tend to examine language from an interpersonal point of view. The transformationalists, on the other hand, are probably more interested in the language as a corpus to examine so that new concepts of linguistic structure might be discovered.

After describing the structure of the directive, the directive is examined with regard to the intentions of the speaker. This involves material pertaining to verbal suggestion and its respective categories.

Suggestion is commonly defined in such a way that it is considered a process of persuasion or propaganda in which an idea for a desired response is established in the margin of attention. The majority of the authors, when considering the intention of the speaker, divide this process into direct and indirect. However, a few of the authors stress that this is an indirect process; therefore, they do not include the direct category.

The authors who include the category seem to be almost in complete agreement that direct suggestion is an explicit, straight-forward command or plea which should bring about the desired response. It is usually thought that the listener will be aware of the aim or intentions of the speaker. There is considerable emphasis on the fact that this is to be an explicit command. If the discussions do not mention this fact, the examples commonly tend to point to that conclusion. As a result, it seems feasible to assume that this category of suggestion would usually have the structure of the imperative sentence. This is in agreement with the traditional and transformational points of view about the structure of the directive or imperative.

One significant difference between direct and indirect suggestion is mentioned again and again. The authors apparently agree that the indirect form of suggestion purposely conceals the speaker's intention. For this reason, the listener needs to draw his own conclusions, either consciously or unconsciously. An examination of the examples given to clarify the form of indirect suggestion, suggest that a declarative or possibly an

interrogative structure would be used to give a suggestion indirectly. One exception is the imperative form used by Sarett and Foster.

Positive and negative suggestion are the next two categories discussed. Nearly all of the references appear to consider these types of suggestion as the means to give the direct or indirect suggestions. That is to say, that a suggestion might be given positively so that the listener will be encouraged to do something, or a suggestion might be given negatively so that a listener will be encouraged not to do something.

However, as mentioned previously, Sarett and Foster treat negative suggestion almost synonymously with the category of counter suggestion. Counter suggestion, although not always mentioned, is discussed in regard to people who often resent being told what to do. Therefore, many of the authors believe that a need arises occasionally to use a suggestion that might possibly provoke an opposite response. Several authors explain that this means of persuasion can be handled by negative suggestion.

Chapter four deals specifically with literature that partially supports the basic hypothesis of this paper. Rather than being considered only as a means of verbal suggestion the directive, frequently termed the demand, is the speaker's call for action.

In this approach, the speaker is supposed to determine exactly what response he desires and phrase it into a demand or an order for action. The literature describing the demand then advises that the demand for action be phrased as an impelling proposition. These authors generally agree that if this proposition is accepted as true the desired response will be performed. They emphasize that care should be taken to phrase the demand and the related proposition.

All of the authors, except Brown in 1955, distinguish between the structure of the demand and related proposition. The imperative sentence is consistently given as the structure of the demand. A declarative sentence usually is given as the structure of the proposition. This material also supports the part of the hypothesis concerned with the structure of the directive.

One other point of view that is explored comes from the work of Burrhus Skinner. Brown and Van Riper also use his approach which, in general, explains that people often use speech as a power tool. Mands are described as all forms of speech that are designed to control others. Skinner identifies nine kinds of mands in terms of the subsequent behavior of the listener. He also includes tacts as the other category of speech. These might simply be described as other forms of interpersonal speech.

The demand and the mand are essentially quite similar. Both of them, like direct suggestion, are described as speech to command. However, the demand is always discussed in regard to formal speeches, while the mand is considered as one main category of all communication. The demand is usually to be stated as an impelling proposition; however, this distinction is not made in regard to the mand. The mand, unlike the demand, cannot easily be identified by structure alone. Skinner concedes that mands are usually imperative, but like Fries he believes that they should be classified in terms of the subsequent behavior of the listener.

There is considerable difference in the directive defined by the speaker's intentions and the directive defined according to the subsequent behavior of the listener. First of all, verbal suggestion is considered to be only one possible means of persuasion that can be used in communication.

Its use is determined by the intentions of the speaker, for example, to be explicit or implicit. On the other hand, the demand and mand are considered basic to effective persuasion. In some of the general speech literature, they are considered to be the basis for all types of speech or communication.

At this point, the information presented about the conditions for phrasing the directive will be reviewed briefly. Much information about the conditions calling for the effective use of suggestion has been located. The seven general laws of suggestion formulated by Hollingworth are often repeated or restated by authors in an attempt to clarify the conditions calling for suggestion. Other men such as Eisenson, Crocker, Dietrich, and Brooks offer some hints about the effective use of suggestion. All of these generalizations about the effective use of suggestion apparently are based on logic and personal observation. However, many of these tentative generalizations certainly would be more beneficial if verified by empirical research.

However, most of Schramm's conclusions about the effective accomplishment of attitude change through the use of suggestion are verified by clinical data. Nevertheless, some of the evidence is conflicting so there is certainly a need for additional research even in these areas.

The authors generally believe that direct suggestion should be used discriminately. Only when the audience seems completely ready should the suggestion be direct. Ordinarily they feel that it is best to give the suggestions indirectly. Oliver's hints about situations conducive to the use of direct or indirect suggestion are mentioned in two books. The authors agree that positive suggestion should be used whenever possible.

Some authors also discuss conditions that call for the explicit or implicit directive. Research indicates that usually there will be more opinion change in the desired direction if the conclusion is stated explicitly, especially if the issues are complicated.

The authors who discuss conditions calling for certain phrasing of the demand or proposition place great importance on choosing an appropriate demand and a proposition that is carefully related to the demand, in order to achieve effective communication. Usually knowledge about the audience helps the speaker determine whether to be commanding or implicit. Only when the audience seems to be in agreement with the speaker is it considered wise to give the directive. Under most circumstances only the proposition or implicit form is advised to be given. Skinner explains that in mand speech praise or flattery will make responses more likely. He claims that a softened or implied mand will be more successful. Certain listeners have been found to be more easily persuaded than others. The speaker is also reminded that his degree of prestige or authority is also important.

Herz stresses the importance of remembering that people will probably become hostile toward the speaker if they are expected to do something of which they are incapable. This condition certainly will apply to the phrasing of a directive.

In conclusion, some of the persuasion literature supports part of the hypothesis that the imperative sentence is the structure of the directive. However, only a part of the literature supports the major part of the hypothesis that the directive is the basis of all communication. The transformational grammar literature appears to reject this hypothesis by assuming that the declarative structure is basic to language. Some of the

persuasion literature partially supports this hypothesis by applying the directive to one aspect of communication, persuasion. However, this literature does not tend to assume that all communication is persuasive. Since many of the statements about the conditions calling for a certain phrasing of the directive have not been derived from clinical data, they are only generalized statements. If they are verified or rejected by appropriate research, they will prove more useful to all communicators.

Therefore, this study indicates the need for additional research to determine more about the basis of language when viewed from an interpersonal standpoint. More evidence is needed to determine whether a concept is more likely to be learned if stated positively rather than negatively. Since present evidence is conflicting, additional study is needed to determine more about the organization of the message.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer is grateful for the opportunity to express her appreciation to her major advisor, Dr. Dalmar Hilyard, for the constructive assistance and encouragement which he offered during the final organization and preparation of this paper.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelson, Herbert. Persuasion: How Opinions and Attitudes Are Changed. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1959.
- Albig, William. Modern Public Opinion. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Allen, Harold Bryon, ed. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of Meredith Publishing Co., 1964.
- Annis, Albert D., and Norman C. Meier. "The Induction of Opinion Through Suggestion by Means of Planted Content," Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 65-79.
- Asch, S. E. "The Doctrine of Suggestion, Prestige, and Imitation in Social Psychology," Psychological Review, LV (1948), 250-276.
- Baird, A. Craig. Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry. New York: The Ronald Press, 1965.
- Black, John W., and Wilbur E. Moore. Speech: Code, Meaning, and Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.
- Blankenship, Jane. Public Speaking: A Rhetorical Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Brembeck, Winston Lamont and William Smiley Howell. Persuasion: A Means of Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
- Brigance, William N. Speech Composition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- Brigance, William N., and Ray Keslar Immel. Speechmaking: Principles and Practice. New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1938.
- Brown, Charles T. Introduction to Speech. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955.
- Brown, Charles T., and Charles Van Riper. Speech and Man. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Bryant, Donald C., and Karl R. Wallace. Fundamentals of Public Speaking. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- Bryant, Margarat M. A Functional English Grammar. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1959.
- Campbell, James H., and Hal W. Hepler, ed. Dimensions in Communication: Readings. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1965.

- Childs, Harwood L., and John B. Whitton, ed. Propaganda By Short Wave. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942.
- Chomsky, Noam A. Syntactic Structures. The Netherlands: Mouton and Co., 1957.
- Coffin, T. E. "Some Conditions of Suggestibility: A Study of Certain Attitudinal and Situational Factors Influencing the Process of Suggestion," Psychological Monographs, LIII (1941), 125.
- Cooper, Eunice, and Helen Dinerman. "Analysis of the Film 'Don't Be a Sucker': A Study in Communication," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (1951), 243-264.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Crocker, Lionel. Public Speaking for College Students. New York: American Book Co., 1941.
- Dietrich, John E., and Keith Brooks. Practical Speaking for the Technical Man. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- Dinner, Francis P. An Introduction to General Linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Doob, Leonard W. Propaganda; Its Psychology and Technique. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935.
- Doob, Leonard W. Public Opinion and Propaganda. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1948.
- Dunlap, Knight. Civilized Life: The Principles and Applications of Social Psychology. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1934.
- Eisenson, Jon, J. Jeffery Auer, and John V. Irwin. The Psychology of Communication. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Estebrooks, G. H. "Experimental Studies in Suggestions," Journal of Genetic Psychology, XXXVI (1929), 120-139.
- Fries, Charles Carpenter. The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1952.
- Graham, Gladys Murphy. "The Natural Procedure in Argument," QJS, XI (November 1925), 319-337.
- Herz, Martin F. "Some Psychological Lessons from Leaflet Propaganda in World War II," Public Opinion Quarterly, XIII (1949), 471-486.

- Hollingworth, Harry L. The Psychology of the Audience. New York: American Book Co., 1935.
- Hovland, Carl I., ed. The Order of Presentation in Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Hovland, Carl I., and Irving L. Janis, ed. Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Hovland, Carl I., Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Hovland, Carl I., and William Mandell. "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion Drawing by the Communicator and by the Audience," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 581-588.
- Hovland, Carl I., and W. Weiss. "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," Public Opinion Quarterly, XV (1951), 635-650.
- Hull, Clerk L. Hypnosis and Suggestibility. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1953.
- Ingram, Karl C. Talk That Gets Results. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957.
- Krech, David, and Richard S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948.
- Lerner, Daniel, ed. Propaganda in War and Crisis. New York: George W. Stewart, 1951.
- Lorge, Irving. "Prestige, Suggestion, and Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, IX (May 1938), 219-225.
- McBurney, James H., and Ernest J. Wraga. Guide to Good Speech. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.
- McCrimmon, James M. Writing With a Purpose. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1963.
- McDougall, William. Social Psychology. Boston: John W. and Co., 1918.
- Meerloo, Joost A. M. Conversation and Communication. New York: International Universities Press, 1952.
- Mickin, Ralph A. Speaking for Results: A Guide for Business and Professional Speakers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.
- Miller, Clyde R. The Process of Persuasion. New York: Crown Publishers, 1946.

- Minnick, Wayne C. The Art of Persuasion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957.
- Muehl, William. The Road to Persuasion. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Ogilvie, Mardel. Teaching Speech in the High School: Principles and Practices. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Oliver, Robert. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1957.
- Oliver, Robert T., and Rupert L. Cortright. New Training for Effective Speech. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.
- Oliver, Robert, Harold P. Zelko, and Paul D. Holtzman. Communicative Speech. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.
- Osgood, Charles E., and Perry H. Tennenbaum. "The Principle of Congruity in the Prediction of Attitude Change," Psychological Review, LXII (1955), 42-55.
- Faget, Edwin. "Suggestion," QIS, XIII (June 1927), 275-278.
- Postman, Leo, and Rheem F. Jarrett. "An Experimental Analysis of Learning Without Awareness," American Journal of Psychology, LXV (April 1952), 244-255.
- Powers, David Guy. Fundamentals of Speech. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.
- Roberts, Paul. The Roberts English Series. A Linguistic Program. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1966.
- _____. Understanding Grammar. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Sanford, William P., and Willard Hayes Yeager. Practical Business Speaking. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952.
- Sarett, Lew, and William Trufant Foster. Basic Principles of Speech. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1936.
- Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954.
- Sidis, Boris. The Psychology of Suggestion. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1898.
- Skinner, Burrhus F. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

- Sorokin, P. A., and J. W. Boldyreff. "An Experimental Study of the Influence of Suggestion on the Discrimination and the Valuation of People," American Journal of Sociology, XXXVII (1932), 720-737.
- Stageberg, Norman C. An Introductory English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Thistlethwaite, D. L., H. de Haan, and J. Kamenetsky. "The Effects of 'Directive' and 'Non-directive' Communication Procedures on Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 107-113.
- Thonssen, Lester, and A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal. New York: The Ronald Press, 1948.
- Thonssen, Lester, and Howard Gilkinson. Basic Training in Speech. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1947.
- Weaver, Andrew Thomas, Gladys L. Borchers, and Donald K. Smith. The Teaching of Speech. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Welden, Terry. "Communication Decisions." Paper read at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, Summer 1966.
- Winans, James A. Speech-Making. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.
- Winterowd, W. Ross. Rhetoric and Writing. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.
- Wolbert Charles. "Persuasion: Principles and Method," QJS, V (March 1919), 110-119.
- Young, Kimball. Social Psychology. New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1944.
- Young, Kimball. "Suggestion as Indirection," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVI (1931-32), 75.

THE DIRECTIVE AS A BASIS OF ALL COMMUNICATION: A SURVEY AND
ANALYSIS OF SELECTED LITERATURE

by

NADYNE A. HENGEN

B. A. E., Wayne State College, 1963

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1967

In this study it is hypothesized that within any communication there is a directive, either explicit or implicit, which could be reduced to the structure of an imperative sentence. In order to further examine this hypothesis, a survey and analysis of the literature is presented. The purposes of this survey and analysis are (1) to provide a classification and general description of the definitions of the directive, and (2) to provide information about the conditions to be considered when phrasing the directive.

The literature presents three categorically different descriptions of the directive. Three chapters are devoted to these arbitrary categories by definition. A fourth chapter presents material about conditions of phrasing a directive.

Information from literature defining the directive by structure is primarily obtained from grammar books. This chapter compares and contrasts three types of grammar, i.e., traditional, structural, and transformational. Particular emphasis is placed on their respective points of view about sentence structure, especially the imperative structure.

The next definitions of the directive are by the intention of the speaker. This is usually considered to be verbal suggestion, which is an effort on the part of the speaker to induce the receiver to make an immediate and sometimes uncritical response. When the intentions of the speaker are clear, it is usually thought that he is using direct suggestion. Indirect suggestion is commonly used when the intentions of the speaker are concealed.

According to much of the persuasion and speech literature, the directive may also be given positively or negatively. The speaker may intend to entreat or command the listener to do something. In other situations he may

intentionally ask the listener not to do something. When the speaker intends to obtain an opposite response, he uses counter suggestion. All of these categories of suggestion are also examined in regard to the sentence structure commonly used to give them.

The third category of definitions places emphasis on obtaining the desired response. In this category, statements about the demand and mand are related. The demand is generally considered to be a command for the desired response. Frequently, this demand for action is to be reworded as an impelling proposition.

Mand speech includes all utterances that are designed to control. This kind of speech is often followed by the desired response. These mands are classified in terms of the subsequent behavior of the listener.

Conditions generally thought to be significant in phrasing the various categories of suggestion are listed. Some mention is also made of the conditions conducive to the effective use of the mand.

One part of the hypothesis, that the imperative sentence is the basic structure of persuasive communication, is supported by much of the persuasion literature. However, the major part of the hypothesis, that the directive is the basis of all communication, is rejected by nearly all of the literature. Therefore, it is concluded that the current literature does not assume that the directive, in the form of an imperative sentence, is basic to all communication.