24. Aug. 1993

ARGUMENTATION

An International Journal on Reasoning

VOLUME 7 - 1993

JOCHEN BECK

ANNEMIEK

LEX BOSM

IAN BAPTIST

Inventar für deutsche Sprache	
Inv.-Nr.	Signatur
	D284

KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON

Types of Dispute Courses in Family Interaction*

THOMAS SPRANZ-FOGASY¹ and THOMAS FLEISCHMANN

¹ Schulbergweg 4
69118 Heidelberg
Germany

ABSTRACT: The article examines entire dispute courses in family interaction with regard to argumentation. The approach is an interdisciplinary one integrating both linguistic conversation analysis and empirical psychology, and leads to a typology of dispute courses. Research is guided by the presupposition that the presentation of an argument depends on two systems, a cognitive one and a motivational one, and that both systems are reflected in the realization of the interaction.

Six types of dispute courses were detected and grouped in the dichotomy of more constructive and more destructive courses where the latter were divided again into courses disturbed in topical progress or disturbed in interpersonal relationships. The types were evaluated through quantitative methods referring to an exhausting coding of the utterances in the material used. Quantitative evaluations yield a synopsis of the different dispute courses concerning the kind of mutual interaction control, the argumentation itself, and the argumentation levels of the participants.

KEY WORDS: Argumentation, conversation-analysis, family, interdisciplinary, conflict, dispute-course, typology.

0. PREFACE

The study of disputes between parents and children promises a thorough understanding of the development of interpersonal relationships in families, because the participants have to mutually elucidate both aspects of separation from each other and aspects of mutuality. These processes may be analyzed in different respects, in different dimensions, or in different units: in respect, for example, to the acting persons, in dimensions such as the topics discussed or the characteristic features of the relationships between the partners, or in units such as single utterances, short sequences, or long phases of the interactions.

This chapter employs a typologizing approach to courses of entire disputes based on interaction analytic considerations about dimensions of the interaction constitution (Kallmeyer and Schütze, 1976). The study is a descriptive one with respect to theoretical and methodological aspects of interaction theory. At the same time it is an attempt to an interdisciplinary approach of conversation

* This contribution is a revised version of a paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Dialogue Analysis in Bologna (May 1990). The research was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the SFB 245 "Sprache und Situation".

analysis and empirical psychology, therefore, in a second step, aiming at quantifying comparisons between different types of dispute courses and between the argumentative behaviour of the participants within the particular types.

Discussion unfolds as follows: first, we present some details concerning the empirical framework of the analysis, followed by a discussion of different approaches to a typology of dispute courses, and the elaboration of an approach of our own. In a third section, six types of dispute courses will be presented and discussed. A last section deals with quantifying different aspects of family disputes based on the typology suggested.

1. EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

A more general outline of the research project the following considerations are taken from is given in Hofer and Pikowsky (this volume). Central to this project is the analysis of conflict discourses between mothers and their adolescent daughters. The main goal is to reconstruct the argumentation of mothers and daughters, and to identify their argumentative levels and personal styles of argumentation. We presume that the presentation of an argument depends on two systems, a cognitive and a motivational one. The cognitive system consists of factual knowledge and strategies concerning the solution of problems. The motivational system, on the other hand, comprises intentions and attitudes, interpersonal relations, and needs. We assume that the motivational and the cognitive system are reflected in the verbal presentation of an argument. A pragmatics based category system has been developed which allows a descriptive quantification of the dialogues (see Appendix; for further information see Hofer *et al.*, 1990a; Hofer and Pikowsky, this volume). The categories reflect an argument aspect and a functional aspect.

Sixty discourses from 30 families were tape-recorded at the homes of the families. Both mothers and daughters were asked to chose one conflict each which they considered relevant in their everyday life. Then they were asked to discuss the two conflicts in a balanced sequence. The records were transcribed according to specific transcription conventions (Gutfleisch-Rieck *et al.*, 1989) and then analyzed by using the category system. Four discourses were excluded from the analysis for lack of authenticity.

2. AN APPROACH TO A TYPOLOGY OF DISPUTE COURSES: DIMENSIONS OF INTERACTION AND CRITERIA OF TYPES

As Rehbein (1979) stated, complex forms of social (inter)actions may be segmented into partial actions, but the function of the total complex form cannot be reconstructed as a mere function of the single segments. The analysis then has to grasp the adequate dimension of the phenomenon considered. The question therefore which we will follow here is how to devise an appropriate

approach to the analysis of dispute courses and a typology of such courses. Vice versa we will take these analyses as a starting point for further sequential and frequency analyses with the argument categories by applying the typology developed.

Conversation analysis as a whole did not systematically provide methods for analyzing long interaction stretches (Heritage, 1985). Linguistic research, especially in the Germanies, however, has yielded a lot of literature about general types of discourse as 'discussion', 'counselling', 'mediation' etc. (Henne and Rehbock, 1979; Kallmeyer, 1985; Nothdurft, in press a; Steger *et al.*, 1974; and for a survey Mayer and Weber, 1983). Analyses of conflict disputes in other research fields (such as psychology or sociology) mostly focused on the results or styles of such interactions (like one partner wins, or both compromise; or for styles of conflict: avoidance, competition, etc.; see Deutsch, 1973; Dieckmann, 1988). But none of the known research is looking for typologizing entire dispute courses (for "patterns of dispute dynamics in mediation discourses" see Nothdurft, in press b; Nothdurft, 1987).

A first approach to a typology of dispute courses could be the reconstruction of the interaction scheme (for the concept of the interaction scheme see Kallmeyer, 1985). For this purpose it is necessary to identify phases regularly occurring in a given type of interaction and to reconstruct the sequential logic of these phases. Conflict disputes hence firstly require an "exposition of the conflict" by the partners; secondly, you may find activities called "conflict discussion"; and as a last interactive task participants have to "resolve the conflict", mostly realized just as finishing the interaction.

Considering the interaction scheme is necessary but not sufficient for analyzing types of dispute courses. Entire courses cannot be typologized by using a single predictor but must be looked at as a multidimensional process. We will, thus, refer to discourse analytic considerations concerning different aspects of the interaction constitution (Kallmeyer and Schütze, 1976, Kallmeyer, 1982) for relevant analytic criteria.

Besides the *development of the interaction* in the course of an interaction scheme there are two further relevant dimensions for conflict disputes, the *dimension of topics* and the *dimension of interpersonal relationships* (both used in the discourse analytic sense of the terms; see Kallmeyer, 1983). On the dimension of topics the participants introduce topical elements, defining them as a particular kind of topic (e.g. as a problem, or, as in this case, as a conflict), and they negotiate their respective positions. This dimension is relevant for analyzing conflict discourses, because conflicts appear through the divergent views on topics. On the dimension of interpersonal relationships the participants release features of their interactive ways to deal with conflicts. Here conflict willingness, conflict ability, and the abilities for conflict resolution are perceptible. Following an ethnomethodological approach (see Bergmann, 1981; Heritage, 1985), there is an amount of organizing activities concerning these three dimensions which could be used as the empirical base for working out types of dispute courses.

Based on theoretical considerations concerning the three dimensions, we want to suggest six relevant tasks the participants have to deal with and which will provide criteria for an analysis of dispute courses (Nothdurft *et al.*, 1984). The analytical perspective here is not result oriented but process oriented.

1. *The clarification of conflict willingness*; concerning the interaction course, the participants have to decide whether they will get involved in a conflict situation, and how: if they are willing to argue, whether they are conflict oriented or rather aiming at a compromise etc.
2. *The clarification of the dispute topic*; the participants have to mutually establish a topical focus.
3. *The constitution of the conflictual ability of the topic*; the participants have to clearly make the topic "a conflict" (Nothdurft (1984) calls that process 'typologizing', while Herrmann (1985) says 'transforming'); not every topic is a conflict topic; where this property is missing the participants have to clarify (e.g. in German there is a proverbial topic "you can't argue about taste" which also occurred in our data).
4. *The negotiation of the different points of view*; the participants have to define their points of view "as different points of view"; as a main task in dispute interactions the participants have to mutually clarify their own perspective, at least for establishing a base for potential dispute solving.
5. *The constitution and maintenance of the topic*; the participants have to establish and to maintain topical coherence (in this regard argumentation is a specific kind of contextualizing; see Auer, 1986; Pander Maat, 1985).
6. *Keeping the interaction scheme going*; the partners – at least in an ideal sense – have to proceed according to the interaction scheme described above (i.e., the exposition of the conflict, conflict discussion, resolving the conflict).

Regarding these tasks as criteria for the analysis of dispute courses, some hints might be found towards a typology of such courses looking at the activities of the participants, whether they stress some of these tasks or neglect them.

3. SIX TYPES OF DISPUTE COURSES

As a result of analyzing 11 randomly selected dialogues of the corpus ($N = 56$) and with reference to other data (as from previous research, and from the mediation project which was run by the Institut für deutsche Sprache (Mannheim, Germany) from 1983 to 1989; see Nothdurft, in press a), six types of dispute courses were found which are described below. The dialogues deal with everyday topics like chores, school, dressing, or lack of consideration.

1. Linear developing

As a first type, dialogues could be distinguished where the partners are diversifying a complex (conflict) topic into separate topics during their interaction, discussing them one after the other while not organizing them in a straight forward way (e.g. directionally aiming at a conflict solution).

Relevant dimensions of interactional constitution with that type of course are the topic dimension and the dimension of interaction development. (We do not want to imply that other dimensions are excluded. They are, however, less important for the purpose of these analyses).

The characteristics of this type are: regular occurrence of new but separate topics oriented at the immediate topical context (realized as splitting the main topic, subsumption, association, etc.; see Hoffmann, 1989); a lot of utterance constructions beginning with "and then"; no summaries can be found.

Referring to the six criteria of a typology of dispute courses, the clarification of conflict willingness is to be considered as a presupposition, and the respective topic is clear enough to the participants or will be clarified soon; also the conflict ability is evident; the main activities are aimed at the negotiation of the different points of view and the constitution and maintenance of the topic; keeping the interaction scheme going is a more or less unexplicit performance.

2. Summarizing Stepwise

The second type of dispute course describes dialogues in which the participants also diversify the complex conflict topic into separate topics. In addition, however, they order these different topics stepwise by abstractional synopsis and/or they bring them into an explicit relation to the components of the interaction scheme (i.e. to the development of the conversation).

Relevant dimensions here are topics and interaction development.

Some characteristics of this type are explicitly summarizing and ordering statement, anaphoric and kataphoric elements, announcements of next activities, and more complex formulations.

The participants handle the performance of the interaction scheme (see criterion 6) explicitly. Also the other interaction tasks described here as criteria will be treated *expressis verbis* or are at least taken for granted.

3. Dissociating

Participants orient themselves to separate topics but soon leave the starting point and the main topic (proverbially described as "loosing the thread").

Here, all the dimensions of interaction constitution described above could be relevant.

As important features there are always new separate topics to be found, soon loosing every coherence with the main topic; also there are topical expansions to other topics which are controversial between the partners.

The clarification of conflict willingness is obvious, a topic is soon found and

defined as conflictual but also abruptly changed; there is less negotiation of the different points of view due to the lack of topical coherence; keeping the interaction scheme going cannot be detected.

4. Turning around in circles

This type describes dialogues where the partners reach no topical progress or only a certain kind with a standstill regularly occurring at particular aspects of the topic. Besides the topical standstill there is also a standstill concerning interactional progress and often a progredient stress for the relations between the partners because of negative feedback lags. (Originally this type was differentiated in two types "turning around in circles" and "stepping without move", but we later collapsed these types in one because of very similar characteristic features.).

There are relevant activities concerning all three dimensions of the interaction constitution which could be used for analyses.

Empirically a total topical standstill can be observed as well as few enduring periods of topical progress, soon to be interrupted (often by a recurring argument); here pauses occur frequently; also repetitions, paraphrases, and negative sequences (a counterargument following another counterargument) are found which the partners are unable to leave (Spranz-Fogasy and Fleischmann, 1991).

While the conflict willingness of the partners is clear, and the dispute topic is soon identified as a controversial one, the negotiation of the views cannot be pushed forward by the partners; topical coherence is only negatively warranted by no further progress, and the interaction scheme therefore could also not be kept ongoing.

5. Obstructing

"Obstructing" as a type of dispute course depends on response activities of only one of the partners. A linear topical progress performed by one of the partners is found, while the other always tries to block this progress by contradiction and similar activities. The latter sometimes does not accept a single word from her partner.

The dimension stressed in this kind of interaction is the dimension of interpersonal relationships.

The dialogues feature quite a few contradictions, objections, doubts and negotiations, negative sequences, and "yes but" constructions always run by one and the same partner.

The obstructing partner prevents the treatment of greater parts of the interaction tasks described above so that the criteria could not be mutually accomplished by the interactional progress. The one-sided lack of conflict willingness totally undermines a constructive interaction.

6. *Dominating*

Like "obstructing", "dominating" is defined on the basis of one partner's activities, but from the active, not the reactive type as in "obstructing". In dialogues which can be described as "dominating", there is a clear topical and interactional development but only pursued by one of the participants. The other participant is going along with that progress but is of low influence.

Dimensions to be considered are interaction development and interpersonal relationships.

All activities relevant for the purpose of the interaction such as abstraction, summaries, interactional transitions (see type 1 and 2) are performed by only one participant.

Referring to the six criteria of this typology, there is no firm clarification of conflict willingness by the dominated partner or any mutually reached treatment of the topic; as it is the complement of the "obstructing" type, there are similar properties concerning the mutuality but also two differences: topical coherence is strictly warranted by the dominating partner as is the performance of the interaction scheme.

Interim General Remarks

The typology of dispute courses depends on activities of the participants. Sometimes the mutual activities are relevant for the type (types 1 to 4), sometimes it is rather one partner whose activities are decisive for classification (at least for the reason of easier perceptibility; types 5 and 6).

With the presented typology, the criterion of exclusiveness cannot be fully met because of fluid transitions. In more extended conversations than the ones we draw upon there may be phases in a dialogue which can be seen as one type and other phases in the same dialogue which clearly could be defined as another type. So, typologizing here means stressing certain aspects of a dialogue.

Some of the types are not very frequent in the material; e.g., "dissociating" which is rare for structural reasons: One of the limits for analyzing the material is topical changes, i.e. when partners leave the main topic the following utterances were not analyzed. Despite that, we do adhere to this type because of systematic reasons; dissociating is an often used interaction pattern, which helps the participants or at least one of them to maintain the communication while neglecting the topical coherence.

In addition, some of the interactions in the corpus are very short, and therefore no topical change or standstill or organizing activities concerning the interaction scheme could be detected.

Though there are some imponderabilities in dealing with a typology of long interaction distances (Heritage, 1985), classification was possible as section 4 will show.

With this typology, chances and risks of a particular type of interaction, "conflict discourse", are evident; chances and risks of an interaction type which is designed to mutually resolve mutual problems of the participants. Chances

here means that the participants may adequately prepare interindividual problems for interactional treatment, thereby transforming characters of the interpersonal relationship into characters of factual knowledge and then process the interaction successively in adequate sequences. On the other hand the participants run some risks at every stage of this process: at the transformation stage, the preparing stage, and during processing the interaction. Activities at these stages hence provide some more or less successful courses of conflict disputes.

A more general consideration leads to the complex forms of reciprocity between the very different aspects of social interaction. Nowhere can the mutual dependences and influences of the dimensions of the interaction constitution named above clearly be perceived as in interactions constituted as a conflict from the beginning. As one can see in the description of type 5 ("obstructing"), only a few obstructive utterances may disavow all efforts concerning the clarification of topics and the performance of the interaction scheme, while on the other hand the explicit location of the interactional progress may facilitate the clarification of topics and maintain the interpersonal relationships (see type 2 "summarizing stepwise"). Conflict discourses hence provide very instructive material for eliciting the different aspects of interaction and their interdependencies.

4. SOME QUANTITATIVE EVALUATIONS

After elaborating the typology of dispute courses we will ask whether the different types can be discriminated on the basis of various language variables. Other research of the project takes various measures for the description of the participants' relationship. We presume that the types presented here are connected in a systematic manner with such differences.

For the purpose of quantitative evaluations types have been pooled. A first dichotomizing grouping used the criterion of regular or disturbed interaction progress concerning the three relevant interactive dimensions: interactional development, topic, and interpersonal relationships (see section 2). Accordingly, a distinction was made between *constructive* courses of disputes (types 1 and 2; see Table 1), where topical and interactional development, and also interpersonal relations are run in an adequate progredient manner, and *destructive* courses (types 3 to 6), where the progress is partially or totally blocked.

A classification within the destructive types subsequently distinguishes dialogues according to the kind of disturbance: whether it is blocked rather on the dimension of topics (types 3 and 4) or on the dimension of interpersonal relationships (types 5 and 6).

The following expectations are connected with these groupings.

Table 1. Types and groups of types.

I	Constructive types
	1. Linear developing
	2. Summarizing stepwise
II	Destructive types
	a. Topical disturbance
	3. Dissociating
	4. Turning around in circles
	b. Interpersonal relationship disturbance
	5. Obstructing
	6. Dominating

Expectations

We expect differences between the types and between the participants in the degree of control behaviour. Control behaviour, as revealed for example in the use of initiatives and reactives and in the distribution of talk, should be enacted to a larger extent in the destructive types, and it should be pursued more by mothers than by daughters.

Furthermore we expect differences in the degree of argumentativity, i.e. differences in the distribution of the totality of the argument categories (evaluations, preferences, facts, connections, norms; see Appendix). These differences should also concern the types as well as the participants' activities.

Methods

The typology was developed on the basis of 11 randomly selected interactions of the corpus ($N = 56$). Also other materials were used (as from previous research, and from the mediation project which was run by the Institut für deutsche Sprache (Mannheim, Germany) from 1983 to 1989; see Nothdurft, in press a). Employing this typology, the other 45 cases of the corpus were then classified.

Based on these groupings, different kinds of frequency analyses have been run. In these analyses, the category system elaborated in the project has been used (see Appendix; Hofer and Pikowsky, this volume; Hofer *et al.*, 1990). Differences between the groups concerning discourse variables (proportion of speech, argument categories, functional categories) were tested using *t*-tests. Thereby the frequencies of the categories per person were weighted to the length of the dialogues respectively. For the purpose of testing for the significance of contingency tables, *chi-square* tests were computed.

Results

Most of the interactions in the corpus could be categorized by using the criteria and the characteristic features described above. Some interactions too short to firm classification were categorized as type 1 because relevant features of one of the other types could not be detected and some characteristics of "linear developing" were discoverable. The distribution of the conflict discourses is listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of types ($N = 56$).

Linear developing	23
Summarizing stepwise	9
Dissociating	2
Turning around in circles	8
Obstructing	9
Dominating	5

Disputes proceeding destructively on the dimension of interpersonal relationships (group IIb, see Table 1) occurred more often with younger daughters (12 to 14 years) than with older ones ($\chi^2 = 6.5$, d.f. = 2, $p < 0.05$).

Regarding the proportion of speech, there is a significant difference between mothers and daughters in all dialogues ($t = 4.5$, $p < 0.001$), but no differences could be detected between constructive and destructive courses. On the other hand, there is a difference within the destructive group IIb; here mothers do speak more than daughters ($t = 4.2$, $p < 0.01$).

Concerning the degree of interaction control, groups I and II differ. In the more destructive courses (II), the controlling activities of mothers (such initiatives as requests, questions etc.) are more frequent than in group I ($t = -2.0$, $p < 0.10$; for this and most of the following see Table 3). There is no difference between groups IIa and IIb.

Also, there are differences in the more reactive utterances. Within group II mothers also utter more reactives to arguments and to initiatives ($t = -2.6$, $p < 0.05$) than they do in group I. Daughters realize more reactive utterances in group IIb than in group IIa ($t = -2.1$, $p < 0.05$).

Argumentativity, i.e. the totality of the argument categories, is higher in group I than it is in group II ($t = 2.3$, $p < 0.05$), but the distribution is different for mothers and daughters: while daughters' argumentative behaviour does not differ significantly, mothers' behaviour does ($t = 2.2$, $p < 0.05$).

The degree of argumentativity also differs between group IIa and group IIb. There is much more argumentation in disputes disturbed on the dimension of topics, than there is in disputes disturbed on the dimension of interpersonal relationships ($t = 2.8$, $p < 0.01$). For this, both participants are responsible (mothers: $t = 2.1$, $p < 0.05$; daughters: $t = 2.2$, $p < 0.05$).

Referring to the individual categories, the following results were found. Mothers and daughters use less norms in the more constructive disputes

Table 3. Distribution of the categories within the groups of types (only the significant values are indicated).

	Mother			Daughter		
	I	IIa	IIb	I	IIa	IIb
Totality of arguments	>	>				>
Control activities (initiative/reactive)	<					
<hr/>						
Norm	<			<		>
Fact	>			>		
Counterargument	>			>		
Supportive argument			>			>
Additional argument						>

Notes: I = constructive courses; IIa = destructive courses (disturbed on the dimension of topics); IIb = destructive courses (disturbed on the dimension of interpersonal relationships).

(mothers: $t = -2.4$, $p < 0.05$; daughters: $t = -1.7$, $p < 0.10$), whereas daughters use more norms in disputes of group IIa than in disputes of group IIb ($t = 2.3$, $p < 0.05$). On the other hand, both participants do utter significantly more facts when arguing in disputes of the constructive types. Again mothers do so more frequently than their daughters ($t = 3.6$, $p < 0.001$ for mothers, $t = 1.8$, $p < 0.10$).

The categories of the argumentative function (see Appendix) of the utterances also yield some remarkable differences. For both participants in constructive disputes, there is evidence that they use more counterarguments than in disputes of the destructive types (mothers: $t = 2.3$, $p < 0.05$; daughters: $t = 3.0$, $p < 0.01$). Analyzing the destructive types ("obstructive" and "dominating"), the participants in type 5 use much more counterarguments than in type 6 (mothers: $t = 3.8$, $p < 0.01$; daughters: $t = 6.0$, $p = 0.001$).

Supportive and additional arguments only differ between disputes of group IIa and IIb. Supportive arguments are used more frequently in destructive disputes disturbed on the dimension of topics ($t = 1.9$, $p < 0.10$ for mothers and $t = 2.1$, $p < 0.05$ for daughters). And, as a last result, daughters also use more additional arguments in disputes of group IIa ($t = 2.9$, $p < 0.01$).

Discussion

As a first overall result we can state that the pooled groups of the different types do discriminate between dialogues as a whole. Referring to the sense of typologizing and grouping concerning the events on the relevant dimensions of interaction constitution, a consistent pattern can be seen as will be discussed now.

Most of the disputes proceed in a constructive manner. Only a quarter of the disputes in the corpus is disturbed in processing the dimension of interpersonal relationships. Overwhelmingly, mothers are responsible for the proceedings of the disputes. They determine the course in an active way through their speech frequency, and through their active part concerning the interaction controlling mechanisms. In disputes of the destructive types at a whole, there are much more control activities by the mothers, and this is even more distinct in disputes disturbed on the dimension of interpersonal relationships. As a complement, there is much more reactive behaviour from the daughters in these dispute types. Summarizing, mothers speak claiming place and in a directive manner in destructive disputes and correspondingly, daughters are only passively reactive.

The fact that disputes proceed much more problematically on the dimension of interpersonal relationships with younger daughters as participants, in our view suggests that the mothers and daughters cannot handle the greater number and larger extent of divergences in levels and/or perspectives in an adequate manner (an interpretation drawing upon the daughters' aggressiveness seems not appropriate regarding the fact of their very defensive behaviour). This consideration fits with the results of developmental psychology, where it is stated that with the beginning of the adolescence more conflicts emerge between mothers and daughters, because of the hitherto unknown demands through the daughter's individuation process (Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986; Montemayor, 1983; Mullison, 1985). Tensions resulting from the divergences described seem to be interactively counterbalanced by the mothers through obstructing and dominating activities.

The grouping of the types also reveals argumentation levels of the dyads in other ways. Constructive courses are much more connected with a higher degree of argumentativity than destructive courses are, whereas within the destructive courses the "merely" topically disturbed courses are more argumentative than the courses regarded as disturbed in the interpersonal relationships. This is true for mothers and for daughters. Obviously it makes no difference for constructive courses that many arguments are enacted as counterarguments. Vice versa this result rather confirms a widespread hypothesis positing more positive effects of an argumentative treatment of conflicts as compared to an oppression of conflicts, for example, by means of control activities (Grotevant and Cooper, 1986; Smollar and Youniss, 1987). More generally, Dieckmann (1989, p. 11) even holds as a "value premise" that a constructive treatment of contradictions and conflicts can be achieved best through dialogue.

At first glance, it may be surprising that both participants use less norms and more facts in constructive dispute courses. On the other hand, there is a strong assumption that an explicit normative argumentation is required only in problematic conversations as a repair mode for the constitution of conditions for undisturbed communication, whereas the participants may argue using only facts in constructive courses while mutually presupposing the normative conditions. There are several hints in literature from various disciplines that critical stages in conversations lead to a change of focus, so as to an explication of norms in the

"Diskurs" (where the conditions of the validity of utterances are discussed; see Habermas, 1981), as to an explication of "relational-control issues", i.e. the explicit discussion of interpersonal relationships as a source of relational control (Wiemann, 1985, p. 87), or as to explicit "metatalk" as a (Western) strategy of interactional control (Gumperz *et al.*, 1982).

An adequate description of the types of dispute courses by means of quantitative evaluations needs further analyses. The typology presented here will be validated using other samples. This analysis is designed as a further attempt to combine qualitative and quantitative research in an interdisciplinary approach (see also Spranz-Fogasy and Fleischmann, 1991). The considerations presented try to grasp a complex social phenomenon by providing an adequately complex level of description, and to work out the connecting elements between the very different aspects of the complex phenomenon in view.

REFERENCES

- Auer, P.: 1986, 'Kontextualisierung', *Studium Linguistik* 19, 22-47.
- Bergmann, J.: 1981, 'Ethnomethodologische Konversationsanalyse', in Schröder, P. and Steger, H. (eds.), *Dialogforschung*, Jahrbuch 1980 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache, Düsseldorf, 9-52, Schwamm.
- Deutsch, M.: 1973, *The resolution of conflict*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Dieckmann, J.: 1989, *Konfliktregulierung durch Dialoge*, Freiburg.
- Grotevant, H. and Cooper, C.: 1986, 'Individuation in Family Relationships', *Human Development* 29, 82-100.
- Gumperz, J., Aulakh, G., Kaltmann, H.: 1982, 'Thematic Structure and Progression in Discourse', in Gumperz, J. (ed.), *Language and Social Identity* - (Studies in Social Interactional Sociolinguistics), Cambridge, 22-56.
- Gutfleisch-Rieck, I., Klein, W., Speck, A. and Spranz-Fogasy, Th.: 1989, Transkriptionsvereinbarungen für den Sonderforschungsbereich 245 "Sprechen und Sprachverstehen im sozialen Kontext". *Arbeiten aus dem Sonderforschungsbereich 245 "Sprechen und Sprachverstehen im sozialen Kontext"*, Bericht Nr. 14.
- Habermas, J.: 1981, *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Henne, H. and Rehbock, H.: 1979, *Einführung in die Gesprächsanalyse*, Berlin/New York.
- Heritage, J.: 1985, 'Recent developments in Conversation Analysis', *Sociolinguistic Newsletters*.
- Herrmann, T.: 1985, *Allgemeine Sprachpsychologie*, München: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Hofer, M., Pikowsky, B., Spranz-Fogasy, Th. and Fleischmann, Th.: 1990a, Mannheimer Argumentations Kategorien System (MAKS), *Arbeiten aus dem Sonderforschungsbereich 245 "Sprechen und Sprachverstehen im sozialen Kontext"*, Bericht Nr. 22.
- Hofer, M., Fleischmann, Th. and Spranz-Fogasy, Th.: 1990c, Argumentationssequenzen in Konfliktgesprächen zwischen Müttern und Töchtern. *Arbeiten aus dem Sonderforschungsbereich 245 "Sprechen und Sprachverstehen im sozialen Kontext"*, Bericht Nr. 26.
- Hofer, M., Pikowsky, B. and Fleischmann, Th.: 1991, Jugendliche unterschiedlichen Alters im argumentativen Konfliktgespräch mit ihrer Mutter, *Arbeiten aus dem Sonderforschungsbereich 245 "Sprechen und Sprachverstehen im sozialen Kontext"*, Bericht Nr. 36.
- Hoffmann, L.: 1989, 'Thema und thematische Organisation', *Linguistische Studien, Reihe*

A (199), 209–224.

- Kallmeyer, W.: 1982, 'Aspekte der Analyse verbaler Interaktion – Zwischenbilanz eines Forschungsprogramms', Mannheim (Ms).
- Kallmeyer, W.: 1985, 'Handlungskonstitution im Gespräch. Dupont und sein Experte führen ein Beratungsgespräch', in Gülich, E. and Kotschi, T. (eds.), *Grammatik, Konversation, Interaktion*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 81–122.
- Kallmeyer, W. and Schütze, F.: 1976, 'Konversationsanalyse', *Studium Linguistik* 1, 1–28.
- Mayer, S., and Weber, M.: 1983, *Bibliographie zur linguistischen Gesprächsforschung*, Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag
- Montemayor, R.: 1983, 'Parents and Adolescents in Conflict: All Families Some of the Time and Some Families Most of the Time', *Journal of Early Adolescence* 3, 83–103.
- Mullison, D.: 1985, *Perceptions of Mothers and Daughters During Conflictual Interaction*, University of Utah (Unpubl. Phil. Diss.).
- Nothdurft, W.: 1984 '...äh folgendes Problem äh ...' *Die interaktive Ausarbeitung "des Problems" in Beratungsgesprächen*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Nothdurft, W.: 1987, 'Conversational Analysis of Complex Interactional Patterns, in Russ, Ch. and Volkmar, C. (eds.), *Sprache und Gesellschaft in deutschsprachigen Ländern*, München, 75–93.
- Nothdurft, W.: (ed.) (in press a), *Streitschlichten. Gesprächsanalytische Untersuchungen zu institutionellen Formen konsensueller Konfliktbewältigung*, Berlin: de Gruyter
- Nothdurft, W. (in press b), *Muster der Gesprächsdynamik in Schlichtungsgesprächen*, in Nothdurft, W. (ed.), *Konfliktstoff*. Berlin: de Gruyter, Kap. 5.
- Nothdurft, W., Schröder, P. and Spranz-Fogasy, Th.: 1984, *Verdichtung – Das situative Zustandekommen von Schlichtung und Ansätze zur methodischen Erfassung*, Mannheim (Ms).
- Pander Maat, H.: 1985, 'Argumentation: Zur Charakterisierung eines Forschungsgegenstandes', *Studium Linguistik* 16, 1–20.
- Rehbein, J.: 1979, 'Handlungstheorien', *Studium Linguistik* 7, 1–25.
- Smollar, J. and Youniss, J.: 1987, 'Transformation in Adolescents' Perception of Parents', *International Journal of Behavior Development* 12(1), 71–84.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Th. and Fleischmann, Th.: 1991, 'Die Ablehnung von Argumenten in Konfliktgesprächen zwischen Müttern und Töchtern – Quantitative und qualitative Sequenzanalysen', Vortrag in der Arbeitsgruppe "Sprachliche Sequenzierung und interaktive Ordnung" auf der 13. Jahrestagung der "Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft", Aachen.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Th., Hofer, M. and Pikowsky, B.: 1990, 'Sprachhandlungs- und Sachverhaltenswissen. Zur Analyse von Argumentationen in familiären Streitgesprächen, Vortrag gehalten in der Arbeitsgruppe "Entwicklung und Gebrauch kommunikativen Wissens" auf der 12. Jahrestagung der "Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft", Saarbrücken.
- Steger, H., Deutrich, H., Schank, G. and Schütz, E.: 1974, 'Redekonstellation, Redekonstellationstyp, Textexemplar, Textsorte im Rahmen eines Sprachverhaltensmodells, Begründung einer Forschungshypothese, *Gesprochene Sprache*, 39–97.
- Steinberg, L. and Silverberg, S.: 1986, 'The Vicissitudes of Autonomy in Early Adolescence', *Child Development* 57, 841–851.
- Wiemann, J.: 1985, *Interpersonal Control and Regulation in Conversation*, in Street, R., and Capella, J. (eds.), *Sequence Pattern in Communicative Behaviour*, London, 85–102.

APPENDIX

Short version of the Mannheim Category System for Mother Daughter Conflicts
(see Hofer *et al.*, 1990a; Hofer and Pikowsky, this volume).

Argument categories

Initiative

request

proposal

question of clarification ("how")

question of justification ("why")

Reactive (to arguments or initiatives)

agreement

rejection

Evaluation

Preference

Fact

Connection

Norm

Metacommunication

Uncodable

Functional categories

Supportive argument

Additional argument

Counterargument

Relativation

Uncodable