activity like forensics.

Competition further complicates this process in forensics because we use comparative system that ranks and rates student performances. Without using some standards based on subjective comparison, a judge is philosophically entrenched when all students perform at the same measurable level. Student A may have had the best performance earning a 1-24, while Student B may have been last in a close round, earning a 5-19. The rating of 19 may not accurately describe the student performance, but descending rating is often mandated in writing IE ballots. Thus, comparative performance (ranking) is the only way to assess students. This approach, however, does not give the student an accurate representation of the judge's assessment. Students could perform admirably, but receive low ranks because the students competing against them did better jobs. The clarity of a literature cutting or speech structure is often measured on a subjective scale. It is not either complete or not; instead, it is done better or worse than the ideal for a judge and in comparison to other presentations in the round. Comparative judging relies on rank to deal with the competitive facet of forensics, which is why feedback is critical to the education of the students. Even if a student receives the first place ranking in the round, that does not mean they cannot improve. As Worth (2012) pointed out, debate culture frames the ballot as a sacred text of the round, unbending to any other record of the debate. Establishing the judge as "god" encourages students to focus on merely the outcome (win/loss) and not what they can learn from a victory. As mentioned earlier, IE competition is different for a variety of reasons, and IE coaches should encourage learning regardless of the placement in the competition round. First place or fifth place, a student can learn from their competitive experience through the comments on the ballot.

An IEJP can help a judge articulate where a student truly stands in relation to the judges learning objectives. Only through detailed and justified feedback can students learn through judges' comments. Morris (2005) argued for judges to avoid evaluation (giving opinion and measuring value) and embrace criticism (apply a formula to determine if something is or is not). Attempting to judge a round through criticism is a noble goal and should be embraced; however, without expressing an opinion of how to improve, judges cannot provide sound pedagogical advice for students and fail at the job of being a forensic educator. An IEJP can provide a well-thought-out rationale for events, giving judges the right mindset coming into a round of competition: that of an educator and not a critic.

Conclusion

Workman (1997) outlined six competencies for a forensic professional, one of which is instructional and professional competency. Workman explains that a forensic professional should be able to teach undergraduate students, have a philosophy of speech performance, and write educational critiques. As mentioned earlier, forensic studies have shown that the quality of ballots is not what they should be. Mills (1983) argued that the justifications behind comments are often unclear and not educational. By adopting IEJPs, judges of competitive collegiate speech competitions can increase the pedagogical gains of the activity for students and themselves. Hoffman (1996) and Przybylo (1997) got the forensic community going in the right direction, but we need to take action and follow the example of the debate community. I encourage every judge and coach to write a personal IEJP and take it along to tournaments.

My IEJP is by no means perfect, is under constant revision, and represents my working pedagogical beliefs and justifications. Too often forensic educators have brilliant ideas and teaching justifications but never fully articulate them. Dimock and White (2007) noted judges need to be conscious advocates for enhancing critical thinking in students by writing empowering ballots. By taking the time to create an IEJP each judge can improve their pedagogical justifications and make a difference in the education of our students. If we seek to improve the education in this co-curricular activity, our evaluation of student performances must be justified and grounded in communicative theory and/or best practice. If we all embrace an IEJP, regardless of the outcome of competition, everyone wins.

REFERENCES

Andrade, H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership, 57* (5), 13-18.

Arter, J., & Chappuis, J. (2007). *Creating and recognizing quality rubrics.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance:* New York: Corwin Press.

Beyond objectivity: The evolution of debate judging paradigms, alternatives to judge objectivity and the dialogue paradigm. (1987). *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, 379-386.

Bolton, C. F. (2006). Rubrics and adult learners: Androgogy and assessment. *Assessment Update, 18*(3), 5-6.

Brown, C. E. (2008). Ethics in extemp: Changing norms, changing behaviors. *Forensic, 93*(1), 19-27.

Buckley, D. C. (1983). A comparison of judging paradigms. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, 858-871.

Burke, K. (2011). *From standards to rubrics in six steps: tools for assessing student learning.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.

Cooper, B. S., & Gargan, A. (2009). Rubrics in education: Old term, new meanings. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(1), 54-55.

Cronn-Mills, D., & Croucher, S. (2001). Judging the judges: an analysis of ballots in Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking. *SpeakerPoints, 8*(2).

Dahl, M. (2001). *Are rubric scores on performance assessments reliable and valid when assigned by different raters?* Unpublished master's thesis. Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN.

Dimock, J., & White, L. (2007). Criticalizing Forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 25,* 81-98.

Edwards, J., & Thompson, B. (2001). Judging the judges: a ballot analysis of Communication Analysis and After-Dinner Speaking. *SpeakerPoints, 8*(2).

Epping, D., & Labrie, J. (2005). You did what?!?: An expectancy violation approach to normative behavior in collegiate forensics. *Forensic, 90*(1), 18-29.

Freeley, A. J. (1981). Judging paradigms: The impact of the critic on argument. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, 433-447.

Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2009). *Argumentation and debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision making.* 12th ed. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensics: When competitive success stifles creativity. *National Forensic Journal, 20,* 54-56.

Gaskill, R.. (1998). Bad taste: Nothing should be done: Celebrating diversity. *SpeakerPoints, 5*(2).

Green, R., & Bowser, M. (2006). Observations from the field: Sharing a literature review rubric. *Journal of Library Administration, 45*(1-2), 185-202.

Gschwend, L. (2000). Every student deserves an assessment tool that teaches. *Communication Teacher, 14*(3), 1-5.

Hoffman, M. F. (1996). Any comments on your judging philosophy before I start?: An individual events judging philosophy. *SpeakerPoints, 3*(1).

Holmes, L. E., & Smith, L. J. (2003). Student evaluation of faculty grading systems. *Journal of Education for Business, 78*(6), 318-323.

Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading far the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Klosa, B., & DuBois, A. (2001). Judging the judges: an analysis of ballots in Prose, Poetry and Drama. *SpeakerPoints, 8*(2).

Kuster, T. (1998). Locating and defining the problems of bad taste in college forensics. *SpeakerPoints, 5*(2).

Lain, B. (2010). Speaker points, wins, and losses: A history of the evolution of academic debate and its place within communication studies. *Conference Proceedings -- National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference On Argumentation)*, 274-280.

Lechtreck, B. (1995). Writing a debate judging philosophy. *SpeakerPoints, 2*(1).

Marzano, R. J. (2000). *Transforming classroom grading.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McBath, J. H. (Ed.). (1975). *Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective.* Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Mills, N. (1983). Judging standards in forensics: Toward a uniform code in the 80's. *National Forensic Journal, 1,* 19-31.

Minch, K., & Borchers, T. A. (1996). A philosophy for judging NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate. *National Forensic Journal, 14*(2), 19-36.

Morris, K. (2005). Evaluator vs. critic: Judging intercollegiate forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 23*(1), 75-78.

Nelson, K., & Lindley, K. (2004). *Starting strong: Surviving and thieving as a new teacher.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

O'Rourke, A., & O'Rourke, B. (1997). *No surprises! No excuses! Using rubrics to improve student performance.* Paper presented at East Side Union High School District's Cluster One Summer Institute, San Jose, CA.

Paine, R. E. (2005). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *National Forensic Journal, 23*(1), 79-88.

Parkes, K. A. (2006). The effect of performance rubrics on college level applied studio grading. PhD. dissertation, University of Miami.

Pelias, R. J. (1984). Evaluating interpretation events on the forensic circuit. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 20,* 224-230.

Petkov, D., & Petkova, O. (2006). Development of scoring rubrics of IS projects as an assessment tool. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, 3,* 499-510.

Popham, W.J. (1997). What's wrong – and what's right – with rubrics. *Educational Leadership, 55*(2), 72-75.

Pratt, J. W. (1998). Bad taste: Something should be done. *SpeakerPoints, 5*(2).

Przybylo, J. (1997, August). *Creating an individual events judging philosophy.* Conference Proceedings: Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, 13-16.

Quinlan, A. M. (2006). *A complete guide to rubrics: assessment made easy for teachers, K-college.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Reddy, Y., & Andrade, H. (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment*

& Evaluation in Higher Education, 35(4), 435-448.

Reeves, S., & Stanford, B. (2009). Rubrics for the classroom: Assessments for students and teachers. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 76*(1), 24-27.

Reitmeier, C. A., Svendsen, L. K., & Vrchota, D. A. (2004). Improving oral communication skills of students in food science courses. *Journal of Food Science Education, 3*, 15-20.

Rowland, R. C. (1982). Standards for paradigm evaluation. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*,133-140.

Simpson. M. L.. Stahl, N. A.. & Anderson. F. M. (2004). Reading and learning strategies: Recommendations for the 21st century. *Journal of Developmental Education. 28*(2), 2-32.

Skillings, M., & Ferrell, R. (2000). Student-generated rubrics: Bringing students into the assessment process. *Reading Teacher, 53*(6), 452.

Stevens, D. D., Levi, A. J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning.* Sterling, VA.: Stylus Publishing.

Stiggins, R.J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment.* 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Swift, C. (2007). Pre-Fiat vs. Post Fiat Kritik Implications Debate, Cost Benefit Analysis Criterion, or Just Water the House Plant?: National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence Judging Paradigms. *Forensic, 92*(2), 27-32.

Wakefield, B. (2010, August). Ballots: A new, comprehensive and educational approach for evaluating forensic competitors. Bloomington, MN. National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.

Ward, A. W., & Murray-Ward, M. (1999). *Assessment in the classroom.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wilhelm, J. D. (2008). *You gotta be the book: Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents* (2nd ed.). New York; Teachers College Press.

Workman, T. (1997, August). Solving for a healthy future: Creating national standards for training future directors of forensics. Houston, TX. National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.

Worth, D. (2012, November). Debating degree zero: Debate as mediating technology. Orlando, FL. National Communication Association Conference.

Zarefsky, D. (1982). The perils of assessing paradigms (response). *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*,141-144.

Ziegelmueller, G., Harris, S., & Bloomingdale, D. (1995). *Advancing in debate: Skills and concepts*. Topeka, KS: Clark Publishing.

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta 98 (Summer 2013): 21-41.

Marital Communication of Needs, Wants, and Desires: Requests that Function as Effective and Ineffective Persuasive Strategies

SUSAN I. HOLT, LYNNE M. WEBB, PHILLIP L. KROPP, MARK L. HANS, MICHELLE CONTY, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS; SARAH K. CHORLEY, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO-BOULDER, AND MEGAN L. WILSON, IVY TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE-INDIANA

Abstract. *This article addresses persuasive strategies, making the point of the importance of learning persuasion skills which can then be applied to a myriad of contexts. Fifteen spouses married two to seven years reported employing a variety of compliance gaining strategies to introduce their needs, wants, and desires to their spouses. The consistent persuasive strategies included direct requests and positive social strategies, such as flirtatious behavior, positive physical contact, and affirming the spouse. During interviews, the participants identified important factors that influenced strategy selection including the moods of both spouses, the importance of the request, the subject of the request, and the predicted likelihood that the spouse would be willing to fulfill the request. The interviewees reported that their spouses employed approximately the same set of strategies guided by the same set of factors influencing strategy selection.*

Marriage is a unique intimate relationship in at least three ways: First, partners enter marriage with a lifetime commitment that can influence the ways marital partners communicate (Bello, Brandau-Brown, & Ragsdale, 2008). Second, many spouses reserve some behaviors for the marriage alone (e.g., confidences, sexuality). Third, the vows so familiar to most people in the U. S. – "to have and to hold, from this day forth, for better, for worse, for richer and for poorer, in sickness and in health" – invoke a sense of marital duty to

SUSAN I. HOLT (BA, 2005, University of Arkansas) is a happily married mother of four and an independent childbirth educator affiliated with the American Academy of Husband-Coached Childbirth practicing in Fayetteville, AR. LYNNE M. WEBB (PhD, 1980, University of Oregon) is a Professor in Communication, Florida International University (Dr. Webb was at the University of Arkansas when this study was conducted in one of her graduate seminars). During the spring semester 2009, PHILLIP L. KROPP, MARK L. HANS, and MICHELLE CONTY successfully completed a graduate seminar in Interpersonal Conflict at the University of Arkansas. SARAH K. CHORLEY (MA, 2012, University of Arkansas) is a PhD student in Communication at the University of Colorado, Boulder. MEGAN L. WILSON (MA, 2009, University of Arkansas) is an Instructor at Ivy Tech Community College in Lafayette, IN. An earlier version of this research report was competitively selected for presentation at the 2008 annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association in Savannah, GA. Correspondence should be sent to the second author: lynnewebb320@cs.com

attend to partners' needs. For these reasons, marital dyads can be viewed as a unique context, worthy of separate analysis, as the communication within this context might be distinctive.

Many studies have examined compliance-gaining methods employed by strangers, acquaintances (e.g., Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981), coworkers (e.g., Klein, Izquierdo, & Bradbury, 2007), and intimates (e.g., Webb, 2008). An intricate set of conditions influence strategy selection (e.g., Paulson & Roloff, 1997; Schneck-Hamlin, Georgacarakos, & Wiseman, 1982; Schneck-Hamlin, Wiseman, & Georgacarakos, 1982) across a variety of compliance-gaining situations (e.g., Goei & Boster, 2005; Kirby, Baucom, & Peterman, 2005; Sillars, 1980). However, research concerning compliance-gaining within marital dyads is comparatively slim (Dillard & Fitzpatrick, 1985; Klein, Izquierdo, & Bradbury, 2007; Rudd & Burant, 1995; Sillars, 1980; Stell & Weltman, 1992). We sought to augment this limited knowledge base by identifying the persuasive strategies and strategies of interpersonal influence (hereafter called simply strategies) married individuals employ to introduce needs, wants, and desires (hereafter called simply needs) in an effort to prompt the marital partner to fulfill them.

Review of Literature

Marriage allows for communication patterns typically not seen in non-intimate and non-interpersonal relationships. Individuals in intimate (versus non-intimate) relationships experience more obligation to assist the partner (Bar-Tal, Bar-Zohar, Greenberg, & Hermon, 1977; Dillard & Fitzpatrick, 1985; Roloff, Janiszewski, McGrath, Burns, & Manrai, 1988). In addition, individuals are more likely to request assistance from an intimate versus a stranger (Jordan & Roloff, 1990; Shapiro, 1980; Sillars, 1980). Thus, married individuals might be most likely to address their needs to the spouse than to others in the social environment, and spouses might be more likely to receive such requests from partners than from strangers or acquaintances. Furthermore, individuals in intimate relationships (versus non-intimate relationships) are more likely to comply with a partner's direct request (Curl & Drew, 2008; Edgar & Fitzpatrick, 1988; Jordan & Roloff, 1990; Sillars, 1980).

Spouses' Obligation or Desire to Meet Partners' Needs

Individuals requesting assistance believe the intimate partner (versus stranger) to be more obligated to fulfill requests (Bar-Tal et al., 1977; Dillard & Fitzpatrick, 1985). Also, individuals expect intimate partners to anticipate and fulfill their needs (Hullett & Tamborini, 2001; Klein et al., 2007). Jordan and Roloff (1990) proposed that because of this strong sense of personal obligation to fulfill partners' needs, defensive responses should decrease and compliance should increase; however, marital partners do not always comply with such expectations. Indeed, a body of research surrounds the negative strategies marital partners employ when spouses fail to comply with requests, including demand-withdrawal (e.g., Weger, 2005). Alternatively, marital partners might negotiate desired changes (Heyman, Hunt-Martorano, Milik, & Slep, 2009).

Awareness of Spouse's Needs, Wants, and Desires

A spouse must have awareness of the partner's needs to fulfill those needs. Although relational uncertainty decreased explicitness of requests among dating couples (Knobloch, 2006; Theiss & Solomon, 2006), spouses have clarified their relational bond and thus might be more likely to express requests explicitly. Schwartz (1975, 1977) asserted that requesters must stimulate the target to perceive that the partner desires the target's assistance and that the target has the responsibility to provide assistance. Indeed, targets provide more assistance when they know about the need (Klein et al., 2007) and experience more responsibility for providing assistance when aware of the need (Duval, Duval, & Neely, 1979; Mayer, Duval, Holtz, & Bowman, 1985). In sum, need fulfillment occurs most often when the target is aware of the need (Klein et al., 2007; Mayer et al., 1985). Therefore, a married individual seeking spousal fulfillment of a need reasonably might desire to make the existence of the need known to the spouse and, when necessary, explain precisely what action the requester is seeking.

Request Making in Marital Dyads

Compliance-Gaining Research. Individuals communicate interpersonally in the hope that their message will be received, understood, and evoke compliance (Eckstein, Byles, & Bennett, 2007; Hullett & Tamborini, 2001). Furthermore, individuals formulate requests in an effort to overcome possible barriers to fulfillment of their need (Francik & Clark, 1985; Gibbs, 1985, 1986; Gibbs & Mueller, 1988), because "the language used in a request affects both the way it is perceived and the refusals that it prompts" (Paulson & Roloff, 1997, p. 261). Research on compliance-gaining contains multiple taxonomies of strategies (e.g., Fitzpatrick & Winke's 1979 list of 5 strategies; Marwell & Schmitt's 1967 list of 16 techniques; Wiseman & Schenk-Hamlin's 1981 list of 12 strategies) employed to elicit assistance from others.

Marital Request- Making. We could locate only eight previous studies directly related to marital request making; they examined self-disclosure (Rosenfeld & Welsh, 1985; Shimanoff, 1987), compliance-gaining (Rudd & Burant, 1995; Sillars, 1980), or strategy use (Dillard & Fitzpatrick, 1985; Klein et al., 2007; Weigel, Bennett, & Ballard-Reisch, 2006; Witteman & Fitzpatrick, 1986). However, none of the eight studies reported a grounded theory approach to developing a taxonomy of strategies employed in spousal requests, as was the focus of our study.

Rosenfeld and Welsh (1985) documented differences in self-disclosure patterns between dual versus single career marital dyads, but did not address requests per se. Shimanoff's (1987) study of emotional disclosures and face-saving, however, documented that, contrary to expectations, requests accompanied by expressions of vulnerability and/or hostility often led to spousal compliance. Two survey studies examined compliance-gaining among spouses: Rudd and Burant (1995) documented differences in compliance-gaining strategies among wives in abusive versus non-abusive relationships, but failed to examine request making specifically. In contrast, Sillars (1980) asked college students to project compliance-gaining strategies appropriate for use with strangers versus spouses. Sillars documented correlations between intimacy and tactic selection, perhaps adding validity to our claims that the marital relationship might represents a unique context in which distinct communication strategies and patterns can emerge.

Finally, four studies examined strategy use in marital dyads. Dillard and Fitzpatrick (1985) studied contentment within marriage and its correlation to compliance-gaining. By observing married couples in two fifteen-minute role-plays, they examined eight message types, or strategies, within three over-arching persuasive strategies called "general power mechanisms" (p. 420). Their study focused on resolving relational conflicts within a prescribed time limit and found that, although wives won the disputes more frequently, it was the husbands' compliance-gaining behavior that more often predicted who won the dispute. Dillard and Fitzpatrick (1985) focused primarily on marital conflicts and their resolution, whereas our study investigated the introduction of needs and the success of request strategies within the marital relationship.

Klein et al. (2007) investigated how dual-income families "negotiate and enact the division of labor inside the home" (p. 29). By videotaping interviews and the natural interactions of couples in their homes, the researchers discovered that clarity (versus ambiguity) in communication facilitated efficient management of household tasks. Their study involved analyzing and labeling communicative interactions regarding household responsibilities. Although the study parallels our study in some ways, the focus of their study, the demographics of their sample, and the methodology employed significantly differed from ours.

Witteman and Fitzpatrick (1986) documented that couples of differing marital types (i.e., traditional, independents, separates, mixed) employed differing persuasive strategies. Weigel et al., (2006) documented associations between marital equity, marital satisfaction, and strategy use. Based on the work of Falbo and Peplau (1980), Weigel et al. examined spousal use of direct versus indirect strategies as well as indirect versus bilateral (open discussion) strategies and discovered spousal preferences for direct, bilateral strategies. Thus, the Weigel et al. (2006) findings provide a further warrant for the present study, exploring the specific strategies spouses employ when making direct, bilateral spousal requests.

Communication Strategies and Partner Regulation. One recent study (Overall, Fletcher, Simpson, & Sibley, 2009) tested the success of communication strategies used by relational partners, including spouses, who were trying to produce desired changes in one another. Immediate and long-term success of communication strategies were measured and categorized by valence (positive vs. negative) and directness (direct vs. indirect). Overall et al.'s (2009) 12-month longitudinal study revealed incongruent perceptions across time. Strategies initially perceived as unsuccessful after three months, later predicted change after 12 months. This study, however, primarily focused on attempts to change particular features of their partner, "such as trustworthiness, attractiveness, and status" (p. 620), and not on partners' needs or requests in their day-to-day lives, as was the focus of our study.

Criteria for Strategy Selection

Although no previous research described specific strategies spouses employ to introduce needs, there are various factors that can influence strategy choice. First, the spouse can take into account that the relationship is intimate and expected to continue for an extended period of time; thus, he/she might be more likely to use strategies perceived as friendly and which promote liking by the target (Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977; Eckstein et al., 2007). Even in courtship, intimacy was associated with positively valenced behaviors toward the relational partner (Knobloch, 2005). In brief, married individuals seem likely to choose strategies that will be best received by the spouse and likely to produce positive feelings toward the requester.

Second, spouses can attempt to predict the target's likely resistance to fulfilling the need. Emotional response research indicates that individuals select or reject compliance-gaining strategies based on the emotion threshold (the degree of negative emotional response from the listener that the individual is willing to produce in an effort to gain compliance) and the emotional impact of the message (individual's prediction of the target's response to possible messages; Hunter & Boster, 1987). Furthermore, Yelsma and Marrow's research (2003) linked emotional expressiveness to marital satisfaction. Married individuals, then, might be motivated to express needs, but less likely to choose strategies for introducing a need that they believe will provoke a negative reaction from their spouses.

Third, consistent with research associating goal characteristics with message features (e.g., Samp & Solomon, 2005), spouses can match strategies to their goals. For example, a spouse wanting to display power can employ a threat, debt, or similar aversive strategy (Overall et al., 2009), although aggressiveness and argumentativeness can result in reduced compliance-gaining (Grant, King, & Behnke, 1994; Javidi, Jordan, & Carlone 1994). Conversely, if the requester wants the target to be attracted to him/her, the requester can use an altruistic strategy. Altruistic appeals are common, persuasive (Tracy, Craig, Smith & Spisak, 1984), and more effective than a direct request (Boster, Fediuk, & Kotowski, 2001). On the other hand, if the target perceives the requester's strategy to be manipulative, then the target can react negatively regardless of the employed strategy. Similarly, direct guilt tactics are less effective than indirect tactics when the target experiences guilt at the beginning of the encounter (Boster et al., 1999).

Furthermore, the requester might take note of which strategies worked best in the past in gaining the target's compliance. Successful strategies might become the most frequently employed strategies; thus, another major factor in the judgment of which strategy to employ can be the degree to which the strategy has been successful in the past. In sum, spouses can select strategies based on its positiveness, the anticipated degree of resistance, the goals of the requester, and the strategy's history of success with the target.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

Based on the gaps in the compliance-gaining and marital communication literature outlined above, the purpose of the present study was to undertake an exploratory study of persuasive strategies spouses employ when introducing needs and requesting need fulfillment from their marital partners. To this end, we posed the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the most common needs married participants report discussing with their spouses?
Research Question 2: According to self-reports of married participants, what factors influence whether spouses reveal their needs to one another?
Research Question 3: What are the most common strategies married participants report for introducing their needs to their spouses?
Research Question 4: What strategies for introducing needs do married participants report as most successful with their spouses?
Research Question 5: What criteria do married participants report as influential in their selection of strategy?

Methods

Given that Burleson et al. (1988) questioned the reliability of using existing paper-pencil tests to assess influence strategies, we desired to employ an alternative methodology. Since no typology of compliance-gaining strategies for marital communication existed, an exploratory research methodology was necessary to develop such a typology. Qualitative methods are appropriate for exploratory research (Cresswell, 1998). Our qualitative methods provided maximum opportunities to learn from the participants (Bouma & Ling, 2004) and thus acquire "a fuller description of what is going on" (Bouma & Ling, 2004, p. 172). We employed the specific qualitative methodology of interviewing to allow participants to speak as long as they