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CHAPTER I & II

The information we acquire about people or environment is often conveyed in informal conversations. A person may tell us about someone he met on his vacation or we may listen to people exchanging anecdotes about mutual acquaintance. Later we may be called on to convey our own impression of the individual who was described. We presumably do this on the basis of cognitive representation we had formed of the person while listening to conversation. The mental representation we form of people from information about their traits and behaviors have been the subject of substantial research and theorizing (Higgins & Bargh, 1987; Srull & Wyer, 1989, Wyer & Srull, 1980, 1989). Thus it has been demonstrated by numerous researchers that verbal communication through language is a central feature of social interaction (Clark, 1985; Higgins, 1981; Kraut & Higgins, 1984). Kraut & Higgins (1984) have suggested that verbal communication represents a rich interaction of social and cognitive processes.

The social cognition of speakers and listeners play a crucial role in many different aspects of language use. For example, the successful use of referential expressions depends on social knowledge that is shared by the interlocutors (Clark & Carlson, 1982; Clark & Marshall, 1981; Krauss &
Vivekanathan, & Weinheimer, 1988). Moreover, social cognition plays an important role in the interpersonal aspects of the social situations (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Giles & St. Clair, 1979) and certain characteristics of the listeners such as relative status (Cansler & Stiles, 1991) and age (Depaulo & Colman, 1986). This various features of language use may reflect the speaker's view of his or her relationship with the listener and the situation they are in.

Conversation memory may be defined as "the ability of an individual to recall or recognize the contents of the conversations correctly". It provides a means for examining the content and structure of the social knowledge that plays a role in interaction processes. It is important in terms of knowledge representation and on line processing. For example, memory for conversations provide one with a store of information that may be drawn on for the generation and interpretation of remarks in a current conversation. Thus, the content and direction of social interaction are affected by what is remembered from previous conversation. Similarly, when the purpose of a communication is to have some effect on the hearers future actions, what the hearer remembers from the conversation will determine the success of the communication. Thus, if conversation memory is based or incomplete in some manner, both future action and interactions will be affected.

While memory has been an important topic of research for some time, relatively little inquiry into memory for conversations has occurred.
Stafford and Daly (1984) investigate the conversational memory of participants in conversation. They use free recall and report that only about 10% of all idea units in a conversation are recall by participants (the best subject recalled only 40%), prompting the conclusion that "people's abilities to recall something as complex as conversations are limited". (P. 393).

However, other researchers obtain results much higher than Stafford and Daly's results. Kintsch and Bates (1977) indicates that students are able to recognize a considerable amount of information from a lecture even after 5 days. Benoit and Benoit (1986 b), employing a recognition test, report that conversational interactants are able to recall over 90% of specific verbal communicative behavior. Benoit & Benoit (1987), also employing a recognition task, report that subjects can remember 86% of verbal behaviors in an interaction. These studies demonstrate that considerable amount of conversational information is stored in memory and subjects are able to retrieve it accurately. Stafford and Daly argue that recognition tests are less useful because memory structures are not isomorphic with the form of these tests. They suggest that free recall procedures "more clearly tap mechanism that operate during everyday conversations" (P. 381) because interactions must access information quickly by drawing "freely from his or her store of memories" (P. 398).

Erland Hjelmquist (1989) in an experimental study in which 44 University students listened to a dyadic conversation and were tested immediately afterwards or 4 days later. The two people in tape recorded
conversation did not know to each other, nor did the audience know the two speaker-listener on the tape. This design was used to further clarify the role of familiarity and personal participation for memory of conversational discourse. Gist memory was high in both conditions with lower performance after four days. Surface memory could be verified, and the level of the variables used to index surface memory was about the same in both immediate and delayed condition.

Recently Ira E. Hyman (1994) in an experimental study of conversational remembering examine the role of social context plays in determining the content and organization of remembered information using 108 undergraduates. As a manipulation of social context, subjects talked about a short story either with another subject (dyads) or for an experimenter (experimenter tested). Subjects were asked about their memory of the story or their personal reactions to it. Regardless of instructions, the dyad subjects spoke more about their evaluation of the story, included more comments linking the story to a larger knowledge frame, and more often used remembered details to support their positions. The experimenter tested subjects more often included story details and interpretations in narrative accounts of the story. Conversational remembering often relies on a non-narrative retrieval Strategy. Regardless of social context, personal reaction instructions led to more meta-comments and evaluation, and less narrative than instructions.
As a matter of fact there are a number of dimensions of language; of these dimension, assertiveness can be most clearly regarded as a social dimension of language and a number of theorists have been concerned with specifying how the various linguistic realization for performing the same speech act are related to social variables. (eg. Brown & Levinson, 1978; Clark & Shunk, 1980, Ervin-Trip, 1978; Lakoff, 1973). The most comprehensive account of these phenomena is provided by Brown & Levinson (1978) who have included in their model interpersonal variables (eg., status & closeness) that are predicted to have an effect on language form. Thus there is some research suggesting relation between high status and speech form conceptually similar to assertiveness such as powerful speech (Erikson, Lind, Johnson & O. Barr, 1978), non-mitigated request (Wish D'Andraid & Goodnow, 1980) and presumptiousness (Cansler & Sites, 1981). These researches demonstrate that assertive or powerful speech reflect status information. In other words there is a language expectation that high status speakers use or allowed to use assertive forms of speech. If such an expectation exists and is relevant feature of social knowledge, then this expectation should have predictable effects on memory for the assertiveness of remarks. HoltGrave, Socall & Srull (1989) carried out three experiments, to examine the effect of information about a speaker's status on memory for the assertiveness of his or her remarks. The finding of their study clearly demonstrated that information about a speaker's status does affect memory for the assertiveness of his or her
remarks, i.e. under certain conditions the remarks of a high status speaker were remembered as more assertive than the same remarks uttered by low status speaker. Subject in the high condition recall both the assertive and non-assertive remarks as more assertive than did subjects in equal status condition. These investigators also found that subject recall assertive version of the remarks more than non-assertive version of the remarks. Though these findings provide evidence for the existence of relation between one speech form (assertiveness) and one interpersonal variable (speaker's status), the result can't be taken for granted as these investigators have ignored one important variable i.e. listener's status as well as listener's emotional mood. Thus it is possible that if the listener him self has high status he might have not remembered the remarks of a high status speaker as more assertive. In other words conversation between high status speaker and low status addressee is heard by a person who also occupies high status, his conversational memory might have been affected in different way i.e. he might have not recalled the assertive and non-assertive remarks as more assertive since social cognition's of both speaker and listener play a crucial role in the memorization of conversational remarks. We therefore hypothesize that subjects himself having high status will remember assertive remarks of high status speaker as non assertive just contrary to the finding obtained by Hollgrave, socall & Srull. The present study is designed to test this hypothesis.
An important consideration that motivated us to take this proposed research is the existence of substantial body of evidence demonstrating the mood biasing effect in memory. Research on the relation between emotional state and cognitive processes has burgeoned in the past 10 years. Although this area of research has a much earlier history of activity. It lay dormant for many years. Beginning in the mid-1970s, this research area began to accelerate to the point where it has now become major area of activity. A number of articles, books, and edited volumes now attested to the validity of this research area (e.g. Clark & Fiske, 1982; Clark & Isen, 1982; Fiedler & Forges, 1988; Isen, 1984) and new journal appeared in 1987, Cognition and Emotion, which is devoted entirely to relation among emotional state and full range of cognitive process typically studied by psychologists.

Brian MacWhinney, J.M. Keenan & Peter Reinke (1982) conducted an experimental study on memory for natural conversation, in which it was found that even after 30 hours, subjects had extremely good recognition memory for the exact wording of statements that contained information about a speaker's "intentions" beliefs, and his relations with the listener, such sentences were said to be high in "interactional content". In this study 12 graduate student had their conversation video tapped. The tape was the shown to 12 familiar non-participants and 12 non-familiar non-participants. Arousal was assessed in all subjects and later related to subjects memory test. Subjects showed excellent recognition memory for
higher interactional content statements from a conversation even after a 72
hours interval. However, there was little relationship between arousal and
subsequent memory. Moreover, involvement had its greatest effect not on
memory but on subjects arousal.

Some investigators have opted to focus their research on a
single emotional state such as depression (Cohen & Gredt, 1981), whereas
others have preferred to look at the effects of numerous mood states on
memory. For example, some researches have compared the effect of both
depression and elation on cognitive processing (Bower et al; 1981; Bower &
mayor, 1985; Bower, Monteiro, & Gilligon, 1978; Teasdale & Russel, 1983)
others have compared the effects of anger and elation on memory (Gerrig &
Bower, 1982). Finally, Laird etal (1982) contrasted the effects of fear,
anger, and depression on subject performance. Most of these investigations
also included a neutral-mood control group with which to compare mood
effects on memory (e.g. Ellis et al; 1987; Ellis et al; 1984).

In determining which emotional states to investigate and in
making predictions as to the outcome of mood-memory research, it should
be noted that the effects of different moods may vary considerably. That is,
various emotion have produced differential effects on cognitive processing
(Isen, 1984). Isen (1985), for instance, cited several studies in which a
positive mood was found to facilitate the recall of positively affect material
from memory. The same mood-congruency effect on performance was not
evident or was less apparent when the effect of a negative mood on the
recall of negative material was investigated. Thus, a careful consideration of the type of mood one chooses to study should be made when predicting the effects of a particular mood on memory due to possible differential effects.

W.G. Parrot & John Sabini (1990) studied effect of mood on memory under natural conditions in two quasi field experiments. In both, subjects in happy moods, recalled autobiographical memories and subjects recall in bad mood also. This phenomena termed as mood incongruent recall is a reliable phenomenon, occurring when subjects are unaware that their moods are relevant to the experiment. Mood incongruent recall for laboratory mood induction, and for self regulation of mood and depression are discussed.

J.B. Morel (1991) in an experimental study titled "effects of mood induction on the recognition memory of word types". In this study 88 undergraduates under went mood induction via depressed or elated self statements and were then presented with emotionally pleasant words. 24 hours later subject underwent mood induction with either the same or opposite mood just prior to presentation of exact match, mood congruent, or mood opposite words. Exact match words produced faster reaction time (RT) and a higher proportion of correct answers. Induced mood bore some relation to speed and accuracy of recognition of mood congruent words.
Recently S.R. Schmidt (1994) studied memory for non-humourous sentences. Humorous and version of sentences was better remembered than the non-humorous sentences on both the free and cued recall tests and on measure of sentence recall and word recall. These effects persisted when subjects were warned that they were about to read a humorous sentence but were attenuated in incidental learning, recall was also scored as a function of subjective ratings of humorous. Subjective humorous affected memory in within and between subjects design. Attention, arousal, rehearsal, retrieval and surprise explanations were explored. Result suggest that humorous material receives both increased attention and rehearsal relative to non-humorous material.

More recently M.K. Johnson et al. (1996) explored the impact of the direction and target of listener's emotional focus on their subsequent ability to identify the origin of memories for statements they had heard. In experiment 1, 45 undergraduates heard an audio tape, and in experiment 2-3; 40 undergraduates watched or videotape of two people making statements about a wide range of topics varying in the strength of the affective response they were likely to evoke. Subjects were given tasks that focused them on how they fell about what was being said or on how they thought the speakers felt. Self focus resulted unequal or better recognition for the contents of the statements than did other focus, but poorer identification of the source of the statements. However the deficit of self focus relative to
other focus was eliminated when subjects focused on how they felt about the speakers rather than on how they felt about what was being said.

These well established findings make it crystal clear that emotional mood of the subjects is a potent determine of memory and hence, conversational memory is not an exception. Thus higher recall of the assertive version of the conversation remarks as assertive as demonstrated by Holtgrave, Socol and Srull, may not only be explained in terms of speaker's status(social cognition of the speaker) but may also be explained in terms of the emotional state of the listener. It is therefore reasonable to assume( in the light of mood dependent effect in memory) that if the listeners is in a state of elated mood, he may not recall assertive versions more than non-assertive versions of the remarks even under high status speaker's condition. Similarly if a listener is in a state of depressed mood he may not recall non-assertive versions more as compared to assertive versions of the remarks even under low status speaker condition. Accordingly, it is also highly reasonable to assume that subject in elated mood may not recognize non-assertive version of the remarks as assertive even under high status speakers condition. Similarly subject in depressed mood may not recognize assertive version of the remarks as non-assertive even under low status speaker's condition. The present study is designed to test these assumptions. The findings of the present study will not only open a new area of research in memory but will also provide significant
information about the development of the interpersonal relations and will highlight the process of impression formation.

Chapter III

The present research is designed to examine the effect of speaker's status, listener's status, listener's emotional mood and version of conversation on conversation memory. More specifically, this research is undertaken to answer the following questions.

1. Does speaker's status influence conversation memory?
2. Does listener's status influence conversation memory?
3. Does listener's emotional mood influence conversation memory?
4. Does version of conversation influence conversation memory?
5. Is there an interaction effect of speaker's status and listener's status on conversation memory?
6. Is there an interactional effect of speaker's status and listener's emotional mood on conversation memory?
7. Is there an interaction effect of speaker's status and version of conversation remarks on conversation memory?
8. Is there an interaction effect listener's status and listener's emotion mood on conversation memory?
9. Is there an interaction effect listener's status and version of conversation remarks on conversation memory?
10. Is there an interaction effect of listener's emotional mood and version of conversation remarks on conversation memory?

**Design**: A $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design in which two socio-economic variables (listener's and speaker's socio-economic status), one personality variable (emotional mood) and one task variable (version of the conversation remarks) each varying in two ways, were used in this experiment. The two values of one social variable i.e. speaker's status were (a) high SES (b) low SES; similarly, the two values of another socio-economic variable i.e. listener's status were (a) high socio-economic status (b) low socio-economic status. The two values of emotional mood were (a) elated mood (b) depressed mood; and two values of version of conversation remarks were (a) assertive and (b) non-assertive. Thus, there were sixteen groups of subjects and each were tested for conversation memory by recall method. More specifically the sixteen groups are as follows.

- **Group I** - Speaker's high status with listener's high status, elated mood and assertive version.
- **Group II** - Speaker's high status with listener's high status, elated mood and non-assertive version.
- **Group III** - Speaker's high status with listener's high status, depressed mood and assertive version.
- **Group IV** - Speaker's high status with listener's high status, depressed mood and non-assertive version.
- **Group V** - Speaker's high status with listener's low status, elated mood and assertive version.
- **Group VI** - Speaker's high status with listener's low status, elated mood and non-assertive version.
Group VII - Speaker's high status with listener's low status, depressed mood and assertive version.

Group VIII - Speaker's high status with listener's low status, depressed mood and non-assertive version.

Group IX - Speaker's low status with listener's high status, elated mood and assertive version.

Group X - Speaker's low status with listener's high status, elated mood and non-assertive version.

Group XI - Speaker's low status with listener's high status, depressed mood and assertive version.

Group XII - Speaker's low status with listener's high status, depressed mood and non-assertive version.

Group XIII - Speaker's low status with listener's high status, elated mood and assertive version.

Group XIV - Speaker's low status with listener's low status, elated mood and non-assertive version.

Group XV - Speaker's low status with listener's low status, depressed mood and assertive version.

Group XVI - Speaker's low status with listener's low status, depressed mood and non-assertive version.

Sample: 400 undergraduate subjects were selected from the different faculties of A.M.U. Aligarh on the basis of their scores on Socio-economic status scale (SESS).

Stimulus Material: A fictional conversation which was developed by Holtgrave Socall and Srull (1989) used in this study. The conversation was
between two persons and the content of the conversation were focused on how to deal with an upcoming deadline.

**Mood Induction:** Modified velten's mood induction procedure was used for mood inducement among subjects. Dr. R.C. Sinclair had modified the velten's mood induction technique (MVMIT).

**Procedure:** Subjects were run in small groups. First of all subjects were selected on the basis of their scores on SES scale and then mood was induced and they were asked to read the fictional conversation between two persons carefully. Instruction had been given to each subject according to design of the experiment and the group to which they belong. After reading the conversation, subject was asked to perform a distracter task to prevent subject from thinking about the conversation. After five minutes retention interval the subject was asked to recall the remarks uttered by Mr. Robert in fictional conversation. In this way 400 subjected recall score were obtained by manipulating the variables according to the design of the experiment. At last subjects were debriefed and thanked for their participation in the experiment. The data were tabulated groupies and were analyzed by means of four ways analysis of variance to draw the necessary inferences.
Chapter IV & V

The results of the present study are presented in the following table:

Table III Showing F-ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's status (A)</td>
<td>1874.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1874.89</td>
<td>535.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener's status (B)</td>
<td>388.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>388.09</td>
<td>110.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener's emotional (C)</td>
<td>222.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222.01</td>
<td>63.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verso of Conversation (D)</td>
<td>538.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>538.25</td>
<td>153.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>377.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>377.01</td>
<td>107.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With in Group (Error)</td>
<td>1344.58</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F-ratio-ratio for speaker status variation is 535.68 which is significant beyond .01 level. The result suggest that subjects under high and low speaker's status condition differ with respect to conversation memory, disregarding listener's status, emotional mood and version of conversation variables. The mean of the means for high status speaker group is 9.88 and the mean of the means low status speaker group is 5.80. It can safely be concluded that subjects under high speaker condition show higher recall performance than subjects under low status speaker condition.

As shown in Table III that F-ratio for listener's (subject) status variation is 110.88 which is significant at .01 level. The result suggests that subjects having high and low status differ with respect to conversation memory; ignoring speaker's status, subject's emotional mood and version of conversation variables. The mean of the means for subjects having high status is 6.88 and mean of the means for subjects having low status is 8.81. The significant difference between two mean clearly indicates that subjects having low status will performed better than the subjects having high status.

Table III reveals that the F-ratio for subjects (listener) emotional mood variations 63.43 which is significant at .01 level. The result suggest that elated and depressed subjects differ with respect to conversation memory. Disregarding speaker's status, listener's status and version of conversation variables. The mean of the means for elated
subjects is 7.16 and the mean of the means for depressed subjects is 8.53. Since these two mean differ significantly; so it can therefore be safely concluded that depressed subjects showed better conversation memory than elated subjects.

A perusal of Table III reveals that F-ratio for version of conversation remarks variation is 153.79 which is also significant at .01 level. The result suggests that subjects under assertive and non-assertive condition differ with respect to conversation memory. Ignoring speaker's status, listener's status and listener's emotional mood variables. The mean of the means for assertive version group of subjects is 8.80 and mean for non-assertive group is 6.80. Since these two means differ significantly; it is concluded that version of conversational remarks have differential effect on conversation memory. More specifically the findings of the present research are as follows.

1. Speaker's status has differential effect on conversation memory. More specifically the remarks of the speaker having high status are better remembered than the same remarks of the speaker having low status.

2. Listener's status also have differential impact on conversation memory i.e. subjects having low status show better conversation memory than the subjects having high status.
3. Subject's or Listener's emotional state was found to have differential influence on conversation memory. More specifically it was found that depressed subjects have better conversation memory than elated subjects.

4. Version of conversation remarks also influences conversation memory; variation in version of conversation remarks was found to have differential impact on conversation i.e. Assertive version of remarks were better remembered than non-assertive version of remarks.

5. There is an interactional effect of speaker's and listener's status on conversation memory.

6. No significant interactional effect was found between speaker's status and subject's emotional state.

7. No significant interactional effect was found between speaker's status and version of conversation.

8. No significant interactional effect was found between listener's status and listener's emotional state.

9. There is an interactional effect of listener's status and version of conversation remarks on conversation memory.

10. There is an interactional effect of subject's emotional state and version of conversation remarks on conversation memory.
The overall findings of the present research not only open a new area of research in memory but also provide significant information about the development of interpersonal relations and highlight the process of impression formation. It is an open secret that our interpersonal relations and our impressions about other individuals are determined to a great extent by the social status of the individuals as well as the way other individuals communicate with us. Thus we have a tendency to value more of those information communicated by our leaders than when the same information is uttered by ordinary individuals. This process helps in continuation of leaders and followers relationships. As soon as this process cease to work the entire relationship between followers and leaders collapse. Thus the finding of our research makes it crystal clear that we remember those informations which are uttered by a speaker having high status, for we have tendency to form positive impressions about such speaker.

Our research also demonstrates the importance of emotional mood in the development of interpersonal relations as well as in the formation of impressions about other individuals.

As mentioned earlier the findings of the present study may be applied for understanding interpersonal relationship and the process of impression formation, it would be however much interesting if a study is designed in which officers and their subordinates are used as subjects. The
conversation memory of these officers and subordinates would certainly help in understanding the interpersonal relationship between officers and subordinates in more meaningful way.

In our study we have two types of emotional mood i.e. elated and depressed mood, it would be however more informative if study is designed using three types of emotional states i.e. depressed elated and neutral mood states.

Furthermore, the findings of our research highlight the fact that the finding off our research would have been more clear had we used larger number of subjects.