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Abstract

The goal of many self-help books on interpersonal relationships is for the reader to learn how to “just act natural.” There are certain processes that interfere with one’s ability to follow such advice, namely, the imposition of calculation of what is ‘natural’ will not generate a reality where the “just natural” interaction that is occurring is believed. This thesis examines several implications of this as it relates to the social organization of experience and the limitations of self-help books in aiding in the learning production of that experience of expression games in informal interaction. These implications and limitations are examined through (1) an analysis of how the learning of expression games occurs through informal socialization. This is followed by (2) a brief content analysis of a sample of 50 self-help books on interpersonal relationships that purport to teach informal interaction. This informs (3) a systematic pilot study of a selected subsample that presents the limitations inherent in the authors’ advice as formalized by the advice’s characteristic content and rule-like quality; which is followed by an analysis of the reactions of readers to the subsample. The thesis concludes with suggestions for future research and considerations for scholars and policymakers in terms of how ‘expression games’ are an integral feature in the generation of solidarity among social interactants and its relation to societal social order.
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Learning Informal Interaction:

The Problem of Self-Help Literature for Expression Games

Michael W. Raphael

Northeastern University

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Problem

Sociology is based on mutuality among individuals and not the individuals themselves. This thesis is concerned with how this mutuality is manifested among individuals *qua* interactants – how mutuality is performed and how its performance is learned or can be taught. This performance is assumed to be constituted by sustained rapport. Sustained rapport presumably depends on how behaviors, gestures, and other sources of information issued among interactants are interpreted, not so much for intentions having to do with ends and choices of means but for the reaction to the fact of being together. This expressive interaction to co-presence are referred to as ‘expression games’. Such games are internally motivated by discrepancies between verbal and non-verbal cues and externally by variations in mutuality based on what has already transpired. In these respects, one can say that expression games are aimed at decreasing the discrepancy between the two types of cues and at increasing the possibility that doing so will be significant to the course of interaction. Then, in effect, expression games are the analysis of the degree to which the nonverbal cues are congruent with the verbal cues. These expression games

---

1 Please direct correspondence to Michael W. Raphael at michael.wraphael@gmail.com. This document was started on 7/30/2012 11:58:02 AM and was last modified as of 4/25/2013 3:06:34 PM.

2 The current order of social science suggests an ideology of individualism in methodology and its resulting theory which obscures the problem. This ideology of individualism is similar to the “cult of the individual” that plagued Durkheim (1953:58-59; Cf. Marske, 1987). For a more modern critique of the ideology of individualism, please refer to Brown, M.E. *What is Human About Human Affairs*, Temple University Press.
are proposed to be the basis of what John Rawls, in his classic *A Theory of Justice*, calls a “well-ordered human association.” (1971 [1999]: 5) This ‘well-ordered human association’ is conceptually similar to that of social order – one of the main objects of study in sociology and criminology.

This ‘human association’ or ‘social order’ can be broken down into two distinction problems in figuring out what is meant by ‘social’ and by ‘order’. The first deals with the term ‘social’ by distinguishing the loci of mutuality in the organization of experience (the ‘cult of the individual’ vs. society-at-large) which can be re-organized as the public-private distinction. The second deals with the term ‘order’ by considering the term independent from others and will assume as a definition that ‘order’ depends on the manner of arrangement. This manner of arrangement, then by definition, is the ordering principle. When this principle is considered as the qualifier of ‘social’ and therefore, the qualifier of mutuality in the organization of experience, ‘order’ reflects a character of regulation. A further look at the character of this regulating ordering principle for social interaction\(^3\) suggests it depends upon the problematic formal-informal distinction. What is specifically problematic about this ‘formal-informal’ distinction is in determining what is informal about interaction and how it can be learned and taught.\(^4\)

Expression games, as informal interaction, are a significant case in this regard. The significance lies in how expression games define the situation in the course of interaction. It is this definition that determines whether the defined situation will be more or less friendly to continued interaction to the extent to which it relaxes the dis-associational force of the public-private

---

\(^3\) The use of the term ‘interaction’ is being used in congress with Goffman’s use of the term throughout his work and more specifically in Goffman, 1983.

\(^4\) While the examination of both distinction problems is fundamental to understanding what is meant by ‘social’ and by ‘order’, to explore both would be to go beyond the scope of the intended thesis; therefore, the main distinction problem that is of concern to this paper will be the formal–informal distinction.
distinction and intensifies interaction likely to decrease whatever lack of congruence between verbal and nonverbal cues might be disruptive of mutuality. How a situation is defined, in such a way as to sustain rapport, determines whether or not interactants are likely to trust one another, which means are likely to continue interacting regardless of shifts in topic, object, or tone. Furthermore, there is a certain frequency to such situations that makes this analysis even more important as it goes unnoticed by most: the question of whether to trust occurs daily in regard to the person standing behind you while in line at the bank, to approach a potential significant other at the end of bar, or the determination if someone really is following you or you just happen to share a destination – these situations and others similar in character are a frequent feature of everyday interactions and all require the assessment of trust.

Whether this is ‘instinctual’ or conscious, the playing of these ‘expression games’ are the basis of mutuality. Ideas of what this mutuality is vary; Emile Durkheim suggests it is solidarity (Durkheim, 1984: 64, 331) whereas Marx mentions alienation and Erving Goffman suggests it is sociability (1961b; 1971; 1974: xii, 552). The significance of what this mutuality is in the obligations that form from it and its subsequent deviance, which in extreme cases, is crime.

The inability to learn how to play expression games and thus, how to define the situation, is problematic. For Goffman, this learning develops through the informal and discursive aspects of interaction (Cf. Goffman, 1967: 116-117) and more historically well-known, by several varieties of self-help literature, some of which Goffman used as source material for his 1963 book, Behavior in Public Places. As Goffman (1963a: 5-6) suggests, the popular source of

---

5 Aspects of criminological theories have picked up on this by suggesting that the path towards attaining the criminal character starts with not learning how deal with the failure to experience solidarity, or sociability. Differential association/social learning theory, control theory, and anomie theory in particular suggest this failure is the result of not knowing the basic regulations of informal interaction where the individual could be led towards disorderly conduct and become marginalized within society. (Cf. Goffman, 1961a: 131-146; 1967: 115)
information in determining how to interact in informal situations lies within etiquette manuals. Since then, several other varieties of self-help literature have filled the shelves in the fields of ‘personal improvement’, ‘dating’ and ‘seduction’.

Then, the thesis of this paper is that the formal character of the self-help literature relevant to expression games decreases the viability for learning the expression game itself. The context of this formal character, operationalized as codification through the writing, editing and formatting for publication, eschews all non-verbal properties of interaction and brackets flaws as irrelevant. This makes it difficult for readers to implement the help offered because any attempt at the expression without the eschewed properties, cannot come off as intended. (Goffman, 1969: 5; Cf. Harper, et. al., 1978)

This paper will proceed to examine this thesis first by presenting a literature review on the current order of things:

(1) A brief exposition of the nature of mutuality concerning:
   (a) Goffman’s sociability;
   (b) Marx’s alienation; and,
   (c) Durkheim’s solidarity;
(2) A brief exposition of the character of the regulating ordering principle concerning:
   (a) The history of the formal-informal distinction.
   (b) The interaction ritual and the problems generated by the self-help literature;
(3) A brief exposition of expression games concerning:
   (a) Its definition and deviation by realizing expression games as an alternative from Goffman’s 1969 exposition in Strategic Interaction.
   (b) The contrast between the interaction ritual and expression games;

This will be done second by presenting the research design and methodology. This will be done third by presenting the analysis and results outlined in the methodology based on data from varieties of self-help literature to clarify its faults for rapport development. This paper will finally provide a summary of its findings and its conclusions for scholars and policymakers.
Chapter 2: The Current Order of Things: A Literature Review

2.1 The Nature of Mutuality

Understanding the nature of mutuality among individuals and not the individuals themselves is what sociology is based on. Therefore, before undergoing the discussion of learning informal interaction, there must be a determination of why the discussion needs to be had.

2.1.1 Goffman’s Sociability

In the introduction to Frame Analysis (1974), Goffman writes that:

“This book is about the organization of experience-something that an individual actor can take into his mind-and not the organization of society. I make no claim whatsoever to be talking about the core matters of sociology—social organization and social structure. Those matters have been and can continue to be quite nicely studied without reference to frame at all. I am not addressing the structure of social life but the structure of experience individuals have at any moment of their social lives. I personally hold society to be first in every way and any individual’s current involvements to be second.”

The significance of an individual’s current involvements cannot be understated. Social organization and social structure have a reciprocal relationship with an individual’s current involvements. It is when we are involved with each other that trust emerges and deceit transpires. Such moments in the aggregate affect the situations individuals find themselves in – Not, then, men and their moments. Rather moments and their men.” (1967: 3) Formalities of social structure were at one time not formalities but proposals – laws and contracts were drafts that were hotly debated and negotiated in conference rooms during business hours but nicely refined at the bar or golf course in “private negotiations.” In those moments, the current involvements of specific individuals can have significant effects on policies that determine changes in socioeconomic factors of millions. But as Goffman noted, it is the moments and not the individuals that matter – we all are human after all. It is the situations that hold the gravity at its
center and not the individuals. It is in these situations we act and find out who we are. The constitution of society relative to the individual matters only to the degree society is experienced in any individual’s current involvements. Or restated, society is relevant to the extent it enters into the individual’s organization of experience. The sustaining of inequalities then can be understood in part as arising from the lack of experience of the interdependence required in society’s constitution. Those that own the means of production who believe they alone built that corporation forget that the individuals who procured the offered goods or services were only able to do so because said individuals had current involvements elsewhere. These individuals overlook the nature of mutuality. (Cf.1963a: 16; Park, 1927)

The concept of these ‘current involvements as sociability’, though, appears to be more attributed to than claimed by Goffman himself. Bennett Berger, in a forward to Northeastern University Press’ edition of Frame Analysis, wrote, “Goffman was always interested in the struggle to achieve that apparently effortless sociability. Just a few years before he wrote Frame Analysis he put it this way:

To walk, to cross a road, to utter a complete sentence, to wear long pants, to tie one's own shoes, to add a column of figures—all these routines that allow the individual unthinking competent performances were attained through an acquisition process whose early stages were negotiated in a cold sweat.” (Berger, 1986)

pages left intentionally blank), and somewhere between 1 and 1.1 million words\(^6\) (including copyright, indexes, headers and the like), with a conservative estimate being the latter, the frequency of ‘sociability’ is approximately 0.00254% of his published books. This compared with the term ‘situation’ appearing 1,628 times (0.148%), ‘interaction’ at a frequency of 1,275 (0.1159%), ‘self’ at 4,207 occurrences (0.382%), ‘actor’ at 677 (.0615%) and ‘drama’ coming in with a frequency of 426 or 0.038%.

While the statistics for ‘self’ and ‘interaction’ are possibly skewed from appearing in headers as part of book titles, 1959 for the former and 1967, 1969 for the latter, as a reader of the text, the skewedness does not undermine the illustrative point – that to say ‘sociability’ is one of Goffman’s main interests is misleading – according to the statistics of Table 2.1. However, while Goffman does not label the encounters he describes as ‘sociability’ as often as he could have, there are thousands of passages from within his books that could ostensibly be labeled to be dealing with ‘sociability’, one of which from *Interaction Ritual* is below:

> “Thus, as Adam Smith argued in his *Theory of the Moral Sentiments*, the individual must phrase his own concerns and feelings and interests in such a way as to make these maximally usable by the others as a source of appropriate involvement; and this major obligation of the individual *qua* interactant is balanced by his right to expect that others present will make some effort to stir up their sympathies and place them at his command. These two tendencies, that of the speaker to scale down his expressions and that of the listeners to scale up their interests, each in the light of the other’s capacities and demands, form the bridge that people build to one another, allowing them to meet for a moment of talk in a communion of reciprocally sustained involvement. It is this spark, not the more obvious kinds of love, that lights up the world.” (Goffman, 1967: 116-117)

---

\(^6\) The percentages of these theoretical terms is based on an *overestimate* of 1.1 million since word counts were conducted on OCR scans of Goffman’s books, excluding *Gender Advertisements* (1979) where Google Books was used instead. However, if one were to assume an average of 350 words a page, the total count would be an estimated 1,073,800 words.
Here ‘sociability’, as Bennett Berger ascribes to Goffman, now appears to be a fair attribution. Hence, sociability can be seen as the obligations the co-participants have to each other within the conversational encounter. These obligations constitute the self-regulation previously mentioned and are dependent on two conditions: (1) the imputation of sincerity to the other and a corresponding willingness to be vulnerable on the part of each party; (2) meaning as an ongoing accomplishment. (C.f. Garfinkel, 1967: 11) From (1), it follows that no one can be absolutely certain of the sincerity of the other interactants but the issue does not arise in the context of rapport building, which is discourse involving small talk that gives the interaction its sense of mutuality. From (2), it follows inexorably that norms are not something known in advance, nor can they be thought of as established as rule-like since they are always in process; this means that interactants cannot be said to know the norms of interaction involving rapport building in the ways in which we come to “know” rules. It also means, and this is the point, that informal interaction cannot satisfy the desire for absolute certainty about the sincerity of one’s partners and it cannot provide fixed meanings or norms in the sense of rules on which one can rely with confidence. Interactants are forced into what, from the outside, looks like a dilemma so long as we do not ask what the constitution of rapport building is. Namely, they rely on a sincerity they do not feel the need to question but about which they cannot be certain; and they can never be sure of the meaning or significance of what they are doing or saying, though they have no choice but to act as if they do. But this does not mean that they are acting strategically since that would violate the conditions of informality. It means that every act or assertion is done in such a way that it is both assertive and an expression of an “attitude of waiting”. By this, it is suggested that each act within an informal encounter is intrinsically ambivalent but not in a way that disturbs the spontaneity of the act. The latter is sustained by the way in which acting is carried out in such
Raphael

ways as to reinforce spontaneity despite the possibility of a mistake. The waiting is the form of vulnerability that makes informal interaction “intimate.” There is no irony in this sort of interaction, but there is a degree of alienation internal to the interaction. To speak informally is to be unable to anticipate what will come next but not to care. One is alienated in the sense of waiting upon a future rather than anticipating it as a likely fact. This is part of what makes of informal interaction what Garfinkel calls “work.” It is work that is spontaneous and not spontaneous, and it has a collective aspect, as Goffman shows in *Stigma* – where the management of spoiled or potentially spoiled identity requires complicity. The irony that is made visible here occurs whenever formality is imposed on or interjected into the interaction situation so that the formal provides a standard that holds what had been beyond scrutiny (informal interaction) up to scrutiny and possible judgment – strategic considerations. Self-help literature, insofar as it attempts to make explicit and rule-like the use of small talk and other resources of rapport building, creates an ironic version of solidarity and is therefore alienating in a different way, one in which sociability is replaced by individual agendas, diminishing the life of the interaction order. Here is where the idea of a confidence man is helpful. If the confidence man is good at using the semblance of rapport building to fool his or her partners, he or she is alienated but not necessarily the others who are fooled successfully into seeing sincerity where the outside observer and the confidence man know that there is none. This is why the end of a confidence game is a surprise on the part of the others in contrast with the violation of a contract which is envisioned within the contract form itself. It is also why the professional, like the confidence man, finds it fairly easy to speak with clients in a way that encourages them to be sincere in making themselves vulnerable by acting in ways that combine rapport building with rational discourse. It is also how one can understand strange meta-informalities in which people interact
by playing at doing rapport building by doing that very work at a different level, one at which the interactants are sincere about showing insincerity.

2.1.2 Marx’s Alienation

Karl Marx provides a short account of alienation in the *Theses on Feuerbach* (1845 [1978]). Here, Marx begins his critique of “all hitherto existing materialism” which sees reality only as an object of “contemplation” rather than “sensuous” practical human activity. He interprets Feuerbach as beginning with a concept of “religious self-alienation” that reverted back to Hegel’s idealism. Marx summarizes his criticism in *Thesis VI*: “But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.” (1845 [1978]: 145) When read in conjunction with his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, it is clear that for Marx this ensemble of social relations is practical in the sense that human existence could only be understood in terms of material production and material activity – the means in which humans satisfy their needs for food, shelter and clothing. Given this, Marx could not agree that alienation was founded in religion, since if individuals are fundamentally social and able to produce what they need only together, alienation must be a consequence of material life. In the *Theses*, Marx finds individuals as ‘social’ within the ensemble of producing.

2.1.3 Durkheim’s Solidarity

Emile Durkheim’s concept of ‘social solidarity’ arose from his discussion of the ‘division of labor’. The significance of both these concepts is in the contrast provided by the intellectual climate from which they arose – as an assault on the “cult of the individual” as Durkheim (1953: 58-59; Cf. Marske, 1987) referred to it. Durkheim’s position, similar to that of this paper’s
author, is to show the degree of interdependence among individuals to show that there is something more to a group or a society than a cluster of individuals – that what gives a group or society its character is not its numbers but the way in which the cluster becomes a group or a society. As Durkheim wrote, “it can be seen that a social solidarity exists which arises because a certain number of states of consciousness are common to all members of the same society. It is this solidarity that repressive law materially embodies, at least in its most essential elements. The share it has in the general integration of society plainly depends upon the extent, whether great or small, of social life included in the common consciousness and regulated by it. The more varied the relationships on which that consciousness makes its action felt, the more also it creates ties that bind the individual to the group; the more, consequently, social cohesion derives entirely from this cause and bears this imprint.” (Durkheim, 1984: 64, Cf. 331; Cf. 1953: 29 [In fact…])

For Durkheim, this is not just a statement of what underlies social cohesion but also a critique of the “social contract” of Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and others. The logical argument is that “society is based on a common moral order rather than on rational self-interest; [therefore the social contract] is thus revealed to be an impossible fiction; contracts are only possible after society has been established, not before.” (Collins & Makowsky, 2005: 96; Cf. Durkheim, 1984: 149-174)

Durkheim’s analyses historically show across societies that in the transition from mechanical to organic solidarity, the rise of the division of labor transforms the homogeneous population into a specialized division of labor where there is a shift in the solidified unit; from the collective emerges an individual, where through changes in solidarity a shift in awareness of social action and primacy shifts from the collective to the individual – a shift from the conscience to consciousness. Thus, the individual begins to reign supreme. As individuals come more into
focus, society transitions into organizing itself less around the collective and more around
individuals as mechanical solidarity declines.\footnote{Durkheim is correct as the 20th century has shown that this is the current status of solidarity in the United States and many other countries. What Durkheim’s analysis could not foresee is the extent to which information technologies have altered the fundament nature of how this social solidarity forms. Given this, this author predicts that society’s division of labor will reach a threshold where specialization becomes overly fragmented and organic solidarity peaks. At this peak, the collective is so fragmented that society will rebound but not regress. Instead, orgo-mechanic solidarity must arise and balance the integration of the formerly individual consciousness and the collective consciousness into a re-integrated individual-collective consciousness.}

2.2 The Character of the Regulating Ordering Principle

2.2.1 The Formal-Ininformal Distinction

The history of the formal-informal dichotomy has a great tradition in the study of social
organizations. Google Scholar, with the search for ‘formal-informal organization’, enumerates
this tradition with more than 17,000 results. To begin to understand the significance of formality-
informality distinction is to first understand how formal rules and impersonality shape an
organization and in what ways formality is limited in its capacity to account for social order.
Historically, this is taken to be the study of how a unit of the organization is conferred authority
and the relations that arise from that authority. The study of authority relations derives from
Weber’s discussion of rationality (C.f. 1947: 185) and the corporate group, including
legitimation of authority. (1947: 145) This legitimation relies on a distinction between authority
and power in which authority is related to the progressive approximation of formally ideal and
largely instrumental rationality in the development of social formations. The issue of interaction-
based order is generally either taken for granted or seen as noise in most accounts. March &
Simon (1958) discuss the Merton model (1940) of bureaucracy in their search towards this ideal
rationality where the informal interaction is seen as a threat to the formal bureaucratic
organization:
“The reduction in personalized relationships, the increased internalization of rules, and the decreased search for alternatives combine to make the behavior of members of the organization highly predictable; i.e., they result in an increase in the rigidity of behavior (3.7) of participants [3.7:3.3, 3.4, 3.6]. At the same time, the reduction in personalized relationships (particularly with respect to internal competition) facilitates the development of an esprit de corps, i.e., increases the extent to which goals are perceived as shared among members of the group (3.8) [3.8:3.3]. Such a sense of commonness of purpose, interests, and character increases the propensity of organization members to defend each other against outside pressures (3.9) [3.9:3.8]. This, in turn, solidifies the tendency toward rigid behavior [3.7:3.9].”

March & Simon later on try to reconcile this threat with the cognitive limits of rationality by accepting that legitimate informal processes of the organization, in addition to the formal processes “will motivate individuals and groups to accept the tasks assigned them” in order to fulfill sub-goals. (March & Simon, 1958: 152) What is problematic here is the confusion of an analytical distinction with an empirical one. That is, as Peter Blau suggests, “Weber's decision to treat only the purely formal organization of bureaucracy implies that all deviations from these formal requirements are idiosyncratic and of no interest for the student of organization. Later empirical studies have shown this approach to be misleading. Informal relations and unofficial practices develop among the members of bureaucracies and assume an organized form without being officially sanctioned.” (Blau & Meyer, 1971: 25) In essence, Blau’s work, and those of others and with suggestions from Chicago School of Sociology, emphasize that the orderliness of a rational organization (e.g., bureaucracy) and the capacity to enact its formal structure, depends not only on formality but on informality as well, as formal, impersonal rules contrast with interaction-based informal practices and norms. Some of this was anticipated by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn in their discussions of “spontaneous involvement,” and, earlier, by the willingness of industrial managers to break up highly cohesive work groups in order to ensure the priority of predictability over level of productivity (Braverman, 1974; Katz and Kahn, 1966). However,

---

8 3.# is referring to other sections within the source material.
while it is true that informal relations and interactions generate innovation by their very nature and are responsive to situations that formal rules may not cover (and such systems of rules are always incomplete), it is not enough to assume that the understanding of how informality contributes to social order of organizations when one speaks of interaction and its outcomes. It is the process of interaction that produces both the fact of informality and its outcomes, and this process must be understood in terms of the mechanisms that make it possible, resulting in an ongoing social accomplishment. (C.f. Garfinkel, 1967: 11)

Hence, in order to comprehend the formal-informal distinction, an understanding of the mechanisms in this ongoing social accomplishment must be obtained. One of these mechanisms is the mastery and use of small talk. That mastery and use occurs as a kind of indexicalization of meaning in the very course of participating in organizational affairs. When Habermas speaks of communicative competence, he has given too much emphasis on linguistic competence and literary competence. (Habermas, 1970) But the competence at issue is socialized, as it were, on the scene; and it has to do with converting formal discourse into informal and expanding on the informal. Small talk is the precise form of discourse that both is informal and therefore immediately useful within the interaction order, and that has a bearing on action that is not mediated in the same way that formal discourse bears on action (as command, rule, etc.). Certain empirical fields, fields usually thought of as open to research because they have to do with relations between incumbents of authority and civilians (non-officials) in constrained circumstances that build in certain observational controls. Yet, if the above argument is taken seriously, then it is recognized the need to re-enter these empirical fields armed with the idea of small talk and its relation to solidarity (that aspect of legitimacy that shows the authority to be a citizen) and to action (that aspect of speaking that has some bearing on the intentionality of
action. Two areas recommend themselves: first is relations of police and community such that the normal distance between police and civilians is elided in the name of community policing; second is the techniques involved in eliciting confessions or admissions. The first has to do with a general problem of relation of official to nonofficial citizenship; the second has to do with a specific instance of the use of small talk to establish not just rapport or a bond but to establish a type of discourse in which a confession or admission might fit as a part of the discourse and therefore not subject to the normal self-criticism that is expected in formal discourse where the officer is being incurably strategic.

2.2.2 The Interaction Ritual

Law, in its many forms, is well-known to be the result of codification of some sort, whether by the executive order of a President or the passage by a legislature. In the domain of the interaction order however, the regulation of etiquette and its similar forms is a bit more de-centralized, fluid and informal – the interaction ritual being a possible process through which this regulation arises. But first, we must consider Goffman’s understanding of informality – in his Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association, *The Interaction Order*, he mentions that “informality is constituted out of interactional materials (as is formality), and the various social relations and social circles that draw on this resource merely share some.” (1983: 11) These “interactional materials” shape the nature of our performances both front and backstage. Given the multiplicities of the actual and virtual self in any given setting that Goffman tries to explain in *Frame Analysis*, the front-back stage distinction in at least one of the frames can be seen as analogous to the formal-informal dichotomy. (Cf. Goffman, 1974) This dichotomy is built in to the nature of co-presence within social encounter where the “interactional materials” determine whether the rules of conduct are of a formal or informal nature. In his discussion of rules of
conduct, Goffman, from Durkheim, suggests that between formal and informal rules, the important distinction is “between substance and ceremony.” (1967: 53)

The distinction of rules between substance and ceremony is a matter of the rule’s situated significance. If a rule “guides conduct in regard to matters felt to have significance in their own right, apart from what the infraction or maintenance of the rule expresses about the selves of the persons involved,” it is said to be substantive. If it is one which guides conduct in matters felt to have secondary or even no significance in then-own right, having their primary importance—officially anyway—as a conventionalized means of communication by which the individual expresses his character or conveys his appreciation of the other participants in the situation,” the rule is ceremonial. (1967: 53-54) The characterization of formal and informal rules as substantive and ceremonial rules, respectively, leads Goffman to the distinct manner in which these rules of conduct are sorted and codified. For our society, “the code which governs substantive rules and substantive expressions comprises our law, morality, and ethics, while the code which governs ceremonial rules and ceremonial expressions is incorporated in what we call etiquette.” (1967: 55) The implementation of etiquette then is what refers to the “interactional materials” of formal discourse. The process by which these “interactional materials” codify these ceremonial rules and ceremonial expressions however is described as a function of ritual found within Goffman’s discussion of universal human nature:

“Societies everywhere, if they are to be societies, must mobilize their members as self-regulating participants in social encounters. One way of mobilizing the individual for this purpose is through ritual; he is taught to be perceptive, to have feelings attached to self and a self-expressed through face, to have pride, honor, and dignity, to have considerateness, to have tact and a certain amount of poise. These are some of the elements of behavior which must be built into the person if practical use is to be made of him as an interactant, and it is these elements that are referred to in part when one speaks of universal human nature.” (Goffman, 1967: 44-45)
For “universal human nature is not a very human thing. By acquiring it, the person becomes a kind of construct, built up not from inner psychic propensities but from moral rules that are impressed upon him from without. These rules, when followed, determine the evaluation he will make of himself and of his fellow-participants in the encounter, the distribution of his feelings, and the kinds of practices he will employ to maintain a specified and obligatory kind of ritual equilibrium. The general capacity to be bound by moral rules may well belong to the individual, but the particular set of rules which transforms him into a human being derives from requirements established in the ritual organization of social encounters. And if a particular person or group or society seems to have a unique character all its own, it is because its standard set of human-nature elements is pitched and combined in a particular way. Instead of much pride, there may be little. Instead of abiding by the rules, there may be much effort to break them safely. But if an encounter or undertaking is to be sustained as a viable system of interaction organized on ritual principles, then these variations must be held within certain bounds and nicely counterbalanced by corresponding modifications in some of the other rules and understandings. Similarly, the human nature of a particular set of persons may be specially designed for the special kind of undertakings in which they participate, but still each of these persons must have within him something of the balance of characteristics required of a usable participant in any ritually organized system of social activity.” (Goffman, 1967: 45)

This “interaction ritual” with self-regulating participants also occurs within informal exchanges of indexical discourse. Yet the indexicality of the interaction generates a curiosity about how this self-regulation occurs within informal interaction since to codify, and thus formalize, the informal “interaction ritual” would be ironic. History has shown that irony, however, does not prevent members of society from trying to do just that. Bradd Shore, a cultural anthropologist, wrote in the *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning*, within a section entitled *Lifestyle: The Self as a Modular Commodity*, that “this idea that the self can be configured to a variety of practical ends has spawned an entire industry in the United States. The technology of “personal growth” or “self-help” specializes in personality engineering. It ranges from venerable self-help guides like *How to Win Friends and Influence People* to dozens of pop psychology manuals providing advice and programs for changing basic orientations in life to elaborately packaged personality-transforming technologies like EST or Alcoholics Anonymous.” (Shore, 1996: 149)
Shore assessment is that the “general appeal [to people] to increase control over one’s life [is] by the use of personality enhancement techniques.” To exemplify this, Shore shows an excerpt from an ad for the Dale Carnegie course, the author of *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (Cf. Carnegie, 1982 [1936]) and, according to Shore, one of the most successful of these self-help programs:

> “The Dale Carnegie Course is designed to help men and women discover, develop and use more of their untapped inner resources. It helps them to build on these innate human talents and capabilities and draw upon them every day to meet the challenges in their work, in their lives […]
>
> In the Dale Carnegie Course […] you learn how to determine what motivates people, what makes them think and act as they do. And you become better able to interact with others with greater harmony and cooperation.
>
> Participants soon feel a positive difference in themselves. Their self-image is enhanced, their self-confidence grows. They become more enthusiastic, more alert, more energetic and self-reliant. Their personalities become more vibrant, more interesting and attractive to others. […] They discover a new vitality, a new excitement as they begin to use their newly developed skills and abilities to reach the goals they set for themselves.” (Shore, 1996: 149)

Given that this irony is produced by a dichotomy, this paper proposes a spectrum as an alternative. If the manifestation of formality is determined by the explicit degree of self-regulation within the interaction order, then it is, perhaps, the failure to recognize the overly implicit “interactional materials” of informal discourse that lead individuals to seek out self-help professionals, et.al.

Yet, there is a roadblock to these considerations and that is how not all behavior is goal-oriented, nor is it in the alternative, necessarily traditional, celebratory, irrational, or part of participating in a situation involving charismatic leadership. For rapport-building and thus gaining trust is different from making people like you, and that is what self-improvement is generally about. The question is, then, what sort of activity is involved in rapport building and why must it always
resist irony, that is present itself immediately as unrelated altogether to both formal and informal interaction when the latter is identified as strategic like in the art of the confidence man?

The demonstration of a lack of irony may be part of building rapport – the capacity to express true sincerity and not the presentation thereof. But this works only if it itself is not ironical in any way that is obvious both to the speaker and to those who listen or are co-participants. This allows us to see how it is that some people are inevitably outsiders, namely people who cannot participate in rapport building because they are either incurably strategic, whether in re formal rules or informal practices, or they are unable to demonstrate a lack of irony when they are trying to be part of the group.

2.2.3 Expression Games

2.2.3.1 Definition and Deviation

So far the meaning of term “expression game” has only been stated out of context. Therefore, as a counterpoint, consider Goffman’s use of the term in his book, Strategic Interaction:

“With higher organisms, especially man, instinct is not sufficient and self-conscious intentional efforts are made to acquire information from local events, with the purpose in mind of using this knowledge to deal with these events. One may speak here of a party assessing its situation, the assessment involving both the collection of information and its use in helping to arrive at decisions. […] Just as it can be assumed that it is in the interests of the observer to acquire information from a subject, so it is in the interests of the subject to appreciate that this is occurring and to control and manage the information the observer obtains; for in this way the subject can influence in his own favor responses to a situation which includes himself. Further, it can be assumed that the subject can achieve this end by means of a special capacity - the capacity to inhibit and fabricate expression. […] There will be situations where an observer is dependent on what he can learn from a subject, there being no sufficient alternate sources of information, and the subject will be oriented to frustrate this assessment or facilitate it under difficult circumstances. Under these conditions game-like considerations develop even though very serious matters may be at stake. A contest over assessment occurs. Information becomes strategic and expression games occur. I argue that this situation is so general and so central that by looking at such games and at the various restrictions and limitations placed upon them, we can begin to learn about important assumptions and beliefs concerning the nature of individuals.” (Goffman, 1969: 10-11)
Here, Goffman’s discussion can be viewed in light of his stated purpose: “to “examine what is broadly thought of as communicative behavior and consider the senses in which this can be analyzed in non-communicating terms within a game perspective. This volume thus deals with the calculative, game-like aspects of mutual dealings—what will be called strategic interaction.” (Op cit.: x) Goffman’s purpose, analyzing doubts at play, being alternative to that of this work, analyzing the basis of sociality, then requires reconsideration of the term. First, an expression is the proffering of nonverbal (proxemics, chronemics, paralinguistics, kinesics, haptics and aromatics) cues and second, the proffering of verbal cues. As previously mentioned, expression games are the analysis of the degree to which the nonverbal cues are congruent with the verbal cues. In light of territorial complexes however, expression games are the negotiation of the tension of verbal-nonverbal congruency in the navigation of the interaction order. It is here in the interpreting of subtle gestures that alterations to boundaries of physical, virtual and ideal space are proffered, accepted, declined and re-negotiated. It should be strongly noted that silence itself is a verbal cue and therefore the tension of verbal-nonverbal congruency is just as constant as interaction itself.

2.2.3.2 Non-Verbal Cues – A Summary

Nonverbal cues are a major part of an expression. Even when people do not speak the same language, non-verbal cues still are able to carry some sort of meaning cross-culturally. (Ekman & Friesen, 1975) Studies estimate that as high as 65 percent of the meaning is carried by nonverbal cues. (Harrison, 1970: 101; Hegstrom, 1979; Cf. Harper, et al., 1978) However, it is also important to note that much nonverbal communication is unconscious making such cues incapable of being isolated either from the verbal message or from the other nonverbal cues. This
permits nonverbal behavior to be uncritically believed, although their meaning depends upon both situational and cultural contexts.

There are three statuses given to a set of non-verbal cues: (1) congruency; i.e. how the nonverbal cues may simply repeat the verbal message, may substitute for part of the verbal message, may complement (modify or elaborate) the verbal message, or may accent or emphasize certain points in the verbal message. (2) Incongruity; when the nonverbal cues express one feeling while the verbal messages denote another feeling. (3) The regulation of communication flow; when nonverbal cues are used to regulate the flow of the conversation as opposed to affecting the meaning of the content of the conversation. (Knapp, 1978)

Under these three statuses, non-verbal cues can be broken down further:

1. Proxemic communication is the manner in which “individuals use physical space in their interactions with others and how physical space influences behavior.” (Harper, et al., 1978: 246)
2. Chronemic communication is the manner in which time is used in interactions with others that can convey feelings, attitudes, and desires. (Gorden, 1987: 355)
3. Paralinguistic communication is the manner in which voice qualities such as volume, pitch, and timbre are used to convey meaning. (Gorden, 1987: 354)
4. Kinesic communication is the use of body movements including facial expression, eye movements, hand gestures, and body posture to convey meaning. (Gorden, 1987: 355; Cf. Key, 1970: 17-19)
5. Haptic communication is the manner in which the sense of touch as is used as a channel of communication. (Gorden, 1987: 358-359)
6. Aromatic communication is the manner in which through the sense of smell conveys meaning. (Gorden, 1987: 359)

It should be noted though that this thesis does not go as far as these modalities require. This is because it is intended to focus on the effects of using formal means to teach informal ends (and activities), and for this purpose, it is appropriate to beg the question posed by modal differences in expression. This thesis refers to this fact of modality when references are made to ‘non-verbal’ aspects of expression games.
Now that the two conceptions of the ‘interaction ritual’ and ‘expression games’ appear independent, it is time to examine if they hold any interdependence as concepts.

2.2.4 Contrasting ‘Interaction Ritual’ and ‘Expression Games’

*Interaction Ritual* (1967) as a book is a collection of six essays, five of which were previously published in some form or another, with the sixth, *Where the Action Is*, is comprised of 121 pages of analysis and argumentation that “action is to be found wherever the individual knowingly takes consequential chances perceived as avoidable.” (Goffman, 1967: 194) The term ‘interaction ritual’ though is not actually used in the body of the text. So what is it then? This inference can be made from the introduction, the first of two (the other already mentioned) pieces of writing original to the book itself:

“The study of face-to-face interaction in natural settings doesn’t yet have an adequate name. Moreover, the analytical boundaries of the field remain unclear. Somehow, but only somehow, a brief time span is involved, a limited extension in space, and a restriction to those events that must go on to completion once they have begun. There is a close meshing with the ritual properties of persons and with the egocentric forms of territoriality. The subject matter, however, can be identified. It is that class of events which occurs during co-presence and by virtue of co-presence. The ultimate behavioral materials are the glances, gestures, positionings, and verbal statements that people continuously feed into the situation, whether intended or not. These are the external signs of orientation and involvement—states of mind and body not ordinarily examined with respect to their social organization.” (Goffman, 1967: 1) […] “Not, then, men and their moments. Rather moments and their men.” (Ibid: 3)

*Interaction Ritual* as a book then appears to be the assessment of whether he had indeed found an ‘adequate’ name; as a precursor to Goffman’s masterpiece of oration that he would not be co-present for: “The Interaction Order” (1983). As a concept though, it appears that the ‘interaction ritual’ is the close systematic examination of the external signs of orientation and involvement as expressed in the social organization of the ritual properties of such persons among the egocentric
forms of territoriality – i.e. the study of interaction not in terms of the individual and his psychology but *the study of the individual qua interactant.*

*Expression Games: An Analysis of Doubt at Play* is one of three sections in *Strategic Interaction* (1969); the others being the preface and the essay, *Strategic Interaction,* Goffman’s attempt “to isolate the analytical framework implied in the game perspective, and show its relationship to other perspectives in analyzing interpersonal dealings” (Goffman, 1969: 85). Ideas contained in both of these papers were previewed in 1966 at a meeting organized by the International Security Program of the Institute of International Studies at the University of California at Berkeley, the year before *Interaction Ritual* was published, and hence, despite the two year gap in the publication dates, it is unclear which conception was prior. The significance of this order turns on a statement in the introduction to *Interactional Ritual* (1967: 2): “we need to see these events as a subject matter in their own right, analytically distinguished from neighboring areas, for example, social relationships, little social groups, communication systems, and strategic interaction.” The phrase which this turn relies upon is the referent of ‘strategic interaction’ because this makes it unclear whether this separation is solely in terms of traditional game-theoretical considerations or from the groundwork from which *Expression Games* arose done in 1966. The only likely way to tell is to see whether one conception precludes the other. In terms of *Expression Games,* Goffman writes the following:

“In this paper I want to explore one general human capacity in terms of the conceptions we have of its physical and social limits: the individual's capacity to acquire, reveal, and conceal information. […] Special attention will be given to occasions when the informing individual is in the immediate presence of the party collecting the information. […] Individuals, like other objects in this world, affect the surrounding environment in a manner congruent with their own actions and properties. Their mere presence produces signs and marks. Individuals, in brief, exude expressions. The information contained in the expressions which an individual exudes has special features. It necessarily concerns the source of expression and cannot solely be about some absent object. It is not discursive in the sense of providing an extended argument, but rather pertains to the
general relationship of that individual to what is transpiring. (Thus, meaning is very much bound to context.) The generating of expression, and hence making its information available, is not an official end of the action, but (at least ostensibly) only a side effect. Here, then, is expressed information. It is the kind I will mainly be concerned with.” (Goffman, 1969: 4-5)

Unlike the term ‘interaction ritual’ which is only present on the cover and in the headers,

Goffman’s intention and reference for ‘expression game’ is clear and this thesis contends that such expressed information is a crucial aspect of the “external signs of orientation and involvement” that occur as features of moments of individuals qua interactant. Hence, Goffman’s reference for being analytically distinguished does appear to reference the game-theoretical perspective broadly and not the framework he draws out from it. In that sense then, expression games are a critical feature, the sustaining element, of the interpersonal social organization of experience that the interaction ritual attempts to capture. As the sustaining element, it is what permits the ritual properties of interaction to arise. It is game-like only because it retrospectively looks like a formal game that has fixed-rules (like chess) that appears reproducible but is in fact improvised. It is this game-like activity in which the interpersonal concealment of information either fails or succeeds; where lies are told or exposed and the workable definition of truth is established. In that truth, the dramaturgical truth, individuals qua interactants generate their realities and determine who is party to those realities. In the sustaining of those realities, these successful expression games sustain what the truth is and failed expression games reveal the concealed information and the deception is exposed. With such tenuous circumstances, solidarity and trust cannot be based on such a fragile fiction such as the truth but in what is far more common – concealment. That is, trust must be founded on both successful and failed expression games.
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But, then, how does a failed expression game not result in immediate alienation? Can it be that the belief that the cause for concealment is just suffices to undo that immediate alienation? How do individuals qua interactants learn these expression games? What does this mean for solidarity?
Chapter 3: The Learning of Expression Games

3.1 The Algorithm–Heuristic Distinction in Learning Social Action and in Learning Expression Games

So far two characters have been discussed as distinctions in the organizing of experience and the regulating ordering principle. It is important however to note how these are significant as dimensions of social action before they can be of use to the ongoing examination of social interaction. What leads to the attribution of what is public and what is private as well as the attribution of what is formal and what is informal is the learning of expression games. Expression games, in their assessment of the congruency of verbal and nonverbal cues, are in of themselves a learning process as expression games build pattern and relational recognition (or, what psychologists, chess players, athletes, cops, et. al. refer to as ‘instinct’, ‘intuition’, or ‘gut-feeling’; Cf. DePaul & Ramsey, 1998; Linhares, 2005; Aagaard, 2010). This relational-pattern recognition dimension of expression games learns how to key the definition of the situation. The data the cognitive heuristic learns from are the various configurations of nonverbal cues, verbal cues and the immediate social action that follows from the interaction of the nonverbal and verbal configurations.

One of the most important configurations that one’s heuristic relational-pattern recognition must learn is keying whether the definition of the situation is characteristically formal or informal. It is this attribution that feeds back for the next move or subsequent expression game of the encounter. In determining the social action that will occur in the ongoing social interaction, one’s heuristic relational-pattern recognition relies on this formal or informal characterization to determine whether to resort to learned/past heuristics or learned/past algorithms of social action.
As children, many are taught to ‘never talk to strangers’ as a straight forward rule; yet as children grow up, this rule becomes impractical and as it begins to act as a barrier to being a participating member of society in everyday interactions, the grown child’s heuristic relational-pattern recognition re-regulates this rule to a heuristic that accounts for situations where such a rule might still apply as in the possible configurations of nonverbal cues and verbal cues that might arise as one walks past an alley late at night.

What might further inform the difference between heuristics and algorithms, in the context of learning expression games within ongoing social interaction, is the examination of the distinction in the learning of a slightly more concrete activity than what is typically involved in ongoing social interaction – the game of chess. Chess is a game more than two thousand years old with rules that have evolved with the evolution of societies themselves (Cf. Yalom, 2004). It is a game with a wide range of tactics and strategies, it has been used to illustrate mathematical concepts, historically in Dante’s *The Divine Comedy*, and more contemporarily in classrooms in New York City and Texas. Even more impressive is the vast literature that has been published on the game.

On the first move, White has a choice of 20 possibilities and Black has 20 possible responses; and the number of possible continuations grows exponentially from there. Given this, chess players have organized what is known about these continuations into a body of knowledge commonly referred to as chess opening theory. This is further subdivided into named opening systems. There are four types of chess openings: open games, closed games, semi-open games and semi-closed games – and from this information alone, it is clear that what characterizes one opening from another is not necessarily clear; it can be very complex or fairly simple. This is why a student of chess must resort to reading the vast literature that is published by masters of
the game. The literature contains its own set of sub-genres – texts on chess in general, specific openings, middlegames, endgames, game collections from tournaments and training manuals. The openings literature presents assessments of which squares are appropriate for particular pieces in particular pawn structures. Chess computers have access to databases full of this information in addition to algorithms (a set of steps or actions knowable in advance that processes an input to output some form of data) that permit the calculation of 20 moves in a few seconds or less. But as much as some may try, humans cannot play chess like a computer. Humans learn instead to ritualize heuristics, and yet the literature does not appear to be written as if that were the case.

Consider this situation: a chess player who has played for several years but never studied decides to finally buy a chess book at the local bookstore. While browsing the selection, the player finds a book on the desired chess opening, pays for the book and goes home. (Many chess players tend to buy chess books but never read them, a possible cause for this is as follows…) When one opens a chess book, one does indeed expect a book on chess, written by a chess player for other chess players, but these authors (and publisher formats) typically take a journalistic approach to writing and aim to profess their observations rather than teach them. This mode of presentation makes the learning of chess openings to appear algorithmic – White moves a pawn up two squares and Black responds in kind. However, given the vast number of possible positional configurations, it is likely that there dozens, if not hundreds or thousands, of positions that look almost the same or are the same but were arrived at in different move orders. By virtue of these unmentioned possible move orders, the analysis will always be incomplete when abstracted from the anticipation of those possible sequences.
What does this have to do with the algorithm–heuristic distinction? When one actually manages to learn an opening from a chess book, it can be understood that the chess player can inform another of the typical pawn structure, the most flexible squares for the Knights and Bishops, whether to castle towards the kingside or queenside, which side of the board the attack is going to occur on and the square that must be held at all costs. In chess books, their authors might mention these details, if one is lucky, but it is hidden beneath several hundred pages of already completed chess games in algebraic notion filled with detailed analysis of possible variations in algebraic notion. When one refers to detailed analysis, this is not indicative of verbose descriptions but of more algebraic notion (i.e. 13. Kb1 [13.Qxd2 Qxd2 14.a8=Q]). Since these games or variations are present in-text, it is easier for a reader to obtain the impression that the matter and its complications are already settled – why not take a piece of paper, draw a tree diagram and memorize it? Which is to say, the strategy of the opening and its complications are adequately described as a kind of recipe based on definite rule.

This is how chess books come to attain their algorithmic character. In this manner, the function of an algorithm can be understood as a process knowable in advance of its implementation, intended to reduce risk and uncertainty; as an application of a pre-set rule in the on-going situation of a game; or if White’s Knight moves to the f3-square, Black’s Knight must move to the c6-square. While lounging in one’s study, this seems very reasonable – unless one is attuned to the complexity of social action. In a lounge chair, there is very little tension, very little at stake, and any gained understanding appears retained and firm in one’s mind and memory. That is the frame of studying chess. When in the frame of playing chess in a tournament, the clock is running, others are staring at ongoing game, as one’s opponent lies in wait for the proffered moves after breaking away from the algorithmic preparation the chess book mentioned was
required for one’s opponent to hold their position. Yet, since this is a requirement, why add complication of memorization by storing its punishment since to indeed go down that path would be disadvantageous for the opponent? But wait, since one can infer that there is a possibility that the opponent does not know this information, assume for the moment that it was indeed added to the algorithm. However, since the clock is running, it is late in the evening, with several thousand dollars on the line, with the anticipation of a long drive home; the punishment that was added to the algorithm escapes the mind at the moment it is needed. Just as one further approaches in description of what Weber refers to as ideal types, such ideal types become less reflective of social reality, and algorithms will produce tragedy in moments when what is needed is a heuristic. The function of heuristics is the realization of what mitigates. With permission to change the example scheme for a moment, this is the main function of law school – to take the black letter law (i.e. what the law states as written) and to have law students ritualize heuristics in order to for them to understand that although the classic saying ‘the law is the law’ is accurate and sounds algorithmic, law students will learn the heuristics of case law and its corresponding legal reasoning that is exemplified by the answer to any legal question with the phrase ‘it depends’, thus turning ‘black’ into ‘gray’.

In general, informal interaction depends on the actor’s capacity to use heuristics, since, as Goffman points out, what counts is “flow” rather than form. Formal social action, in contrast, relies primarily on rules that operate like algorithms. This is to say that the functions of the algorithm–heuristic distinction have been defined, but the terms themselves have not:

- An algorithm is a “procedure or set of rules used in calculation and problem-solving; a precisely defined set of mathematical or logical operations for the performance of a particular task.” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2012)
- A heuristic is a “simple procedure that helps find adequate, though often imperfect, answers to difficult questions.” (Kahneman, 2011: 98)
A heuristic is a “piece of knowledge that can be used to select among the options in a problem state.” (Ohlsson, 2011: 77)

What these definitions do in the vein of specificity is reproduce the irony the algorithm–heuristic distinction is attempting to clarify in the formal-informal distinction. What matters more than the definition is its function as it relates to being a basis for social action. Heuristics, as the realization of what mitigates, are situated as flexible to the problems of everyday life whereas algorithms, by design, are situated to anticipate success. Ironically, this leads to a preference for algorithms but a preference in which only heuristics apply. Consider some students in a social science undergraduate course: the grading system present in the syllabus is an algorithm in which a few students might use in order to figure out the minimum amount of work required for the desired grade. In a mathematics or physical science course, this strategy might work, but in the social sciences, papers are graded heuristically. This is also a restatement of what the chess player wants when buying a chess book – what steps are needed to win and a restatement of what a reader wants when buying a self-help book – what steps are needed to get more friends? Both chess and self-help books present their readers with the necessary information to learn the specific skill – learning chess or learning expression games; but in both cases the emphasis is on techniques, as if they are intended to be rules sufficient to maximize some index of success in situations in general. Before further addressing how formally learning these informal skills from a formalized source (i.e. the book itself) is problematic, one must address the question of how this learning is accomplished informally. Since such an answer is prior to the question: can performance under conditions of informality be taught as an application of formal rules?

A great deal of research in cognitive psychology is devoted to informal learning, memory, and heuristics, especially around studies of chess players. (de Groot, 1965, 1966; Chase & Simon, 1973a, 1973b; Reynolds, 1982; Pfau, 1988; Cooke, 1993; Schultetus, 1999; Linhares, 2010;
Raphael Lane, 2011) The relevance of this to algorithm–heuristic distinction as it applies to expression games is in how a majority of the discussion focuses on learning, or more specifically on the development of expertise and skill in human problem solving and analytical thinking. (Newell, Shaw & Simon, 1958; Newell & Simon, 1972; Cf. Ohlsson, 2011: 75-78, 102-103)

While expression games, which involve responses to non-verbal as well as verbal cues in the course of the flow of interaction, might not be viewed as participating in the same type of heuristic analytical problem solving associated with a typical game of chess (i.e. two players sitting down taking hours to think) because of the temporality in which the problem solving operates, that notion would be misleading. Although descriptions of the heuristic search by cognitive psychologists read as algorithmic (See Figure 3.3 in Ohlsson, 2011: 76) and thus appear to take extended processing time, chess games quality actually occur at a variety of time controls. What might be thought of as the typical chess game might occur at a common time control (2 hours for 40 moves and 1 hour sudden death). It is also possible that the longest correspondence games can take years to complete (a time control of 10 moves in 50 days). Yet on a daily basis, thousands of quality chess games are played on the internet at blitz (3-29 minutes per game) or bullet (2 minutes or less per game) time controls. On occasion, one might even find players participating in time controls as swift as 10 seconds per game (with a second added for each move made). Thus, the temporal dimension of problem solving in chess does not disqualify the cognitive problem solving from being applicable to expression games. Since expression games are situated in everyday life, it is then, a valid inference that expression games are critical to both the simple and complex problems associated with everyday life. It is in fact during the course of an expression game, that problems are solved using the heuristic search of one’s relational-pattern recognition within the environment of the encounter. The problem
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solving occurs, both formally and informally, and may be as simple as avoiding a collision while walking down the street or as complex as an attempt to convince a police officer to not write a traffic ticket. In this regard, it is fairly clear that chess and everyday interaction overlap in regard to the importance of heuristics in a sequential activity in which multiple possibilities can be anticipated at each point – realizing that social action is naturally problematic and primed for problem solving.

It is now clear that chess and expression games appear to use the same cognitive process for problem solving. What about the learning process? The heuristic process used in accumulating relational-pattern recognition in chess, appears to suggest that if what is meant by learning is the accumulation of patterns and relations stored for later use as resources for further activity, then learning in chess appears to occur through problem solving, but problem-solving of an altogether different order from what is done by a computer. (Newell, Shaw & Simon, 1958; Newell & Simon, 1972) In chess, the patterns and relationships being stored is among chess pieces. In expression games, the patterns being stored are the relations among the various configurations of nonverbal cues, verbal cues, situational context and the immediate social action that follows from the interaction of the nonverbal and verbal configurations. Problem-solving in both types of games involves a process of taking account of contingencies in such a way that relations and patterns are on-going accomplishments of a reliance on heuristics. Therefore, it appears that chess and expression games do use the same cognitive process for learning.

Now that it is clear that the learning process for expression games is based in heuristics, it is clear why algorithms for learning expression games would appear problematic. As most elementary students learn, algorithms are excellent for summaries of numerical data which can have operations performed on them, and these steps are taught, learned and tested on exams. But
what if the algorithm–heuristic distinction was not only a distinction between algorithms and heuristics but a distinction between algorithms and “algorithmic heuristics”? Consider the possibility, with algorithms taking its Oxford English Dictionary meaning as applied in formal processes, that heuristics may become routinized after a period of accumulation of relational-patterns, thereby arriving at a stage in which the routinization of the heuristics takes on the appearance of algorithm, and not the heuristics itself. These appearances, from the point of the observer, are the constitution of informal skills.

A master of expression games might be said to have ‘charisma’ and is typically the type of person who ends up writing a self-help book on interpersonal relationships. This author might or might not recognize that the content of their ‘charisma’, small talk and big talk success is the result of “algorithmic heuristics”, rather than algorithms alone. Their book might describe principles or steps to participate in expression games. What the authors do not realize is in the writing of the book, the author has transformed what is in their personal experience of expression games, an algorithmic heuristic into an algorithm (just like the problem described with the reading of chess books). They instead come to disregard the problem of teaching the informal aspect of social interaction in favor of rules and an attempt to persuade readers to operate according to their specific prescriptions. In effect, these are “algorithmic heuristics” and if their mode of presentation ignores their informal aspect the result is a learning that cannot be applied with any hope of success, not necessarily because that is the author’s intent but because it is not necessarily under the author’s control. Decisions made by publishers and others that do the typesetting affect how a text is read. Consider Dale Carnegie’s bestseller of more than 15 millions copies, *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. It has a section entitled “Six Ways to Make People Like You in a Nutshell”:
1. Become genuinely interested in other people.
2. Smile.
3. Remember that a person’s name is to that person the sweetest and most important sound in any language.
4. Be a good listener. Encourage others to talk about themselves.
5. Talk in terms of the other person’s interests.
6. Make the other person feel important – and do it sincerely.

Carnegie refers to each of these as principles with the implication that they are rules adequate to the situations to which they are applied. Consider the first, “Become genuinely interested in other people.” It cannot help but be read as a rule as that is its grammatical form. The type of authenticity ‘genuinely’, ‘smile’, and ‘sincerity’ requires to be successful is only possible in the course of employing heuristics, so what is written in the form of an algorithm should be thought of by its reader as an algorithmic heuristic. Then, such authenticity can only be achieved as the result of many other heuristics (which to an observer may appear to be algorithmic heuristics) – all of which require obtaining what I refer to as Shaman’s Condition. Without Shaman’s Condition, during the course of an expression game, the recalling of Carnegie’s instruction to ‘smile’ will generate inconsistent non-verbal cues incompatible with the ongoing expression game and ultimately a failed smile nor will it produce the desired effects of a smile.

To restate the algorithm–heuristic distinction, heuristics are the basis for social action during the course of an expression game. Over time, these heuristics are routinized and appear as algorithmic heuristics. It is in this form that the algorithmic heuristics learned informally are mistaken for the algorithms characteristic of formal interaction.

Oran R. Young’s review of Strategic Interaction suggests interpreting the term “expression game” as referring “to those aspects of strategic interaction involving the acquisition, revelation, or concealment of information affecting the relationship between the parties involved in the strategic situation. Consequently, expression games are calculative activities taking place within
the broader framework of strategic interaction in general.” (Young, 1974:128-129; Cf. Swedberg, 2001) A broader reading of Goffman’s body of work suggests an alternative interpretation – that all social interaction operates under strategic conditions but not all strategic conditions are necessarily calculative conditions. The implication of this requires further explication of what is meant by ‘strategic’ and by ‘calculative’. This clarity will be obtained by examining the type of conditions expression games operate under: (1) strategic, yet non-calculative conditions; and (2) strategic and calculative conditions.

3.2 Strategic, Yet Non-Calculative Conditions

The strategic, yet non-calculative conditions under which expression games are situated is predicated upon the simple cognitive fact that heuristics gather and process information about the environment an interactant is located within. At times, this gathering may rise “to acquire information about him or to bring into play information about him already possessed. They will be interested in his general socio-economic status, his conception of self, his attitude toward them, his competence, his trustworthiness, etc. Although some of this information seems to be sought almost as an end in itself, there are usually quite practical reasons for acquiring it. Information about the individual helps to define the situation, enabling others to know in advance what he will expect of them and what they may expect of him. Informed in these ways, the others will know how best to act in order to call forth a desired response from him.” (Goffman, 1959: 1) This rises to a conception of strategy (Goffman, 1969: 10) but not to a conception of calculation as Young’s review suggests (Op. Cit.) or to the level of “deliberateness, calculation and express management” as suggested by Garfinkel (1967: 174). Most expression games operate under these strategic, yet non-calculative conditions.
3.3 Strategic and Calculative Conditions

Expression games operating under strategic and calculative conditions tend to take two forms: (a) formal strategic interaction and (b) informal strategic interaction. Formal strategic interaction, where there is knowingly “deliberateness, calculation and express management” like that of business negotiations and other situations examined by formal game theory as presented in von Neumann and Morgenstern’s *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*; this examination is outside the scope of this study.

Informal strategic interaction operating strategic and calculative conditions is more complex form of social action. The apparent source of Garfinkel’s critique of Goffman is how this deliberateness calculative quality adds a formal character to interaction where it is not warranted.

Since most expression games operate under strategic, yet non-calculative conditions, a particular operation disguises the calculative condition as non-calculative; thus maintaining what Glaser & Strauss (1964) refer to as a closed awareness context. The operation that performs this maintenance is referred to as *Shaman’s Condition*.

3.4 Shaman’s Condition

Shaman’s Condition is obtained through a variety of heuristics that permit social action to take on a deceptive authenticity. The word ‘Shaman’ in the phrase “Shaman’s Condition” is a reference to the social phenomenon examined by Emile Durkheim (1965) and Marcel Mauss (1972). The phenomenon under examination is the relationship between calculation, belief and deception. Unlike the magician who is aware of his or her intent in deceiving his or her audience, (Jones, 2011; Cf. Dutton, 2010: 70) the shaman shares the same belief as his audience and is taken in by his own performance. It is this state of being, or condition, that permits the deception
to be successfully disguised. Politicians, actors, and confidence men are said to have charisma and that it is suggested by Weber that this ‘charisma’ is what gives them their compelling authority. (Gerth & Mills, 1946) But what is compelling about this ‘charisma’ is not just the confidence in what is being said – consider politicians specifically – it is easy to imagine that politicians do not necessarily agree with every speech given to them by their speechwriters or party leaders yet when it is thrown on prompter, the politician and the a great number of people somehow are still taken in. What is compelling about ‘charisma’ is its authenticity. This authenticity can indeed be a partial result of confidence, but confidence in one’s belief is not a substitution for authentic belief – that is the difference between the amateur politician, the newly minted actor, the apprentice confidence man and their expert counterparts. The amateurs still attempting to internalize Shaman’s Condition still recognize their intent to deceive and have yet to master all the heuristics required to eschew that intent and all the other algorithmic features obtaining a goal requires. The experts, on the other hand, under Shaman’s Condition, perform their calculations at a cognitive level just below the level of attention where the specific steps are no longer ‘known’ to them – much like how an expert chess player can play a speed chess game accurately without explicit calculation. Under Shaman’s Condition, the interactant’s heuristic search is already primed with the problem at hand and the solution comes off as naturally as a chess player’s technique when swiftly picking up a piece, moving it, hitting the clock, without displacing up to 31 other pieces.

It has been previously implied that there are certain types of vocations or ventures where obtaining Shaman’s Condition is a kind of prerequisite for success in the kind of informal strategic expression games where calculation is required. Actors, confidence men, ‘social
engineers’, pickup artists and undercover police officers as a requirement of the activity their work must partake in these strategic expression games with some level of calculation in mind.

Actors must turn lines of text into not just speech but into authentic social interaction all the while an entire audience is staring at them – an actor needs to forget that he or she is acting.

Further consider the description of actors and their training as provided by David Mamet, a Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright and director, who draws on his decades of observing good and bad acting in his authoring of *True and False: Heresy and Common Sense for the Actor* (1999). Mamet aptly describes the problem of acting without Shaman’s Condition at the same time of critiquing the Stanislavsky Method of acting:

“Most acting training is directed at recapitulating the script. Actors are told to learn how to "be happy," "be sad," "be distracted," at those points in the script or performance where it would seem the "character" would so be. Such behavior is not only unnecessary, it is harmful both to the actor and to the audience. [N]othing in the world is less interesting than an actor on the stage involved in his or her own emotions. The very act of striving to create an emotional state in oneself takes one out of the play. It is the ultimate self-consciousness, and though it may be self-consciousness in the service of an ideal, it is no less boring for that. The actor on the stage, looking for or striving to create a "state" in himself can think only one of two things: (a) I have not reached the required state yet; I am deficient and must try harder; or (b) I have reached the required state, how proficient I am! (at which point the mind, ever jealous of its prerogatives, will reduce the actor to (a). Both (a) and (b) take the actor right out of the play. For the mind cannot be forced. It can be suggested, but it cannot be forced. An actor onstage can no more act upon the order "Be happy" than she can upon the order "Do not think of a hippopotamus."

Mamet continues his written diatribe against “method acting” yet inadvertently ends up describing one set of possible heuristics for obtaining Shaman’s Condition:

“The Method got it wrong. Yes, the actor is undergoing something onstage, but it is beside the point to have him or her "undergo" the supposed trials of the character upon the stage. The actor has his own trials to undergo, and they are right in front of him. They don't have to be superadded; they exist. His challenge is not to recapitulate, to pretend to the difficulties of the written character; it is to open the mouth, stand straight, and say the words bravely—adding nothing, denying nothing, and without the intent to manipulate anyone: himself, his fellows, the audience. To learn to do that is to learn to act. The actor, in learning to be true and simple, in learning to speak to the point despite being
frightened, and with no certainty of being understood, creates his own character; he forges character in himself. Onstage. And it is this character which he brings to the audience.” (Ibid: 22)

Mamet’s description appears similar to the religious rituals described by Durkheim (1965). In this way, with the immense practice and rehearsals, it is understandable how actors become masters of Shaman’s Condition onstage where the formality of a script disappears into captivating expression games. Just as an actor’s job is to take in his or her audience, what is the difference between an actor and confidence men? The purpose the audience plays – as Goffman (1952) writes, “The con is practiced on private persons by talented actors who methodically and regularly build up informal social relationships just for the purpose of abusing them.” However, Shaman’s Condition plays an even stronger role in this type of expression game – it is crucial to convince the mark that there is ‘honor among thieves’ as they say, especially since a “confidence man prospers only because of the fundamental dishonesty of his victim. First, he inspires a firm belief in his own integrity. Second, he brings into play powerful and well-nigh irresistible forces to excite the cupidity of the mark. Then he allows the victim to make large sums of money by means of dealings which are explained to him as being dishonest—and hence a "sure thing." As the lust for large and easy profits is fanned into a hot flame, the mark puts all his scruples behind him. He closes out his bank account, liquidates his property, borrows from his friends, embezzles from his employer or his clients. In the mad frenzy of cheating someone else, he is unaware of the fact that he is the real victim, carefully selected and fatted for the kill. Thus arises the trite but none the less sage maxim: "You can't cheat an honest man.”” (Maurer, 1999 [1940]: 2) If the confidence man fails at obtaining Shaman’s Condition, the mark will see no honor among thieves and the con game cannot be played.

“Social engineers” appear to be a relatively recent venture when compared to the millennia that actors and swindlers have taunted society. In the current technological age of information, the
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necessity to secure that information grows as more information is accumulated and stored digitally; regardless of whether the data is the photos from one’s wedding, the trademark recipe to a company’s secret sauce or the Department of Defense’s contingency plans to prevent nuclear war, security experts and hackers agree that the most vulnerable aspect of an organization’s security is not necessarily its technological infrastructure but the people within its organization. When these ‘people’ are targeted for information, they are all of a sudden targeted by a new breed of manipulators – the “social engineers”. One might hazard to guess that the change in terminology from ‘con man’ to ‘social engineering’ sounds more intelligent, less threatening, systematic and technical as if a confidence game had none of those qualities. Social engineers are still con men – they just have added a variant to the short con which changed the currency provided by the mark from money to information which will typically be used to con much bigger fish. Instead of calling it for what is it is – a con game – instead it is referred to as “social engineering techniques” which “are specifically designed to bypass expensive IT security countermeasures” by hacking humans. (Mann, 2012: 1) This makes the problem they pose technical and thus, solvable – the illusion real con men take advantage of. Their use of Shaman’s Condition in expression games is only altered from that of confidence men in that the change in currency alters from convincing the mark that there is ‘honor among thieves’ to convincing the mark the engineer is authentically permitted access to the desired ‘currency’.

---

9 Consider these two slightly different descriptions of social engineers:

1. “Social engineering is the act of manipulating a person to take an action that may or may not be in the “target’s” best interest. This may include obtaining information, gaining access, or getting the target to take certain action.” (Hadnagy, 2010)

2. “A social engineer’s primary goal is to develop the trust to enable them to carry out their attack. Therefore, it is essential that we thoroughly understand the processes that make up the development of trust. For an organization to function effectively, it needs to store information between people in a variety of situations. However, in understanding and protecting ourselves from social engineering attacks, it is important that we understand where the limits of trust should lie. We shall also be showing just how flaky the foundations of trust can be and how easily it can be established with the target of a social engineering attack.” (Mann, 2012: 87)
‘Pick-up artists’ are also a master of Shaman’s Condition in their calculated expression games. Mystery (Erik von Markovik), host of the 1 season show on VH1, *The Pickup Artist* and author of the book of the same name (von Markovik & Odom, 2010) describes his experience of Shaman’s Condition: “I honestly feel like I am a master at this. Not because I can get any woman—that, of course, is impossible—but because my pickups are so controlled and smooth; not sleazy, but rather natural.” Mystery however does not describe how he gets to be so ‘smooth’ (into Shaman’s Condition); instead he described what is referred to as the Mystery Method – another algorithmic heuristic presented as a mere algorithm for attracting hot women, even what he refers to as “10s”: “It is a very simple system, really. 1. Find 2. Meet 3. Attract 4. Close.” (Ibid: xviii) If it were that simple, such a book would not need to exist…

In undercover police work, it appears that obtaining Shaman’s Condition to disguise the lies and calculation is a prerequisite for success in the kind of informal strategic expression games, in fact their lives typically depend on it. (See Queen, 2007; Dobyns, 2009; Diaz, 2011; Sellers, 2012; Russell, 2013 for first person accounts of undercover operations.) The question protracted undercover work poses for expression games is quite interesting – what happens when the encounter that the informal strategic expression games occur in is not truncated but protracted – meaning the calculation and goal sought in the expression game is a long term project – i.e. “covert work is very intense. The agent is always "on." For some agents, the work has an addictive quality as they savor the sense of power, intrigue, excitement, and their protected contact with illegality.” (Marx, 1988: 161) It appears this would not be problematic under Shaman’s Condition since the Shaman unlike the agent has no need to be ‘on’. This suggests that Shaman’s Condition is similar to the phenomenon of “going native”, or operating under Native’s Condition, which seems more of a requirement of these protracted expression games: “A number
of the interview, news, and nonfiction and fiction accounts in the literature suggest that some deep-cover agents undergo a striking metamorphosis. As lying becomes a way of life, the agent may become confused about his or her true identity. Familiarity can breed affection as well as contempt. This is particularly likely to the extent that the agent is cut off from friends and becomes immersed in a new life.” (Marx, 1988: 163) The difference between Shaman’s Condition and Native’s Condition is the length of the encounter and thus the length of the expression game. When the situational calculative conditions of the encounter do not permit retreat – the play must go on and this sense of being always “on” appears to be a stage prior to obtaining Shaman’s Condition or the requisite for finding oneself under the operation of Native’s Condition. In more swift undercover operations, where one can be sure Shaman’s Condition (and not Native’s Condition) is indeed operating is in drug buys like that presented in the following excerpt from a transcript used in the training of FBI agents:

“AGENT: "I'm gonna talk to you like you were my kid brother, or something ... just because I'm available and I could do business, don't, don't get sucked in by that just because it's a way to make money. ... I frankly don't need the business, and, ah, if there's some other way you can survive without doing it, my advice to you because you already had the light shined on you and they probably [are] giving you your last chance would be go do something else."

SUBJECT: "Right, I understand where you're coming from."

AGENT: "Yeah, so, I just wanted to lay that on you and if you're still bound and determined then it's a new ball game, but at least we've talked about it."

SUBJECT: "I'm still bound [and] determined." (Marx, 1988: 137)

Marx (1988:136) gives an interesting example where an expression game can be misinterpreted:

“Frequent references to a corrupt practice may lead the unreflective observer to tie the target into the scheme, even when the target may be a passive participant. In a phenomenon linguists refer to as "contamination," one party to a conversation has a secret agenda to which he keeps returning, thus creating the impression that everyone involved in the conversation agrees with the speaker. But the failure to actively reject an offer or to vocally or visibly disagree with a line of conversation may reflect politeness, posturing, intimidation, or disinterest, rather than acquiescence. Even saying "Uhhuh," "Yeah," or "Yes" may mean "I hear you" or "I understand" rather than "I agree."
When the obtaining of Shaman’s Condition is successful, the expression game proceeds as if the social interaction was operating under strategic, yet non-calculative conditions. Now that it is clearer how strategic and calculative conditions are disguised as strategic, yet non-calculative conditions, this analysis must further explain the components of the intended imitation.

This is now at a point where the term ‘strategy’ or ‘strategic’ may appear problematic, but only if the term is seen synonymous with the term ‘rationality’ as that appears to be a reversion back to formal interaction. However, recalling the simple cognitive fact that heuristics gather and process information about the environment that an interactant is located within makes all interaction strategic, the real problem is what is meant by ‘calculative.’ Then, to be calculative, or tactical, is to narrow attention where the focus is upon eliminating options in the elements of the situation. The inverse concept is to examine what ‘not calculative’ looks like. It appears to be a type of attentiveness to the overall picture of things rather than any particular detail and a type of receptiveness to spontaneity – i.e. to allow something to happen rather than applying the constraints tied to strict decision-making procedures. Just like how chess pieces have squares that are ‘natural to that particular position; or how a string of musical notes constitute a melodic harmony; or how a particular color shirt ‘just works’ with a particular pair of pants, or how a particular wine tastes ‘just right’ with a particular entrée; our heuristic relational-pattern recognition senses how things fit together.

For informal situations, to calculate and thus attempt specific tactical considerations without Shaman’s Condition is to attempt to place a puzzle piece where it will never fit. Such an attempt overly focuses on particular elements (like only one of the four tabs of a puzzle piece) and in focusing upon such elements, one takes action toward such elements – that is to produce a large degree of incongruity in the expression game. This kind of focused action comes off as social
incompetence. When such social incompetence is perceived by the other interactants, it is immediately marked as ‘odd’; and the incongruity in the expression game is sensed as deception. It is this that alienates the individual from the rest of the interactants. What is needed instead is social competence, and congruency in one’s expression games, for informal social interaction. Informal social interaction requires fitting in and therefore an act of attention that is strategic but not calculating and that it has its object the relational aspect of the situation rather than the particulars relative to other particulars. Social competence requires this kind of active attention – it requires perceiving the relations in a situation such that one knows how to fit in and one cannot teach a model of how to fit in on a model on how to calculate.

3.5 Finding the Key

When things fit together, without the hazards of calculation, expression games generate a relational reality that stands on its own. The remaining question though is the character of that relational reality; what Goffman refers to as ‘tightness’ and ‘looseness’ among such component relations; or what has been discussed so far as formal or informal.

When one first hears one the word ‘key’, one of the first associations is likely ‘lock’ or ‘door’. One unfamiliar specificity with Goffman’s use of the term in Frame Analysis (1974) but with the awareness that the general subject concerns the organization of experience might imagine the chosen key could grant access to a particular door to be found in an infinite hallway where the doors are labeled in a particular way that communicated what relational reality that would be found on the other side of the chosen door. A sign on one door might read “Playroom” where inside it would be expected to find things conducive to ‘playing’. Another might read “Gameroom” where inside it would be expected to find things conducive to ‘playing’ but are more likely of a more mature nature like a billiards table. Another labeled “Library” would
determine that the type of activity occurring beyond the threshold, once unlocked, would constitute studying quietly of some sort. A gateway labeled “Bar”, once unlocked, could possibly reveal the relational reality produced by intoxication. For Goffman however, this is not his particular use of it; instead, the key refers to “the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else. The process of transcription can be called keying.” (1974:43-44) Or more specifically, Goffman describes keying “when there is one, performs a crucial role in determining what it is we think is really going on.”

Consider the following example: a professor and a student are chatting informally at a café. As the student is speaking, the professor inadvertently glances at his watch. The student, while still speaking, sees this and because the professor’s work is variable in nature (meaning that work can happen at a café, in a conference room, office, or lecture hall, etc.) the student interprets the ‘watch glancing’ as a sign that the professor has somewhere to be. For the student, this transforms the informal character of chatting socially in to a type formal inquiry for strict answers so the student might ascertain all that is required before the professor is “required” to leave. The professor can recognize this and decide whether to attempt to re-transform the interaction to informality or to let the student continue with their “hit-and-run” type of inquiry.

As previously mentioned, it is vital that one must learn whether the conventions characteristic to the definition of a particular situation is formal or informal as this determines the nature of the expression game and in effect the type of relational reality that activity progresses within.

Instead of the rough musical analogy Goffman intends, or the Hall of Playrooms, Libraries and Bars, given what has come before, return to the jigsaw puzzle. Imagine having several copies of
the same jigsaw puzzle thrown into one pile. To key is to select which puzzle to put the piece in. During this process, there is a sense of ambiguity among the puzzles and their respective pieces – i.e. are two pieces identical? If so, how? Do the tabs match or are they opposites? This process leads to a negotiation of meaning, unlike musical notes or doors in a hallway, which sorts out what fits where – *the something patterned on to the activity*. As the entire puzzles begin to take shape, the subject of the puzzle becomes more recognizable. As it becomes more recognizable, it becomes more relatable. As it is with jigsaw puzzles, it is so within the course of expression games. Such relatablity builds mutuality and rapport (Tickle-Degnen, 1990: 286-287), which over time develops into trust. (Johnson, 1975: 82-104)

With the understanding of the cognitive underpinnings of how social action is learned and the application of that learning process to how expression games occur under a variety of strategic conditions, it can then be understood how expression games generate a relational reality that keys what type of activity is permissible – i.e. what the rules of the expression game are and what type of activity will be sanctioned and therefore deemed as the placement of a piece in the wrong puzzle – the type of activity that does not fit. When the interaction sustains the relational reality, the ambiguity of meaning that arises from expression games is further negotiated and as meanings become further understood, rapport arises within the relational reality and functions as the foundation for trust. When interactants fail to key into the relational reality shared by the other interactants, this has several possible interrelated causes. Since heuristic searches are based on previously learned patterns, the interactant might (a) have never successfully stored the various configurations of nonverbal cues, verbal cues and the immediate social action that follows from the interaction of the nonverbal and verbal configurations (as in several forms of autism) and therefore suffers from failed interpersonal socialization; (b) be socialized in a
different culture where the learned configurations are inapplicable to the current set of interactants; (c) not have had the opportunity to learn the patterns appropriate for the situation;\textsuperscript{10} or (d) have learned the patterns through formal study with very little practice. Formal study with extensive practice will lead to obtaining Shaman’s Condition at a minimum, if not the attainment of strategic, yet not calculative conditions through typical socialization processes. The cause of interest to this thesis is (d) specifically when formal study fails to teach how to obtain Shaman’s Condition; specifically when that failure of attainment produces alienation and the interactant feels ‘out of place’ during the course of expression games and is therefore discouraged further from the practice obtaining Shaman’s Condition requires. As previously discussed, the underlying cause for this failure is the mistaking of algorithms for algorithmic heuristics and it is now time for a detailed examination of the materials used for formal study, drawn from the self-help literature, to see how much of what has been discussed so far is taken into account; especially the disconnection between the author’s written word and the activity of reading that accounts for the alienation experienced in interaction.

3.6 Summary Diagrams

In summary, please consider the following two diagrams. For Diagram 1, please keep in mind in the case of the single directional arrows (those with only 1 arrowhead) that there is a certain reflexive character that is more of a spiral (\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{spiral}) than straight (\includegraphics[scale=0.5]{straightarrow}) from one element to the next. This was not done in the diagram for the sake of visual clarity.

\textsuperscript{10} A great example of this can be gleaned from HBO’s series \textit{The Wire}, in Season 4, Episode 9 entitled \textit{Know Your Place}. In the episode, three students from gang-controlled neighborhoods in Baltimore win dinner with their teacher to Ruth’s Chris Steak House, a high-class establishment downtown by the waterfront. The evening starts well, with the students looking forward to a new experience. But once inside, the students find the atmosphere overwhelming and intimidating and fail to grasp the restaurant protocol or enjoy the experience. After they finish dinner, they leave the steakhouse disappointed and end up going to McDonalds. This is different from (b) as (b) has learned patterns for how to behave in a steakhouse but with different protocols whereas in (c) the learning of protocols is just absent.
Diagram 1. The Learning of Expression Games in the Informal-Informal Distinction
Diagram 2. Learning Expression Games in Self-Help Literature

Learning Expression Games in Self-Help Literature

Writing is a formal process of organization.

↓

Writing produces literature on many subjects.

↓

There is a Self-Help Literature.

↓

A Sub-Set of this Literature Aims to Help with Interpersonal Relationships.

Research Question

Does this Sub-Set Intend for Readers to Formally Learn Informal Interaction?

↓

Data

Purposive Sample (N=50)
Drawn From Amazon.com's Best-Seller Lists

↓

Method

Content Analysis

Tested for 'Learning'

Tested for Informal 'Expressive Aspects of Interaction'

Results?

The Sampled Self-Help Literature Contains Phrases Indicative of 'Learning' and 'Expressive Aspects of Interaction'

Yes, the Intent of the Authors' Self-Help Literature is for Readers to Learn the Informal Expressive Aspects of Interaction

↓

Starker, Steven. (1989)
Oracle at the Supermarket:
The American Preoccupation With Self-Help Books

↓

"The particular technology [or information] offered is quite secondary to the inspirational message of individualism proffered by the self-help oracle. It is a powerful, motivating message which temporarily makes the reader feel more in control, less helpless, less despairing." (1989: 73)

↓

The Content of the Literature Acts as a "Placebo Effect" as an Acceptable Scientific or Humanistic Source of Inspiration

Reader Becomes Inspired To Be More Social

Reader Is Not Inspired But Attempts to Follow Instructions

More Failed Expression Games

More Alienation
Chapter 4: Research Design & Methodology

As Goffman did in *Behavior in Public Places* by citing etiquette manuals, it is clear that the popular source of information in determining how to interact in informal situations lies within the literatures of ‘personal improvement’, ‘etiquette’, ‘dating’ and ‘seduction’. By virtue of being written, each author has formalized a guidebook, with steps one is supposed to follow, during the course of “natural” informal interaction. This study proposes to examine the codified informal “interaction ritual” explicated by these self-help professionals et. al. with structural and modified content analyses to determine if the “interactional materials” contained within are conducive to building rapport.

4.1 Data

Since this study aims to be representative of what the popular literature has to say about teaching small talk, this study will be based on samples drawn from Amazon’s “Best Sellers Rank by Category”. ¹¹ A list of 50 books ranked and drawn from the lists of ‘Self-Help’, ‘Interpersonal Relations’, ‘Etiquette’, and ‘Dating’. These were collected in May 2011 using purposive sampling (C.f. Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998: 86) based on the qualitative assessment of the book’s subject. Several selections were also ranked best sellers in the ‘Communication Skills’ category. Selections were made if, from the book’s title, it was inferable that a discussion of formalizing ‘small talk’ would be present. (Cf. Appendix A for the catalogue of books.)

¹¹ For an explanation of how this rank is calculated, please see Amazon.com, 2011.
4.2 Analytical Methods

The proposed content analysis will attempt to establish the validity of the sample and the proposed structural analysis will attempt to identify the structural properties and functions of these books (i.e. how the book is structured; the division of the table of contents, the way its advice is summarized, etc.). To determine whether these works are conducive to building rapport, these works will be coded qualitatively to determine to what extent any of these texts do the following: (1) express the formal aspect to the exclusion of the informal; (2) express strategic aspect of interaction at the expense of rapport building or other kinds of non-goal-related initiations of interaction; (3) express irony in the emphasis on formality or explicitness; (4) deny irony by speaking of something like sincerity – since to speak of something like sincerity in such a way that it is fairly clear that the author is identifying something that is spontaneous, uncontrived, etc., and wants to keep the reference alive even though it cannot be illustrated, exemplified, or clarified definitionally; (5) deny the obvious. In addition, these works will be coded for (6) intended audience, (7) whether the work recognizes the impossibility of formalizing small talk, manners, etc., and that each betrays that by formalizing; and if (7) then (8) whether the ideas of informality and spontaneity are reinforced. It retrospect, it was found that the attempt to use these analytical methods for the structural analysis evolved into the pilot study described in §4.3.2; the results of which are presented in Chapter 6.

4.3 Reliability & Coding

4.3.1 The Content Analysis

The problem of possible bias or arbitrariness can arise whenever complex material is coded. In this case, it can arise because the texts that are the objects of study are written in a prose that has
both rhetorical and non-rhetorical elements, and these are difficult if not impossible to separate. Moreover, the rhetorical elements, including images, are likely to pose interpretive problems that go beyond what the ordinary conception of coding allows. In addition, the organization of persuasive texts, such as these, is likely to follow a different order than can be idealized as either logical, plotted, or dialectical, among other possibilities, again raising an issue as to how those aspects can be interpreted in ways that can either be repeated or seem not to need the normal repeatability required by empirical observation. Thus, the reliability of the coding procedures will be an issue in some aspects of my research and not in other aspects. For example, some content analysis will involve word counts and classifications of units of meaning. To the extent to which these elements are clearly articulated, all that is needed is to show the reliability of counting and classifying. For this, it may be sufficient to teach the procedure to two or three others and measure the degree of deviation, adopting a standard point at which it is possible to say that a specific degree of deviation constitutes a failure of reliability. For this part of the research, I will use the method of content analysis described by Klaus Krippendorff in his book, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. (Cf. 2004) For the interpretation of other aspects of these texts, I will rely on a simplified variant of literary analysis aimed at demonstrating by corroboration within the same text the validity of a given interpretation. As for overall features of the texts, apart from those having to do with their having been categorized by libraries, stores, etc., I will again rely on well-exemplified analyses of literary texts and archived documents. The examples will be drawn from known and respected writers such as the historian, E. P. Thompson (Cf. 1975), the literary critic, Peter Brooks (Cf. 1992), the ethnographer, Jeff Juris (Cf. 2008), and the literary historian, Marie-Helene Huet (Cf. 1993). I will try to approximate their interpretive procedures so far as possible. Thus, these procedures are intended
to reduce the possibility of arbitrariness in coding and interpretation, but they cannot eliminate them. As a result, I will try to be as comprehensive as possible in the details used for interpreting each text, attempting to provide a “thick description” of each text (Cf. Geertz, 1973).

Additionally, to improve reliability of the data, all 50 books will be tested using a frequency analysis to test for the presence of ‘learning’ and ‘expressive aspects’ of communication using what Krippendorff (Ibid.) describes as a dictionary approach. This dictionary (Cf. Appendix C) was developed by through word associations and thesauri and was checked for validity through consultation with others (i.e. if you were going to create a list representative of ‘X’, that list would include…?) This dictionary was then used in a content analysis software program called “WordStat 6” created by Provalis Research, Inc. which counted the frequencies across the 50 books. Furthermore, to ensure the size or length of each book is not affecting the reliability since it is variable, it will be controlled for by further dividing the sample of books into small (<50,000 words), medium (50,000-75,000 words) and large (>75,000 words).

4.3.2 The Structural Analysis

The coding of the material for the structural analysis will be done as a pilot study. It is the intent of this pilot study to perform an examination that requires very close reading of relatively few books. To do so viably, it was necessary to capture a relative large amount of information about a few specific books rather than relative small amount of information about a large number of books. In terms of generalizability, the selected subsample is seen as representative of the self-help literature because they are widely reviewed and have been bestsellers relative to other books on similar topics. Furthermore, as a pilot study, this type of in-depth study is required, as preparation for a larger scale study, to establish three things: (1) to explore possible ways of coding to test the adequacy of the coding; (2) to look for how the authors deal with the question
of sufficiency of formal instructions for informal situations – this question cannot be answered without such a focused analysis of a relatively small number of books; and, (3) it is hoped this study will provide more variables to arise for further study of the pedagogy of rapport.
Chapter 5: Content Analysis & Results

5.1 The Population: Categorizing Self-Help Books

Are self-help books self-helping? The answer to this question is divided in the classic ‘yes’ and ‘no’ categories. What categorizes the books in these two categories is mostly dependent on one factor – content – the content of the help required by the reader and the content of the help offered by the author. Examine, for a moment in Table 5.1, how Amazon.com breaks down its self-help category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books (N)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>Memory Improvement</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>Motivational</td>
<td>28,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreams</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>New Age</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Disorders</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>Personal Transformation</td>
<td>40,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwriting Analysis</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>6,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>8,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypnosis</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Child</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>16,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Writing</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,215</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N is subject to change, numbers taken on July 29, 2012.

With 131,215 books split into 18 different subsections, there are plenty of opportunities presented by authors for readers to find what is sought. But consider for a moment that what is ‘sought’ is subsequently ‘found’ with all the content desired – if the reader actually reads the book, what could go wrong? Plenty – based on a very specific type of help being sought within these categories and within others (Table 5.2), the help desired for informally dealing with other people.
Informally dealing with other people is problematic precisely because there is no universal step-by-step that would work for all transactions like in mathematics but there are heuristics.

A heuristic is a “simple procedure that helps find adequate, though often imperfect, answers to difficult questions.” (Kahneman, 2011: 98) In this instance, the difficult question is how to informally deal with other people? These books are marketed thematically as manuals of some kind intended to teach procedures for adequately dealing with others. Does the data support this?

### 5.2 The Sample

The sample is of 50 books drawn from best-seller lists. (See Research Design for sampling methodology and Appendix A for the catalogue of books.)

#### 5.2.1 Validity of the Sample

Before examining specific cases where the formal character of the self-help literature relevant to expression games decreases the viability for learning the expression game itself, logic and reliability requires the establishment of whether the sampled self-help literature does indeed discuss the informality representative of aspects of expression games and whether the sampled self-help literature does indeed intend for learning to occur. Please refer to Table 5.3.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Books (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, Fitness &amp; Dieting &gt; Relationships &gt; Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>14,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Reference &gt; Etiquette &gt; Conversation</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Reference &gt; Words, Language &amp; Grammar &gt; Communication</td>
<td>14,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Investing &gt; Skills &gt; Communications</td>
<td>14,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Investing &gt; Business Life &gt; Etiquette</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,544</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N is subject to change, numbers taken on July 29, 2012.
As Table 5.4 makes clear, there is a strong emphasis on *learning* within the sample and Table 5.5 makes it clear, there is also an emphasis on *expressive aspects*, although to a lesser degree.
5.2.2 Themes of the Sample

The following (Table 5.6) illustrates the overarching themes of the sample in italics and its sub-themes. These themes were generated through an examination and synthesis of impressions gathered from book titles and publisher descriptions of the sampled books:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6 Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation (General) as Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enchantment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette\Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Self-Centered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the generation of these themes, it appears as if the formalization of the advice i.e. codification eschews all non-verbal properties. This frames the programmatic reality as if an individual controls all the variables in interaction and brackets flaws as irrelevant to the results.
5.2.3 Characterization of the Sample’s Authors

As shown in Table 5.7, the gender of the sample’s authors were slightly skewed towards male authors who wrote 52% of the sampled books. Female authors composed 40% of the sampled books and the remaining 8% of the books were jointly authored.

While the trend is weak, male authors tended to produce smaller books than female authors as shown by Table 5.8. However, female authors were more likely to be in the top ten books that emphasized expressive aspects of interaction versus learning; while male authors were more likely to be in the bottom ten books that emphasized expressive aspects of interaction versus learning; this is shown in Table 5.9.

For the in-depth analysis of a sub-sample of five books, it was not feasible to consider the gender of the authors. In any case, this thesis focuses on the ways in which each author faces the limitations of the formality of their texts is aimed at clarifying the limits of formal pedagogy.
Chapter 6: Structural Analysis: A Pilot Study

There appears to be two different realities that tension arises between: (1) the reality generated by the author for the reader; and (2) the reality generated by the reader from what is written. As much as each other wishes to share the same reality, a structural analysis of these texts will show why this is not possible and if it were possible, what that book would conceivably look like.

6.1 The Seven Structural Elements

A review of the sampled self-help literature suggests that these books follow a certain structure. These book can be broken down into approximately seven structural elements. (1) They start out with a description of the author and their qualifications to try and establish a sense of rapport between the author and the reader. (2) Then there is the programmatic language that sets out to generate the reality the author intends to be offering advice for. Then there is (3) the rules to follow as the meat of the advice being offered – some refer to them as principles, techniques, tricks, maneuvers or guidelines; some offer steps or scripts to follow which are algorithmic end up becoming rule-like. Sometimes intertwined with and sometimes separated from the rules themselves are (4) the language that qualifies the ‘rules’ as ‘rules’ – i.e. the specification of the conditions under which the advice is to be followed and how they are to be applied; and (5) the language that attempts to qualify the ‘rules’ as ‘not rules’ – i.e. the specification that attempts to eschew the rule of its algorithmic character and instead tries to present it as a situational heuristic. Then there is a structural element implicit among the ‘rules’ themselves: (6) the qualification of being a meta-rule. The last structural element is (7) the extracurricular language – i.e. the text that is seen as ‘filler’ or ‘distracting’.
The sub-sample for exemplifying these structural elements are as follows: (1) *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (Carnegie, 1936); (2) *The Fine Art of Small Talk: How to Start a Conversation, Keep it Going, Build Rapport and Leave a Positive Impression* (Fine, 2005 [2002]); (3) *The Art of Conversation: A Guided Tour of a Neglected Pleasure* (Blyth, 2009); (4) *How to Talk to Anyone: 92 Little Tricks for Big Success in Relationships* (Lowndes, 2003); and (5) *The Art of Mingling: Proven Techniques for Mastering Any Room* (Martinet, 2006). In order to save space, the books will be referred to by their parenthetical citation without parentheses, instead of using title references.

My purpose is to show that no rule or set of rules is sufficient to the change of behavior which is its aim, and that neither qualifications nor meta-rules can add significantly to sufficiency – though they contribute to the possibility of sufficiency as such. The hypothesis, justified theoretically, is that between rules and acts are moments of practice, guided or not, that bring the person into a situation as a practical manner – to be qua interactant.

### 6.1.1 The First Structural Element: *The Author’s Generation of Rapport with the Reader through Credibility*

In Carnegie, 1936, the book starts out with a chapter entitled ‘How This Book Was Written-And Why’. It contains the following excerpt: “This book wasn't written in the usual sense of the word. It grew as a child grows. It grew and developed out of that laboratory, out of the experiences of thousands of adults. Years ago, we started with a set of rules printed on a card no larger than a postcard. The next season we printed a larger card, then a leaflet, then a series of booklets, each one expanding in size and scope. After fifteen years of experiment and research came this book. The rules we have set down here are not mere theories or guesswork. They work like magic. Incredible as it sounds, I have seen the application of these principles literally
revolutionize the lives of many people.” (Ibid: xvii) Through a passage like this, the text sounds empirically well-researched and fairly credible. It generates rapport with the reader in the sense that it places the reader in a mood where it appears that something can be learned from reading more.

In Fine, 2005, the author attempts to meet what the author believes is her intended audience by showing the author’s relatability to the reader’s problem as someone who has overcome the same problem and somehow became a world-renowned expert in what was her former weakness: “As a girl I had been an overweight, reticent kid who sat invisible in the back of the class, often excluded because of my size. One of my most vivid memories of childhood is that of a birthday party for my third-grade classmate Rita. Every girl in my class was invited except for one other very overweight girl and me. That experience was so hurtful that I withdrew into a world of books. I had no idea how to make a friend or have a friend. Consequently, I never learned how to talk to my peers.” (Ibid: x) Not only does this passage scream empathy (“I understand you! I have been there!), it also adds a fiction-esque storytelling element that makes the reader want to read more about how such a transformation could occur; and if that story is reasonable, it is plausible that a similar transformation would be possible for the reader and for the reader, that risk would be worth taking.

Blyth, 2009, is not a self-help book in the same vein as Carnegie, 1936; Fine, 2005; Lowndes, 2003, or Martinet, 2006. The author does not provide credentials but assumes rapport by imagining an audience fed up with the state of modern conversation: “We need to talk. … Some say this is the age of information; others, the communication age. There is no question that our ever growing means of keeping in touch have unleashed intelligence, creativity, passion, and fun, offering countless new directions in which to stretch our hours. Yet these riches leave many of us
feeling not so much lucky as time-poor, as if life were hurtling by in a fuzzy stream of images glimpsed from an accelerating car. Fewer of us complain that conversation, especially face-to-face—for thousands of years the core of human interaction—is being pushed to the sidelines. But we should. We are losing out on one of life’s greatest, certainly most useful, pleasures. One that has the power to slow and enrich the passage of time, rooting us in a shared moment as no other pastime can. Potentially.” (Ibid: 1, 2) The rapport generated by this passage is not one of credibility per se but more one of shared frustration that is fairly different from what is generated by Fine, 2005. While Fine, 2005 does try to produce empathy, Blyth is not trying to connect emotionally but intellectually.

In Lowndes, 2003, starts off trying to generate jealousy in the reader in order to inspire action and to position the book as the solution: “Have you ever admired those successful people who seem to have it all? You see them chatting confidently at business meetings or comfortably at social parties. They’re the ones with the best jobs, the nicest spouses, the finest friends, the biggest bank accounts, or the most fashionable zip codes. But wait a minute! A lot of them aren’t smarter than you. They’re not more educated than you. They’re not even better looking! So what is it? … What it boils down to is their more skillful way of dealing with fellow human beings. … It’s as though well-liked people have a bag of tricks, a magic, or a Midas touch that turns everything they do into success. […] How to Talk to Anyone gives you ninety-two of these little tricks they use every day so you, too, can play the game to perfection and get whatever you want in life.” (Ibid: 1) The author acts as the confidence man prior to being found out, as if she has access the tomorrow’s winning lottery numbers, like the shaman who has the cure to all one’s problems. While this type of rapport is tempting like a Faustian bargain, it is also alienating to
those who cast the text off right away as being ‘too good to be true’ and therefore should be avoided.

In Martinet, 2006, in the preface to the new edition and into the introduction, the author describes how she came to realize her expertise from the classic motif of notes being written on a cocktail napkin and her discovery that there was a market for her newfound expertise. She then attempts to engender rapport with the reader by surprising the reader with what they least expect – a short tidbit that TV talk show hosts, radio personalities, and top executives revealed to her that they are what she refers to as ‘minglephobia’, i.e. terrified of making small talk with strangers. Her tone is motherly and her concerns appear sincere.

6.1.2 The Second Structural Element: The Author’s Programmatic Language

In the generation of the reality the author sets out for the reader, it can be shown that the programmatic language intends for the reader’s reality to operate under strategic and calculative conditions in situations that require operating strategic, yet not calculative conditions – in effect the programmatic language suggests an intent to teach its readers Shaman’s Condition. Yet, it is the precise nature of Shaman’s Condition that cannot be learned from rules alone. While the reasoning behind this does indeed require further clarification, it is best to wait for an explication of the third structural element first; for now, let this examination show how the programmatic language of these self-help books is pushing for a translation of skills into a transformation of calculative conditions.

In Carnegie, 1936, the author starts off with a short chapter entitled ‘How This Book Was Written – And Why’. In this chapter, the author asks, “Why, then, did I have the temerity to write another book? And, after I had written it, why should you bother to read it?” (Ibid: xiii) He answers his own question through a story about the failed search to find a ‘practical, working
handbook on human relations’. This is indicative of a search for a formal reference guide for how to operate under strategic, yet not calculative conditions. This inference is only further reinforced by the author’s citation of a former president of Princeton University who said, “Education is the ability to meet life's situations.” The fact that this quote was chosen over countless other possibilities that could just as easily made reference to ‘business situations’ or ‘workplace situations’ shows that what is meant by ‘life’s situations’ is not just strategic formal interaction but strategic informal interaction as well. Then the programmatic language that follows attempts to inspire the reader into a reality of strategic and calculative conditions with a challenge that would easily be accomplished under strategic, yet not calculative conditions, had it not called attention to the challenge itself – for calling attention to the challenge to action, raises it to a level of calculation:

“If by the time you have finished reading the first three chapters of this book- if you aren’t then a little better equipped to meet life's situations, then I shall consider this book to be a total failure so far as you are concerned. For "the great aim of education,” said Herbert Spencer, "is not knowledge but action.” And this is an action book.” (Ibid: xix)

As an action book, the reader being aware of the action the book references, sets out a reality that strategic, yet not calculative conditions are not prepared for – for once the reader qua actor becomes aware of the fact that one is indeed smiling or not smiling, calculation attempts to control it\(^\text{12}\) and all of a sudden a puzzle piece that fitted just moments ago grows a tab that extrudes and the puzzle starts to look altogether different.

\(^{12}\) Another example of how this rise of awareness to a level of calculation is problematic can be drawn from a personal experience in an introduction to linguistics course. As a child who had speech problems and had years of lessons to address those problems, it might be understandable that one could have learned different ways to pronounce the same word. This makes learning the application of International Phonetic Alphabet difficult because to apply the alphabet, one must pronounce the word. In the act of pronunciation, there arises an awareness of different pronunciations (i.e. water as waater, warter, worter, etc.) and this awareness becomes paralyzing.
The second half of Carnegie, 1936’s programmatic language is the following chapter entitled ‘Nine Suggestions on How to Get the Most Out of This Book’ which is exemplified for four pages and then summarized as follows:

“(a) Develop a deep, driving desire to master the principles of human relations; (b) Read each chapter twice before going on to the next one; (c) As you read, stop frequently to ask yourself how you can apply each suggestion; (d) Underscore each important idea; (e) Review this book each month; (f) Apply these principles at every opportunity. Use this volume as a working handbook to help you solve your daily problems; (g) Make a lively game out of your learning by offering some friend a dime or a dollar every time he or she catches you violating one of these principles; (h) Check up each week on the progress you are making. Ask yourself what mistakes you have made, what improvement, what lessons you have learned for the future; (i) Keep notes in the back of this book showing how and when you have applied these principles.” (Ibid: xxv; Cf. xxi-xxiv)

These nine rules for reading try to set up strategic and calculative conditions for learning the content as well as instruction for self-discipline; Rule (g) however is the only one that provides the author with the possibility of escaping the fact that what is written is written which is to say that the author has indeed written a book. What is plaguing about this for the reader is how ever word must be read and understood within the reality the author intended such that the advice given may be situationally understood; failing that, rule (g) provides for the involvement of an interpersonal safeguard which attempts to give the book’s material consequence that could possibly exceed the interpersonal cost of attempting to operate under strategic and calculative conditions in situations requiring strategic, yet not calculative conditions. When considering that cost however, it might be its own demise by making the learning of the book’s principles cost-prohibitive – and that’s ironic considering many examples in Carnegie, 1936 are about accruing wealth from apply those same principles.

In Fine, 2005, once the reader is drawn in by the author’s rapport generation strategy, the author clearly states her programmatic reality:
“My goal in writing this book is to offer what I’ve learned so that you, too, can reap the rewards that come from having a repertoire of conversation skills. The techniques, tips, and skills in this book are for everyone—not just nerds. I know salespeople who are wonderful at making formal presentations but who enter a networking event in a cold sweat. [...] Competent people from all walks of life need assistance to develop conversation skills. This book will provide you those small talk skills. Enhancing your conversational skills will no doubt improve your quality of life. I think you’ll be surprised at the potency of small talk. It has an amazing ripple effect. Becoming a good conversationalist will bring new people into your network of friends and colleagues. You will find joy in the social events you used to dread, and you will create pathways and channels for new opportunities to present themselves. [...] Take a moment. Spend some time filling out the following “Winning at Small Talk” worksheet. If you answer yes to most, you are certainly on the right track. If you find yourself responding no to more than a few, it’s time to get to work.” (Ibid: xiii-xv)

Although this programmatic language does indeed read easily, there are a lot of elements contained within that shape the reality she intends for her reader: (1) there are rewards for having conversational skills; (2) conversational skills fit into a repertoire; (3) general competence is not necessarily correlated with quality conversational skills; (4) the author has a test for judging competence in conversational skills. The reality in which these rewards exist for the author’s imagined reader can be ascertained to be one in which the operation is one of strategic, yet not calculative conditions. This deduction is based on the author’s associations – the mention of joy in social events; references to general ‘quality of life’ and the contrasting juxtaposition of ‘formal presentation’ from ‘networking events’.¹³ Yet, a conversational repertoire made up of ‘techniques, tips, and skills’ finds itself victim to the same critique of the activity arising to the level of calculation. Switch back to the discussion of chess for a moment. Individual chess players have personal repertoires of chess openings – the lines the player studied and plans to drawn his or her opponent into; and some of these repertoires can go 15 or 20 moves deep from the opening move. As with the discussion of why learning algorithms is problematic when

---

¹³ A Note on Networking Events: As Fine, 2005 is read, the author considers networking events to be informal despite the fact that networking events are actually quite formal in the sense that the entire purpose of the event is for interactants to operate openly under strategic and calculative conditions.
heuristics are required, it is one thing to study and memorize facts as a learning activity and quite another to perform the recall on the spot without making mistakes. This delay, however minuscule even in milliseconds, is still detectable by other interactants. In this way, without Shaman’s Condition, Fine, 2005’s programmatic language places her reader into a direct contradiction between strategic and calculative conditions and strategic, yet not calculative conditions. Fine, 2005’s programmatic language referring to the lack of a correlation between general competence and conversational competence is a reaffirmation of the reality the author sets out for the reader – a reality in which anyone can enroll and learn Fine, 2005’s course offerings. Now consider the author’s admissions exam, which is referred to a ‘worksheet’ entitled “Winning at Small Talk”:

“WINNING AT SMALL TALK

Please answer “yes” or “no” to the following questions:

1. I have joined or participated in at least one club or group activity in order to develop new business friendships or to meet new people this year.
2. I’m conscious of “taking turns” in most conversations so that I can learn more about others and help them get to know me.
3. In the past year, I have used my contacts to help at least two people find a new job, get a date, hook up with potential customers and clients, or I have provided information for other networking purposes.
4. I go to at least two functions a month where I can meet people in my profession/industry or who are potential decision-makers.
5. If someone is friendly toward me, it is easy to be friendly back. However, I don’t wait to make sure someone is friendly before I am friendly toward him or her.
7. At meetings, parties, job fairs, and such, I introduce myself to people I don’t know and come away knowing the names of at least three new people.

Well, how did you do? Once you master Small Talk, you are guaranteed to: Build business; Make friends; Improve networking skills; Get dates; and land jobs.”

Apparently, according to Fine, it only takes seven questions to ascertain one’s competency at informal interaction; although Sherlock Homes would be able to do it in four… Never mind the fact that the grading of the worksheet is vague, the reality the author seeks to convey is
reinforced by the questions themselves because the author assumes if someone answered ‘yes’ to all seven questions, they would not be a reader of her book in the first place. In addition to this logical misstep, there are also hidden assumptions and logical contradictions within the questions that reinforce the reader’s desire for the self-help oracle supplemented by the author’s mistaken assumption that small talk is solely a feature of strategic and calculative conditions. Consider Question (1): “I have joined or participated in at least one club or group activity in order to develop new business friendships or to meet new people this year.” There are many different types of clubs or group activities – chess club, book club, bird watching club, people watching club (also known as the American Anthropological Association), radio club, music club, local historical societies, volunteer organizations, dance club, religious organizations, etc. – the point is ‘in order to develop new business friendships or to meet new people this year’ is not the sole reason or necessarily even a reason for going to a club. Some activities, like chess, simply require an opponent, and the point of attending the club is the activity and not the people who happen to be participating in that activity. Therefore, to answer the question in the negative is not a clear indicator of a lack of competence with conversational skills. Now, Question (2); while turn-taking is indeed important for conversation, the critique again falls on the author’s dependent clauses: “so that I can learn more about others and help them get to know me”. The question starts out prior to the dependent clause as operating under strategic, yet not calculative conditions but then switches to strategic and calculative conditions during the dependent clause. This question also fails as an assessment device for two reasons: (1) not all or even most conversations are about learning the personal histories of one another, even in small talk; (2) to be conscious in a manner that Fine suggests is to posit that the turn taking itself is self-serving and not a benefit for others – not an attitude favoring skilled conversationalists; to become too
conscious of turn-taking after awhile will lead to an attitude where there will be a demand for the turn itself when it is felt that it is due, which can easily escalate into an argument – again, not a quality of a skilled conversationalist. Now Question (3); being a skilled conversationalist and a skilled networker are two fundamentally separate things – a networker’s primary concern is operating under strategic and calculative conditions – i.e. to network – whereas a skilled conversationalist maintains strategic, yet not calculative conditions in actuality or through Shaman’s Condition. A networker can become a skilled conversationalist through Shaman’s Condition but most do not bother, failing that, Question (3) is assessing networking skills and not conversational skills. Even if that was not the case, using one’s contacts to find only one person a new job, a get a date, a hook up with potential customers and clients, or provided information for other networking purposes instead of two people is not an indicator of poor conversational skill – it is just a bad statistic, nothing more. A comedian would look at that question and remark something along the lines of “Well, you know, in the past year, all my friends have been very busy being successful and stuff like that… none of them need my help and because my friends are successful that makes me a bad conversationalist?!?” Now to Question (4), again, one is just a bad statistic, and is not an assessment of conversational skills nor is attending functions where “potential decision makers” or people in one’s industry are absent. On to Question (5); Friendliness is not a conversational skill but a relational pattern; therefore it is not an indicator of conversational skill. While Question (6) actively deals with conversation, in many situations but not all, to actively answer the question in further the detail is to breach etiquette (Cf. Garfinkel, 1967). While it is tempting to give the author a break on critiquing this question, the response format disables it from being an indicator of conversational skill, specifically because the author is asking about algorithmic behavior in which the context requires heuristics to be applied. In
Question (7), Fine’s downfall continues to be her dependent clauses and bad statistics – not recalling peoples’ names or only recalling two of them is not indicative of incompetency at conversation although it is important for a networker. Fine, 2005’s worksheet continually confuses small talk with networking – falsely seeing them as synonymous and as this analysis suggests, Fine fails on 7 counts to make any reasonable assessment of conversational skill but succeeds with firework-worthy marks on writing an assessment of networking skill. As a result, the author’s programmatic language appears to be at odds with itself: “My goal in writing this book is to offer what I’ve learned so that you, too, can reap the rewards that come from having a repertoire of conversation skills” (Op. Cit.) Whereas if ‘conversation’ was replaced with ‘networking’ the author’s problems might have been solvable, but unfortunately, that is not the case. Given this and the author’s guarantees that a master of small talk will be able to build business, make friends, improve networking skills, get dates and land jobs all under strategic and calculative conditions without Shaman’s Condition, a reader should be very skeptical of such things as if all those things are only attainable to a master of small talk…

Blyth, 2009’s programmatic language is thought-provoking. Her introduction stars off with a simple sentence followed by a qualification: We need to talk. When did this become a threat rather than a statement of fact? Is it a fact?” (Ibid: 1) The remainder of her twenty-five page introduction is a touring critique of modern society with section headings like “The Multitasking Miracle”, “Why Modern Life is Bad For Conversation”, “The Logic of Rudeness”, The Mind Mechanic”, and There is No Right Way”. The prose takes an essay form explaining with quotes from a variety of sources (celebrities, technologists, novelists etc.) It is in fact a moral statement on the current state of affairs of what Blyth refers to as a “neglected pleasure”. The author concludes this programmatic argument as follows:
“Can conversation save lives? It certainly saves marriages, and few would dispute it builds self-esteem. Shouldn’t it be obvious it can also raise social esteem, generating the goodwill that funds the best in life and business? Neglecting it graffiti's cultural DNA, muddles minds, and helps granulate us into extremists. But using it can rebuild our crumbling common ground. As researching this book has taught me, we are more complicated and magnificent than we realize: Far from behind technology, we’re beyond it. Close your eyes a moment. Imagine saying hi to the strangers on your street. Imagine everyone saying it. Imagine it is the start of a conversation. Is that so preposterous? It never used to be. Let’s wage war on shyness. With a friendlier environment, we have a better chance of making it into the next century. And enjoying it. […] Understand the steps, you will hear the music. We need to talk.” (Ibid: 24-25)

It is a passage worthy of oration – not a call to action as Carnegie suggests but a call to a reflect upon the reality the author is programmatic argument attempted to expose – and unlike Carnegie, Fine, and Lowndes and Martinet, Blyth is attempting to draw the reader out of that reality rather than draw the reader into a reality of the author’s design. The others assume the reality of the reader already exists and that the reader is in that reality and the authors attempt to proceed directly from that reality whereas Blyth actually recognizes that the reader needs to reflect on what is problematic about the reader’s current operating reality before being invited into the reality the remaining programmatic language sets up in what is referred to as “The Concise Manifesto”:

“The Concise Manifesto

Attention x Interest = Conversation = Joy

WHAT CONVERSATION ISN’T
- Performance art
- Competition
- Scripted

WHAT IT IS
- Mutual appreciation
- Cooperation
- Spontaneous

THREE PRINCIPLES
- Generosity
- Openness
- Clarity

FIVE MAXIMS
- Think before you speak
- Listen more than speak
- Find the incentive for talking
- Never assume you know what they mean or that they understand you
- Take Turns” (Ibid: 26)
Raphael

It is worth noting that in the table of contents, the concise manifesto is intended for the “busy reader” meaning that many readers as the author imagines will start reading the book from this page or might only read this page, thus making its hidden assumptions ever more significant. Unfortunately, Blyth 2009’s fundamental statement of the book’s programmatic reality is an algorithm: Attention x Interest = Conversation = Joy. While the author does not intend for this to be read literally, which can be inferred from the reading of the previous twenty-five pages, it is still likely to be read literally by those that deem page twenty-six to be page one; therefore an analysis of both ways of reading is required. As a literal meaning, it is unclear what function the multiplication operation serves and therefore further obfuscates the meaning of the algorithm whereas the symbolic meaning of an addition sign would be much clearer. Yet, even if the addition sign were the case, there are certainly other elements that are left out of the equation; speech for example is certainly an element of conversation but not in her equation. Leaving out speech is like leaving out sugar from a recipe for sugar cookies. After all, conversation cannot be solely the product of ‘attention’ and ‘interest’ – as much as the author constantly reminds her reader – something needs to be said but the algorithm neglects what could easily be referred to as Blyth’s constant: speech. Hence, if the algorithm is read literally, it does the reader little good since the parts do not make up the whole, ignoring for the moment that ‘conversation’ and ‘joy’ are not equivalent quantities nor qualities – meaning that even if it was read literally as a statement of symbolic logic rather than an algorithm, the truth value is still false because what the author intends to say symbolically but fails to do so is several compound statements compounded into a conditional statement; something like: (Attention + Interest + Respect + Mutual Reciprocity + Speech=Conversation) ∩ (Conversation ⊃ Joy) but that was not the case.
Now if this fundamental programmatic statement of the book’s intended reality was not read literally, but a statement to be qualified by the remainder of the language on the page, it is no longer read algorithmically, but as an incomplete thought to-be-completed by the reader just like the meaning of a poetic statement is completed by its reader. If this is the case then, it does indeed follow that it depends on what follows or qualifies it. Therefore, it is time to analyze its qualifications of what Blyth, 2009 refers to as “What Conversation Isn’t”, “What Conversation Is”, “Three Principles”, and “Five Maxims”. Unlike Fine, 2005, which confuses networking with conversation, Blyth, 2009, what it is and what it isn’t rules out strategic and calculative conditions and emphasizes strategic, yet not calculative conditions instead. However, remembering that the author is making a moral argument: Attention x Interest = Conversation sets out where adhering to its conditions will produce not just a reality of conversation but a reality of good conversation. In this light however, in seeking good conversation, the mutual appreciation, cooperation, spontaneity, generosity, openness, and clarity appear to take on a calculative element where Shaman’s Condition is required for these heuristics to become operationally viable since to aim for or actively attempt to adhere to ‘mutual appreciation’ or to seek to be ‘spontaneous’ is to just miss the mark or not to do so. Hence, to complete the thought of the Concise Manifesto is to require Shaman’s Condition so that ‘good conversation’ can be successfully sought and obtain the experience of ‘joy’ – whatever that is.

In terms of the five maxims, unlike the previous sections of the Concise Manifesto which had the logical flow of conditions of Strategic, Yet Not Calculative → Strategic and Calculative → Shaman’s Condition → Strategic, Yet Not Calculative, all five maxims start operating at a level of calculation because all five require it. To follow the maxim is to calculate in which the level of activity is so active and rule-like that Shaman’s Condition would not be of much help.
Consider Maxim (1), “Think before you speak”, to do so is to filter thought before it becomes speech – a process that sometimes can take a few too many seconds – at a level of awareness requires calculation in which others could be left in an uncomfortable sense of waiting producing a violation of the tempo of the conversation. Maxim (2), “Listen more than speak”, is an activity of awareness just like Maxim (1) except that this has a possibility of producing no conversation at all if everyone followed this maxim; while an extreme, nevertheless this maxim does not help the reader enter the programmatic reality knowing whether to listen or speak. Maxim (3), “Find the incentive for talking” appears to be in contradiction with Maxim (1) and (2) because the activity of finding the incentive to talk interrupts the activity of listening and the activity of filtering thoughts from becoming speech. Furthermore, Maxim (4) is a statement that informs the reader to attempt to address all ambiguity – the ambiguity that exists in all communication and not all ambiguity necessarily needs to be resolved, if resolution is need, it will be gained organically through further interaction under strategic, yet not calculative conditions; to actively seek out to resolve all ambiguity as an implication of Maxim (4) is to partake in the very activity of calculation and to perform such calculation in situations that do not require it is to attempt to place a puzzle piece where it does not belong. As for Maxim (5), the critique follows the similar line of argument of Fine, 2005’s discussion of turn taking. The programmatic reality set out by Blyth, 2009 is one the reader wants to understand and wants to take its advice seriously but as a logical, coherent whole, yet again, like Fine, 2005, the programmatic language is at odds with itself and prevents this reality from being fully realized.

The programmatic language of Lowndes, 2003 is that of the quintessential self-help book. Before even opening the book, strategic and calculative conditions are established by the back cover, where it says the reader will “find 9 ways to make a dynamite first impression, 14 ways to master
small talk, "big talk," and body language, 14 ways to walk and talk like a VIP or celebrity, 6 ways to sound like an insider in any crowd, 7 ways to establish deep subliminal rapport with anyone, 9 ways to feed someone's ego (and know when NOT to!), 11 ways to make your phone a powerful communications tool, 15 ways to work a party like a politician works a room, [and] 7 ways to talk with tigers and not get eaten alive.” When the reader does open the book, a quick glance of the table of contents shows that all 92 chapters start with the phrase ‘how to’ and that the subtitle of the introduction makes obtaining Shaman’s Condition its last priority: “How to Get Anything You Want from Anybody (Well, at Least Have the Best Crack at It!)”. Within this introduction, the author further justifies the writing of the book as an “update” to Carnegie, 1936:

“With the billions of subtle actions and reactions zapping back and forth between two human beings, can we come up with concrete techniques to make our every communication clear, confident, credible, and charismatic? Determined to find the answer, I read practically every book written on communications skills, charisma, and chemistry between people. I explored hundreds of studies conducted around the world on what qualities made up leadership and credibility. […] Dale Carnegie was GREAT for the twentieth century, but this is the twenty first. Most of the studies simply confirmed Dale Carnegie’s 1936 classic, How to Win Friends and Influence People. His wisdom for the ages said success lay in smiling, showing interest in other people, and making them feel good about themselves. That’s no surprise, I thought. It’s as true today as it was more than sixty years ago. So if Dale Carnegie and hundreds of others since offer the same astute advice, why do we need another book telling us how to win friends and influence people? Two mammoth reasons. Reason One: Suppose a sage told you, When in China, speak Chinese, but gave you no language lessons? Dale Carnegie and many communications experts are like that sage. They tell us what to do but not how to do it. In today’s sophisticated world, it’s not enough to say smile or give sincere compliments. Cynical businesspeople today see more subtleties in your smile, more complexities in your compliment. […] Reason Two: The world is a very different place than it was in 1936, and we need a new formula for success. To find it, I observed the superstars of today. I explored techniques used by top salespeople to close the sale, speakers to convince, clergy to convert, performers to engross, sex symbols to seduce, and athletes to win. I found concrete building blocks to the elusive qualities that lead to their success. Then I broke them down into easily digestible, news-you-can-use techniques. I gave each a name that will quickly come to mind when you find yourself in a communications conundrum. […] When I was in the presence of the most successful and beloved leaders, I analyzed their body language and their facial expressions. I listened carefully to their casual conversations, their timing, and their choice of words. I watched as they dealt with their families, friends, associates, and adversaries. Every time I detected a little nip of
magic in their communicating, I asked them to pluck it out with tweezers and expose it to the bright light of consciousness. We analyzed it together, and I then turned it into an easy-to-do little trick others could duplicate and profit from. My findings and the strokes of some of those very effective folks are in this book. Some are subtle. Some are surprising. But all are achievable. When you master them, everyone from new acquaintances to family, friends, and business associates will happily open their hearts, homes, companies, and even wallets to give you whatever they can.” (Ibid: xiv-xv)

While both reasons appear reasonable, Lowndes, 2003 programmatic language is inconsistent with Carnegie, who realized that rules for reading, however faulty, are required. Additionally, there is several specific reasons for Carnegie not doing what Lowndes sees as reason one: (a) *How to Win Friends and Influence People* was intended as a text book for a classroom environment; and, (b) Carnegie and several other conversation experts recognize, unlike Lowndes, that to say one needs to smile but quite another to give overly specific algorithms for smiling or what Lowndes refers to as the ‘flooding smile’ – a “technique” where one waits a few seconds when meeting someone. However, unlike Carnegie, 1936, Fine, 2005 and Bylth, 2009 whose programmatic statements suggest the importance of strategic, yet not calculative conditions in some regard despite the fact that that support is inconsistent with itself, it is nevertheless present. Lowndes, 2003’s programmatic language makes no attempt to strive for strategic, yet not calculative conditions. As that last sentence states: “When you master them, everyone from new acquaintances to family, friends, and business associates will happily open their hearts, homes, companies, and even wallets to give you whatever they can.” For this author, all interaction appears formal and is therefore is strategic and calculative, thus there is no need for Shaman’s Condition to conceal that calculation.

In contrast to Lowndes, 2003’s programmatic “how-to” language that generates a reality reflective of purely formal strategic and calculative interaction, Martinet, 2006’s giggly rapport with the reader tones down the seeking of strategic, yet not calculative conditions through the use of ‘techniques, tricks, lines, and maneuvers’, things that require strategic and calculative
conditions. Consider the following section of the interdiction as the author’s laying of her programmatic reality:

“Contrary to what you might think, “making conversation,” “being a social butterfly,” or “working the room” is a learned art—a simple one—which anyone can master. [...] Even the pathetically shy, the tongue-tied, and the foot-in-mouth types can learn simple techniques, tricks, lines, and maneuvers that can mean the difference between fun and misery, between a night of total humiliation and one of social ecstasy. Of course, there are those few misguided souls who think mingling is simply a waste of time; that it is nothing but an endless stream of meaningless conversations with people you will never see again. And yes, I admit I’ve had my share of inane discussions about weather or traffic. But I’ve also had countless ten-minute conversations about supposedly trivial subjects like wallpaper that were memorable and fun, after which I’ve usually gone home feeling happy and more connected to the world. You must never forget that simply being in a room full of people who are communicating with each other is exhilarating! Just look up “mingle” in the dictionary: “to be or become mixed or united or to become closely associated; join or take part with others.” Sounds stimulating, even sexy, doesn’t it? It is. I know from experience. I’ll tell you a secret. Although I have always adored parties—anywhere, anytime—mingling didn’t come naturally to me at all. When I was about thirteen, I made up my mind that I would become a mingling virtuoso. I proceeded to teach myself the art over the course of years, by trial and error. I have collected tips and adapted techniques from countless friends and acquaintances, as well as from books (mostly old ones, from previous eras when every well-brought up person was highly proficient in the art of conversation). All the methods I use have been tested and honed for best results, and now I have a system that never fails. It’s easy, and you can learn it, too. Each of the following techniques and lines is applicable to just about any type of large gathering. However, there’s one fundamental principle to remember as you begin to study this time-honored art: Your purpose in any mingling situation is to have fun. This is an absolutely vital, hard-and-fast rule; your success as a mingler depends on your following this basic premise. Whether you are at a business affair or a neighbor’s party, whether you are mingling for love or for career advancement (incidentally, I think we’ve all had enough of the word “networking”; I myself refuse to use it except in the context of fishing!), your primary goal must be your own enjoyment. You may see a given mingling situation as a means to climbing the proverbial corporate ladder or hooking up with a hottie, but unless you truly enjoy meeting and talking with people, your success will be limited. The truth is that mingling is its own reward.” (Ibid: xvi-xvii)

From this, two things are immediately clear: (1) the author intends a programmatic reality built upon authentic strategic, yet not calculative conditions – “Your purpose in any mingling situation is to have fun.”, “Your primary goal must be your own enjoyment” and “unless you truly enjoy meeting and talking with people, your success will be limited.” (2) The author fails to recognize that not everyone knows how “to have fun”. To make fun the premise of “techniques, tricks,
lines, and maneuvers” is to raise a level of awareness and therefore a level of calculation about having ‘fun’, questioning whether ‘fun’ is occurring and how to seek it out; thus, for Martinet, what is being sought, strategic, yet not calculative conditions, requires Shaman’s Condition for shielding the activities operating under strategic and calculative conditions.

6.1.3 The Third Structural Element: The Rules Themselves

Now that there is reason for the reader to “trust” the authors’ invitation given the developed rapport and the enticing description of what will be learned, the question is whether the reader will indeed be taken in – the risks are great. There is the cost of the book itself to consider, if purchased, rather than borrowed. The effort in procuring the book by whatever means appears to create an obligation to read but that obligation is typically felt to be relatively weak – chess books are a great example of this. Then, that cost is not the great cost, as such a risk is inherent in the procurement of any book. What then is the great risk to stop reading and reject the invitation to the programmatic realities these authors have established? It has been shown that what underlies the authors’ programmatic language is an intent to instruct on how to operate within or under either strategic, yet not calculative conditions or strategic and calculative conditions – and that is the information sought; presumably because the reader experienced a lack of such information and wishes to remedy that experience from reoccurring. But why is that risk so great? Its greatness lies not in what was a past failure nor the anticipation of a failure but in the constant repetition of anticipation of failure to grasp what is going on at any particular moment and the corresponding doubt that things will not change, For to embark beyond the authors’ programmatic language and enter these realities is to make a Faustian bargain and consent to face that failure and doubt over and over again, each time a piece is offered. What separates these pieces of advice from dicta (that is which is not pertinent to the holding of a legal case or in
this sense, that which is not the statement of the rule itself) is it being deemed as a ‘rule’, ‘principle’, ‘technique’, ‘trick’, ‘maneuver’ or ‘guideline’. What these authors’ do not realize, or at least notify the reader of, is that by deeming their advice separate from dicta in this manner, it formalizes what is likely to be a heuristic of some sort with its situated applications into something that can be visually extracted from the text through types of through formatting (boldness, italics, lists etc.) which may result in the writing up of a summary of only the differently formatted text. This extraction is done without the language that qualifies the rules as rules and the language that qualifies rules as not rules and it is likely that the extracted list is the only thing that will be studied. However, if this is process is not the likely scenario, the very act of remembering, to search through what have been studied or learned is to calculate and to be seen as doing. To be seen as doing so is to reject the operating strategic, yet not calculative conditions of others and there to be ill at ease with the situation. To be so “means that one is ungrasped by [the] immediate reality and that one lessens the grasp others have of it. To be awkward or unkempt, to talk or move wrongly, is to be a dangerous giant, a destroyer of worlds. As every psychotic or comic ought to know, any accurately improper move can poke through the thin sleeve of immediate reality.” (Goffman, 1961b: 181) These are the risks – the risk of continued failure and doubt which comes off as being ill at ease or the risk of being ill at ease for calculating without Shaman's Condition. With the former having little purchase, the reader has little else to do but attempt the impossible – learn Shaman's Condition with one's only reference being a self-help book that neither recognizes its existence nor the implications it holds for the fate of the book itself – the likelihood of failure and continued alienation. With that said, it is time to examine the pieces of advice themselves offered up as ‘rules’, ‘principles’, ‘techniques’,
‘tricks’, ‘maneuvers’ or ‘guidelines’ but read by the reader due to the books’ structural elements as ‘rules’.

The rules themselves take on a different form, varying from book to book. As already mentioned, some are called ‘principles’ when in fact they are heuristics or algorithms, some rules are rules in the sense they should not be broken, many are ‘techniques’, which the author views as very simple to perform but really is an algorithmic heuristic that is developed over time; several are ‘tips’ which are provided in a ‘by the way manner’; a few dozen are specific maneuvers and tactics for specific situations and hundreds are a mix of scripted and partially scripted questions statements, lines and topics. This amounts to 30 specific principles in 4 categories for Carnegie, 1936; 391 pieces of advice in 36 categories for Fine, 2005; 104 specific rules across 15 categories for Blyth, 2009; 92 techniques in 9 categories for Lowndes, 2003 and a mix of 132 pieces of advice in 23 categories for Martinet, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1. The Categories of Rules by Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fundamental Techniques in Handling People (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Six Ways To Make People Like You (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 20 Business Icebreakers
2. 50 General Icebreakers
++3. 15 Starting Statements
4. 6 Open Ended Questions
5. 6 Questions for Digging Deeper
6. 15 Fail-Safe Questions for Every Business Function
7. 6 Positive Messages to the Speaker that Express Listening
8. 9 Off-Putting Gestures You Should Never Use
9. 16 Verbal Cues that Express Conversational Engagement
10. 7 Verbal Cues to Redirect Conversation
11. 10 Tips for Tip-Top Listening
12. 5 Jumpstarters to Prevent Pregnant Pauses
13. 5 Questions for Maintaining Acquaintances
14. 3 Questions to Avoid with Acquaintances
15. 4 Categories of Questions for Social Situations
16. 20. 15 Assertive Conversational Tactics
17. 19. 4 Categories of Questions for Social Situations
18. 21. 8 Conversational Crime-Fighting Techniques
19. 22. 8 Exit Lines
20. 23. 5 Lines to Ask for a Business Referral
21. 24. 5 Lines to Ask for a Social Referral
22. 25. 6 Lines to Exit as a Pair
23. 26. 8 Ways to Show Appreciation
24. 27. 8 Ways to Issue an Invitation
25. 28. 50 Ways to Fuel a Conversation
26. 29. 18 Tips for Business Professionals to Improve Small Talk Skills
27. 30. 8 Icebreakers for Singles
28. 31. 7 Ways to Relate at a Singles Event
29. 32. 6 Lines for Date-Scheduling Small Talk
Given the immensity of these numbers (749 pieces of advice in 87 categories), an exhaustive analysis of these individual ‘rules’ is not feasible nor particularly useful. Instead, the advice can be coded according to what part of the encounter the advice is meant to address.
This diagram shows the different parts of the encounter that the categories and therefore the rules themselves can be coded as. The order of this presentation (context, engagement, endurance, disengagement, and memory) is a logical order and not necessarily a practical order. That is to say, within the encounter, there are many things going on simultaneously and these contents are an attempt to disentangle the logic of how the rules (pieces of advice) are applied. Hence, ‘context’ rules refers to the social action, verbal and nonverbal configurations (gestures, words, etc.) aimed at setting up the situation (setting the stage; setting up the chessboard; “put your ‘game’ face on”, etc.). These context rules only anticipates that some things are possible – chess will be played with a chess set and not checkers. ‘Engagement’ rules refer to the social action, verbal and nonverbal configurations that perform a relationship on the beginnings of a relationship. It is the rules that attempt to structure what further contact is possible – here is where strategic, yet not calculative conditions or strategic and calculative conditions are determined within the encounter. ‘Endurance’ rules refer to the social action, verbal and nonverbal configurations that keep the encounter going (the fuel in the car, wood for the fire, etc.). ‘Disengagement’ and ‘memory’ rules are interrelated. Disengagement rules refer to the social action, verbal and nonverbal configurations that advise how to exit the encounter while ‘memory’ rules attempt to codify the experience of the encounter as a positive one (rules for not leaving a bad taste in the other interactants’ mouths). What is meant by the arrows is how each type of ‘rule’ tries to prepare the interactant for the following interaction. In this way, memory rules, by not leaving a bad taste in the other interactants’ proverbial mouths, enables the one who
uses such rules to be reflected upon favorably. In this way, all memory rules are disengagement rules but not all disengagement rules are memory rules.

The coding of these categories of rules is to capture what their characteristic content – the ‘what’ to do (context, engagement, endurance, disengagement, and memory) and to capture what possibilities are taken into account in expressing how the rule can be carried out and this determines its rule-like quality – a heuristic, algorithm, algorithmic heuristic, general tip or statement, tactical heuristic, tactical algorithm, and tactical algorithmic heuristic. A heuristic can be considered, for coding purposes, to be a statement or set of statements that appear to account the volatility of situations i.e. for many possible futures in which the advice would be useful. An algorithm can be considered, for coding purposes, to be a statement or set of statements that is strict in its progression of logical steps and narrow in its focus. An algorithmic heuristic can be considered, for coding purposes, to be a statement or set of statements that describe what would typically be referred to as a ‘technique’ which is a set of things (typically social actions, verbal and nonverbal configurations) that have mosaicked over time into what appears as a simple act. A good example of this is the magic trick where a coin appears to have come out of a person’s ear. On behalf of the magician, it takes a lot of time, practice and muscle memory to get the coin to move along the muscles of the palm and fingers while maintaining what appears to be an open hand. A general tip or statement is a piece of advice that is not presented as a rule but more of a comment. The ‘tactical’ element of heuristics, algorithms, and algorithmic heuristics can be considered for coding purposes to be the addition of a ‘war-like’ attitude (i.e. ‘us verses them’, attack’ defend’, etc.) that raises the level of calculation beyond normal levels.
6.1.3.1 Results
The total number of categorized pieces of advice in this extracted subsample of books was 87 and adjusted for Carnegie’s small N makes is 113, producing an average of 22.6 categories of pieces of advice per a book.14 The studied subsample’s characteristic content was primarily endurance (59.3%) followed by engagement (20.3%), context (11.5%), memory (5.3%) and disengagement (3.5%). The frequencies of the categorized pieces of advice’s characteristic content are presented in Table 6.3.1. The studied subsample’s rule-like quality was primarily algorithms (51.3%), followed by tactical algorithmic heuristics (16.8%), tactical algorithms (9.7%), general tips (8.8%), heuristics (7%) algorithmic heuristics, (6.2%) and tactical heuristic (0%). The frequencies of the categorized pieces of advice’s rule-like quality are presented in Table 6.3.2. When heuristics, algorithms, and algorithmic heuristics are combined with their tactical counterparts

---

14 Given the small N of categories for Carnegie, 1936, only four, it would have been difficult to make meaningful comparisons, so his 30 principles were coded rather than his four categories. This adjusted total N of 113 was therefore used in calculations.
the studied subsample’s rule-like quality was primarily tactical and non-tactical algorithms (61%), followed by tactical and non-tactical algorithmic heuristics (23%), tactical and non-tactical heuristics (7%) with the remainder of that, having no tactical form, being accounted for by the general tip (8.8%).

Table 6.3.2
Frequency of Pieces of Advice's Rule-Like Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heuristic</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Algorithmic Heuristic</th>
<th>General Tip</th>
<th>Tactical Heuristic</th>
<th>Tactical Algorithm</th>
<th>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie, 1936</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine, 2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth, 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes, 2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinet, 2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that the subsample is characterized as a whole, it is time to examine its parts. For each book, four different ratios were calculated: in terms of characteristic content, (1) the frequency relative to the total frequency of rules found within the book itself (presented in Table 6.3.3); (2) the frequency relative to the total frequency of rules found across the subsample (presented in Table 6.3.4); and in terms of rule-like quality, (3) the frequency relative to the total frequency of rules found within the book itself (presented in Table 6.3.5); and (4) the frequency relative to the
total frequency of rules found across the subsample (presented in Table 6.3.6).

Table 6.3.3
Ratio of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content Within Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3.4
Ratio of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content Across Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3.5
Ratio of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality Within Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithm</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tip</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3.6
Ratio of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality Across Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithm</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tip</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.3.2 Findings

From these statistical impressions, several things become clear about the rules themselves and the books the rules themselves find themselves in. For each piece of advice’s characteristic content, there appears to be a book that specializes in it; for context rules, it is Martinet, 2006; for engagement rules it is Fine, 2005; for endurance rules it is Lowndes, 2003; for memory rules it is Carnegie, 1936; and for disengagement rules it is Martinet, 2006. These books all tend to deal with the question of endurance in interaction, however Fine, 2005 and Martinet, 2006 focus less on enduring and more on the engaging relative to the statistical emphasis. In this manner, these two authors appear to be trying to assist the reader by considering the ‘going’ into the crowd from the standpoint of a whole course of activity that begins well before the reader arrives. Furthermore, it is the same two authors that appear to deal with the question of disengagement. Martinet, 2006 gives it prominence whereas it is less prominent in Fine, 2005 but it stands out because Carnegie, 1936, Blyth, 2009 and Lowndes, 2003 do not deal with leaving the interaction on bad terms whereas in Fine, 2005 and Martinet, 2006 given the size of the books, the ratios indicate that there appears to be a decent amount of coverage of disengaging from interaction.

For each piece of advice’s rule-like quality, the variance tends to group the books into two: it seems in Carnegie, 1936 and Lowndes, 2003, the authors are much simpler in the way they construct their arguments whereas Fine, 2005, Blyth, 2009 and Martinet, 2006 are relatively more subtle, using several different ways of expressing and instructing the reader. This is founded in the emphasis Carnegie, 1936 and Lowndes, 2003 place on using only two rule-like qualities relative to a higher variance of rule-like qualities in the others. Heuristics are clearly emphasized in Carnegie, 1936 – he has more than the rest of them. Algorithms (both tactical and
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non-tactical) have a reasonable distribution throughout the subsample, indicative of the requirement of strategic and calculative conditions when strategic, yet not calculative conditions are necessary. Algorithmic heuristics (both tactical and non-tactical) are the preferred weapon of choice to Lowndes, 2003 and Martinet, 2006 (less so characteristically of Fine, 2005 but according to the statistics, Fine reserves the right to do so…). Although the general tip has a presence in Fine, 2005, Blyth, 2009 and Martinet, 2006, it is not a major feature of these books (the means support this). The absence of tactical heuristics is noteworthy since it was created for coding as a logical feature but was practically absent during the coding process. Possible reasons for this is that a tactical heuristic does not stay pure for long – with routinization and experience it becomes a tactical algorithmic heuristic, of which there were plenty.

Overall, the notable presence of endurance rules stresses the management of activity and the high presence of algorithms and algorithmic heuristics are indicative of advice that requires qualification that is aloof and calculation that is going to be at odds with the strategic, yet not calculative conditions of everyday informal interaction. These things taken together, it is clear all these authors are aware that there is a problem of going from knowing the rules to applying them – with practice of their systems as the solution. But Lowndes, 2003 focuses on content that seems least likely to lead to a solution of that problem and the rest are unaware that the solution lies not in the practice of their pieces of advice but practice in general.

6.1.4 The Fourth Structural Element: The Language Qualifying Rules as Rules – The Extracted Form

The way in which this fourth structural element will become clear is by further examining what content makes certain pieces of advice either a context, engagement, endurance, disengagement, or memory rule and how that structure or lack of structure of additional language that qualifies
the rule as either a heuristic, algorithm, algorithmic heuristic, general tip or statement, tactical heuristic, tactical algorithm, or tactical algorithmic heuristic.

In Carnegie, 1936, taken from the second category, “Six Ways to Make People Like You”, consider “Principle 1: Become genuinely interested in other people.” This was coded as a ‘context’ ‘algorithm’. The principle is characteristically ‘context’ because it sets up an attitude that is necessary to obtain prior to interaction with other people whether genuinely or under Shaman Condition. Its rule-like quality is algorithmic because it does not specify when, where or how to do so. The act of ‘becoming’ needs Shaman’s Condition and needs to happen prior to the interaction with others because to suddenly ‘become interested’ during the course of the encounter is to realize that one is not genuinely interested in what others are currently saying, which is to flash a micro-expression (Cf. Eckman, 1975) which others do in fact notice and would “poke through the thin sleeve of immediate reality.” (Goffman, 1961b: 181) Operating under strategic, yet not calculative conditions, in which case a genuine interest in others has developed organically, possibly from watching one too many plays, movies, sitcoms, stand-up comic specials on HBO; things that try to exemplify the doings of everyday life and the funny inconsistencies in human behavior. Another source of this interest growing organically is from too much reading – the reading of too many novels, too much classical philosophy or classical sociological theory will generate many questions of human nature and the staring at one too many paintings at the local art museum has typically led to questions about beauty which circle back to philosophical considerations. The point being such activities have generated this newfound curiosity in the human condition for many individuals, especially during their college years. And it is this curiosity that would make conversation with almost anyone ‘interesting’ because each conversation is the addition of variance to one’s own experience – a further
explanation of oneself through an exploration of others – the basis of the human experience. In lieu of that, operating under Shaman’s Condition is required in order to avoid alienating social actions. Carnegie takes for granted what the expression of ‘interest’ is and that to be ‘interested’ all the time is to not act with tact or constraint – that is, to apply the principle at all times, in all situations, is to apply it algorithmically, which is to overstep the bounds of moderation and produce the exact alienation the principles are designed to avoid. This is the problem if the principle is examined in its extracted form as present in its “nutshell” form or on Wikipedia, which has no qualifying language. 

Now consider, from the fourth category, “Be a Leader”, “Principle 9: Make the other person happy about doing the thing you suggest.” This principle is characteristically dealing with memory in the disengagement sense. Consider the example from the 2002 movie, “My Big Fat Greek Wedding”: Fotoula Portokalos is going through an early midlife crisis. Gus, her overly-patriotic father, merely wants his daughter to marry and settle down rather than pursue a career. At thirty, she is the only woman in her family who has “failed” to meet their expectations to marry and start a family and she is stuck working in the family business, a restaurant. Maria, her mother, and her aunt Voula then contrive a way to get Gus to allow her to work at Voula’s travel agency. They talk with Gus through a series of what he does not recognize as ‘leading questions’ which result in Gus suggesting that Fotoula work at Voula’s travel agency – making it his idea rather than Voula and Maria’s idea. If Maria had asked directly, Gus would have perceived it as a challenge to his authority. This manner of disengagement permit ‘direct orders’ to appear not so direct and leaves a positive impression for future encounters. This is not coded as an algorithm but a heuristic because the giving of orders, is not necessarily always occurring but is situational. Hence, this principle is coded as a ‘memory heuristic.’
Fine, 2005 is filled with lists upon lists. Some are qualified beforehand or after but such qualifications do little good when the list form primes the advice for extraction without the qualification like juice from concentrate rather than from fresh oranges – it’s a different flavor and has different results. The author lists 20 “business” icebreakers and 50 “general” icebreakers. An icebreaker is characteristically ‘contextual’ in its content because it sets up the possibility of conversation and invites a reply. Yet, these 70 scripted lines are algorithmic in character because they do not appear to envision situations when such icebreakers would be inappropriate beyond the general or business settings as the categories suggest as the ‘general’ or ‘business’ qualification does suffice as a useful qualification. One of the ‘general’ icebreakers the author lists, although ostensibly reasonable, actually relies upon an entire set of previous information to avoid possibly alienating the other interactant. The icebreaker “Tell me about your kids.” (Ibid: 24) cannot be algorithmically asked to just anyone as its extracted form suggests. The most basic qualification necessary for this context algorithm prior to asking is the knowledge of whether such “kids” exist. Not knowing such information in advance increases the likelihood of alienation – a situation in which the asking of the icebreaker might break too much ice – the potential respondent could be infertile, too young, or have problems conceiving. To simply assume that everyone has kids to talk about is insensitive to the problems of others. Possible responses in the negative are statements like “Why can’t I just be single and not have to worry about getting a family!? I’m only 29…” or “The adoption agency has run into problems with the paperwork.” This is only two of the many scenarios that the icebreaker “Tell me about your kids.” could produce. It is an ill-advised context algorithm without the meta-rule ‘find out if kids exist.”

Consider Fine, 2005, in the category of “50 Ways to Fuel a Conversation”, three of those ways:
“9. Tell others about the important events in your life. Don’t wait for them to draw it out.  
10. Demonstrate that you are listening by restating their comments in another way.  
11. Communicate enthusiasm and excitement about your subjects and life in general.”  
(Ibid: 155)

These are perfect examples of where the pieces of advice are characteristically endurance rules.
Yet before addressing the endurance character of these three types of fuel, their algorithmic rule-
like quality has the same the problem as “Tell me about your kids.” “Tell others about the 
important events in your life. Don’t wait for them to draw it out.” Provides no assistance in
determining what is an important event nor whether that event, once deemed ‘important’ is
appropriate for the current specific set of “others”. For example, a manager might have just lost
his virginity to a European fashion model, quite possibly an important event in the manager’s
personal life, but not likely appropriate to share at a networking event. An answer to this critique
might be “use common sense in social situations” but the entire problem with that is part of very
programmatic reality set out by these authors is the learning of that very social sense.

“Demonstrate that you are listening by restating their comments in another way.” The problems
with this algorithm is in its omission of the answer to the simple question: how often? Without
that simple qualification, one might appear to be listening but one also might appear to be dim-
witted by not contributing one’s own thoughts to the conversation – the effect of talking to a
parrot. “Communicate enthusiasm and excitement about your subjects and life in general.” To
always algorithmically communicate enthusiasm and excitement is not only exhausting but also
alienating – not everyone can or is willing to show such systematic enthusiasm and excitement.
A meta-rule for moderation is necessary for these last two but none is present. The ‘endurance’
quality is indeed present though, all three in practice involve the maintenance of momentum of a
good ‘give and take’ but the lack of further qualification makes such things limited.
Now consider what appears to be the endurance tactical algorithms from Fine, 2005, category seven:

“Positive Messages to the Speaker

- Lean forward
- Maintain eye contact
- Open up your arms and body
- Relax your body posture
- Face your partner
- Nod and smile” (Fine, 2005: 73)

What adds the tactical element to this algorithm is in the activity required to preform each one of these tasks when someone is listening to a speaker. It seems the fourth, to relax, is contrary to the rest. The short term memory can only retain approximately 7 units of information at any given point and there are six things that should all be done simultaneously. As an ongoing checklist, doesn’t this seem problematic? What the author misses in the instruction of this algorithm, a possible meta-rule is that control of body language requires a lot of practice. As written, it seems that memorization of this list is all that is required. As anyone who has written a speech and attempted to deliver it without practice ought to find out, oration and social interaction require more than just a good memory for the message to be well received by its audience.

In Blyth, 2009, the following are the author’s five ‘endurance’ rules for lying:

1. Rule one: Trimming the truth is a social skill
2. Rule two: Directness is a privilege of intimacy
3. Rule three: We’re biased to believe and tell convenient truths
4. Rule four: A bad lie is antisocial
5. Rule five: A good lie may mean sincerely well

The ‘lying’ category and therefore these rules were coded as endurance because, according to the author, “Our species’ success comes of sociability, serving four social goals—collaborative, convivial, competitive, and conflictive—none of which correlate with truth unmodified. While getting along means being trustworthy, could we gain one another’s trust if we were totally
honest?’” (2009: 163) Survival and success are ‘endurance’ activities. This category’s rule-like characteristic was coded as a general tip or statement because these rules do not explicitly call its reader to do anything specific – there is no verb, only verbs as an implication and therefore rules for action by implication. By not giving a direct order as Carnegie’s ‘becoming’, Blyth allows the reader to realize the tip as a heuristic at a later situation.

Unlike Blyth, 2009’s category for lying, the category for flattery is algorithmic:

1. Rule one: Artful compliments are never too great to be returned
2. Rule two: If flattery is self-serving, it should hide it

In considering the first, ignoring the lack of a qualification of what is ‘artful’, it is not enough to simply say ‘return a good compliment with a compliment’: telling a fashion model of his or her beauty does little to differentiate the compliment giver from all other suitors; however, complimenting a non-obvious quality might garner favor. The problem with this algorithm is its missing the ‘how’. But the problem of coming up with such a schema is that in such interpersonal situations, typically all that is available to the interactant is the information gleaned from the encounter itself. In this regard, only the obvious exterior features of the other interactants is available for comment. To go fishing for other qualities about another interactant for the sole purpose of finding something interior to compliment is too devious to be useful, which leads to the critique of the second algorithm: “Rule two: If flattery is self-serving, it should hide it.” Again, how? Does one orate an entire story and just attach a compliment at the end? “After walking all that way to the supermarket, my legs were so tired…And, by the way, you are awesome!” The obvious point is to avoid a situation where something along the following is not said: “Your figure is just wonderful, the proportions of your butt to chest is perfect. My room is just up stairs, care to join me?” or “I really like your company. The research I did shows there are great benefits, can you hire me?” As these examples make clear, blatant
flattery is the core of many pick-up lines that typically only work after the interactants are heavily intoxicated. It is this blatant quality that led Carnegie, 1936: 29, in the language that qualifies rules as not rules, to call it “cheap praise” and it should be avoid at all costs. These pieces of advice, in their algorithmic rule-like quality consistently deny specification of the ‘how’ which is what the programmatic language claims is provided by these pieces of advice. These can however be recognized as memory rules because successful flattery (flattery that is indeed artful, not a statement of the obvious, and does not alienate) qualifies the interactant that offered it positively – characterizing the interaction that “went down” as something that might be enjoyable to re-engage in at a later point in time.

The following are Blyth, 2009’s two ‘endurance’ ‘tactical algorithms’ for retorts:

1. Rule one: Ensure defense is necessary and justified
2. Rule two: A smart riposte raises verbal and intellectual stakes

The ‘retorts’ category is further qualified as rules by the author with the statement: “This is warm and it begins with a protocol.” (Ibid: 255) Just after the first, the author provides the mission:

“But with a persistent big mouth or bully, prepare to fight. Your aim is twofold: to silence him and retain moral high ground.” (Op. cit.) What follows is a further qualification of twenty tactics in order of ascending difficulty (Ibid: 256-262):

1. Do nothing: Fold your arms and smile like you’re being paid to.
2. Laugh.
3. Challenge: Flip back a challenge, forcing the attacker to defend his attack.
4. Embrace: Why expend energy on repulsing a strike when you can welcome it: “The pleasure is all mine” or “You’re too kind.”
5. Quibble: Tackle the terms of your attacker’s criticism, rather than the central charge: “Sure you wouldn’t rather I parboiled my head?”
6. Reject: Put the onus on the other person: “Prove it.”
8. Reverse: “The question, is what are you up to?”
10. Invert: Can you invert the jibe and find advantage in alleged weakness?
11. Prick the pompous: On the sharp end of a lecture? Dull it with a tease: “I’m afraid you can’t reform me.”
12. Ironic praise: Eulogize a minor and unrelated aspect of the assailant, which should highlight the gravity of his crime, or at least disconcert him.
13. Escape the moment: Try an ominous question. Say: “I wonder how you’ll remember this conversation” or “Feel good now? Remember, feelings change.”
14. Mock the mocker: If someone is crude, you might venture: “I bet you can’t say that backwards,” “Now spell it,” “And words of more than one syllable?”
15. Instruction: You might suggest, as Mr. Bennet does to his unmusical daughter Mary at the piano in Pride and Prejudice, that your assailant has delighted you long enough. So will he, kindly, shut it.
16. Take him on a journey (a stratagem for the strong): Play consequences, showing what his attitude will cost: flash a Clint Eastwood smile.
17. Distract: Create a sideshow. Mount a demi-attack (implied rather than outright lampoon). Ask, “You always wear your hair like that?” “Did you plan that outfit?” or “Your dentist still in practice?”
18. Back to school: Be childish. Puerile comments are utterly disarming, because they lift calumny to a comic plane—with the happy possibility of fettering an assailant in giggles.
19. Bash the basher (not for use on the violent): Take it up a notch with a hecklerism.
20. The most deserved assault in the world: There is no greater conversation-shirking cowardice than pulling rank. If asked “Do you know who I am?” use a boast gag: “Yes, but I’m prepared to overlook it.”

Such qualifications make the coding of the ‘tactical’ aspect of these endurance algorithms clear.

Retorts though appear to have the capacity to be coded also as a ‘disengagement’ or ‘memory’ rule – so why ‘endurance’? A ‘retort’ or ‘comeback’ might end a conversation but not in all cases; as rule two suggests, the stakes are raised and with each retort, the more chips there are in the pot and thus as argumentative conversations go, endurance is required in all cases to handle the verbal assault during the bombardment and after disengagement has occurred.

In Lowndes, 2003, the category “7 Ways to Establish Deep Subliminal Rapport with Anyone” is Part 5 of the book entitled “How to Sound like You’re Peas In A Pod: "Why, We’re Just Alike!"” It contains chapter 44 through chapter 50. Each chapter contains what the author refers to as a specific technique for getting ‘rapport’:

- Technique #44 Be a Copyclass
- Technique #45 Echoing
These were categorically coded as ‘endurance’ ‘algorithmic heuristics’. After considering each one, the coding will not only be justified but the structural element will be further visible:

**Technique #44 Be a Copyclass**


**Technique #45 Echoing**

“Echoing is a simple linguistic technique that packs a powerful wallop. Listen to the speakers’ arbitrary choice of nouns, verbs, prepositions, adjectives and echo them back. Hearing their words come out of your mouth creates subliminal rapport. It makes them feel you share their values, their attitudes, their interests, their experiences.” (Ibid: 180)

**Technique #46 Potent Imaging**

“Does your customer have a garden? Talk about sowing the seeds for success. Does your boss own a boat? Tell him or her about a concept that will hold water or stay afloat. Maybe he is a private pilot? Talk about a concept really taking off. She plays tennis? Tell her it really hits the sweet spot. Evoke your listeners’ interests or lifestyle and weave images around it. To give your points more power and punch, use analogies from your listeners world, not your own. Potent Imaging also tells your listeners you think like them and hints you share their interests.” (Ibid: 184)

**Technique #47 Employ Empathizers**

“Don’t be an unconscious ummer. Vocalize complete sentences to show your understanding. Dust your dialogue with phrases like I see what you mean. Sprinkle it with sentimental sparklers like ‘That’s a lovely thing to say.’ Your empathy impresses your listeners and encourages them to continue. (Ibid: 187)

**Technique #48 Anatomically Correct Empathizers**

“What part of their anatomy are your associates talking through? Their eyes? Their ears? Their gut? For visual people, use visual empathizers to make them think you see the world the way they do. For auditory folks, use auditory empathizers to make them think
you hear them loud and clear. For kinesthetic types, use kinesthetic empathizers to make them think you feel the same way they do.” (Ibid: 191)

**Technique #49 The Premature We**

“Create the sensation of intimacy with someone even if you’ve met just moments before. Scramble the signals in their psyche by skipping conversational levels one and two and cutting right to levels three and four. Elicit intimate feelings by using the magic words we, us, and our.” (Ibid: 194)

**Technique #50 Instant History**

“When you meet a stranger you’d like to make less a stranger, search for some special moment you shared during your first encounter. Then find a few words that reprieve the laugh, the warm smile, the good feelings the two of you felt. Now, just like old friends, you have a history together, an Instant History. With anyone you’d like to make part of your personal or professional future, look for special moments together. Then make them a refrain.” (Ibid: 196)

In each one of these ‘techniques’, the author is recognizing a specific set of social actions, verbal and nonverbal configurations. For the author, these things appear easy to do as she is recognizing for her personal experience as an expert. Grandmasters do not always make the best coaches for beginning chess players because that experience of being naïve is so foreign to their current experience. Lowndes, 2003 does not realize that recognizing its parts is not enough to instruct the dynamics of the whole. With all the pictures in the world, showing step by step by step, an instructional magic trick book full of actual ‘techniques’ could still fail to teach its reader magic. As David Mamet wrote, “For the mind cannot be forced. It can be suggested, but it cannot be forced. An actor onstage can no more act upon the order "Be happy" than s/he can upon the order "Do not think of a hippopotamus."” (Mamet, 1999: 11) An algorithmic heuristic cannot be learnt by reading but must be learned by doing. Following a recipe perfectly should theoretically produce the same tasty meal each time but over time that taste will begin to sour, not because the recipe wasn’t followed but because the experience has dulled. Practicing Lowndes, 2003’s techniques over and over again for them to become fluid is for them to become as dull as last
week’s current events. The rapport developed in that moment cannot be sustained any longer than it takes time for an intoxicated interactant to sober up.

In Martinet, 2006, three different content-rule-like quality combinations will be examined: the context tactical heuristic, the disengagement general tip and the memory tactical algorithmic heuristic. For the context tactical heuristic, consider one of the author’s four entrance maneuvers, “The Sophistication Test”:

“There’s no better way to find out what kind of person you’re talking to than this, and it’s also an excellent icebreaker. I use the Sophistication Test often, especially when I’m feeling out of my element. It’s a quick, surefire method of figuring out what kind of subject matter, what tone, and what level of familiarity are appropriate. Please note that this opener must be directed to only one or two people at a time; if you are entering a larger group, use the Test on one person in the group. The question that I’ve found works best is: “So how did you get here?” (Be sure to smile.) This question can obviously be taken many different ways, which is the whole purpose of the Test. If the person answers, “In a cab,” you can relax a bit (although you might prepare to be a little bored); this person isn’t going to throw you any curves and will probably stay more or less on the surface of things. If he or she replies, “Well, I knew the hostess’s ex-husband, so I guess that’s how I rated,” you know you’ve got a fun person with whom you can kid around somewhat. Even, “How does anyone get here?” is good news; it’s a sign of a witty conversationalist. But watch out for the guy or gal who says, “My father caught my mother on a good night”—this one’s big trouble, and you’ve got to really hold on to your hat. There are only two other types of responses, and both of them call for immediate escape. One of them is, “What business is it of yours?” and the other is, “I have no idea.” The former signifies out-of-control hostility—a great detriment to mingling—and the latter could be evidence of mental impairment of some kind (or heavy-duty drugs). You may want to concoct your own Sophistication Test question or use one of the ones listed here, but be sure whomever you use it on hasn’t heard you giving the same Test to another guest. You don’t want anyone to realize you are conducting pre-conversational research!”

As mentioned with the discussion of Fine, 2005, icebreakers are context rules. However, unlike Fine, where those icebreakers were algorithms, “The Sophistication Test”, is a heuristic and tactical one at that. Its tactical quality arises from its assessment mechanism of the other interactants and it is in its assessment mechanism that its heuristic character is realized. Unlike, “Tell me about your kids.”, “The Sophistication Test” recognizes many possible futures and
addresses basic concerns of who, what, where, when and how in terms of its contextual quality but the type of engagement it is setting up is unclear because that determination relies upon whether the test results come back positive or negative. But, then again, Fine’s test was help up to careful scrutiny, so does the “The Sophistication Test” test for sophistication? Unfortunately, it fails to do so, although not on the basis of the question but in the manner Martinet graded responses. Aside from the individualistic variance in what is ‘witty’, there are scenarios with different sets of nonverbal configurations in which “in a cab” or “I have no idea” is not evidence of a ‘bore’ or ‘mental impairment’/‘intoxication’ but an, albeit failed or not, attempt at a witty response. On such grounds, “The Sophistication Test” succeeds contextually and heuristically but misses the mark tactically.

For the disengagement general tip, examine one of the author’s four tips for moving on, “Saving Face”:

“The great thing about large parties is that if you do happen to make a faux pas, tell a joke that no one else thinks is funny, or otherwise embarrass or humiliate yourself, you can leave the witnesses behind and start over somewhere else with a fresh slate. Just forget your failure and try again with someone new.”

Here, there is no rule per se like “If you mess up, leave…” The linguistic form is more of a statement of a very general observation, which is why this was coded as a general tip for deciding when to disengage.

In the memory tactical algorithmic heuristic, consider one of the author’s 12 Exit Maneuvers, “The Personal Manager”:

“If you can’t find a Human Sacrifice, you can try to motivate the person to leave you. This ploy requires a little acting skill and a lot of charm. Point out someone else in the room and say, “Oh look, there she is! … That woman over there is dying to meet you.” Or, “I’m sworn to secrecy, but there’s someone in that group there who is giving out free theater tickets [gift certificates/expensive cosmetics].” (Be sure to be vague about who this supposed philanthropist is.) Or wave in the general direction of a group and say, “I
think you’re being summoned.” When your victim looks confused and asks, “By whom?” tell her, “I can’t see him now, but he was waving to you … over there.” There are countless ways of seducing the person into leaving you (you can tell her the food is disappearing fast or there’s only one bottle of champagne left), and the great thing is, you can keep inventing until something works!”

An exit maneuver sounds like a magic trick, an illusion that leaves its audience wanting more – and that is the intended effect of “The Personal Manager”. A rule that produces disengagement on behalf of the other relentlessly (its tactical character) that is subtle in its application. By stating, “Be sure to be vague about who this supposed philanthropist is” is to not choose a fall guy and redirect the memory of alienation away from the illusionist when the ‘victim’ cannot find the ‘philanthropist’ and fault is likely turned inward by the ‘victim’. Like a magic trick, this is a tactical algorithmic heuristic and is subject to the same critique of Lowndes, 2003’s techniques – recognizing its parts is not enough to instruct the dynamics of the whole. To state that, “This ploy requires a little acting skill and a lot of charm” is to say that instruction in ‘acting’ and instruction in being ‘charming’ are qualifications necessary for implementation of “The Personal Manager” – which this book, Martinet, 2006, does not provide. Furthermore, to “keep inventing until something works” is too tactical to be of use – after two or three tries, the intended ‘victim’ is likely to catch on and the illusion will fade into a scene of alienation.

In this structural element, several things have become clearer: the rules in their extracted form require other rules for the possibility of success; many of these pieces of advice aim to assist in some part of the encounter under strategic, yet not calculative conditions but most, if not all, especially the tactical ones, aim for the execution of an algorithm or heuristic (except the general tips) in which strategic and calculative conditions are required; even if its for only a few moments. But it is in these few moments that all these rules, in their extracted form, need Shaman’s Condition for successful execution, but it is no where to be found. In this way, the
language that qualifies rules as rules requires the qualification of what Shaman’s Condition is and what it represents – it is not enough to say ‘be genuine for sincerity or authenticity’s sake’ because that is no different than the basic instruction, “just act natural”; rather what is needed is to reconnect with the childish wonder that practical conditions of everyday life have eschewed with the preoccupation of routine thoughts like “Did I pay the phone bill?”, “If I work all week, I might get a chance to relax…”, “If only she would talk to me…”, “I could really use a nice cold beer about now…”, Damn… I made a mistake in my March Madness draft pick…”, “If the stock market stays steady, I might be able to leverage my portfolio and retire soon…”, “If I don’t get this done, my boss is going to kill me…” With that reconnection with one’s childish wonder, there is a return to a level of abstract thinking conditioned in a trance of innocence and curiosity in which other interactants have little choice but to be taken in.

It is precisely because of these conditions of innocence and curiosity that so many horror stories and films use the motif of a little girl as the basis of the deception – *The Ring* and *Scary Movie 3* are just two examples.

**6.1.5 The Fifth Structural Element: The Language Qualifying Rules as Not Rules – The Situated Form**

Now that the pieces of advice offered up by these authors have been coded and characterized in their extracted form for their content and rule-like quality, it is clear that such extracted forms, the advice still requires other advice in order to suffice but such qualifications appear absent in its extracted form. Now it is time to look around the text to see if such qualifications are there to be found and consider the pieces of advice in their situated form.
In Carnegie, 1936, it is time to reconsider “Principle 1: Become genuinely interested in other people.” If the chapter in which the principle is discussed is actually read, it starts off with a discussion of Dale Carnegie’s yellow-haired dog, Tippy:

“You never read a book on psychology, Tippy. You didn’t need to. You knew by some divine instinct that you can make more friends in two months by becoming genuinely interested in other people than you can in two years by trying to get other people interested in you. Let me repeat that. You can make more friends in two months by becoming interested in other people than you can in two years by trying to get other people interested in you.” (1936: 55)

This qualification is followed by another qualification a few pages later: “If we want to make friends, let’s put ourselves out to do things for other people - things that require time, energy, unselfishness and thoughtfulness.” (1936: 60) This qualification is what Carnegie means by being ‘interested’ – the expenditure of valuable resources in favor of another when it’s not due. Yet, Carnegie still forgets the operation of strategic and calculative conditions – it forgets the long con as a possibility and Shaman’s Condition’s as the operational protocol, although there is indeed the possibility of ‘going native’ and actually becoming friends but that is not the only scenario. However, with such qualifications, “Principle 1: Become genuinely interested in other people.,” is not an algorithm to be bestowed upon oneself just prior to entering a situation but an context algorithmic heuristic for general interaction – a humanist approach.

While Fine, 2005 is indeed filled with lists upon lists, with very little consideration of situational properties that would make the use of even one of the listed items at the time it is listed, the author does indeed qualify the list of icebreakers as a whole as follows:

“The first step in becoming a great conversationalist is becoming invested in the conversation and actively working to help the other person feel comfortable. Take a look at the list of icebreaker questions that follow and make a commitment to use at least four of them in your next conversation. If you’re afraid you won’t remember them, write them down, put them in your pocket, and refer to them before you to go into the event. If you go blank while you’re there, excuse yourself for a moment and walk into the restroom to
take a peek at your list. The most famous and worn-out icebreaker is that age-old question ‘What do you do for a living?’ It’s so standard that it didn’t make the icebreaker list. Here are some other ways to begin a conversation that will provide a refreshing diversion from shoptalk. You’ll never ask them all, just the ones that seem appropriate for the particular conversation and time. And be prepared to reciprocate, since your conversation partner is likely to return whatever questions you pose.’(Ibid: 21)

The qualification that stands out “just the ones that seem appropriate for the particular conversation and time”. This could be read as an attempt to state the answer to this thesis’ critique of “Tell me about your kids” where the thesis argued that one might be “use common sense in social situations” to determine whether the icebreaker was appropriate. In that vein of argument, Fine’s qualification still fails against the response to the critique of Fine’s text precisely because the entire problem with determining what ‘seem appropriate’ is part of very programmatic reality the author sets out to instruct about!

In the qualification of “50 Ways to Fuel a Conversation”, Fine simply states:

“Here’s a cheat sheet full of tips to review before any event, occasion, interview, or date. Always take the risk and assume the burden. Check out the following, go to whatever meeting, luncheon, or party awaits and seize the day!” (Ibid: 154)

A way to read this through the lens of this thesis is something like “Here is a list of rules in their extracted form, go figure it out and thanks for the book royalty.” That statement would have been more instructive to the reader because it would be an instruction for the reader to think for themselves. While that statement appears to contradict the instruction be “use common sense in social situations”, the two are similar but not the same. In ‘go figure it out’, the instruction’s reference is broad and non-committal whereas in “use common sense in social situations”, the reference is to use a specific body of knowledge in order to proceed – the very body of knowledge these books claim to instruct about. Unlike Carnegie where the qualification of Tippy, et al. made a difference between the extracted form and situated form in terms of its rule-like quality, Fine, 2005’s qualifications do not perform any such transformation nor acknowledge
the necessity of additional help beyond the practicing of the book's own contents. The author concludes the book with the statement: “I hope you’re truly winning at small talk. Fake it for a while till it becomes second nature. If you are diligent about practicing, you’ll become an expert” (Fine, 2005: 198) followed by the ‘Winning at Small Talk’ worksheet, which has already been sufficiently proven to not assess progress in improvement in conversational skills. This concluding statement is recognizably proof that the author believes that ‘fake it for a while until it becomes second nature’ suffices as a qualification of the book’s contents and thus fails to see the problem of operating under strategic and calculative conditions when strategic, yet not calculative conditions are required. This qualification leaves its reader with the lack of the ‘fine art of small talk’ and the necessity of finding further qualification; which will likely be sought in a different self-help book that will likely suffer from the same structural deficiencies as Fine, 2005.

In Blyth, 2009, rules from three categories were examined, lying, flattery and retorts. For this structural element, consider only the lying category. Unlike Fine, 2005, where qualifications, when present, were unhelpful, Blyth, 2009 presents a section that follows the rules that adds guidelines for lying:
These maxims do reinforce the rules but they themselves require qualification – how does one know if one is ‘over controlling behavior’?

For Lowndes, 2003, the category “7 Ways to Establish Deep Subliminal Rapport with Anyone” was considered in its extracted form. Despite the book somehow reaching 345 pages, there is not much content in between the listing of “her” techniques. What is there is a story of her ‘discovery’ of the ‘technique’ which should act as a qualification but fails to do so and the technique itself. “Chapter 47” is so short, it looks like this:
The qualification “You do need to listen” is not helpful in a book about “How to Talk to Anyone.” How is there a conversation if no one is listening to anyone? When one looks to find further examples as one might expect from the author’s use of the phrase ‘explore’ the reader finds a different chapter. In search of qualification, consider the conclusion to Part 5:

“Now What’s Left? Chemistry, charisma, and confidence are three characteristics shared by big winners in all walks of life. Part One helped us make a dynamic, confident, and charismatic first impression with body language. In Part Two, we put smooth small-talk lyrics to our body ballet. Then in Part Three, we seized hints from the big boys and big girls so were contenders for life’s big league. Part Four rescued us from being tongue-tied with folks with whom we have very little in common. And in Part Five, we learned techniques to create instant chemistry, instant intimacy, instant rapport. What’s left? You guessed it: making people feel really good about themselves. But compliments are a dangerous weapon in today’s world. One mishandling and you can butcher the relationship. Let us now explore the power of praise, the folly of flattery, and how you can use these potent tools effectively.” (Lowndes, 2003:197)
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No such luck – only a reminder of “techniques” that require qualification beyond ‘if you want to empathize with someone, you need to listen when you are having a conversation with them.’

In Martinet, 2006, as the fourth structural element made clear, it was not the rule-like quality that was problematic so much as what was intended to be learned needs to be learned by doing rather than learned by reading. Therefore the problem for Martinet, 2006 is not so much that instructing the reader to practice the book’s contents but that heuristics work because the qualifications are not fully stated in advance but when written down and codified it appears as if those are all the qualifications required. Hence, this leads to the discussion of the sixth structural element.

6.1.6 The Sixth Structural Element: The Language Qualifying Some Rules as Meta-Rules

Whereas the third structural element specified the rules themselves, the fourth structural element specified the rules in their extracted form, the fifth structural element examined some of the surrounding language in which the third and fourth structural elements are situated; this sixth structural element is the search not for the qualifications the rules themselves require theoretically (as provided in the analysis of previous elements), but the search for the qualifications of the rules themselves as provided by the author.

A rough definition of meta-rules is a rule that takes the logical form of “do this in order to do that” according to another rule. They are rules about how to form a rule and how to apply it.

The reason for this search is to find the qualifications for that address the question of ‘whether these books are applicable?’ For rules to be applicable, there must be rules for following rules in situations that vary by type and possibility in general. If the problem with the rule is its algorithmic rule-like quality then it appears that its ambiguity can be resolved by a set of meta-rules such that it can be read as heuristics; but then the meta-rules in application then begin to
look algorithmic by inserting the reader into a different but still awkward situation. Therefore, these ‘meta-rules’ must not have the problems of rules, since they are supposed to make the rules applicable in fact. Why do rules need meta-rules? But how to apply meta-rules without 3rd order rules and so forth. To avoid this, meta-rules need to be seen as rules and non-rules at the same time rules situated already. This implies a guide who embodies the meta-rules – how might that work? Before the possibility of addressing these concerns is arrived at, (see conclusions) consider some of the results of the search for meta-rules written by the authors themselves.

In Carnegie, 1936, recall the chapter entitled, ‘Nine Suggestions on How to Get the Most Out of This Book’, which is summarized on the page to the right: The statement, “In order to get the most out of this book” fits the “heuristic” definition of a meta-rule in that logical form where the list that follows are rules about learning the rules in the book itself. As previously stated, these nine rules for reading try to set up strategic and calculative conditions for learning the content as well as instruction for self-discipline – conditions for learning the applicability of the rules themselves.

In Fine, 2005, recall the qualification of the list of 70 icebreakers which included the following statement: “You’ll never ask them all, just the ones that seem appropriate for the particular conversation and time. And be prepared to reciprocate, since your conversation partner is likely to return whatever questions you pose.”(Ibid: 21) This statement qualifies each of the icebreakers in two ways: (1) Each icebreaker has an appropriateness for a particular conversation and time;
and (2) the asker should know the answer to the asked question for when it is returned. Ignoring the first qualification for the moment, since it was adequately dealt with in previous analysis, consider the second qualification as a meta-rule for using icebreakers. In the case of “Tell me about your kids”, if the asker has no kids, the asker ought to have a response that will not kill the conversation like “They died in a car accident two years ago…” and more like “I wish I had more time with them, but you know life gets in the way of things…” The latter stipulates that the topic should be changed whereas the former is too jarring for any interactant to respond in kind without coming off as overly sympathetic or speechless. If for some reason that analysis is felt to not stand up to scrutiny, consider the title of the chapter which itself acts as a meta-rule for applying the chapter’s contents: “Get Over Your Mom’s Good Intentions.” Relative to the icebreakers, this is a meta-rule for applying the two meta-rules listed above to the rules themselves – a 3rd order rule. For Fine, “Because of our earliest training, we are predisposed to refrain from initiating a conversation. When we were impressionable toddlers, our parents taught us: (1) Good things come to those who wait. (2) Silence is golden. (3) Wait to be properly introduced. (4) Don’t talk to strangers.” (Fine, 2005: 12) In Fine’s view, overcoming each of those are required before applying the 2nd order rules in order to apply the 1st order rules (the icebreaker).

In Blyth, 2009’s programmatic language, “The Concise Manifesto” (Blyth, 2009: 26) was analyzed in detail:

Because of its location in the book, just after the introduction, and just before the author’s rules are mentioned and its contents: the three principles and

**THE CONCISE MANIFESTO**

Attention × Interest = Conversation = Joy

**WHAT CONVERSATION ISN’T**

Performance art
Competition
Scripted

**WHAT IT IS**

Mutual appreciation
Cooperation
Spontaneous

**THREE PRINCIPLES**

Generosity
Openness
Clarity

**FIVE MAXIMS**

Think before you speak
Listen more than speak
Find the incentive for talking
Never assume you know what they mean or that they understand you
Take turns
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five maxims act as meta-rules for apply the book’s subsequent rules. For example, the second rule for flattery, ‘If flattery is self-serving, it should hide it’ is the application requires the first maxim, ‘think before you speak’. Otherwise, one might end up relying on a pickup line in which the interactant is left alone in bed that night (Are you hurt? I think you fell from heaven…) since the act of ‘hiding’ something conversationally, on purpose, requires the act of thinking.

The results of the search for meta-rules in Lowndes, 2003 returns to the “extensive” chapter 47:

![Technique #47](image)

Of course, you pay a price. To use the right empathizers, you do need to listen.

(Lowndes, 2003: 187)

While the author makes the qualification right away in this case, “Of course, you pay a price. To use the right empathizers, you do need to listen.” There is a combination of features to this statement, (1) there is a price to pay; (2) there is the possibility of using the wrong empathizers if one is only physically present in the situation and not co-present qua interactant; and (3) listening is required for rapport to be a possibility. This combination suggests, especially with the emphasis placed on the first, that the further qualification of strategic and calculative conditions are at play which makes the strategic and calculative conditions a 3rd order rule to the 2nd order rule of listening in order to the 1st order rule, the employment of empathizers.

In the same vein of “The Concise Manifesto” for Blyth, 2009, Martinet, 2006 uses a specific phrase (which appears to be copied by Fine, 2005: 64-65 without attribution according to publication dates of 1st additions) – “Fake It Till You Make” and it is stated right away in Chapter 1:
What makes ‘fake it till you make it’ a meta-rule is the author’s statement “It is an attitude aid rather than a specific technique, but it’s important to remember it as you begin to mingle, because it is the basis of all the opening gambits and entry lines. Your mind-set as you enter the fray is extremely important.” (Ibid: 1) That is the statement of the 2nd order rule; and Martinet manages to take it a step further by stating the 3rd order rule, how to get into such an attitude:

“Remember when you were little and you used to tell ghost stories to scare yourself and by the end of the night you really did believe in ghosts? It was amazingly easy to fool yourself when you were a child, and it’s just as easy to fool yourself as an adult. Just pretend to be happy to be wherever you are; make believe you are confident; simulate self assurance— even for ten minutes—and an amazing thing will start to happen: You’ll actually begin to feel that way, partially because of the response you receive from other people.” (Ibid.)

What Martinet leaves out is the qualifications for if the 3rd order rule does not work… a psychoanalyst for example is extremely self-aware by training and it is that very training that prevents the psychoanalyst from fooling oneself – meaning if one is very self-aware, how can
one convince themselves without feeling ridiculous? The problem is that as long as meta-rules “belong” to the author they will have the same problems as rules – always in need of further qualification. The way in which common law deals with applicability not in advance but on a case by case basis exemplifies this very problem.

6.1.7 The Seventh Structural Element: Extracurricular Language

The seventh structural element, the extracurricular language, is a question of whether the text that is seen as ‘filler’ or ‘distracting’ actually is so remains open. While the answer might appear obvious in the sense that by definition, extracurricular is ‘extra’, there are several possible albeit interrelated positive and negative functions for such language to serve: (1) maintains the author’s solidarity with the reader, keeping the rapport alive and thriving; (2) distracts from the rigor of reading in a way that motivates further reading; (3) softens the effect of the book on its reader; and (4) transitions that might appear ‘extracurricular’ allows the flow to continue by asserting the logical organization of the book in its compartmentalized form that maintains the feel of an instructional manual, which is not seen as problematic by authors, editors, typesetters or publishers, but is at the heart of this thesis’ analysis. Therefore, this seventh structural element will be shown through exemplifying each of these elements for each book.

6.1.7.1 Carnegie, 1936

The Maintenance of Solidarity

Statements like,

1. “Do you know someone you would like to change and regulate and improve? Good! That is fine. I am all in favor of it, but why not begin on yourself?” (Ibid: 13)
2. “Instead of condemning people, let’s try to understand them. Let’s try to figure out why they do what they do. That’s a lot more profitable and intriguing than criticism; and it breeds sympathy, tolerance and kindness. “To know all is to forgive all.”” (Ibid: 17)
3. “Here is a riddle. See if you can guess it.” (Ibid: 78)
4. “It is a very simple technique - this yes response. And yet, how much it is neglected! It often seems as if people get a sense of their own importance by antagonizing others at the outset.” (Ibid: 153)

This extracurricular language maintains solidarity by creating the sense that Dale Carnegie is right there with the reader as if one were attending one of his courses.

The Motivational Readability

There is a difference between storytelling and exemplification. The former adds a certain tempo, some substantive plot extracurricular to the main point whereas the latter is the situation of the main point. These stories keep the reader going, looking for the next story in between the pieces of advice themselves. Carnegie tells many stories; here is one of the more concise ones:

“Florenz Ziegfeld, the most spectacular producer who ever dazzled Broadway, gained his reputation by his subtle ability to “glorify the American girl.” Time after time, he took drab little creatures that no one ever looked a twice and transformed them on the stage into glamorous visions of mystery and seduction. Knowing the value of appreciation and confidence, he made women feel beautiful by the sheer power of his gallantry and consideration. He was practical: he raised the salary of chorus girls from thirty dollars a week to as high as one hundred and seventy-five. And he was also chivalrous; on opening night at the Follies, he sent telegrams to the stars in the cast, and he deluged every chorus girl in the show with American Beauty roses.” (Ibid: 27)

By the mention of another person, in this instance, Florenz, the reader finds the mention of the name like the alluding to a character who has a story, a plot, hopes, dreams and problems that might be similar to the reader. In this way, the reader wants to know what happened to ‘Florenz’ and is motivated to keep reading.

The Reduction of Effect

While it might appear redundant to state that the ‘table of contents’ provides its reader with advance knowledge of a book’s contents, the redundancy is overcome by the manner in which
such advance knowledge reinforces some of the content of the book as rules primed for extraction. Consider the three pages that make up the table of contents for Carnegie, 1936:
otherwise experienced if you did not skip to the end of the story... Thus, you must ask yourself - why do I want to study chess? To win of course... Yet, you study because you also wish to learn and to enjoy the odyssey of the game - the plot as it develops. And there... is the 'Ah-ha' moment...” (Raphael, 2010-2011: Kindle Locations 72-85).

Just like how knowing the result of a chess game a head of time will affect how the game is analyzed, knowing the contents of any book, especially self-help books, will reduce the effect of discovery – and this reduction should not be underestimated.

The Assertion of the Organization of an Instructional Manual

This assertion, outside of the formalization of the pieces of advice in their extracted or situated form in regard to their characteristic content or rule-like quality is the structural element that performs the priming upon the rules themselves. For Carnegie, it is the systematic ‘In a Nutshell’ style that primes the advice by highlight what appears important, and bracketing away what appears to be qualifications that should only be considered ‘if necessary’ at a later point in time… Dale Carnegie’s nutshells are found on the following pages: 50, 112. 200-201, and 248-249 as shown by Page Set B:
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Notice the white space and the way in which this is formatted permits the breezy speed reader to note these principles and not their qualifications and for Carnegie, 1936, there are six formatting elements that prime the pieces of advice for extraction: (1) the restatement of the principle at the end of each chapter with its double lines; and the five elements that make up Dale Carnegie's
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nutshells: (2) the heading that qualifies the nutshell’s contents; (3) the box that brackets the nutshell from the rest of the text – signifying its importance; (4) the “In a Nutshell” statement itself, which acts as a qualification for why the box is performing its bracketing; (5) the numbered heading implies that what follows is significant; and (6) the statement of the piece of advice itself. These formatting elements taken together visually as a whole draws attention away from the qualifications and for the lack of a better expression, screams “READ ME”. This scream reinforces what is thought to be important and asserts that ‘these are the instructions, go follow them.’ Additionally, text that is italicized also has a similar effect; just like the nonsensical heading below:

**READ ME**

However, just because the above heading was read, does not mean this reflexive sentence was…

Given the systematic character in which the maintenance of solidarity, motivational readability reduction of effect and assertion of the organization of an instructional manual is present and follows closely the argument presented for Carnegie, 1936, what follows is mere illustration of these points rather than an algorithmic restatement of the argument of these 4 points over and over again. The meta-rules for understanding the illustration are present when it appears necessary; but even so, those meta-rules cannot suffice and will require qualification themselves, which is not done, since as this thesis suggests, formalization of the qualification of a rule as a meta-rule which itself requires a meta-rule of its own will produce rules about rules about rules ad infinitum where the meta-rule that intends to be instructive to the rule it is ‘meta’ to, whether the rule is of the 2nd, 3rd, 7th, or Nth order, the instruction will be too abstract and far removed to be useful to the interactant.
The Maintenance of Solidarity

There are many statements in which the author attempts to maintain rapport with her reader as if she was going to revert from being an expert at any moment:

1. “You are armed with a pocketful of icebreakers. You know that if someone greets you, you’ve got some great material for a conversation. Just having topics in mind to talk about goes a long way toward improving your skills.” (Ibid: 27)
2. “But I soon discovered that everything would go a thousand times better if I engaged them in small talk. I found that they relaxed, and that the time went by much faster if I could draw them out of the moment. We didn’t talk about their health or their fears or politics or sports, but just general, easy stuff, like where they lived, what it was like there, where they were from originally, things like that.” (Ibid: 28)
3. “You no longer have to worry about avoiding people because you’ve forgotten their names.” (Ibid: 32)

The Motivational Readability

Consider the following story:

“My friend Barb took a leap out of her professional comfort zone to run for city council. She’s a natural at small talk anyway, but she discovered something very important during her campaign. At public forums, the other candidates would enter the room, find their place on the dais, and sit down to review their notes or prepare answers to anticipated questions. But Barb would mingle with the people in the audience, making a personal connection with as many as possible. She discovered that the best way to get people comfortable enough to open up and express themselves was to look them in the eye and ask ‘What’s your name?’ Making eye contact and placing the emphasis on the word ‘your,’ rather than the word name, signaled to the person that they were important. She never failed to make a connection when she used this approach.”

As with Carnegie, 1936, with the mention of another person, in this instance, Barb, the reader finds the mention of the name like the alluding to a character who has a story, a plot, hopes, dreams and problems that might be similar to the reader. In this way, the reader wants to know what happened to ‘Barb’ and is motivated to keep reading.
The Reduction of Effect

As with Carnegie, 1936, advance knowledge reinforces some of the content of the book as rules primed for extraction. Consider the two pages that make up the table of contents for Fine, 2005: vii- viii:

Page Set C: Fine, 2005: vii-viii

This table of contents not only contains advance knowledge of the contents but also a few meta-rules for applying the chapter’s contents. Aside from the previously mentioned, ‘get over your mom’s good intentions’, Chapter 4’s ‘Keep the Conversation Going!’, Chapter 5’s ‘Let’s Give’Em Something to Talk About’, Chapter 7’s ‘Prevent Pregnant Pauses with Preparation’ and Chapter 10’s ‘The Graceful Exit’ are each meta-rules in their own right.
The Assertion of the Organization of an Instructional Manual

Unlike Carnegie, 1936 where the number of formatting elements was relatively small, the sheer number of lists present in Fine, 2005 make it impractical to fully exemplify in the same manner. Therefore, a sample of these organizational formatting elements will be examined. As the formatting elements below will illustrate, Fine, 2005’s organization heavily reinforces the formal character of the pieces of advice. This is further formalized by the extraordinary number of lists that tend to be no more than one to two sentences with headings to content that require further qualification:

Page Set D: Fine, 2005: 154, 77, & 178

These formatting elements contribute to this formal character and prime the advice for extraction. Like Carnegie, 1936, formatting element (1), the box, brackets its contents from the other structural elements and id used systematically throughout Fine, 2005. (2.1) and (2.2) illustrate the logical form of “if…then…” where (2.3) and (2.4) point out 8 instances of that
logical form. These instances in (2.3) and (2.4) do require qualification but are primed for extraction because of the logical form they are presented in without the qualifications that are required. There are situations in which the question, “why?” does not necessarily follow the statement “Along the same lines, do you…” but that is how the statement is likely read due to such formatting where the rule extracted from this is something like, “in order to expand on an idea, ask ‘Along the same lines, do you…’ and then ask ‘why’.” This formatting is far more conducive to producing a situation akin to the story created by a mad lib than any practical social situation. On 178, formatting element is reproduced here which produced (3.4) – a sentence interrupted mid-sentence by the placement of the box. Who is this ‘women’? The one that comes just before ‘my friend’… where is her predicate? (3.1) is a bulleted list, (3.2) is a heading that qualifies the list and (3.3) is the blank meant to be situationally by the reader but it is in those situations that a mad lib is far more likely to occur than the ‘small talk’ suggested by the author.

6.1.7.3 Blyth, 2009

The Maintenance of Solidarity

As previously mentioned, Blyth, 2009’s aim is slightly different from the others, and this can be understood by recalling the author’s subtitle, ‘A Guided Tour of a Neglected Pleasure.’ Hence, unlike Carnegie, Fine, Lowndes and Martinet, the need to maintain rapport is less pronounced as Blyth’s aim is to be a moral tour guide of the ‘museum’ of conversation as suggested in the programmatic language (the second structural element) rather than be on the tour itself as Carnegie, Fine and Martinet appear to do so. However, this sub-element is still present:

1. “To improve, try to notice how you listen. Do you hear people out? Or are you, like me, so eager to show empathy that you’re prone to talk over them?” (Blyth, 2009: 74)
2. “Communication doesn’t just create or conserve relationships; it is their essence, and face-to-face matters since so much lies beyond speech. I could tell I liked someone by the
butterflies that jived in my belly when we met, and the daydreams after—second-guessing the meaning of a hesitation, a lowered voice, the shade of a smile; promises that neither email nor telephone deliver.” (Ibid: 178)

3. “Before anything else, we must manage ourselves, using analysis and planning to compensate for our self-serving inclinations to blame others instead of examining causes and, likewise, to personalize success when surfing a lucky break.”

There is a certain subtly to Blyth’s maintenance because the writing has a much higher quality to it and since the author is giving a ‘tour’, the maintenance activity it is intertwined with stories and historical references.

The Motivational Readability

Blyth, 2009 tours examples and stories from history, literature, philosophy, anthropology, and popular culture. The examples exemplify (“Aristotle had a neat concept for explaining what enables topics’ polymorphous perversity: the active intellect. In brief, inside Homo sapiens’ lively mind lie imaginary versions of the world, and in the collective craft of conversation, we trade perceptions and ideas: a wondrous capacity that has enabled us to transform each other’s views and, with them, the world.” [Ibid: 99]) and stories dramatize:

“One man recalled: Sitting next to a beautiful princess is a reward for bravery in fairy stories, but if the gallant man were popped down every night next to Princess Beatrice, he would soon cease to be brave. Not that she has nothing to say, for when the subject moves her, she has a torrent, but what with subjects tabooed, the subjects she knows nothing about, and the subjects she turns to the Queen upon, there is nothing left but the weather and silence.” (Ibid: 98)

The more the book is read, the more what might look like stories are actually examples, but this does indeed appear to be a story.

The Reduction of Effect

As with Carnegie, 1936 and Fine, 2005, advance knowledge reinforces some of the content of the book as rules primed for extraction. Consider the inside flaps and the page that makes up the table of contents:
Like Fine, 2005 some of these chapter headings act as meta-rules: Chapter 3, ‘Pay Heed’ (there is a cost to applying these rules) and Chapter 11, ‘The Fine Art of Flattery’ (flattery requires artistic skill). The advanced knowledge from the flaps, with its reference to sex, (“Conversation is second only to sex, a lot less hassle, and it really matters.”) primes its reader to search the book for techniques rather than the qualifications.

The Assertion of the Organization of an Instructional Manual

For Blyth, 2009 there are several systematic formatting elements that reinforce an instruction manual-like organization:
The the end of each chapter, there is a box entitled “Typology of Bores, Chores and Other Conversational Beasts”. This box is, as element (1) illustrates, is shaded in and brackets off these sections even more than the boxes present in Carnegie, 1936 and Fine, 2005. Aside from its shade, there are four other elements that qualify the box that further detracts its presence from the main text and asserts its organization: (1.2) the boldered uppercased heading, (1.3) slightly...
smaller uppercase subheading and (1.4) a body of text in which (1.2) and (1.3) qualify as being separate from the remaining text. The reading of only these gray shaded boxes would produce a different learning experience relative to what ought to be achieved by reading cover to cover and everything in between.

Formatting element (2.1) is an arrow that qualifies every statement of a rule throughout the book. This arrow signifies to those that are flipping through the book to ‘look here and read what is being pointed to’ – formatting element (2.2), the rule itself. These rules are bolded and numbered where in the first rule present per a chapter begins at one – this perhaps is to not overwhelm the reader with the actual number of rules present in the book but there formatting still prepares the reader for extraction nevertheless. While qualifications do typically follow, the arrow is not pointing to the qualifications but the statement of the rule itself.

Formatting element (3.1) and (3.2) frame certain sections of the book in a manner different from the gray-shaded boxes of (1.1)-(1.4). These are not systematic as in after the end of each chapter but like mini-articles/exercises. Blyth, herself, is a journalist and these sections are likely sections from magazine articles she had written before: ‘The Algebra of a Follow-Up’, ‘Conversation Survival Kit’ and ‘Ten Commandments for Emotional Ventilation’ all sound like great articles. These brackets do interpret the text like Fine, 2005 but what is even more problematic from a formatting perspective is how the frame in at least two instances in Blyth, 2009 extends beyond a single page unlike what element (7) illustrates. Hence, even if the bracketed text was enough to learn, there are problems with the bracketing itself. While (3.1) and (3.2) have the benefit of being in the same visual field when one opens the book, the page numbers illustrated by (4.1) and (4.3) show that (4.2) and (4.4) bracket text that is printed in a manner in which a page turn is required. This not only interrupts the flow of the bracketed text but
further reduces the effect of the text because the act of page turning in that moment distracts the short term memory from conceiving the parts as a whole. Formatting element (5) is not problematic because it’s a quote but because its italicized – this is a frequent device throughout Blyth’s qualifying text and distracts the reader from reading the qualifications because the italics are not applied to just a few words but the entire paragraph. There is a point where emphasis is no longer emphasizing but distracting. Formatting element (6) is merely illustrative of the fact that Blyth has lists too, Fine, 2005 is not the only one and the critiques of Fine’s lists apply here as well but it does little good to repeat them here – the nail should already be hammered in to the coffin as deep as possible.

6.1.7.4 Lowndes, 2003

The Maintenance of Solidarity

In Lowndes, 2003, the author wants the reader to know that she understands as the expert and she is ‘right there with you’ through the use of ‘we’ statements:

1. “To that end, we now explore the most important technique to make you look like a very important person.” (Ibid: 17)
2. “Remember the old joke? The comic comes onstage and the first words out of his mouth are, ‘Well, how do you like me so far?’ The audience always cracks up. Why? Because we all silently ask that question. Whenever we meet someone, we know, consciously or subconsciously, how they’re reacting to us.” (Ibid: 21)

Somehow, someway, the author has taken her own advice to an extreme – she attempts to make the reader into her co-author in the conclusion: “As we said in the introduction, nobody gets to the top alone.” (Ibid: 340) In the reading of that statement, there are several reactions, “Oh? Look at that, I helped write the introduction!” or “Since I helped write this, I now know these techniques!” While both of these are extreme reactions, it does appear as if the author is attempting to stretch the solidarity far beyond its natural bounds.
The Motivational Readability

Lowndes, 2003 dramatizes the story of Roberto:

“My friend Roberto was out of work last year. He applied for two positions: a sales manager of an ice cream company and head of strategic planning for a fast-food chain. He did extensive research and found the ice cream company had deep sales difficulties and the food chain had long-range international aspirations. Did he send the same resume to each? Absolutely not. His resume never deviated one iota from the truth of his background. However, for the ice cream company, he highlighted his experience turning a small company around by doubling its sales in three years. For the food chain, he underscored his experience working in Europe and his knowledge of foreign markets. Both firms offered Roberto the job. Now he could play them off against each other. He went to each, explaining he’d like to work for them but another firm was offering a higher salary or more perks. The two firms started bidding against each other for Roberto.” (Lowndes, 2003: 98-99)

A bidding war… it’s dramatic. Now the reader wants to know who won and keeps reading… As it turns out, Roberto “finally chose the food chain at almost double the salary they originally offered him.” (Ibid.)

The Reduction of Effect

As with Carnegie, 1936, Fine, 2005 and Blyth, 2009, advance knowledge reinforces some of the content of the book as rules primed for extraction. Consider the page that makes up the table of contents:
For Lowndes, 2003, the ‘How to’ quality of the chapter titles, reveal too much about the contents of the chapter and reduce the effect of the book overall by making it obvious that ‘to do this’ ‘go to this page’ and ‘forget the rest.’
The Assertion of the Organization of an Instructional Manual

As mentioned earlier in the discussion of Lowndes, 2003’s Chapter 47, the entire book is systematic and minimal, hence there it little to analyze in the same detail as Blyth, 2009.

Consider the following page set:

Page Set H: Lowndes, 2003: 192, 193, 180, & 8
Raphael

The formatting element of how headings prime themselves for extraction are illustrated by (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), and (1.4) without the qualifications that follow much like the how chapter titles fragment the book. The problem does not necessarily lie in that the author uses headings, but just visually, consider the sheer font size – it is disproportional to the body text and it is this that makes it problematic with its frequency throughout the book. Now consider the systematic manner in which the author presents her ‘techniques’ to the reader. In these, there are 6 sub-elements: (2.1) a star, (2.2) a technique number, (2.3) a technique name, (2.4) the technique description, (2.5) the shade, and (2.6) the bracketing box. These elements taken together reinforce the logical ‘if…then…’ form of an instruction manual and distract from further qualification.

6.1.7.5 Martinet, 2006

The Maintenance of Solidarity

Unlike Lowndes, 2003 who attempts to overstretch the rapport with the reader, Martinet, 2006 attempts to mingle and act ‘motherly’ with the reader:

1. “Sometimes your opening line will fall flat on the ground and just lie there, dead. Don’t be disheartened; this can be demoralizing, but it happens to everyone at one time or another.” (Ibid: 30)
2. “We all know there are literally millions of subjects from which to choose: observations about the party or about current events; questions about people’s background or connection to the host or hostess; and, if it’s a business affair, remarks about whatever may be new or exciting in your profession. The problem is how to pull something out of the air when you’re stumped. So before we go any further, I’m going to offer you a very simple way—a trick, really—to think of a good topic.” (Ibid: 36)
3. “Here’s a really fun way to keep things going but not dig too deeply. It takes a little courage, but you’ll be pleasantly surprised at how well most people respond.” (Ibid: 47)

This extracurricular language maintains solidarity by creating the sense that the author’s advice is just a page-turn away.
The Motivational Readability

The following story exemplifies as well as dramatizes:

“I have a great faux pas story—a true one—which almost always acts as a healing ointment for any mistakes I may have made. What I usually do, in the midst of the embarrassing silence or the nervous laughter I have caused, is say something like, “I really can’t believe I just did that [said that]. Boy, leave it to me! Did I ever tell you about the time I …” And I recount my Erica Jong story. Years ago when I was looking for a job, someone arranged for me to have an interview with Erica Jong, for the position of her secretarial assistant. At that time I was very nervous to be meeting a famous author, and it didn’t help that I had broken my foot and was on crutches. On top of everything else, it was raining on the evening of the interview and I couldn’t get a cab. By the time I arrived at Ms. Jong’s Upper East Side town house—my hair dripping wet, my crutches muddy—I was almost an hour late for the interview. I was a complete wreck. What a way to begin! But I took a deep breath and rang the doorbell. The housekeeper let me in, and then the fabulous Erica Jong herself came sweeping down the front stairs. She graciously put out her hand. “Hello, I’m Erica Jong,” “she said to me, smiling. I looked straight into her eyes, smiled back at her, and said, “Hello, I’m Erica Jong.” (!) In my nervousness and general disarray, I had actually introduced myself as her! There was a long, long moment of the loudest silence I have ever experienced—all three of us, I think, were totally confused—until Ms. Jong came through for both of us like the mingling pro she must be and reminded me gently, “You must be Jeanne Martinet.” “Uh … yes, that’s who I am,” I agreed sheepishly. I don’t think there are many moments (certainly I haven’t had many) in life that can rival the embarrassment of the one I just described; however, the incident did end up serving a very useful purpose: It gets me out of faux pas hot water almost every time. After I tell that story, no one thinks too much about whatever current error I may have committed.” (Ibid: 125-126)

What reader would stop half way through a story like that? The reason people do not learn from history is because the mistakes are not the reason many read history – it is the characters, and

Martinet surely is a character and enough of one to motivate readers to keep reading.

The Reduction of Effect

As with Carnegie, 1936, Fine, 2005 Blyth, 2009, and Lowndes, 2003, advance knowledge reinforces some of the content of the book as rules primed for extraction. Consider the page that makes up the table of contents:
Just like Lowndes, 2003, Martinet, 2006’s table of contents has a ‘how to’ quality to it, which reveals too much about the contents of the chapter and reduce the effect of the book overall by making it obvious that ‘to do this’ ‘go to this page’ and ‘forget the rest.’
Raphael

The Assertion of the Organization of an Instructional Manual

Like Fine, 2005 and Blyth, 2009, Martinet, 2006 uses bulleted lists [formatting element (1)], numbered lists [formatting element (4)], lists of statements that take the two-column ‘if...then...’ form of an instruction manual [formatting element (2.1) with 2.2 and (3.1) with (3.2)], headings [formatting element (5.1)] and sub-headings [formatting element (5.2)]. Consider the following page set:

Page Set J: Martinet, 2006: 37, 96, 56 & 67

The Fine Line of Survival

Mingling has its own set of rules, many of which are different from the traditional norms of etiquette. More is to be said about what is intended when you are in mingling situations.

1. It’s OK to tell a lie. That’s right. Forget all that stuff you learned in school about George Washington and the cherry tree. George was probably not a liar at all. He was the president of his day so he could get away with it.

2. No one knows what you are really thinking. Even though you may think you know what someone is thinking, you are usually wrong about what a person is thinking.

3. The other people are thinking primarily about themselves. They are not just mingling but there’s a lot of it. It helps to remember this rule if you have been known to go on and on about how you feel about yourself.

4. It’s better to escape from someone than have someone escape from you. If you are a good storyteller, it is a good way to improve your speaking skills while preparing to escape. There’s nothing worse than being left hanging by yourself.

5. Change equals movement; movement equals change. This is the most powerful law and applies to all aspects of mingling.
While the critiques of Fine, 2005 still stand as do the nails hammered into Blyth, 2009, for at least formatting element (2.1) and (2.2), the heading makes it clear that this mnemonic function is only an example and not to be extracted literally. Other than that, these formatting elements taken together reinforce and assert the organization an instruction manual and distract from further qualification.

6.2 Reactions to the Subsample

This discussion now returns to Dale Carnegie’s bestselling self-help book, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1936). Before an analysis of this text gets underway, it is particularly important to discuss the context under which *How to Win Friends and Influence People* arose and some of its unintended consequences. Dale Carnegie, born in poverty on a Missouri farm in 1888, was educated at the state teachers college at Warrensburg, Missouri. (Kemp & Claflin, 1989) He had come to New York to “study dramatic art; eventually he got a role in a company which took *Polly of the Circus* on tour. But he had trouble finding another engagement and began giving public-speaking lessons at a New York Y.M.C.A.” (Mott, 1960: 260) “As to technique, he soon learned that he did not have all that much to say, and began asking students to deliver impromptu talks. In this way, each student gained actual experience in speaking before an audience. This approach proved remarkably successful, and by 1914 the young Carnegie was earning about $500 weekly and lecturing to large audiences.” (Starker, 1989: 62-63) “The First World War interrupted his activities; but after his uneventful tour of duty, he resumed his work, built it up again, and organized the Carnegie Institute of Effective Speaking and Human Relations. In his classes, some of which met in the grand ballroom of the Pennsylvania Hotel, he now enrolled many important business men; and almost without exception they became enthusiastic Carnegie fans. Among Carnegie's students in 1934 was Leon Shimkin, of the Simon
& Schuster publishing house. Shimkin was not long in becoming a Carnegie fan himself, and suggested a book which should embody the materials of the Institute lectures. The result was *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. It is a practical, readable book, crammed with illustrative anecdotes and quotes from famous men and women, instrumented with exercises which the reader was urged to try—all given in a rapid-fire, talking style. It was so convincing that readers were converted in spite of themselves and went about making friends and influencing people as a kind of game.” (Mott, 1960: 260) What also must be understood is the context of The Great Depression in which his book was seen an opportunity to procure security. Yet, since its initial printing of 3,000 copies, it was transformed from what Dale Carnegie himself referred to as a textbook on human relations, meant to be accompanied by an instructor, to a bestselling book read independent of any educational accompaniment.

Steven Starker, author of *Oracle at the Supermarket: The American Preoccupation with Self-Help Books*, (1989: 65) saw “Carnegie’s philosophy of humanity was a negative one, in that he characterized people as entirely selfish in their interests and motives. The world was said to be full of grubbing, self-seeking people, and the wise person would recognize this and use it to advantage.” This however appears to be a direct contradiction with what Carnegie himself wrote:

> “Let me repeat: The principles taught in this book will work only when they come from the heart. I am not advocating a bag of tricks. I am talking about a new way of life. Talk about changing people. If you and I will inspire the people with whom we come in contact to a realization of the hidden treasures they possess, we can do far more than change people. We can literally transform them.” (Carnegie, 1936: 231)

The problem of reading *How to Win Friends and Influence People* and being ‘successful’ with it really depends on whether it is read to learn formal strategic interaction or informal strategic interaction. Carnegie’s intent can be deduced from the passage above and is really disconnected from the title. Carnegie’s intent was to produce a book that assisted in a re-socialization process and would not have sold many copies if it was titled, albeit more aligned with his intent, *How to
Be Social. In this regard the advice within was intended to guide readers toward better interaction under *strategic, yet not calculative conditions* but was high jacked by those whom did not bother to read the text but only the summaries. On one occasion of informal interaction, a personal friend of the author, who majored in business, was reviewing some of this text and asked where the conclusion was so he didn’t have to read the entire argument, although the conclusion was unwritten at the time, he informed the author that this is the practice taught in undergraduate business courses. This practice, if generalizable to the extent the author of this thesis believes, can account for Carnegie’s algorithmic heuristics, meant to be developed through a course of study with extensive practice, being read as algorithms; the practice of which would not fit the definition of the situation unlike the practice of the heuristical form of the behavior which would be more phased in through socialization.

However, if the practice of reading summaries is not as generalizable, but is read largely by those in the business community as Starker (1989) and Mott (1989) suggest, the likelihood of Carnegie’s book being read for the *strategic, yet not calculative conditions* he intended is very low. Instructional materials for a market research course at Northeastern University express how Carnegie’s advice has become formalized with terms like ‘service encounter’ which adds the calculative condition to situations where it is unwarranted. Examples of situations where it is unwarranted can be found in *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. (Garfinkel, 1967) Another example of how *How to Win Friends and Influence People* is read as a formal document is provided by a graduate student at Massachusetts Institute of Technology who wrote her master’s thesis on trying to come to terms with Carnegie’s book:

“How to Win Friends and Influence People [the title of the thesis] originally came out of a desire to make light of my feelings of entrapment by acknowledging my discomfort with certain types of social performance. What makes me awkward and shy? What is it about the notion of “winning” and “influencing” people that makes me uncomfortable?
Interacting with this book is a confrontation with the peculiar systems we use to rule social interaction. I skirt around this conflict by “reading” the text in a convoluted way. I use an animated representation of myself — Jess — to feel the situation out. Jess falls into the text and meets Dale Carnegie, the author. Dale offers to take her through the book and acts as a mentor to Jess, attempting to help her social skills. These roles of teacher and student eventually break down and the two become buddies: Dale reveals his vulnerabilities over a beer and Jess is able to show him something new about his book — that the corner of the page is a flipbook. Jess does not necessarily learn society’s rules, but instead learns how to move her illogical self through an inherently illogical world. The journey through my absurd workaround of How Win Friends and Influence People allows Jess to escape social performance and achieve friendship on her own terms.” (Wheelock, 2010: 57-58)

In Ms. Wheelock’s case, it appears that the book helps heuristics develop organically. However, the verdict on How to Win Friends and Influence People is that there does appear to be a disconnect for some in this regard – see review #1 in Appendix B.

Unlike Dale Carnegie who was performer by training, Debra Fine began her career as an engineer, within an occupation that allowed her to maintain her natural shyness and avoid situations that required social interactions. However, like Carnegie, Fine’s book developed from her journey from shy person to small talk “expert” and from the presentations she developed to teach technically oriented professionals conversational skills and networking techniques that help them develop business relationships, build rapport, and enhance networking opportunities. Her book was initially self-published in 2002 and was so well-received that Hyperion Books ultimately decided to take over as its publisher in 2005. As of March 10, 2013, her book is still bestselling in the Conversation, Etiquette and Communication categories with 86 book reviews. (Cf. www.amazon.com/dp/1401302262) Out of these reviews, 35 gave the book 5 out of 5 stars.

Cris McLaughlin, from Maryland, provides a detailed summary that is reflective of the other 34 reviews:

1. “I found myself walking around day to day saying, “folks just aren't friendly”... my neighbors, church members, parents at my child's school, folks I see every day/week at the grocery store and believe it or not relatives. I think Debra Fine has hit on some of the
key reasons that I was not finding folks to be "friendly". Some of the reasons being: we are socialized to be wary of strangers, we think too many questions makes us nosy, introducing ourselves and others is not easy always, initiating, carrying on and ending a conversation is a challenge and lastly, finding similarities and interest in our conversation partners is hard at times.

Ms. Fine advised that no one can wait to be introduced or expect someone else to initiate the conversation and she is right. When I used the suggestions it made a world of difference in the contacts and connections that I began to make. I used the suggestions in professional and personal settings, with women and men and with folks my age and teens.

What I relay to folks when I use these techniques is "I care about you" and "I am interested in you as a person". The feedback I have received from people is that I make them feel good, in a world that is too busy I take time. That is really the bottom line about this book, why would I not use the suggestions when the potential is to evoke that kind of feeling from folks that you interact with every day of your life.

Lastly, I have used this book in many ways. I have passed the book to my husband who works in a technical field is reading the book and has begun using some of the suggestions at his workplace and finding them to be applicable. As a homeschooling parent I used the book as part of a communications curriculum for my 16-year-old son. Many of the strategies he used to get a job and now to maintain his employment; he has been told he is a wonderful conversationalist." (McLaughlin, 2005)

Such positive results however cannot necessarily be attributed to Fine’s book in the way the review suggests. What, then, can account for the success of the 35 positive reviewers? Steven Starker, again, provides the remedy:

“"The particular technology [or information] offered is quite secondary to the inspirational message of individualism proffered by the self-help oracle. It is a powerful, motivating message which temporarily makes the reader feel more in control, less helpless, less despairing." (1989: 73)

This is claim is supported as well as the problem of Fine’s algorithmic advice where heuristics are clearly need as a sample of the negative reviews will show. Consider excerpts (See Appendix B for full reviews) from 3 negative reviews:

2. “I wanted a method for finding appropriate topics to ask questions about based on the context and situation I was in at a given time. This book did not deliver at all; among other things, it gives you a list of stock questions that don't necessarily apply to situations most people find themselves in. Does the author really expect us to approach a perfect stranger and ask them, "How has the Internet affected your life?" or "If you knew you were going to die tomorrow, what would be your biggest regret?"" (Thomas, 2002)
3. “If a stranger at a party or a business meeting or whatever just came up to me and said "What's the best vacation you've ever had?," I'd feel really, really uncomfortable and probably try to get away fast. Even if they said "Hi, my name is Bob. What's the best vacation you've ever had?". Now I don't have the best social skills in the world, but I'm pretty sure that asking a random personal questions immediately about meeting a new person is NOT socially appropriate, at least not in the American culture that I know. Some of the suggestions might work in some contexts if they were worded differently. For example, she suggests to say "Tell me about your weekend" or "Tell me about your family" instead of "How was your weekend" or "Do you have any kids?". Probably she suggests this because "How was your weekend?" Could be met with "Fine" and the conversation ends, and the kids questions is a yes or no. But demanding that a stranger "Tell me about ______" makes you sound either rude and bossy, or like a therapist.” (Katie, 2011)

4. “Upon finishing this book I couldn't resist being disappointed at what the book had just delivered. It's possible that it was I who had unreasonably high expectations of what the book should've taught me, but I doubt it. The author, Mrs. Debra Fine, is supposedly a super conversationalist (she calls herself that!) who promises to teach you how to become a super conversationalist yourself. She claims that she was one of those boring engineering specialists who aren't capable of talking about anything that they haven't been trained on in school or college. She used to be shy, afraid, and hesitant during conventions and hospitality receptions. So how did she change? In the beginning she tells you that there are many old tapes playing in your head that you should get rid of, which include the popular sayings "Don't talk to strangers" and "Silence is gold." Instead, she provides you with new tapes to play that encourage talking to strangers and taking initiative in conversations. After that she talks about the benefits of getting over your shyness and hesitation and talking to strangers without fear. Afterwards, she provides you with tips and guidelines on what to say and what not to say during small talk conversations. Things not to say such as those questions that will result in a dead-end answer (i.e. How was your weekend, how's the family doing... etc.) and things to say such as proper self-introduction. Then she carries on by providing tips about proper and improper body language gestures during small talks. And finally, she tells us about some conversation killers that we should avoid at all costs. So you're wondering by now, all of the above seems to be quite interesting. What made me not enjoy the book and learn valuable skills from it? My answer is that I didn't like the book for two reasons. The first reason is that even though I might not be a "super conversationalist" but I can tell when I'm given bad advice! Why bad advice, you wonder? Well, what Mrs. Fine keeps telling you on and on is to approach strangers with questions that will make them talk, not questions that will make then answer! She keeps going on and on about how to ask the proper questions and how to acquire "free" information about the person you're talking to so that you'll be able to ask even more questions! She also advises you that you shouldn't be just a silent listener, because you should be an active listener. Thus, participate in the discussion by asking questions such as "How did that affect you" or "what did you learn from all that."
Notice anything wrong so far?
She wants you to be one of those annoying people you meet at parties who keep on asking you questions and questions and questions and questions until you feel that you
want to pull your arm until your rip it off just to have something to throw at them! You walk into a person’s office and you notice a framed university degree hanged on the wall. Wow... free information... let’s harass this guy! What did you like about the university? What are the advantages of living in that town? What did you learn in that major? How did this career affect your personal life? ...etc.

Yet what puzzled me the most was that she herself, Mrs. Debra Fine the first, gives you a totally contradicting advice telling you to avoid being an FBI agent! She warns you against harassing people with questions. And I was like, but... what about what you've been telling me for over an hour now? What should I do with all the questioning techniques you just taught me? I guess, nothing...

The second reason I didn't like the book is that whatever good advices remain after you filter the book are pretty much obvious to the average reader. Always keep an eye contact but don't just stare and try to nod and show interest. Don't initiate a conversation you're not sincerely interested in because it will show on you. Always seek the opportunity to converse with strangers because you never know what tremendous effect they might have on your life. And so on.

The only good outcome possible of this book is for really shy readers who need some motivation to get out of their shells and approach people. For that purpose I recommend buying the audio tape because Mrs. Fine is a good speaker and her style is exciting and moving. But please, while doing so be careful so that you don't transform from a shy person into a nagging annoying person!” (Jefri, 2002b)

Now that a few of the reviews of Carnegie, 1936 and Fine, 2005 have been examined impressionistically (see Appendix B for the reviews of Blyth, 2009, Lowndes, 2003 and Martinet, 2006), consider the overall reaction on Amazon.com:

**Table 6.2.1**

*Average Amazon Customer Review on 5 Start Scale By Book*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie, 1936</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine, 2005</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth, 2009</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowndes, 2003</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinet, 2006</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The date of observation of this data was April 10, 2013.

From the distributions in Table 6.2.1 and Table 6.2.2, a few statistically-based impressions may be drawn: (1) Carnegie, 1936 has overwhelmingly positive feedback; (2) Lowndes, 2003 appears to have more positive feedback than negative feedback; (3) Fine, 2005 and Blyth, 2009 were, on average, better received than Martinet, 2006 but less so than Carnegie, 1936 and Lowndes, 2003; and (4) Martinet, 2006 has a relatively even distribution compared to the rest.

From these statistically-based impressions alone, as a summary of the 1,538 reviews, with 1,118 (or 72.7%) of those reviews being rated with 5 stars reviews (with Carnegie, 1936 representing 86.3% and the others only 13.7%); one might easily get the impression that self-help books do in fact work – but that is assuming the validity of these reviews. As some analysis of the negative reactions make clear, there is an experiential disconnect between positive results readers might have in fact achieved and the casual attribution to the specific self-help book or the advice
offered by the author. In light of this, what these statistics do show is the problem of formalizing informal expressions (the content of the review itself that articulates, with great variance, the personal, and sometimes emotional, experience of the reviewer qua reader instead of reader qua reader – the very relationship this thesis has already addressed: the tension between author qua interactant and reader qua interactant where ‘qua’ is intended to be instructed by the book itself.

6.3 Conclusions

From this structural analysis and the reactions to the subsample, it is clear that the authors do intend to establish credibility with their readers, present a programmatic reality, provide pieces of advice with and without qualification and in a few cases present qualifications to their qualifications. In the course of doing so, the authors attempt to maintain their solidarity with the reader, motivate the reader to keep reading, reduce the effect of what is being learned and reinforce their books’ content as ‘instructive’. These authors try to imagine themselves as author qua teacher but forget that the activity of writing that produces the learning opportunity for the reader will always add limitations that no amount of qualification will make useful: the problem that 1\textsuperscript{st} order rules will always require a 2\textsuperscript{nd} order of meta-rules and that the 2\textsuperscript{nd} order will require a 3\textsuperscript{rd} order, so on and so forth. The reason for Dale Carnegie’s success is that it was intended as a textbook for his courses. Then, to imagine a self-help that works is to image a textbook with the proper meta-rules in which a teacher (the living embodiment of meta-rules) shows their situational application and informalizes the formal rules (presented in the book) for informal situations by showing by doing. The teacher is the extra-step sometimes required in a math problem like when adding fractions, it is sometimes helpful to convert each fraction to its decimal form, perform the addition, and convert it back to its fractional form. Under these
circumstances though, it is no longer a ‘self-help’ book per se but the recognition that to learn to understand the mutuality that we share, we do in fact need each other to do so.
Chapter 7: Implications and Conclusions

7.1 Implications for Scholars: The Question of Calculation & Solidarity

In the sociological, criminological, psychological, economic and philosophic literatures, there is a discussion of rationality as it pertains to certain views of human nature and its relationship to action; a debate that has been raging for centuries. After conducting this study, this seems to be the wrong question: not “do I, in fact, make rational choices” but “do we appear to calculate?”

After all, it is due to appearances, and not actualities, that are reacted to in social life. As Goffman writes,

“This whenever students of the human scene have considered the dealings individuals have with one another, the issue of calculation has arisen: When a respectable motive is given for action, are we to suspect an ulterior one? When an individual supports a promise or threat with a convincing display of emotional expression, are we to believe him? When an individual seems carried away by feeling, is he intentionally acting this way in order to create an effect? When someone responds to us in a particular way, are we to see this as a spontaneous reaction to the situation or a result of his having canvassed all other possible responses before deciding this one was the most advantageous? And whether or not we have such concerns, ought we to be worried about the individual believing that we have them?” (Goffman, 1969: 85)

The significance of the question being the wrong question lies in how its answer is used throughout society – the notion of rational action/choice organizes institutions (political, legal, penal, economic, etc.) and what services are provided to those that “make bad choices”. People are arrested, incarcerated, marginalized, discriminated, starved and left to die because the societal answer to the question sees human nature as rational and therefore responsible for such choices and absolutes are sought (clear defined morality, truth, objectivity, ‘with us or against us’ etc.). This disregards the entire concept that the source of human action is qua interactant and primarily social, which this thesis has shown to be the case. The question’s modification by
adding the term ‘appear’ and substituting the term ‘calculate’ for ‘make rational choices’
changes the subject of the question from concerning ‘goal-oriented’ thinking to the appearance
of thinking in general. It is this shift of reflection on what ‘does’ happen to what ‘appears’ to
happen is a change in the view of human nature from strict algorithms to adaptable heuristics –
recognizing the tenuous circumstances of everyday life and that absolutes must not be sought
since absolutes cannot hold people together for very long. (Algorithmic “truthfulness can
sometimes bring on the dissolution of a human relation more surely than a defensive falsehood.”
[Woodworth, 1970: 1]) This is why expression games are so significant and the learning of them
even more so. Hence further consideration is required not on whether choices are ‘rational’ but
on the differences in successful and failed expression games under strategic and calculative
conditions and strategic, yet not calculative conditions and under Shaman’s Condition because it
is in such conditions of managing concealment\textsuperscript{15} or the lack thereof that solidarity is founded and
built upon by interactants heuristically.

\textbf{7.2 Implications for Policymakers}

What follows are mere suggestions of the thesis’ relevance to certain types of policy.

\textbf{7.2.1 Implications for Policing Policy}

As mentioned previously society is to be first in every way and any individual’s current
involvements to be second. As with social life, so is policing. Police officers find themselves in
formal highly structured organizations, with protocols and mandates yet they are granted
discretion. It is in this discretion that the police officers find their organization of experience split

\textsuperscript{15} It is important to note that what is being concealed is highly variable, it is not zero-sum nor just ‘truth’ verses
‘lies’ – it can be simple, complex or simply complex, just like the players that play them.
in two: the formal mandate to enforce the law and the informal mandate to patrol order (i.e. “protect and serve”). This informal mandate requires officers to frequently participate in strategic interaction with citizens, some of which have been formally deemed ‘the enemy’ (Cf. Moskos, 2008: 22-23). Officers are sometimes required to “cool the mark out” and defuse intense situations. Both mandates require vigilance on the behalf of the officer, but it is a vigilance that is directed at the total situation and not at immediate problems or threats. This vigilance is what dominates the officer’s current involvements. In this vigilance, the police officer conducts what is referred to as tactical poetry (Manning, 2010: 185-203) focused upon the incident.

The “incident is a microcosm of sensible, thoughtful, rational individualistic choices. It is the sacred center of policing. The idealized concept of the police officer transcends the actual officer in everyday practice. The officer is idealized as exceptional—he or she stands apart from malice, emotion, prejudice, or distorted perceptions.” (Manning and Raphael, 2011) This interpersonal tactical poetry aimed at the incident is not learned in the academy nor could it be. The A&E reality television series, Rookies, which aired from October 2008 to May 2009, documents police officers straight out of the academy in Jefferson Parish, Louisiana and Tampa, Florida as they train on the beat with their field training officer (or FTO). There are several scenes that reinforce Peter Moskos’ experience in East Baltimore approximately a decade earlier where “one quartermaster officer warned me that everything I would learn in the academy is ‘bullshit.’” (Moskos, 2008: 19) In this sense, the police academy produces the same disconnect these authors produce in the writing of these self-help books, particularly because the academy does not challenging material (classes cover subjects such as report writing, shooting, law, and physical training), never mind teaching how to handle interpersonal problems – the “academy environment is less a learning process than a ritualized hazing to be endured” (Ibid: 21) Moskos
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reports that “by the end of the academy, less than half the class saw a relation between what police learn in the academy and what police need to know on the street.” (Ibid: 22)

The teaching of tactical poetry by the FTO is an informal skill because the act of patrolling is an informal skill based on the accumulation of tacit knowledge. A variety of heuristics, algorithmic heuristics and expression games are required to survive on the street. In one episode of Rookies, the FTO pointed out just after an arrest how during the arrest, the rookie’s stance made the rookie vulnerable to attack. No formal rule like ‘always stand a minimum of 5 inches back during an arrest’ is useful in practice. Officers need to ‘size up the incident quickly’ and ‘the police joke is that the officer is supposed to have it sized up before arriving”. (Manning and Raphael, 2011) Such a skill cannot be taught by formal instruction – only by doing. The fact of the matter is, despite being in a formal highly structured organization, the majority of what is done is informal and cannot be measured nor do the police believe what they do is measurable. There is no way to tell what well-played expression games have avoided or what expression games went un-played by an officer’s mere presence – as Moskos (2008: 23) wrote, “A police officer gave the class very wise advice: ‘Your goal, as is my goal, is to lead a boring life.’” When boredom, as the absence of anything interesting occurring, is the measure of success, by definition, there is little to actually measure and in those circumstances, little to formalize into reports.

As this thesis suggests, expression games cannot be codified and be useful. Again, Moskos (2008: 26-27) provides a useful illustration: “In a class on the department’s vehicle pursuit policy, the instructor lectured, reading in monotone from his notes: “The pursuit policy, which is General Order O3, states that pursuits are only to be done in exigent circumstances, when immediate action is necessary, and when there is no alternative, and when failure to pursue
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would likely cause grave accident or death. The general order also states that a police car may, under no circumstances, ever drive more than ten miles per hour over the posted speed limit. [Pause] Everybody knows this is a joke, but I just have to teach you what the General Orders say."

Given these points, the policy implications of this thesis are serious. Just as in the game of telephone, where messages are modified from one node to the next, the tacit knowledge of a FTO is never fully passed on and is different each time. In this way police socialization may appear formalized or standardized but can never be so in practice.

Moreover, it has been pointed out that most police reforms of tactics and strategies are cosmetic and do very little to change practices. (Manning, 2010: 155-181) Given Moskos’ experience in the Eastern District of Baltimore, it is clear why the idea of ‘community policing’ – policing with the community and not the policing of the community can only be a cosmetic reform. The socialization of the officers grounded in current practices teaches new trainees that the academy is survival training, thus deeming the ‘community’ as the ‘enemy’. With this view of reality grained into new trainees, how might an officer be able to enter an on-the-job situation under strategic, yet not calculative conditions when the situation is immediately formalized into strategic and calculative conditions by virtue of symbolic status of being a police officer (the uniform, badge, cuffs, etc.)? After reading this thesis, one ought to conclude that Shaman’s Condition is the solution – after all, undercover police officers were used as an example of what Shaman’s Condition looks like… However, undercover police officers, like confidence men and pick-up artists, all have uniforms that attempt to simulate the informality of the situation. The uniforms of confidence men and pick-up artists might indeed stand out, a suit of a slightly higher class or with a small extra flair of color, but those elements are intended to seduce, just like the
uniform of the undercover officer, which depending on the operation can vary from a homeless look to the style of an upper-class pimp – again, situated to seduce and but not stand out too much. For the uniformed officer on patrol, the one meant to be partaking in ‘community policing’, Shaman’s Condition is not a solution. While expression games can conceal various forms of calculation and Shaman’s Condition would simulate strategic, yet not calculative conditions, Shaman’s Condition nor any expression game could overcome the poetic power of a uniformed officer’s presence simply because it is a direct contradiction. Police officers are magicians, not shamans. (Cf. Manning, 2010: 59-60) Hence, police officers qua police officers cannot act under strategic, yet not calculative conditions but must act under strategic and calculative conditions; therefore the question for further research is what rapport can develop, if possible, under strategic and calculative conditions that is extensive enough for policing with the community to become a reality in the extreme case, like the Eastern District of Baltimore? This thesis does not perceive high hopes for such a prospect, but the answer to such a question ought to finally answer whether community policing is generalizable as a strategy in practice and not just another presentational strategy.

Hence, it is a conclusion of this thesis that community policing is not likely under strategic, yet not calculative conditions outside of any societal tragedy (like the bombings of the 117th Boston Marathon on April 15, 2013 where there was intense community cooperation).

7.2.2 The Implications for Education Policy

The formal-informal distinction is at the heart of the problem of education policy. As this thesis argues, the processes involved in sociability and communication are largely informal while policymakers want to see that every dollar spent on education actually contributes to education. To ensure this, they implement standards for both students and teachers. Students take a
standardized exam (which in some states count as graduation requirements) and teachers are evaluated based on how their students perform on these exams. Policymakers see no problem using such formal methods as a means of budgeting and accountability through statistical trends. While such formal methods might be appropriate for assessing whether students have learned certain types of material, it is a logical jump to assume that the student’s failure is attributable to the teacher, even if it is a significant number of students. Learning does indeed take many forms and the form it takes should largely depend on its subject matter but policymakers discard this as a consideration. Formal languages of mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and the like have right and wrong answers. They are procedural and rote practice is necessary for learning such formal languages. However, not all languages take on this formality and such formal methods are not necessarily appropriate for the remainder of education. It is well documented that successful elementary and secondary education relies on its reinforcement outside of school. Whether in after-school programs or at home, this reinforcement occurs in a largely informal environment. The remainder of education, once the formal languages are attended to, deals largely with the socialization of students and the development of identity. (Knowing one’s history, language and literature assist in this development but should not necessarily be characterized by the same formal methods of study as mathematics.) The subject of this thesis is in effect methods of learning sociability. This learning cannot occur simply like 2+2=4 without producing social inequalities as it currently is taught. With formal methods and grading, students are placed in a formal system of competition that does not start with equal chances and with little odds of a tie as socio-economic factors tend to be reflected in a student’s performance. Hence, learning how to interact with others in a formal system of competition has little choice by its nature but to produce winners and losers. Losers get this reinforced in both formal and informal processes and
make sociability problematic. Goffman shows how complex and rich social life is but these formal methods of education are reductionistic and eschew students of this complexity. While there is little doubt in the significance of developing mathematical proficiency as it is quite necessary for managing one’s material life as Marx might say, it is even more important, especially in the United States, for students to learn the public and private dimensions of their actions. While the humanities largely attempt this, the stories of history and literature can be too far removed, romanticized or abstract relative to the student’s perspective for this educational purpose. Chess on the other hand is both a formal and informal system that can be used as a resource for teaching mathematics, logical reasoning, public duty, private responsibility, cause and effect, language, creative thinking, problem solving, conflict resolution, morality and sociability and in the Middle Ages, chess was used for many of these purposes. (Cf. Shenk, 2006, Raphael, 2011)

**7.2.3 The Implications for Internet Policy**

The implications to draw from this thesis concerns the implications of the thesis itself about the nature of interaction rather than the thesis generally. The internet poses several policy problems, most notably the question of government regulation. This question can be re-asked as whether to rely on informal processes or formal processes. In absence of formal processes, parties have resorted to contracts. While these are usually conceived of as ways of securing mutual obligations between two parties, the new electronic media and the internet have created a world of use and communications that often involve social forms somewhat at odds with traditional organizations, groups, and interactions. In this case, law and policy have to come to terms the adaptation of expression games to the internet as the foundation of constructing identity. In coming to terms with this reality, law and policy must also come to terms with the many
problems this shift in communication and identity construction poses for any attempt to regulate it according to standard conceptions of contract law, the public aspect of what had been considered private exchanges, and the sorts of policies that can address the social and public dimensions of using the internet.

7.3 Suggestions for Future Research

While a pilot study does indeed have limitations, it is nevertheless perceived that this thesis has produced genuine findings. Future research could use more systematic sampling of other self-help books that deal with interpersonal relationships – testing for the presence of the seven structural elements presented in the structural analysis. There could also be further methodological gains by extending the codebook to its 35 logical combinations of a rule’s characteristic content and rule-like quality.

Future research might also examine the variance of situations in which certain pieces of advice are coded: for example, generally, a piece of advice aimed at reducing social distance ought to be coded as an ‘engagement’ rule since that distance will begin to reduce immediately as engagement occurs; however, in the case of the police officer, that would need to be coded as a ‘context’ rule because the reducing needs to happen prior to entering the situation because the uniform, as already mentioned, immediately formalizes and in doing so increase distance. A context algorithm for reducing social distance might be ‘never have one’s hands on one’s gun holster when interacting with others.’ The effects such a policy might provide further insight on the formalization of the situation by mere presence of another’s uniform.

Further study is also needed into the spectrum of activity that finds strategic, yet not calculative conditions and strategic and calculative conditions at its ends. In light of this distinction, some
reconsideration is required by those that reduce social life to strictly formal models and see what insights this thesis might hold for their own research.

Given the significance of the distinction between strategic, yet not calculative conditions and strategic and calculative conditions, future research is required on how to observe Shaman’s Condition, its relationship to Native’s Condition and its pervasiveness throughout society as this thesis perceives it as an integral trait in the generation of interpersonal social order; which reflects as a piece in the mosaic of societal social order at-large.

7.4 Conclusions

This thesis shows that everyday social life is problematic in the problem-solving sense. This primes social life for strategic considerations but not always under calculative conditions, which produces an emphasis on the informal character of the regulating ordering principle. When those that doubt their competence at expression games, or their skill at parts of informal interaction in which expression games are a feature of, a popular remedy is a self-help book on interpersonal relationships. However, in seeking this remedy, the individual qua reader does not realize that there is a question of pedagogy, a question of instruction that its authors can never fully address: the need but insufficiency for meta-rules. With the tension found by a police officer trainee between what is learned in the academy and what is learned in field training being a prime example, what follows from this research is, at the very least, is that a manual by itself cannot produce the result, it has to have guidance within the field of practice. This does not mean that formal rules have no place, nor that formality has no place, but that formality without informality is not likely to have a positive effect.
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### Appendix A: Tables

#### A.1 Sampled Book Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book ID:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>ISBN13:</th>
<th>Publisher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>How To Win Friends and Influence People</td>
<td>Dale Carnegie</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>978-1439167342</td>
<td>Simon and Schuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>How to Talk to Anyone: 92 Little Tricks for Big Success in Relationships How to Instantly Connect with Anyone: 96 All-New Little Tricks for Big Success in Relationship The Fine Art of Small Talk: How To Start a Conversation, Keep It Going, Build Networking Skills -- and Leave a Positive Impression!</td>
<td>Leil Lowndes</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>978-0071418584</td>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Debra Fine 1997 978-1401302269 Hyperion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Jeannine Martinet 2006 978-0312354312 St. Martin's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Margaret Shepherd 2005 978-0767921695 Broadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Diane Windingland 2010 978-0983007807 Self-Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Catherine Blyth 2008 978-1592404971 Gotham Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Kerry Patterson 2002 978-0071401944 McGraw-Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Susan Scott 2004 978-0425193372 Berkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Small Talk: The Art of Socialising</td>
<td>Kathy Schmidt and Marisha Rogers</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>978-1741106190</td>
<td>New Holland Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Confident Conversation: How to Communicate Successfully in Any Situation</td>
<td>Mike Bechtle</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>978-0800732424</td>
<td>Revell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Complete Book of Questions: 1001 Conversation Starters for Any Occasion</td>
<td>Garry Poole</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>978-0310244202</td>
<td>Zondervan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25 Conversation Lubricants - Easy Ways to Start and Keep a Great Conversation Flowing</td>
<td>Peter W. Murphy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amazon Digital Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change</td>
<td>Stephen R. Covey</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>978-0743272452</td>
<td>Free Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Talk Like a Winner!: 21 Simple Rules for Achieving Everyday Communication Success</td>
<td>Steve Nakamoto</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>978-0967089355</td>
<td>Java Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Art of Convening: Authentic Engagement in Meetings, Gatherings, and Conversations</td>
<td>Craig Neal and Patricia Neal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978-1605096681</td>
<td>Berrett-Koehler Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Date Smart!: How to Stop Revolving and Start Evolving in Your Relationships</td>
<td>David D. Coleman</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>978-0761521730</td>
<td>Three Rivers Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>How To Get The Girl - Dating Mindsets Explained</td>
<td>Robert Belland</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978-1448673124</td>
<td>CreateSpace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Daternet for Women and The Daternet for Men: The Sexy, Unbridled, Definitive Guide to Internet Dating</td>
<td>Courtney Lauren Kanner and Jeremy Stephen Howard</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>978-1440174063</td>
<td>iUniverse.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The Pickup Artist: The New and Improved Art of Seduction</td>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>978-0345518194</td>
<td>Villard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Secrets of Speed Seduction Mastery</td>
<td>Ross Jeffries</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>978-0557388493</td>
<td>lulu.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Fine Art Of Erotic Talk: How To Entice, Excite, And Enchant Your Lover With Words</td>
<td>Bonnie Gabriel</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>978-0553373967</td>
<td>Bantam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Small Talk Tactics: Making Small Talk Sexy</td>
<td>Bobby Rio</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amazon Digital Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Flirting for Dummies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Clark</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978-0470742594</td>
<td>For Dummies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dating for Dummies</td>
<td>Joy Browne</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978-0470892053</td>
<td>For Dummies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Emily Post's Etiquette 18th Edition</td>
<td>Peggy Post, Anna Post, Lizzie Post and Daniel Post Senning</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>978-0061740237</td>
<td>William Morrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Miss Manners' Guide to Excruciatingly Correct Behavior</td>
<td>Judith Martin</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>978-0393058741</td>
<td>W. W. Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>As a Gentleman Would Say: Responses to Life's Important (and Sometimes Awkward) Situations</td>
<td>John Bridges</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>978-1558538467</td>
<td>Thomas Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Verbal Judo: The Gentle Art of Persuasion</td>
<td>George Thompson</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>978-0688137861</td>
<td>Quill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The Fine Art of the Big Talk - How to Win Clients Deliver Great Presentations and Solve Conflicts at Work</td>
<td>Debra Fine</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>978-1401302344</td>
<td>Hyperion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The Bro Code</td>
<td>Barney Stinson &amp; Matt Kuhn</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>978-1439152935</td>
<td>Simon and Schuster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raphael

47 How to Make People Like You In 90 Seconds Or Less
Nicholas Boothman 2000 978-0761149460 Workman Publishing Company

48 The Art of Manliness: Classic Skills and Manners for the Modern Man
Brett and Kate McKay 2009 978-1600614620 How Books

49 Choosing Civility: The Twenty-five Rules of Considerate Conduct
P.M. Forni 2003 978-0312302504 St. Martin's Griffin

50 The Power of Charm: How to Win Anyone Over in Any Situation
2006 978-0814473573 American Management Association

A.2 Word Counts Across Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book ID</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>Book Size</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Expressive Aspects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>90006</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>6399</td>
<td>0.071095 828</td>
<td>0.009199387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>77775</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td>0.055275 1183</td>
<td>0.015210543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>67393</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6855</td>
<td>0.101717 971</td>
<td>0.014408025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>37792</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3904</td>
<td>0.103302 396</td>
<td>0.010478408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>56429</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4095</td>
<td>0.072569 772</td>
<td>0.013680909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>55023</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4032</td>
<td>0.073278 660</td>
<td>0.011994984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>13221</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>0.080251 245</td>
<td>0.018531125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>66402</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4288</td>
<td>0.064576 876</td>
<td>0.013192374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>68028</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4639</td>
<td>0.068193 850</td>
<td>0.012494855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>84996</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>0.073003 1027</td>
<td>0.012082922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>72219</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5863</td>
<td>0.081184 712</td>
<td>0.009858901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>64417</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4726</td>
<td>0.073366 664</td>
<td>0.010307838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>53308</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3641</td>
<td>0.068301 363</td>
<td>0.006809485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>83711</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5366</td>
<td>0.064101 743</td>
<td>0.008875775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21733</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>0.063222 290</td>
<td>0.013343763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60687</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>0.050802 709</td>
<td>0.011682897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>46726</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>0.090977 711</td>
<td>0.015216368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18220</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3231</td>
<td>0.177333 162</td>
<td>0.008891328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>86818</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5593</td>
<td>0.064422 1518</td>
<td>0.017484853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21538</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>0.045733 305</td>
<td>0.014161018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>105857</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>6849</td>
<td>0.0647</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>0.009484493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>51576</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>0.079494</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>0.011478207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>53456</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>0.102963</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>0.009671506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>64272</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>0.064258</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>0.013987428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27380</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0.072608</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>0.019758948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>37528</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td>0.070625</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>0.014320994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>60317</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5989</td>
<td>0.099292</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>0.013445629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>68566</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4780</td>
<td>0.069714</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>0.024560278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6521</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>0.078516</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.011347953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>71023</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3654</td>
<td>0.051448</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>0.016980415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>83331</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4304</td>
<td>0.051649</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>0.022092619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>161438</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>10557</td>
<td>0.065394</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>0.01720165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>116572</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7167</td>
<td>0.061481</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>0.015775658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>291766</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>18056</td>
<td>0.061885</td>
<td>3311</td>
<td>0.011348135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>289607</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16749</td>
<td>0.057834</td>
<td>2552</td>
<td>0.008811942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>22897</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>0.096563</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.009127833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>29103</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>0.081194</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0.011682644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>6787</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.055989</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.0116399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>60849</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5357</td>
<td>0.088038</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>0.009959079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>50663</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>0.165801</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0.012316681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>13059</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>0.099548</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.009342216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>31517</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>0.065647</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>0.020909351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>70335</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4151</td>
<td>0.059018</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0.012085022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>46413</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>0.06356</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>0.012518045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>29025</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>0.078002</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0.016744186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean** | **71520.23404** | **5281.531915** | **0.07826** | **942.6170213** | **0.013553787**

**Median** | **64272** | **4304** | **0.072569** | **772** | **0.012494855**

**Totals:** | **3488738.234** | **256479.5319** | **0.073516** | **46334.61702** | **0.013281196**
Appendix B: Sample of Amazon.com Book Reviews

B.1 How to Win Friends and Influence People by Dale Carnegie (1936)

1. “When I was 12 years old my best friend gave me a copy of this book and told me that I might find it interesting. He could not have been more right, for I delved deep into the book and I finished it in a matter of 2 weeks (to me it was a record to finish a book so quickly at that age!) I found the book to be very informative and entertaining at the same time. The author, Mr. Dale Carnegie, will not introduce a principle or a notion without supporting it with at least one real life story where the principle introduced was proven effective. After that point I noticed a great, almost immediate, effect on my behavior as I was growing up. I noticed that I have become a very good negotiator with my parents and teachers, more popular at school, and I even began to understand people much better than I used to prior to reading the book. I grew up believing that this book was one of the greatest factors involved in shaping my character. Recently though, I noticed some growing criticism of the book and its teaching, and I thought that this would be a good time for me to refresh what I learned from the book and assess its quality based on the experience I've gained since the first time I read the book. So I bought the unabridged audiotapes of the book and listened to it whenever I was in the car. Mr. Carnegie said somewhere in the book that if one thing you learn from the book, which is the ability to understand the different views of other people in different situations, then that would be enough. And I agree wholeheartedly.

My judgment is that this book will indeed teach you how to understand the motives and the different forces playing in the different people you meet. Humans all across the globe share basic needs and characteristics that play a major role in forming their attitudes and decisions. Understanding those factors and satisfying them will be the most effective method of influence you'll ever need. Mr. Carnegie begins the book with the foundations of developing this skill of understanding others. He extends three principles that if applied will help you identify what other people want and how you can satisfy them. After that he introduces six ways to make people like you. These methods hover around the same three principles mentioned in the beginning of the book. After that the author discusses in two parts methods and principles that help you influence people to your way of thinking.

All of this seems interesting but why are people criticizing this book, you wonder. The first issue with this book is the title. It says "How to win friends and influence people." I would have called it "How to make people like you and influence their behavior." The methods Dale introduces aren't for winning friends. You don't win friends by avoiding arguments and by projecting enthusiasm that is not honest. You'll only have them like you, but they are not won as friends, yet at least. Honesty is absent in Carnegie's teachings, and sometimes even unadvised! In one story he tells of a manager of a singer who would lie to the singer just to get him on stage! Another observation I had on the book was the relevance of some of the stories to the principle being introduced. Some of those principles would not have worked in the stories he mentioned have the circumstances been even little different! Yet Dale would acclaim the introduced principle as the reason that the story reached the happy ending it did. But, to the benefit of the author, this happened only a few times overall and it doesn't degrade the whole quality of...
the book. Nevertheless, the lack of emphasis on honesty is a serious issue. This has caused many reviewers to warn readers from reading this book. But here is where I disagree.

You'll need to read this book to learn the methods, not just to be able to understand other people, but also to be ready when others are applying them to influence you. I'll have to agree that some of these methods are extremely powerful especially if the receiver isn't ready for them. Reading this book will make you resilient to the weapons of many unwanted salesmen and negotiators. My advice is to read but with caution. Learn the methods but always remember that honesty should always be present when these methods are being applied.” (Jefri, 2002a) For the other 1,000+ reviews, please visit: http://www.amazon.com/product-reviews/1439167346

B.2 The Fine Art of Small Talk: How to Start a Conversation, Keep it Going, Build Rapport and Leave a Positive Impression by Debra Fine (2005 [2002])

2. "‘I found myself walking around day to day saying, "folks just aren't friendly"... my neighbors, church members, parents at my child's school, folks I see every day/week at the grocery store and believe it or not relatives. I think Debra Fine has hit on some of the key reasons that I was not finding folks to be "friendly". Some of the reasons being: we are socialized to be wary of strangers, we think too many questions makes us nosy, introducing ourselves and others is not easy always, initiating, carrying on and ending a conversation is a challenge and lastly, finding similarities and interest in our conversation partners is hard at times.

Ms. Fine advised that no one can wait to be introduced or expect someone else to initiate the conversation and she is right. When I used the suggestions it made a world of difference in the contacts and connections that I began to make. I used the suggestions in professional and personal settings, with women and men and with folks my age and teens.

What I relay to folks when I use these techniques is "I care about you" and "I am interested in you as a person". The feedback I have received from people is that I make them feel good, in a world that is too busy I take time. That is really the bottom line about this book, why would I not use the suggestions when the potential is to evoke that kind of feeling from folks that you interact with every day of your life.

Lastly, I have used this book in many ways. I have passed the book to my husband who works in a technical field is reading the book and has begun using some of the suggestions at his workplace and finding them to be applicable. As a homeschooling parent I used the book as part of a communications curriculum for my 16-year-old son. Many of the strategies he used to get a job and now to maintain his employment; he has been told he is a wonderful conversationalist.” (McLaughlin, 2005)

3. "I am a 21-year-old male who lives in Los Angeles, and I was looking for a book that would help me get off to a good start with people I was meeting for the first time. I wanted a method for finding appropriate topics to ask questions about based on the context and situation I was in at a given time. This book did not deliver at all; among other things, it gives you a list of stock questions that don't necessarily apply to situations most people find themselves in. Does the author really expect us to approach a perfect stranger and ask them, "How has the Internet affected your life?" or "If you knew you
were going to die tomorrow, what would be your biggest regret?" I don't know what kind of demographic this book was written for, but it's definitely not for anyone my age.” (Thomas, 2002)

4. “If a stranger at a party or a business meeting or whatever just came up to me and said "What's the best vacation you've ever had?" I'd feel really, really uncomfortable and probably try to get away fast. Even if they said "Hi, my name is Bob. What's the best vacation you've ever had?". Now I don't have the best social skills in the world, but I'm pretty sure that asking a random personal questions immediately about meeting a new person is NOT socially appropriate, at least not in the American culture that I know. Some of the suggestions might work in some contexts if they were worded differently. For example, she suggests to say "Tell me about your weekend" or "Tell me about your family" instead of "How was your weekend" or "Do you have any kids?" Probably she suggests this because "How was your weekend?" Could be met with "Fine" and the conversation ends, and the kids questions is a yes or no. But demanding that a stranger "Tell me about ______" makes you sound either rude and bossy, or like a therapist.” (Katie, 2011)

5. “Upon finishing this book I couldn't resist being disappointed at what the book had just delivered. It's possible that it was I who had unreasonably high expectations of what the book should've taught me, but I doubt it. The author, Mrs. Debra Fine, is supposedly a super conversationalist (she calls herself that!) who promises to teach you how to become a super conversationalist yourself. She claims that she was one of those boring engineering specialists who aren't capable of talking about anything that they haven't been trained on in school or college. She used to be shy, afraid, and hesitant during conventions and hospitality receptions. So how did she change? In the beginning she tells you that there are many old tapes playing in your head that you should get rid of, which include the popular sayings "Don't talk to strangers" and "Silence is gold." Instead, she provides you with new tapes to play that encourage talking to strangers and taking initiative in conversations. After that she talks about the benefits of getting over your shyness and hesitation and talking to strangers without fear. Afterwards, she provides you with tips and guidelines on what to say and what not to say during small talk conversations. Things not to say such as those questions that will result in a dead-end answer (i.e. How was your weekend, how's the family doing... etc.) and things to say such as proper self-introduction. Then she carries on by providing tips about proper and improper body language gestures during small talks. And finally, she tells us about some conversation killers that we should avoid at all costs. So you're wondering by now, all of the above seems to be quite interesting. What made me not enjoy the book and learn valuable skills from it? My answer is that I didn't like the book for two reasons. The first reason is that even though I might not be a "super conversationalist" but I can tell when I'm given bad advice! Why bad advice, you wonder? Well, what Mrs. Fine keeps telling you on and on is to approach strangers with questions that will make them talk, not questions that will make them answer! She keeps going on and on about how to ask the proper questions and how to acquire "free' information about the person you're talking to so that you'll be able to ask even more questions! She also advises you that you shouldn't be just a silent listener, because you should be an active listener. Thus, participate in the discussion by asking questions such as "How did that affect you" or "what did you learn from all that."
Notice anything wrong so far?
She wants you to be one of those annoying people you meet at parties who keep on asking you questions and questions and questions and questions until you feel that you want to pull your arm until your rip it off just to have something to throw at them! You walk into a person's office and you notice a framed university degree hanged on the wall. Wow... free information... let's harass this guy! What did you like about the university? What are the advantages of living in that town? What did you learn in that major? How did this career affect your personal life? ...etc.
Yet what puzzled me the most was that she herself, Mrs. Debra Fine the first, gives you a totally contradicting advice telling you to avoid being an FBI agent! She warns you against harassing people with questions. And I was like, but... what about what you've been telling me for over an hour now? What should I do with all the questioning techniques you just taught me? I guess, nothing...
The second reason I didn't like the book is that whatever good advices remain after you filter the book are pretty much obvious to the average reader. Always keep an eye contact but don't just stare and try to nod and show interest. Don't initiate a conversation you're not sincerely interested in because it will show on you. Always seek the opportunity to converse with strangers because you never know what tremendous effect they might have on your life. And so on.
The only good outcome possible of this book is for really shy readers who need some motivation to get out of their shells and approach people. For that purpose I recommend buying the audio tape because Mrs. Fine is a good speaker and her style is exciting and moving. But please, while doing so be careful so that you don't transform from a shy person into a nagging annoying person!” (Jefri, 2002b)

B.3 The Art of Conversation: A Guided Tour of a Neglected Pleasure by Catherine Blyth (2009)

6. “Catherine Blyth's The Art of Conversation is a wonderful excursion into the mind of a modern conversationalist. While some may open this book thinking it is a straightforward instruction manual that will give an empirical formula for successful conversations, most are no doubt pleasantly surprised that it is so much more than a how-to booklet. Catherine takes you through the situations that so often happen in conversation giving her own witty anecdotes and opening the mind of the reader to the art of listening and interpreting visual as well as vocal cues during conversation. I find her sections on listening and knowing when to speak as well as the proper use of silence particularly important. Too often is this overlooked in favor of always finding something interesting to force down someone else's throat. These sections alone make it worthwhile to check this book out. Also, her free-flowing openness leaves room for you to experiment while less confident speakers will get helpful straightforward tips. She not only has helpful step by step sections juxtaposed with (supposedly) real-life experiences, she has a sense of humor that most anyone can appreciate from time to time.
Finally, it is always a positive when the author is accessible and helpful, personally to the average reader. At the end of her book she leaves her web address to her blog and really does value your input individually. The art of Conversation is a brief but worthwhile
glimpse into the mind of an expert conversationalist that promises to teach you a thing or two that you do not already know or think you know.” (Mahan, 2010; 5/5 Stars)

7. “This is an advice book. Do not expect any in-depth reflections on the philosophy, psychology, anthropology, or sociology of conversation. The best that can be said of it is that there is a lot crammed into its 288 sparse pages and many readers may find some small part helpful. We have all fumbled conversations, and as I read Blyth's book I had some shocks of recognition of mistakes I have made far too often. Her attempt to fit in so much is also the book's chief weakness. I counted 95 "rules" strewn throughout, and that only scratches the surface of her advice precepts. There are also "principles," "maxims," "guidelines," "commandments," and other kinds of lists, adding dozens (if not hundreds) of further directives. Little space is left for meaningful discussion of any of these (although illustrative anecdotes and quotations appear with many of her rules). The Art of Conversation is broad and shallow. There is no way that I, for one, could possibly remember more than a few of Blyth's guidelines when I am caught in, say, a tedious cocktail party conversation. It might be best just to focus on some common sense, such as "don't embarrass anyone" or "listen more than you talk." The author does not overlook such fundamentals as these, but they are buried into all of her other material. After reading the book I was unsure of what she might consider to be the three or four most helpful things she had to say.” (Smith, 2009; 2/5 Stars)

8. “Frankly, this book felt like a written version of listening to a manic talker.” (Rand, 2009)

9. “This work is a brilliant magazine article inflated into a mediocre book. The brilliant part ends with page 26. That page, titled "The Concise Manifesto," is a summary of what conversation ought to be, and it may be worth the price of the entire book. From there on, "The Art of Conversation" uses too many devices familiar to writers with deadlines to meet and spaces to fill: short paragraphs, abundant quotations from others, recurring categories and subcategories with slangy names, lists where ordinary paragraphs would do, and subheadings every few paragraphs. In other words, typography and repetition in place of thought. Two other observations: The author, Catherine Blyth, is as beautiful as a fashion model, judging by the photograph on the dust jacket, and perhaps for her the art of conversation is not as fraught as it is for the rest of us. Also, she is English and occasionally uses phrases that must be clear on her side of the Atlantic but that puzzle me.” (Pinney, 2010; 2/5 Stars)

B.4 How to Talk to Anyone: 92 Little Tricks for Big Success in Relationships by Leil Lowndes (2003)

10. “I borrowed this book from a friend. I was both impressed and turned off by it on many different levels. I have no interest in navigating the shark filled waters of corporate America or the yacht club and this book seems to be geared for those seeking entrée into that world. Of the 92 tips, the majority focused on working parties like a politician, making people think you like them when you secretly find them to be bores and pandering to native human egocentricity. Basically, it's a how-to guide for people who want to learn how to be charming and fake, without seeming to be fake. All very useful for ambitious corporate folks, entrepreneurs seeking financial backing, and even musicians looking to get a record deal, no doubt, but not very useful for average people
Raphael

looking to improve their social skills among friends. For instance, the publisher's blurb on this site brags that the book shows you "7 ways to establish deep subliminal rapport with anyone". What they don't specify is that the author only shows you tricks to SIMULATE rapport with that person. This book is mostly about creating a complex, flexible illusion. Although the author had many useful tips (I made myself a list of the 19 excellent tips I want to remember and incorporate into my own life) and her writing was very entertaining, I found myself thinking - "I'm glad she's not my friend. She may be a cool cat and a charmer, but she's also plastic."

So I'm giving the book a mixed review. Be aware of why you are buying it. If you want tips on how to network (a necessity for many people to succeed in their field), this book is probably nothing short of brilliant. She's keenly observant and gifted with the ability to analyze behavior and articulate it in an easy to understand manner. This book may very well be a life saver if you are trying to survive in a world that essentially runs by the rules of politicians and bureaucrats, where the ability to play the game is what counts. When you are surrounded by fakes, sometimes your best option is to learn how to put on your game face. The author does deliver the goods on this, in fine style.

If you want to improve your relationships with family, friends and romantic partners, where the creation of a facade is of no real value, this book does have something to offer you, but it will be limited. You'll find yourself trudging through entire chapters on how to sell people widgets by handing them pictures of your dog, or how to get a dead bore to tell his favorite "I'm so cool" story to your friends at a party so you can sneak off for better company without him realizing you've ditched him.” (Coyote, 2008; 3/5 Stars)

11. “Jesus... I don't even know where to begin. This book fails on so many areas. Slowly curve your lips to smile so it would look more sincere???? Whaat??? A sincere smile is not learned or calculated. A sincere smile just shows up naturally. Another thing that is very well-known is to look people in their eyes, all the time. There is a big problem with this. While it is true that you need to look people in the eyes. It is not the case all the time. The big exception is depending on the person. The world is not just all Americans. There are many cultures where looking someone straight into their eyes for a long period of time is considered very rude. It can be seen as intrusiveness and aggressiveness. In some others, it is an invitation for a fight, like "What are you looking at?"

Another problem is many people can look at you straight in your eyes and still lie. They are called sociopaths and pathological liars. See, from this alone this book and any other books that profess this has already failed. Many help coaches like to box people into their definition but people are different. Not everyone is like you and that's the way it should be. People act differently to situations so stop interpreting people based on their body language.

Now, onto the CD itself. I wish somebody else read this book instead of the author. A professional reader, maybe. The author's voice is very annoying and she tries so hard to be enthusiastic but it fails. You don't need to sound like you are jumping all the time to sound sincere and enthusiastic. Also, I cannot understand many of her words. I listen to audio books all the time and this is the first time someone's voice annoyed me and couldn't understand what she was saying.” (Diwata, 2012; 1/5 Stars)
B.5 The Art of Mingling: Proven Techniques for Mastering Any Room by Jeanne Martinet (2006)

12. “I hoped from the title to get some good ideas on engaging in small talk at a church event or husband's work party where I have to make pleasant conversation with people I don't really know or expect to work with long term. The author's philosophy is that your sole purpose in mingling is to have a good time. This goal justifies creating little deceptions like a) pretending that someone is stalking you so that you can excuse yourself; and b) asking multiple people to check up on you during the night to see if you're okay after some supposed trauma. She suggests all kinds of "little white lies" that will allow you to enter or leave a group at will. She advocates testing people's "sophistication level" and then leaving the conversation if they don't immediately entertain or amuse you. My purposes in attending most mingling events are very, very different. I am not hanging around cocktail parties to flirt or attract attention. I attend group gatherings to try to create feelings of trust and connection, to try to learn things I didn't know I needed to know, and to help others feel genuinely valued and welcome. This book will not help you with any of those goals.” (L., 2011; 1/5 Stars)

13. “The book of the week was The Art of Mingling by Jeanne Martinet. I had a first this week... the book I read for this blog was awful. Each page I read made me a little less smart and more and more perturbed. I will explain this very quickly because I feel the need to guard you from prolonged exposure to this book (You may need sunscreen if you decide to read the whole book to avoid getting burned.) In summation, this book is misleading. I read it under the assumption that it was geared toward helping people master communication within social settings. I felt that if I could grab some good tidbits from this book I could use them to help me (and you) professionally. However, I would put this book in the same category as a Nora Robert's novel or a Lifetime Original Movie. I don't have any problem with Nora or the Lifetime channel, but both have little to add toward a professional repertoire and neither does this book. The book had two main philosophies I disagree with as a business person: Lying and Flattery. I do not think that lying is ever a good thing. I think integrity is the most important part of being a good business person today. All too often you hear about the Bernie Madoffs and Ted Stevens... and even telling little lies is no way to make it in business. The book says it's a good way to open up communication when you don't know someone or a good way to "get out of talking to someone." Why would you want to have a new relationship that was founded off the basis of a lie? Doesn't make much sense. The whole concept sounds very juvenile... And flattery... Flattery is basically using lies to compliment someone. Dale Carnegie is a big advocate of avoiding flattery and I am most definitely on his side. If you want to compliment someone because you genuinely like something about them, then I would say go for it. But, if your compliment is insincere and you are using it as a fabled leverage to create a new acquaintance, think twice... we all graduated high school a long time ago... Many parts of the book were written for a female reader, although the author tries (and fails) to make it for both sexes. If I went up into a crowd of people and say "Excuse me, no one had informed me we had become intimate" (and giggle)... I would probably be shunned. Or... "You look bored, so bored you must be smart, are you smart?"... I'm embarrassed for anyone that would say that. Here is my tip on mingling with new people... Be sincere with what you say, ask them questions, and be friendly... Don't buy this book…” (Flannigan, 2011; 1/5 Stars)
Appendix C: Codes

C.1 Content Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>222537</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorb</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>Cultivate</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ascertain</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlighten</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Inspect</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalize</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>Retrain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Rehearse</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Analyse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acquire</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>2357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>Detect</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elucidate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognise</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instruct</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Reiterate</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Rethink</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorize</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>Indicate</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay_Attention</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>Click</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Locate</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practise</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Comprehend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imagine</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Conceive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Reexamine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relearn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Conception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Scrutinize</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorize</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visualise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 257597
Table C.1.2 Words Coded As “Expressive Aspects”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxemics Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Paralinguistics Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Haptics Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Feel</td>
<td>6225</td>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational Distance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Breathy Voice</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>2486</td>
<td>Foreplay</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hugging</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tickle</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Space</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Massage</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Brush</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loud</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Tap</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Buss</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Soft Tone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>Kiss</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>Tactile</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Seek</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Voice Volume</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fumble</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Grope</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Chuckle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hug</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Giggle</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Pinch</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>Inflect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronemics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sensitiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Pronounce</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Sexiness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>Punctuate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Squeeze</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10558</td>
<td>Snicker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stab</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kisser</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promptness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Snigger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stimulate</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Kissable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Snort</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Hugger</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardiness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Leer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Make A Face</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Move</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>Nod</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frown</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gape</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pout</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Salute</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Slouch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimace</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Smile</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grin</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Scowl</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinning</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Squint</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshake</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Stand Up Straight</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat Tip</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Five</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sulk</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stink</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunchback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wince</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Whiff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Incense</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impress</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Wink</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Reek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sweetness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Posture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Snarl</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sniff</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Odour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Chronemics</th>
<th>Paralinguistics</th>
<th>Kinesics</th>
<th>Haptics</th>
<th>Aromatics</th>
<th>Total Expressive Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4555</td>
<td>13105</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>8096</td>
<td>17720</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>46220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.2 Structural Analysis

#### C.2.1 Coding of Carnegie, 1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece of Advice</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fundamental Techniques in Handling People (3 Principles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1: Don’t criticize, condemn or complain.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2: Give honest and sincere appreciation.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3: Arouse in the other person an eager want.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Six Ways To Make People Like You (6 Principles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1: Become genuinely interested in other people.</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2: Smile.</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3: Remember that a person’s name is to that person the sweetest and most important sound in any language.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 4: Be a good listener. Encourage others to talk about themselves.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 5: Talk in terms of the other person’s interests.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 6: Make the other person feel important-and do it sincerely.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Win People To Your Way Of Thinking (12 Principles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1: The only way to get the best of an argument is to avoid it.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2: Show respect for the other person’s opinions. Never say, “You’re wrong.”</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3: If you are wrong, admit it quickly and emphatically.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 4: Begin in a friendly way.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 5: Get the other person saying “yes, yes” immediately.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 6: Let the other person do a great deal of the talking.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 7: Let the other person feel that the idea is his or hers.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 8: Try honestly to see things from the other person’s point of view.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 9: Be sympathetic with the other person’s ideas and desires.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 10: Appeal to the nobler motives.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 11: Dramatize your ideas.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 12: Throw down a challenge.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be A Leader: How to Change People Without Giving Offense or Arousing Resentment (9 Principles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1: Begin with praise and honest appreciation.</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2: Call attention to people’s mistakes indirectly.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3: Talk about your own mistakes before criticizing the other person.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 4: Ask questions instead of giving direct orders.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 5: Let the other person save face.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 6: Praise the slightest improvement and praise every improvement.</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 7: Give the other person a fine reputation to live up to.</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 8: Use encouragement. Make the fault seem easy to correct.</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 9: Make the other person happy about doing the thing you suggest.</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2.1.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Carnegie, 1936

Table C.2.1.3 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Carnegie, 1936
### Table C.2.2.1 Coding of Fine, 2005 [391 Pieces of Advice; 36 Categories]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece of Advice</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20 Business Icebreakers</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 50 General Icebreakers</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 15 Starting Statements</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 6 Open Ended Questions</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 6 Questions for Digging Deeper</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 15 Fail-Safe Questions for Every Business Function</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 6 Positive Messages to the Speaker that Express Listening</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 9 Off-Putting Gestures You Should Never Use</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 16 Verbal Cues that Express Conversational Engagement</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 7 Verbal Cues to Redirect Conversation</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 10 Tips for Tip-Top Listening</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 5 Jumpstarters to Prevent Pregnant Pauses</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 5 Questions for Maintaining Acquaintances</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 3 Questions to Avoid with Acquaintances</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 9 Questions for Getting an Interpersonal History Lesson</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 11 Interviewing Questions</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 6 Topics That Are “Off-Limits”</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 6 Behavioral Compliments</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 4 Categories of Questions for Social Situations</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 15 Assertive Conversational Tactics</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 8 Conversational Crime-Fighting Techniques</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 8 Exit Lines</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 5 Lines to Ask for a Business Referral</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 5 Lines to Ask for a Social Referral</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 6 Lines to Exit as a Pair</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 8 Ways to Show Appreciation</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 8 Ways to Issue an Invitation</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 50 Ways to Fuel a Conversation</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 18 Tips for Business Professionals to Improve Small Talk Skills</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 8 Icebreakers for Singles</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 7 Ways to Relate at a Singles Event</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 6 Lines for Date-Scheduling Small Talk</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 7 Lines for First-Date Small Talk</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 8 Ways to Build Rapport</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 5 Conversation Killers</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Top 10 Icebreakers for Holiday Parties</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2.2.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Fine, 2005

Table C.2.2.3 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Fine, 2005
### Table C.2.3.1 Coding of Blyth, 2009 [104 Rules; 15 Categories]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules for...</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greetings</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small Talk</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Listening</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Silence</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selecting Topics</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Changing Topics</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Managing Boredom</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Humor</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lying</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Flirting</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Flattery</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Workplace Talk</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Difficult Conversation</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Retorts</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Creating Conversation Opportunities</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C.2.3.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Blyth, 2009

![Pie chart showing the distribution of advice content types](chart.png)

- **Context**: 0
- **Engagement**: 1
- **Endurance**: 3
- **Memory**: 2
- **Disengagement**: 9
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**C.2.3 Coding of Blyth, 2009**

(Table continued on the next page.)
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Table C.2.3.3 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Blyth, 2009

Table C.2.4.1 Coding of Lowndes, 2003 [92 Techniques; 9 Categories]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece of Advice</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 9 Ways to Make a Dynamite First Impression</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 14 Ways to Master Small Talk, &quot;Big Talk,&quot; And Body Language</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 14 Ways to Walk and Talk Like A VIP or Celebrity</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 6 Ways to Sound Like An Insider In Any Crowd</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 7 Ways to Establish Deep Subliminal Rapport with Anyone</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 9 Ways to Feed Someone’s Ego (And Know When Not To!)</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 11 Ways to Make Your Phone a Powerful Communications Tool</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 15 Ways to Work a Party Like A Politician Works A Room</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 7 Ways to Talk With Tigers and Not Get Eaten Alive</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2.4.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Lowndes, 2003

Table C.2.4.3 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Lowndes, 2003
### Table C.2.5.1 Coding of Martinet, 2006 [132 Pieces of Advice; 23 Categories]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece of Advice</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4 Survival Fantasies</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4 Places to Begin Mingling</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4 Entrance Maneuvers</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3 Rules for Mingling</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 3 Levels of Mingling Openers</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5 Ways to Recover from a Bad Opener</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 26 ABCs of Topics</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 11 Tricks of the Trade</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 4 Tips for Moving On in Mingling</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 5 Laws of Survival in Mingling</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 12 Exit Maneuvers</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 6 Mingling Styles</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 5 Gimmicks for the Confident Mingler</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 3 Elements of Mingling with Body Language</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 4 Ways to Mingle with Props</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 6 Ways to Team Mingle</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 6 Ways to Deal with Faux Pas</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 4 Ways to Navigate a Tough Room</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 4 Quick Fixes for Dire Circumstances</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 4 Ways to Navigate Mingling on Current Events</td>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 3 Ways to Mingle in Public Places</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Tactical Algorithmic Heuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 3 Tips to Mingle for Love</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 3 Tops for Hosting Parties</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>General Tip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2.5.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Martinet, 2006

Table C.2.5.3 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Martinet, 2006
C.2.6 Coding of Subsample

Table C.2.6.1 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Characteristic Content for Subsample
Table C.2.6.2 Distribution of Piece of Advice's Rule-Like Quality for Subsample

- Heuristic
- Algorithm
- Algorithmic Heuristic
- General Tip
- Tactical Heuristic
- General Algorithm
- Tactical Algorithm
- General Algorithmic Heuristic

Congratulations!
You Have Successfully Completed Reading
Michael W. Raphael’s Master's Thesis!
The prize you will now receive is the following partial electronic expression game: