The influence of speaking rate on indicators of conflict situations

Author: Thomas Driedger
Master Thesis
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede
The Netherlands

First supervisor: Dr. Niels Pulles

Second supervisor: Dr. Raymond Loohuis

“Conflict between Men will become impossible only when mankind is reduced to one person or less”

- Hajime Isayama

Table of content

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude towards my supervisors Dr. Niels Pulles and Dr. Raymond Loohuis for I could not have finished this thesis without their immense help and support. Furthermore, I would like to thank Reinier Heemink for the many hours of teamwork and discourse. Additionally, I wish to thank Thomas Mattusch, a friend and master's student at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich, for coding a program to count the words, syllables and letters in each utterance, finalising this project would have been a lot harder without his help. Last but not least I want to thank my family and friends for their continuous support and ideas during the past months of researching and writing this thesis.

Abstract

Interpersonal conflict situations often need to be managed. However, too little is known on the influencing factor speaking rate has on conflict situations. This study aims at furthering the understanding of conflict management by examining the influence of speaking rate on several different aspects important to conflict management; the likeability, willingness to collaborate, oppositional intensity and directness of two interlocutors. The speaking rate is determined by calculating the number of words per minute, syllables per second and letters per second, which represent the speed a person talks with.

The corresponding hypotheses are tested using data gathered from experiments with 84 participants, of which 58 delivered valid results. The experiment was conducted using student participants of the author's university. The data used was around 40 hours of roleplayed negotiation between two parties and amounted to roughly 500 pages of transcripts. To determine the speaking rate, a program was used to calculate the speed every single interlocutor talked with in every single utterance. The levels of oppositional intensity and directness were determined by manually looking at each utterance. Afterwards, a one-way ANOVA was used to test whether different speaking rates influenced the dependent variables.

No statistically significant effect of speaking rate on likeability, willingness to collaborate, oppositional intensity and directness could be found. However, two trends could be distinguished; people in faster conversations tend to like each other more and people in hard conflict situations tend to talk faster. Further research is needed to clarify the connection between speaking rate and conflict situations.

Keywords: Speaking Rate, Conflict Management, Oppositional Intensity, Directness

1. Introduction

Conflict is inherent to life. Whether you look for it in nature, where animals might fight over food, resources or territory, or humans, where children fight over toys. There is no life without conflict, as animals and humans always attempt to better their position, which mostly leads to tension. The same is valid for organizations. There is conflict within as well as between organizations; this has and always will be so. Whether it is about price negotiations or wrongly delivered goods, conflict is present in our everyday life. However, mostly conflict was seen as something negative that needed to be avoided (Bai, Sheng, & Li, 2016; Griffith, Harvey, & Lusch, 2006; Litterer, 1966; Lumineau & Henderson, 2012).

More current research defines conflict as one pre-requisite to growing organizations, as differences of opinion are necessary for innovation and creativity (Chaudhry & Asif, 2015). Therefore, theory suggests that conflict can be both positive and negative. However, the positive aspects of conflict have not been properly examined (Todorova, Bear, & Weingart, 2014). Furthermore, the way that conflict is resolved has a positive or negative influence on the relationship between the discussing parties, which also has an influence on partnership success (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). Keeping in mind that conflict is practically unavoidable and can have very costly consequences, the importance of conflict management research is self-evident. Additionally, it also has very practical implications, as managers must deal with conflict nearly every day, and knowing the most promising way to manage conflict can have a great influence on the manager's success. However, most research on conflict is focused on how different types of conflict (e.g., task, process and relational) affect group processes and outcomes (DeChurch, Mesmer-Magnus, & Doty, 2013).

A new focus in conflict research has emerged in the last years, which includes the behavioral aspects in conflict situations. Weingart, Behfar, Bendersky, Todorova, and Jehn (2015) argue that understanding the expression of conflict can help in gaining new insights about the effects of conflict. They postulate that conflict is expressed in a certain degree of *directness* and *intensity*. The degree of directness and intensity that the other party perceives influences how the conflict is experienced and the way the counterparty reacts. This new stream of conflict research is particularly interesting because conflict research has produced conflicting results (Weingart et al., 2015).

Central in this study is the influence of the speaking rate on conflict. It can be assumed that one influencing factor of conflict expression is the speaking rate. A lack on research focused on the influence of speaking rate on conflict was found. It is interesting to determine another factor impacting conflict situations, as conflict is a concept with many influencing variables. Showing the existence of another influencing factor will help better the understanding of conflict situations and the ways to manage conflict. This results in the following research question; "*What is the effect of speaking rate on conflict?"* The research

goal of this study is to investigate if conflict can be influenced by changing one's speaking rate.

2 Literature Background

2.1 Relationship, Task and Process Conflict are the common types of interpersonal conflict

An emphasis on the status of literature on conflict research should be made. In the beginning of conflict research two widely accepted sub-types of interpersonal conflict were established; *relationship* conflict and *task* conflict (e.g. (Amason & Schweiger, 1997; Cosier & Rose, 1977; Hansen, 2015; Jehn, 1997; Kabanoff, 1991)). Later, a third type of conflict was established: *process* conflict. Relationship conflict is about different interpersonal preferences, e.g. about the political views or something as trivial as how you drink your coffee. Task conflict includes conflict about "the content and outcomes of the task being performed" (De Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012, p. 360). In contrast, process conflict is about the way the task is accomplished, for example the delegation of tasks and responsibilities (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003).

For over more than twenty years (e.g. (Hjerto & Kuvaas, 2017; Jehn, 1997)), scholars tried to determine which relationship and consequences the three conflict types have, both in terms of association between each other as well as the effect on conflict outcomes and/or team performance (for a bigger picture see meta-analysis of De Dreu and Weingart (2003) and De Wit et al. (2012)). The meta-analysis of De Dreu and Weingart (2003) was redone by De Wit et al. (2012), who conducted a meta-analysis with 116 empirical studies of intragroup conflict.

De Dreu and Weingart (2003) found "strong and negative correlations between relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction" (p. 741), which was reinforced by De Wit et al. (2012). However, while De Dreu and Weingart (2003) also found a strong and negative correlation between task conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction, which was surprising as the expected effect was positive, De Wit et al. (2012) did not find a strong negative correlation between those variables, but a more complex picture with several main and moderator effects. De Wit et al. (2012) found that process and relationship conflict mostly have negative effects on intragroup conflict, however task conflict can have a positive effect on intragroup conflict if certain conditions are met. One pre-condition for a positive effect of task conflict is that task conflict and relationship conflict are weakly correlated, another example is when conflict occurs among top management teams (De Wit et al., 2012).

2.2 Speech rate is acknowledged and measured by the recipient of the message

Mehrabian (1968) was one of the first to investigate speech rate in the context of a study aiming to further the understanding of the indicators influencing "a communicator's attitude toward, status relative to, and responsiveness to his addressee" (p. 203). So already 50 years ago, a positive effect of an increased speech rate on positive attitudes between the interlocutors was postulated.

Speech rate is usually measured in words per minute or syllables per second, sometimes letters per second. What is considered a normal speech rate can be found in Weiner 1984 (cited after Shipley and McAfee (2016)): In spontaneous speech, an adult was found to use 220–410 words per minute. Calvert and Silverman in 1983 found that adults use an average of 270 words per minute in spontaneous speech (cited after Shipley and McAfee (2016). When reading, adults use less words per minute, namely between 160 and 180 (Shipley & McAfee, 2016).

However, those figures differ from study to study. Jones and Brinkert (2007) discuss 100 to 150 words per minute spoken by an average adult and up to 600 words maximum per minute, which can be understood when listening. In Camiciottoli (2007) a classification is found that defines a speech rate of 100–185 words per minute as normal, with 100–125 words per minute being moderately slow and 160–185 word per minute moderately fast. However, the author defines a speech rate of 190–239 words per minute as normal for conversations. These numbers range in the same height as Weiner's (220–410 words per minute). There seems to be a difference between speech rate used in spontaneous speech, such as conversations and other situations like talking in front of an audience.

Speech rate is dependent on various factors. These include but are not limited to age, gender, culture and language (Yuan, Liberman, & Cieri, 2006). Yuan et al. (2006) furthermore found a relationship between speech rate and the topic discussed as well as the relationship of two conversation partners. English as same as Chinese speakers were found to speak faster when talking to intimates such as family members and also friends than when talking to strangers (Yuan et al., 2006). The researchers also found that the speech rate of a second language depends on someone's mother tongue. While French speakers who were fluent in English spoke rather fast when speaking English, Japanese used fewer words per minute in English yet they were also fluent in the language (Yuan et al., 2006). da Costa Pinto (1991) found that reading rates of bilinguals were higher in their native than in their second language.

Hints can be found in previous research showing that in a conversation, the interlocutors align their speech rate with time. Additionally, other elements of the conversation are been aligned, such as lexical processing, comprehension and articulation (e.g., repeating expressions, aligning accents) (Pickering & Garrod, 2004).

2.3 Altering the speaking rate during a conversation can influence the conversation

According to Shipley and McAfee (2016), a person's speech rate "can directly affect articulation, intelligibility, voice production, and fluency" (p.136). However, there are vast differences in speech rates among people considered as normal speakers. It can be found that one person with a rapid speech rate experiences communicative impairments while another one with the same speech rate has good control over his speech and presents very intelligibly. Similarly, a slow speaker might have a communicative disorder or just excellent speech (Shipley & McAfee, 2016)

Very little research can be found that examined the relation between speech rate and conflict. Jones and Brinkert (2007) emphasize on the importance of listening in constructive conflict resolution yet most people are worse listeners than they think they are. People do not listen properly for different reasons. They might not have the time to listen or even fake it, meaning acting as if they are listening but are not actually focusing on what the other one is saying. Another reason mentioned by the authors is that people allow their minds to wander. This is possible because we can comprehend a multiple of the words per minute an average person speaks, which gives the listener time to think about other things. As a result, he stops listening. This finding encourages the assumption that conflicts are resolved better when speaking faster than usual, as this will force the conversation partner to stay focused on the discussion rather than drifting off (Jones & Brinkert, 2007).

Camiciottoli (2007) found that lecturers speak slower to their students than people usually speak in conversations. This might be due to their endeavor to be comprehended well by their students. If being understood by our conversation partner is vital when resolving a conflict, it seems clear that talking slower will influence the conflict-solving process positively.

McCorkle and Reese (2015) found that in families, two different conversational styles are used during conflicts: (1) high-*involvement* conversational style, which is characterized by fast speech rate, short pauses and lots of simultaneous speech and (2) high-*considerateness* conversational style, exhibiting slower speech, longer pauses and fewer simultaneous speaking. According to McCorkle and Reese (2015), adolescents were found to be rather highly involved when talking to their parents, especially their mothers, while parents rather use the high-considerateness conversational style. Differences in conversational styles create misunderstandings and conflict. Teenagers talk fast and interrupt their mothers who can interpret this as a lack of respect. When being stopped by their parents, young people might then feel misunderstood and not considered as an equal. These findings suggest that a high rate of speech can lead to misunderstanding and conflict, if it is perceived as inconsiderateness and disrespect.

2.4 Oppositional Directness and Intensity as indicators for conflict severity

As conflict directness and conflict intensity are of core importance to this study, it is necessary to go deeper into understanding the meaning of directness and intensity. According to Weingart et al. (2015) directness refers to "the degree to which the sender explicitly versus implicitly conveys his or her opposition". With explicitly, or directly, expressed conflict the sender clearly states that there is a problem, which position the person has to the conflict, and that the conflict is directly expressed towards the opposing party (Tinsley & Brett, 2001). Additionally, there are two features which, when fulfilled, show potential high directness in conflict. One feature of direct conflict is that the oppositional position is expressed explicitly rather than implicitly; another feature is that no third parties are involved in the conflict (Weingart et al., 2015). One potential way of showing direct conflict is by verbally disagreeing with the other party or shaking one's head to show disagreement non-verbally.

In contrast to a directly expressed conflict is the indirectly expressed conflict. While direct conflict is mostly rather easy to detect, indirectly expressed conflict is much harder to identify, since it can take on a variety of forms. Additionally, the receiver has more room for interpreting the sender's message. Expressing the conflict to a third party is a sign of indirect conflict expression. However, different cultures might experience conflict directness in diverse ways. It is argued that with indirect expressed conflicts, the receiver has much more to notice and infer compared to directly expressed conflict (Weingart et al., 2015).

The second key aspect of this paper is the conflict intensity. According to Weingart et al. (2015), oppositional conflict intensity is the "degree of strength, force, or energy with which opposition is conveyed by the sender during a given conflict event." The intensity of the conflict has a great influence on the recipient and can be used to alter the way the conflict would have been taken. One way the recipient can be manipulated is to change the core of the conflict by arguing harshly over points, which are actually of minor importance (Weingart et al., 2015).

2.5 Like someone? Show it by talking faster!

Research has linked likeability to a higher speech rate. Ketzmerick had found that advertisements in a faster speech rate correlated with a positive attitude towards the advertisement (cited after Weiss & Burkhardt 2010). Additionally, Weiss and Burkhardt (2010) research found a correlation between listeners' ratings of likeability and higher articulation rate.

Another aspect investigated in this research is the concept of likeability of two interlocutors in a conflict. Per Cialdini (cited after Barsky 2017), likeability is one of the six principles of persuasion. People are easier persuaded by someone who they like than by someone who they do not like (Barsky, 2017). In other words, if I want to convince my conversation partner

of my point of view, I should try to establish empathy between us. Attribution theory suggests that people associate negative motivation with people who are different and positive motivation with people who are similar to themselves (Barsky, 2017). Therefore people with similar values, life experiences and ethics are more likely to cooperate with each other than people who are different (Barsky, 2017)

Manson, Bryant, Gervais, and Kline (2013) examined in what way language style matching and convergence in speech rate in an open-ended conversation between two interlocutors prior to an unannounced prisoner dilemma game influence their likeliness of cooperation. In this case, speech rate was expressed in mean syllable duration. Together with other factors, e.g., coordinated laughter, a language style matching score was calculated to determine how similar two conversation partners use language. It was examined whether greater convergence correlated with cooperation. The authors found that speech rate convergence was positively related to the probability of cooperation during the prisoner dilemma game: "Co-participants did tend to cooperate more as a function of how much their speech rates converged" (Manson et al., 2013). The results of this study indicate that probably it is not the speech rate itself that determines how two interlocutors resolve a conflict together but whether it is that they both speak approximately in the same rate. In other words, readiness to collaborate is higher when two people talk in the same speech rate.

3 Building Hypotheses

The data we have makes it possible to test whether hard conflict situations correlate with higher speaking rates. However, it is not possible to check for causality, as the one might lead to another. No prior literature could be obtained which is looking for a correlation between conflict severity and speaking rate. Although speaking rate probably won't lead to higher conflict severity, the other way around is probable. This might be interesting for people who are not as obvious for conflict situations and then have a way of recognizing conflict situations. Additionally, hiding ones speaking rate is rather difficult, although it is of course possible to alter it. So, it might be that by altering ones speaking rate, the conflict severity can be influenced.

H1: *Harder conflicts lead to higher speaking rates.*

As the speaking rate influences the way that each conflicting party perceives his opponent, it is interesting to investigate to what extent it influences the conflict. Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, and Valone (1976) showed that people speaking at a rate of around 195 words per minute (wpm) are more persuasive than people talking at 105 wpm. Smith and Shaffer (1991), however, found that a message that fits into the receiver's attitude is best delivered in a rather slow pace, while a message that conflicts with the receiver's attitude is best delivered at a fast pace. According to Smith and Shaffer (1991), this effect can be seen

because when talking fast, the opposing party does not have enough time to actually think of counter arguments, which does not happen when the opposing party has enough time to come up with counter arguments due to a lower speaking rate. Mapping those results to our research leads to the following hypotheses:

H2: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the likeability of the interlocutors.*

H3: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the willingness to collaborate of the interlocutors.*

Furthermore, I assume a connection between speaking rate and oppositional intensity and directness. I believe that conversations that are faster lead to higher intensity. If one is in a heated argument, the intensity is probably high. In such kind of conversations, people also tend to speak faster than in normal conversations. Additionally, such conflicts are mostly rather direct. Expressions like “I don’t like you” or “You’re an idiot” are both, highly direct and highly intense. Therefore, the following hypotheses will be analyzed:

H4: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the directness is higher.*

H5: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the oppositional intensity is higher.*

4 Methodology

4.1 Practice-based background as the foundation of the experiment

This paper is based on the case described by Pulles and Loohuis (In Press). For a more detailed case-description check the paper of Pulles and Loohuis, in the following a short summary of the case will be provided. The case is build up on a practice-based background, where two leather producing companies are observed over a period of eight months (January – September 2006). The two companies are called "Dutch Leather" and "Yankee Leather" (both fictitious names). Over the course of their 25-year business relationship both partners saw their relationship as strategically important. While Dutch Leather dominantly delivers leather to the furniture industry, Yankee Leather mainly produces leather for the private yet industry. Due to a rise in orders for commercial aircrafts, Yankee Leather aimed at entering this market. However, due to the smaller production capacity at Yankee Leather, Dutch Leather and Yankee Leather formed a new joint business activity by producing leather seat cushions for the commercial aviation industry, and it was decided that Dutch Leather produces those. But since Dutch Leather has no experience in producing leather for the aviation industry, Yankee Leather provided a handbook on how to produce leather for the aviation industry. The process of producing this leather takes about eight weeks, six weeks for the production and 2 weeks for subsequent tests.

So, the partners decided to run a sample production first and the sample failed the tests. Yankee Leather expressed their disappointment and offered help to find suitable measures to increase the leather's quality. The Dutch partner, however, did not want to get help by their US partner and so they tried to do it on their own. However, during the production of the second sample, both companies tried to do business as usual. After the eight weeks, Dutch Leather hesitantly had to report that the sample failed again. The US company expressed their frustration clearly, not only about the failed sample but also because of their partner's unwillingness to work together and even threatened to terminate the relationship if Dutch Leather would not share the procedure. As a reaction, Dutch Leather reconsidered their behavior and offered full disclosure to their US partner. Through extensively working together, they were able to produce a sample that passed all the aviation tests.

This real-life case is the foundation of the experiment conducted by Pulles and Loohuis (In Press). The experiment was conducted using 48 undergraduate (2nd year) students who enrolled in purchasing courses and 36 executive MBA students at the author's university. However, not all gathered data was used, leaving 58 pairs. "Similar to other studies on buyer-supplier interactions we used student participants (e.g., Eckerd, Hill, Boyer, Donohue, & Ward, 2013; Ribbink & Grimm, 2014; Thomas, Thomas, Manrodt, & Rutner, 2013)" (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). It is argued that the use of student samples is "appropriate when researchers are mainly interested in detecting invariant relationships among constructs rather than the interaction of these constructs with characteristics of individuals (e.g., age, experience)" (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). However, if the aim of this study would have been

to analyse the effect experience has on negotiation outcomes, a student sample would be inappropriate as this theory would not apply to the student population. “Yet, the main construct in this study is conflict in negotiation dyads. Similar to studies on, for example, cultural differences (Ribbink & Grimm, 2014), conflict can be observed in both student and professional populations which implies that results are generalizable to a broader audience” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press).

“Upon arrival, the participants were explained that they would partake in an experiment without being given further details. After introducing the case, participants were paired up randomly. Each pair received an envelope with documents. These documents are four questionnaires; two for each participant, one Dutch and one Yankee case description and one action sheet” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). It was explained that the experiment consisted of two negotiation rounds and that “something would go different than planned, in the instructions it would appear that this “something” would be the first batch that did not pass the aviation quality test” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). The first questionnaire was filled out after the first negotiation round and the second questionnaire was filled out after the second negotiation round. The participating students were “instructed to act as the CEOs of Dutch and Yankee” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). The students were told that their task was to “negotiate with each other what measures to take to handle the situation. Participants were instructed to write down these measures on the action sheet. We explicitly instructed the participants that they were free to write down as many/little or as creative/straightforward measures as they deemed suitable to cope with the situation” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press).

The pairs were randomly assigned to either “soft” or “hard” conflict conditions which “all receive the same conflict description in the first round of negotiations. During the second round of negotiation the soft conflict condition received a similar description as in the first round. In the hard conflict condition the Dutch CEO was instructed to be reluctant in discussing actions and to favor to solutions by him/herself. The Yankee CEO was instructed to respond very disappointed and to ask provocative questions” (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press). The first round of negotiations lasted for around twelve minutes and the second round lasted for around eleven minutes on average (Pulles & Loohuis, In Press).

4.2 To quantify the data a content analysis is used

The term *content analysis* reflects a technique for compressing words of texts into fewer categories based on coding rules (Berelson, 1952; Krippendorff, 1980; Weber, 1990). To conduct a content analysis, it is necessary to have content, although the way the content is presented is of minor importance (Mayring & Fenzl, 2014). Per Hodder (1994), it is possible to distinguish five sources of content; (1) written text, (2) oral text, (3) iconic text, (4) audio-visual text and (5) hypertexts. Content analysis is an unobtrusive method (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966). An advantage of content analysis is that it is a very transparent research method (Bryman, 2015), which, due to the coding scheme and the sampling procedure, can be set out to be replicable. Due to this transparency, content analysis is often described as an objective method of analysis (Bryman, 2015).

The preparation phase starts with selecting the units of analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). The unit of analysis could be but are not limited to a word, a sentence, some pages, number of participants in discussion or the time used for discussion and depends on the research question (Polit & Beck, 2004). After selecting the units of analysis, the researcher must become familiar with the data to gain insights from the data (Polit & Beck, 2004). The next phase is the organising phase. In the deductive approach, the first step in this phase is developing a structured analysis matrix (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). This matrix is normally based on existing and relevant theories, models or literature reviews (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Then, the data will be coded per the categories in the created analysis matrix (Polit & Beck, 2004). Therefore, only the aspects from the data that fit into categories in the matrix of analysis will be used (Sandelowski, 1995). The way of coding in this study will be discussed in more detail later (see section coding). The next and last step in the organising phase is testing the hypothesis of comparing the results obtained to prior studies. The last phase in a deductive content analysis is reporting the analysing process and the results. Therefore, the results describe the meanings of the categories and sub-categories. These (sub)categories must be conceptually and empirically grounded (Dev, 1993). The success of a content analysis depends on the researcher's ability to analyse and simplify the data and form categories that reflect the subject of study in a reliable manner (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

4.2 Rules for coding the data concerning directness and intensity

Conflict outcomes are based on conflict resolution techniques. Examples of these techniques are (from positive to negative): joint problem solving, persuasion, smoothing, domination, harsh words and arbitration (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). It is not directly clear whether arbitration is positive or negative, because arbitration by a third party can be beneficial; however, for the long term, an intern resolution shows greater promise (Mohr & Spekman, 1994).

The categories above are not measurable; therefore, we must operationalize them. This is described below.

4.2.1 Scaling Directness on a 3-point scale; low, medium and high

The directness of expression is divided into three categories: low, medium and high. Per Weingart et al., directness has two dimensions, namely how the conflict is expressed and to whom the conflict is expressed. The more a sender expresses that there is a conflict, the higher the score on this dimension. For the second point of the dimension, it is important to know if the person expresses the conflict directly to the opposing party or to a middleman. As we had controlled circumstances where both parties were in direct conflict, the second dimension can be neglected. Therefore, we only checked how the conflict was expressed.

As already mentioned, the directness is divided into three categories:

High:
Using few words, the conflict is very distinctly expressed. In this case, this is often done in such a manner: “We have a problem, we did not pass the test”. If there are only few words used and such a manner of language is used, a high directness conflict can be seen.

Medium:
Conflict expressions that are not high direct or low direct can be found in this category. Here, people are still rather direct, while trying to play the conflict down. “It appears that we have a problem in our production. Apparently, we did not pass the tests”

Low:
The conflicting parties do not want to express the conflict directly and try to talk their way around, mostly by using more words. An example of a sentence ranging on the lower scale would be “I have not so good news, the results are not as good as we hoped for”.

4.2.2 Oppositional Intensity measured in low, medium and high

The other mean category in this research is the intensity of the conflict expression. Per Weingart et al., oppositional intensity has two dimensions, namely how involved parties entrench themselves in a position and to what extent actions are subverted by counterparties. Additionally, the oppositional intensity is divided into three categories.

High:
The oppositional intensity is high when the proposal of the counterpart is undermined and/or when it will be held on its own proposal, without there is any space to negotiation.

Medium:
The oppositional intensity is middle when the proposal of the counterpart is called into question and/or when it will be held on its own proposal, with there is some space for negotiation.

Low:
The oppositional intensity is low when the proposal of the counterpart is accepted without any negotiation and/or when own proposals can be easily negotiated.

4.3 Practical example of coding

In the following, some examples of the actual data will be shown and the coding will be explained. The first and second conversation of one couple is used to demonstrate the coding as well as speech rate calculation. It can be found in appendix 3 & 4. There, the individual directness and intensity scores are seen as well as the paragraph where the WPM were calculated with. The example resembles conversation B1 and B2 which was in the hard conflict group. The first conversation is 13 minutes long and contains 740 words, 1.066 syllables and 3.174 letters. The mean words per minute, syllables per second and letters per second are 135.44, 3.19 and 9.27 respectively. The second conversation is 10 minutes long and contains 978 words, 1.314 syllables and 4.030 letters. The mean words per minute, syllables per second and letters per second are 131.26, 2.89 and 8.8 respectively.

The first conversation is held in a rather direct way with a mean score for directness at 2.54 and is moderately intense with a mean score of 2.27. Compared to the second conversation, the directness and intensity scores are a bit higher, as the second conversation had an average score of 1.90 for directness and 2.25 for intensity.

To further clarify the way we coded the data regarding directness and intensity, three example exhibits of conversation B1 and three examples of conversation B2 will be provided and explained.

Example 1:
Dutch Leather: Yeah. Ehm. So we have to make sure the next sample will pass everything. Because this takes a lot of time and costs a lot of money. Ehm. Let's see. We used your handbook. We invested money. But what do you think might be a good idea to make sure that next time we pass the test? Because your company knows everything about the aviation industry.
This exhibit scored high on directness and high on intensity. It consists of 66 words, 90 syllables and 269 letters. The length of the utterance is 33 seconds, therefore having a speech rate of 120 WPM, 2.72 syllables per second and 8.15 letters per second. The directness of this exhibit is high, because Dutch says directly what he needs to say, without using unnecessary words. This exhibit is also high intense, because Dutch leather clearly explain his selves and what his position is. This gives Yankee leather no opportunity for negotiation.

Example 2:
Yankee Leather: What about involving the avion industry itself? So maybe contact them and ask them for their help so we have integration of their opinion. I mean, they are in this business, they know how this... [00:03:01] - [00:03:03] [inaudible] is necessary for the product. And yes integrate them as well. So buyer integration.
Example 2 shows an utterance with low levels of directness and intensity. This is low, because Yankee express his position in a question. By doing this, Yankee shows he is not sure about his position. So, he is not direct and not intense. It entails 53 words, 78 syllables and

230 letters, being said in 25 seconds. This leads to a speaking rate of 127 words per minute, 3.12 syllables per second and 9.2 letters per second.

Example 3:
Dutch Leather: Yeah. I think maybe we can bring someone from your company to our company to see the whole production process of the sample. Somebody who knows everything about it.
This exhibit scored medium on directness and low on intensity, because the proposal of Dutch Leather is direct and intense, but the part "I think maybe" makes it less direct and intense. It consists of 29 words, 45 syllables and 133 letters being uttered in 11 seconds. This leads to a speaking rate of 158.18 words per minute, 4.09 syllables per second and 12.09 letters per second.

Example 4:
Yankee Leather: Alright. So the second batch has failed as well. And we have to come to a better agreement this time, otherwise this might be even more, bigger waste of money. Ehm. The U.S. airlines are still waiting for the samples and they announced to order larger batches this time. So we have some pressure, we really need to solve this problem. And I really don't understand, how, after this huge investment, we still can't make the sample work. What went wrong?
Example 4 scores high on both scales, directness and intensity, because he makes his position very clear and he put the initiative for a proposal by Dutch Leather. During the course of 38 seconds, Yankee Leather uses 81 words, 108 syllables and 354 letters, leading to a speaking rate of 131.35 words per minute, 2.91 syllables per second and 9.57 letters per second.

Example 5
Dutch Leather: And then have another meeting so that we can compare everything. See if we have the same results, and if we have different reasons..
Example 5 displays a highly direct and low intense utterance, because Dutch Leather makes his opinion directly clear, but he gives much opportunity for negotiation, so he is low intense. It lasts 16 seconds and entails 24 words, 34 syllables and 105 letters. The speaking rate is moderately slow at 90 words per minute, 2.125 syllables per second and 6.56 letters per second.

Example 6:
Dutch Leather: Yeah we already that, so that's not working anymore. So I'd rather don't have that. Ehm. It might, like to, I don't want to start from scratch because you already made such a huge investment. But like, ehm, for the requirements maybe do something with that, like.. It is important that you pass all the tests and I still don't understand how we still haven't passed a single test.
Example 6 shows a situation with medium directness and high intensity. In this example, Dutch Leather is medium direct, because he said not directly what he needs to say. This part

is high intense, because he emphasizes that it is important to pass all the tests. The utterance consists of 69 words, 90 syllables and 293 letters being said in 44 seconds. This leads to a speaking rate of 94 words per minute, 2.05 syllables per second and 6.66 letters per second.

4.4 The process of transcribing and assessing reliability

It all started with transcribing the interviews we received from the docents. As R. Heemink is a native-Dutch speaker and T. Driedger is more fluent in English, the conversations were split. To ensure that we transcribed in a similar manner, we started off by each transcribing two interviews and then comparing the resulting transcripts. Both conversations were in English. After we discussed some minor issues, we rechecked it by transcribing another two conversations, one held in Dutch and one in English. Afterwards, we compared our results again and were sufficiently satisfied with the overlap.

As time was an essential aspect of the analysis, we wanted to include it in the transcripts. We chose the online tool *transcribe.wriley.com*, as this program had the feature of including the time stamp with a simple click.

While the conversations have been transcribed we chose Excel as the program that was suited best for coding the transcripts. Other programs such as SPSS had shortcomings, which were made obsolete using Excel.

To increase the inter-rater reliability, we had a similar approach to the coding as we had to the transcription process. Before we coded the first transcript, we discussed which triggers in sentences lead to which level of directness and intensity. After that, we each coded four transcripts—two in English and two in Dutch. With the first try, we did not reach satisfying overlap of the results, so we went through each of the coded transcripts and discussed every occurring discrepancy. Thereafter, another four interviews were coded and compared. In this case, we reached an overlap of more than 90% in each coding, which was satisfyingly identical.

To establish intra-rater reliability, we coded the first transcripts again after we completed coding everything else to check if we would have done it the same, which we did.

During this process, some of the 84 conversations were discharged, leaving 62 valid conversations. Some of the conversations were left out because they were too short with a duration of less than 2 minutes. One conversation was left out because a third party joined the conversation and might have influenced the results. Another was discharged because no audio file could be found. In some conversations, the audio started mid-negotiation.

5 Data Analysis

To measure speech rate, three different measurement scales have been used; words per minute, syllables per second, and letters per second. To fully use the gathered data, a program was developed to count all the words, syllables and letters in every conversation. Hereby, the most difficult dimension to measure was syllables, as the rules to what classifies as a syllable is more complex than those for words or letters. The developed program was scanning the document and looked for the times, then checked whether it was Dutch Leather or Yankee Leather talking and then counted the syllables, words and letters used in this certain talk segment.

To count the syllables, the program first checked a database, or dictionary, where the number of syllables can be found per word. Additionally, a routine was implemented in case the word was not found in the dictionary, e.g. due to misspelling, and the word was divided into syllables per the number of vowels.

To check if the program works the way it is supposed to work, the syllables in three conversations in English were counted by hand by two different people and then compared to the results of the program. The discrepancy was 1.5%, which is sufficiently accurate. Additionally, the same was done for conversations held in Dutch, the discrepancy here was at 1.8%, what is still sufficiently accurate.

The syllables per second were calculated by taking the number of syllables per speaking part and dividing it by the length of it (in seconds). Afterwards, the mean syllables per second per conversation was calculated for Dutch Leather and Yankee Leather. The same was done for letters per seconds, but instead of using syllables the number of characters without spaces was used. The words per minute (WPM) were calculated by dividing the number of seconds in a minute by the number of seconds in the paragraph and then multiplying the result with the counted words (Shipley & McAfee, 2016). Therefore, for example, if someone says 60 words in a 20 seconds paragraph, the WPM would be (60/20)*60=180. After determining the WPM of each party, the average for this conversation was calculated.

In order to categorize the speaking rate, the mean and standard deviation of all conversations was calculated using SPSS. As there is no definite definition (Camiciottoli, 2007; Jones & Brinkert, 2007; Shipley & McAfee, 2016) on what slow, normal and fast speaking rates are, we used the mean and standard deviation to classify it. The values were categorized with every speaking rate smaller than the mean minus one halve of one standard deviation was considered as slow and every speaking rate bigger than the mean plus one halve of one standard deviation was considered as fast. Everything in between was considered as normal.

To determine the value of the directness and intensity of a conversation, the weighted average value of directness and intensity were calculated. The values for likeability and

willingness to collaborate are derived from a questionnaire filled in by the participants at the end of each conversation (Pulles & Hartman, 2017).

Afterwards, SPSS was used to check the hypotheses using one-way ANOVA and Kruskall-Wallis when necessary (Hypothesis 2-5). To test hypothesis 1 an independent sample t-test was conducted. The following part is therefore structured per the hypotheses. Additionally, Pearson correlations were calculated to investigate any possible correlation between the variables.

Since a difference in speaking rate between native speaking and not-native speaking students is expected, an independent sample t-test was conducted to check for a significant difference in speaking rates of native speaking and not-native speaking students.

6 Results

	Mean			SD			T			P		
	WPM	Syl/sec	Let/sec	WPM	Syl/sec	Let/sec	WPM	Syl/sec	Let/sec	WPM	Syl/sec	Let/sec
Native	171.2	3.86	11.4	27.62	0.65	1.93	11.5	11.3	10.6	0.001	0.001	0.001
Non	117.1	2.64	8.01	22.13	0.49	1.46						

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of the speaking rate in Native speaking and not-native speaking students. Also, the corresponding t- and p-values are shown.

To determine whether a significant difference between native speaking students and not-native speaking students' speaking rate can be found, an independent sample t-test was used. There was a statistically significant difference in speaking rate native speaking and not-native speaking students, with native speaking students speaking faster than not-native speaking students ($t(114) = 11.58$, $p < .001$). The mean difference in WPM was 54.08, in syllables per second 1.22 and in letters per second 3.38. Therefore, we can't look at the data as a whole. So, the results section is divided, the first part is going to be about not-native speaking students and the second about the native speaking students.

6.1 Results from not-native speaking students

H1: *Harder conflicts lead to higher speaking rates.*
To determine whether a significant difference between hard and soft conflict conditions regarding speaking rate can be found, an independent sample t-test was used. Homogeneity of variances could not be assumed as Levene's test for equality of variances was too low ($p < 0.05$). There was no statistically significant difference in speaking rate between hard and soft conflict situation ($t(26) = 1{,}76$, $p = .09$). The mean difference in WPM was 19.86, in syllables per second 0.33 and in letters per second 0.95.

H2: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the likeability of the interlocutors.*
H3: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the willingness to collaborate of the interlocutors.*
H4: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the directness is higher.*
H5: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the oppositional intensity is higher.*

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of speaking rate on likeability in slow, medium and high speaking rate conditions. The Levene's test of

homogeneity of variances did not deliver any significant results, therefore a one-way ANOVA could be conducted.

Likeability scores increased from slow speaking rate conditions (M = 3.68, SD = 0.44) to moderate speaking rate conditions (M = 4.04, SD = 0.76) to moderate speaking rate conditions (M = 4.28, SD = 0.89). There was no significant effect of speaking rate on likeability at the p<.05 level for the three conditions (F (2, 55) = 2.675, p = .078) when using WPM as a measurement of speaking rate. When using syllables per second as a measurement, no significant effect can be found (F (2, 55) = 1.27, p = .289). Using letters per second as a measurement of speech rate did not show a significant effect (F (2,55) = 1.41, p = .252).

Willingness to collaborate was highest in fast speaking rate conditions (M = 3.97, SD = 0.56) and decreased over moderate speaking rate conditions (M = 3.95, SD = 0.81) to slow speaking rate conditions (M = 3.68, SD = 0.93). No statistically significant effect could be found (F (2, 55) = 0.447, p = .496).

The rest of the tests delivered comparable results for the other variables. The results are shown in appendix 1.

6.2 Results from native speaking students

H1: *Harder conflicts lead to higher speaking rates.*
To determine whether a significant difference between hard and soft conflict conditions regarding speaking rate can be found, an independent sample t-test was used. Speaking rate for each level of conflict severity was normally distributed, as assessed by Saphiro-Wilk's test (p>.05) and homogeneity of variances could not be assumed as Levene's test for equality of variances was too low (p < 0.05). There was no statistically significant difference in speaking rate between hard and soft conflict situation (t (28) = 1.68, p = .103). The mean difference in WPM was 17.26, in syllables per second 0.36 and in letters per second 1.16.

H2: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the likeability of the interlocutors.*
H3: *The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the willingness to collaborate of the interlocutors.*
H4: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the directness is higher.*
H5: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the oppositional intensity is higher.*

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of speaking rate on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity in slow, medium and fast speaking rate conditions.

There was no significant effect of speaking rate on likeability at the p<.05 level for the three conditions (F (2, 59) = 0,149, p = .862) when using WPM as a measurement of speaking rate.

When using syllables per second as a measurement, no significant effect can be found (F (2, 59) = 0,661, p = .520). Using letters per second as a measurement of speech rate did not show a significant effect either (F (2,59) = 1.065, p = .351).

The one-way between subjects ANOVA for directness did not show any significant results regardless of the way speaking rate is measured (WPM: F (2, 59) = 0.305, p = .738; Syll/sec: F (2, 59) = 0.028, p = .972; Let/sec: F (2, 59) = 0.028, p = .972). No statistically significant effect of speaking rate on intensity could be found either (WPM: F (2, 59) = 0.956, p = .390; Syl/Sec: F (2, 59) = 0.858, p = .429; Let/sec: F (2, 59) = .669, p = .516).

The test of homogeneity of variances was not significant for likeability (p = .523), directness (p = .405) or intensity (p = .491). However, willingness to collaborate showed a significance at the test of homogeneity of variances, therefore homogeneity of variances can not be assumed. A Kruskal-Wallis was conducted to check whether there is a significant difference between speaking rate and willingness to collaborate. The results, however, did not show any significance.

The remaining results are shown in appendix 2.

7 Discussion

In this chapter, the previously presented results will be discussed. The discussion will be structured per the hypotheses.

H1: Harder conflicts lead to higher speaking rates.

A statistically significant difference in speaking rate between hard and soft conflict situations was not found, but a trend supporting the hypothesis could be observed. In hard conflict situations, interlocutors tend to talk faster than in soft conflict situations. The mean speaking rate in hard conflict situations for not-native speaking students was 123.85 WPM (SD = 18.94) and in soft conflict situations 103.95 WPM (SD = 25.32). The mean speaking rate in hard conflict situations for native speaking students was 176.42 WPM (SD = 20.94) and in soft conflict situations 159.16 WPM (SD = 33.75). The mean difference of roughly 20 WPM in both groups indicates that there might be a trend visible since the differences are of comparable height.

Interestingly, also no significant difference in speech rate between the first and the second conversation in general was found. This would have been expected, as speech rate in the second conversation for the hard-conflict group was expected to go up while the one of the interlocutors of the soft conflict group was expected to remain the same, which would have resulted in a general increase in average words per minute from the first to the second round of negotiations. Yet average speech rate was found to be one word per minute lower during the second conversation. A possible explanation might be that although interlocutors

talked faster when encountering a harder conflict, generally participants were more relaxed and comfortable with their conversation partner when negotiating with them for the second time.

Generally, when applying Camiciottoli (2007) classification of speech rate, it can be said that not-native speaking students talked moderately slow and native speaking students moderately fast. This is not surprising, considering that native speaking students could talk to their partners in their mother tongue while not-native speaking students had to talk in English. The difficulties faced by not-native speaking students when talking in a foreign language might have negatively influenced their speaking rate. With Yuan et al. (2006) finding that people talk faster when knowing their interlocutor better it can also be concluded that native speaking students when talking amongst themselves had a higher feeling of belonging and intimacy than students from different origins. Native speaking students might therefore have chosen a faster speech rate when talking to each other than not-native speaking students.

Similarly, the literature review results had been controversial regarding the question whether slow speaking rates or higher speaking rates are linked with conflicts as well as a better perspective of solving the conflict the results of this study are not very distinct. On the one hand, faster speech rates were found in the hard-conflict group, and these results were persistent before *and* after the manipulation. Additionally, other factors such as origin or mother tongue, respectively, might have had a major influence on the speech rate of interlocutors.

In general, however, hypothesis 1 was not supported by the results.

H2: The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the likeability of the interlocutors.

The results revealed a difference in the mean likeability between the three groups. The means of likeability in the group of fast speakers differs noticeable from those speaking comparably slow, however there is not enough statistical evidence to support the hypothesis. However, these findings show that with an increased speech rate, the likeability also rises, what is in line with Ketzmerick (2007) as well as Weiss and Burkhardt (2010).

Hence, this hypothesis is not statistically supported by the results and delivers only anecdotal evidence.

H3: The average speed of the conversation has a positive influence on the willingness to collaborate of the interlocutors.

This hypothesis assumes that interlocutors are more willing to collaborate in the future when the speech rate in their conversation is high. Here, no statistically significant effect of speaking rate on the willingness to collaborate could be found. Additionally, no significant

correlation was found between speaking rate or willingness to work together. Therefore, it can be said that interlocutors do not determine whether they want to work together in the future based on the speaking rate. So other aspects are of importance when determining whether two parties are willing to work together in the future, such as sharing similar life experiences and ethics (Barsky, 2017). Although McCorkle and Reese (2015) had linked a fast speech rate to little cooperation and perspective to solve conflicts, these results could not be replicated.

In result, hypothesis 3 was not found to be true.

H4: *In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the directness is higher.*

This hypothesis expects that in a conversation with a faster speaking rate, directness between the conversational partners will be higher. However, no statistically significant effect between speaking rate and directness was found. It can therefore be said that interlocutors do not tend to use more or less words when talking more or less directly. This is unexpected, as it was assumed that if participants wanted to make their positions very clear, they explained themselves well, argued and expressed directly their agreement or disagreement with their negotiation partner. No trend whatsoever could be seen.

So, hypothesis 4 was not supported by the results.

H5*: In conversations with a fast speaking rate, the oppositional intensity is higher.*

This hypothesis assumes that oppositional intensity in a conversation is higher when interlocutors talk faster. Yet, no significant effect was found between the intensity of the conflict and words per minute spoken by the two interlocutors. Additionally, no trend could be seen.

Therefore, hypothesis 5 was not found to be true.

8 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to find out whether there is a correlation between speech rate and the intensity of a conflict. An experiment was conducted in which native speaking and not-native speaking students had two conversations in pairs in which they were instructed to discuss a fictive business situation. During the second round of negotiations, some groups were randomly assigned to use certain communication methods that would create harder conflicts than in the other group.

The results showed that speech rate was significantly higher in the group of native speaking students than in the group of not-native speaking students. This was expected, as native speaking students were able to talk in their mother tongue while most international students had to talk in their second language. Although expected, this circumstance complicated the study since the parties had to be viewed at separately. The decreased number of participants might have distorted the statistical analysis, although it is to believe that if there was any significant effect, we would have found it.

Not a single significant effect of faster speaking rates compared to slow speaking rates on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity has been found. Additionally, no statistical significant effect could be found when looking for a difference in speaking rate in soft and hard conflict situations.

However, trends in the data could be detected, although they are not statistically significant. The likeability increased as speaking rate increased and the speaking rate increased in hard conflict situations compared to soft conflict situations. Concerning these trends, a comparable percental increase could be observed, in both groups and independent of the way speaking rate is measured. So, managers can be advised to watch out for the speaking rate of the other party, however they should not put too much weight on it.

Therefore, it cannot be generalized that when two interlocutors on average talk faster tend to like each other more than when talking slowly together. Although this hypothesis is not statistically supported by the results, a trend is visible and therefore it should not be completely discarded.

I assume that the mostly missing effect of the manipulation of the experiment conditions is owing to other factors influencing participants' speech rate, likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and oppositional intensity. The different results found for native speaking and not-native speaking students should be due to the factor of language. While one group spoke in their native language, the other group used their second language English in the negotiations. Another factor might be the role instructions given to the two interlocutors "Dutch" and "Yankee", which influenced how they communicated with each other. Since no correlation was found between speech rate and intensity, it is not surprising

that speech rate is not related to willingness to cooperate and oppositional directness either.

The named factors have probably distorted the results. It is therefore not possible to state that there is a relationship between speech rate and conflict. However, it is not proven that no correlation exists.

9 Limitation and future research

The results of the study have some limitations worthy of noting. One limitation is that our sample consists of students as respondents. However, it is justifiable that students are used as subjects despite their lack of experience compared to professionals in business negotiations. Nevertheless, it would be advised to use samples consisting of people with a business background in future studies aiming at extending this study.

Another limitation concerns the difference in used language. As stated earlier, the difference in speaking rate was significantly different between Dutch and international students. The explanations are stated above, but for future research it would be advised to let Dutch students also talk in English. This way, all respondents use the same language which makes the comparison much easier, not only because then almost everybody talks in their second language but also because then concerns regarding e.g. differences in word length of English and Dutch language become obsolete.

When determining the level of intensity and directness of all utterances, only the text was used, so no clues concerning e.g. intonation or posture of the discussing couple was included. This is a problem which is not easily solvable, as respondents might be reluctant to be filmed and it is questionable how the additional data should be operationalized.

Further research must be conducted to clarify how the conflict intensity and speech rate of two interlocutors correlate. This could be done by conducting another experiment were the speaking rate is explicitly altered. A possible experimental design could be to form four groups with specific instructions.

Group 1: Person A gets the instruction to talk fast while person B is instructed to talk slowly.
Group 2: Person A and B get the instructions to talk fast.
Group 3: Person A and B get the instruction to talk slowly.
Group 4: Control group, no instructed alternation of speaking rate.

Then, it should be possible to determine whether speaking rate had an influence on the aforementioned factors. Such an experiment would, however, require a lot of work, as the transcription process alone took us several months.

Additionally, looking at the difference in speaking rate between two interlocutors might be interesting, as some theory suggests that people tend to imitate each other concerning e.g. lexical use, gestures and postures.

10 Bibliography

Amason, A. C., & Schweiger, D. M. (1997). The Effects of Conflict on Strategic Decision Making Effectiveness and Organizational. *Using conflict in organizations, 101*.

Bai, X., Sheng, S., & Li, J. J. (2016). Contract governance and buyer–supplier conflict: The moderating role of institutions. *Journal of Operations Management, 41*, 12-24.

Barsky, A. (2017). *Conflict Resolution for the Helping Professions: Negotiation, Mediation, Advocacy, Facilitation, and Restorative Justice*: Oxford University Press.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communications research.

Bryman, A. (2015). *Social research methods*: Oxford university press.

Camiciottoli, B. C. (2007). *The language of business studies lectures: a corpus-assisted analysis* (Vol. 157): John Benjamins Publishing.

Chaudhry, A. M., & Asif, R. (2015). Organizational Conflict and Conflict Management: a synthesis of literature.

Cosier, R. A., & Rose, G. L. (1977). Cognitive conflict and goal conflict effects on task performance. *Organizational behavior and human performance, 19*(2), 378-391.

da Costa Pinto, A. n. (1991). Reading rates and digit span in bilinguals: The superiority of mother tongue. *International Journal of Psychology, 26*(4), 471-483.

De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis: American Psychological Association.

De Wit, F. R., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: a meta-analysis: American Psychological Association.

DeChurch, L. A., Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Doty, D. (2013). Moving beyond relationship and task conflict: Toward a process-state perspective: American Psychological Association.

Eckerd, S., Hill, J., Boyer, K. K., Donohue, K., & Ward, P. T. (2013). The relative impact of attribute, severity, and timing of psychological contract breach on behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. *Journal of Operations Management, 31*(7–8), 567-578. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2013.06.003

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107-115. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Griffith, D. A., Harvey, M. G., & Lusch, R. F. (2006). Social exchange in supply chain relationships: The resulting benefits of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Operations Management, 24*(2), 85-98.

Hansen, R. (2015). *The relationship between task conflict, task performance and team member satisfaction: the mediating role of relationship conflict.*

Hjerto, K., & Kuvaas, B. (2017). Burning hearts in conflict: new perspectives on the intragroup conflict and team effectiveness relationship. *International journal of conflict management, 28*(1).

Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. *Sage biographical research, 1*.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687

Jehn, K. A. (1997). Affective and cognitive conflict in work groups: Increasing performance through value-based intragroup conflict. *Using conflict in organizations, 87100*.

Jehn, K. A., & Bendersky, C. (2003). Intragroup conflict in organizations: A contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship. *Research in organizational behavior, 25*, 187-242.

Jones, T. S., & Brinkert, R. (2007). *Conflict coaching: Conflict management strategies and skills for the individual*: Sage Publications.

Kabanoff, B. (1991). Equity, equality, power, and conflict. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(2), 416-441.

Ketzmerick, B. (2007). Zur auditiven und apparativen Charakterisierung von Stimmen.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis. Beverly Hills. *California: Sage Publications, 7*, l-84.

Litterer, J. A. (1966). Conflict in organization: A re-examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 9*(3), 178-186.
Lumineau, F., & Henderson, J. E. (2012). The influence of relational experience and contractual governance on the negotiation strategy in buyer–supplier disputes. *Journal of Operations Management, 30*(5), 382-395.
Manson, J. H., Bryant, G. A., Gervais, M. M., & Kline, M. A. (2013). Convergence of speech rate in conversation predicts cooperation. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 34*(6), 419-426.
Mayring, P., & Fenzl, T. (2014). Qualitative inhaltsanalyse *Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung* (pp. 543-556): Springer.
McCorkle, S., & Reese, M. (2015). *Personal conflict management: Theory and practice*: Routledge.
Mehrabian, A. (1968). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavior Research Methods, 1*(6), 203-207.
Miller, N., Maruyama, G., Beaber, R. J., & Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 34*(4), 615.
Mohr, J., & Spekman, R. (1994). Characteristics of partnership success: partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. *Strategic management journal, 15*(2), 135-152.
Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and brain sciences, 27*(02), 169-190.
Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2004). *Nursing research: Principles and methods*: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
Pulles, N. J., & Hartman, P. (2017). Likeability and its effect on outcomes of interpersonal interaction. *Industrial Marketing Management*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.06.008
Pulles, N. J., & Loohuis, R. P. A. (In Press).
Ribbink, D., & Grimm, C. M. (2014). The impact of cultural differences on buyer–supplier negotiations: An experimental study. *Journal of Operations Management, 32*(3), 114-126. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2014.01.004
Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in nursing & health, 18*(2), 179-183.
Shipley, K. G., & McAfee, J. G. (2016). *Assessment in speech-language pathology: A resource manual*: Nelson Education.
Smith, S. M., & Shaffer, D. R. (1991). Celerity and Cajolery: Rapid Speech May Promote or Inhibit Persuasion through its Impact on Message Elaboration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(6), 663-669. doi:doi:10.1177/0146167291176009
Thomas, S. P., Thomas, R. W., Manrodt, K. B., & Rutner, S. M. (2013). An Experimental Test of Negotiation Strategy Effects on Knowledge Sharing Intentions in Buyer–Supplier Relationships. *Journal of Supply Chain Management, 49*(2), 96-113. doi:10.1111/jscm.12004
Tinsley, C. H., & Brett, J. M. (2001). Managing workplace conflict in the United States and Hong Kong. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 85*(2), 360-381.
Todorova, G., Bear, J. B., & Weingart, L. R. (2014). Can conflict be energizing? A study of task conflict, positive emotions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(3), 451.
Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences* (Vol. 111): Rand McNally Chicago.
Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*: Sage.
Weingart, L. R., Behfar, K. J., Bendersky, C., Todorova, G., & Jehn, K. A. (2015). The directness and oppositional intensity of conflict expression. *Academy of Management Review, 40*(2), 235-262.
Weiss, B., & Burkhardt, F. (2010). *Voice attributes affecting likability perception.* Paper presented at the INTERSPEECH.
Yuan, J., Liberman, M., & Cieri, C. (2006). *Towards an integrated understanding of speaking rate in conversation.* Paper presented at the INTERSPEECH.

11 Appendix

11.1 Appendix 1: Statistical results for not native-speaking students

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
directness	56	1,170000000000	2,875000000000	2,35033149046	,260851373096	-1,801	,319	6,922	,628
intensity	56	1,500000000000	2,65000000000	2,03434302795	,25380257845	-,009	,319	-,611	,628
LettersSec	56	4,86	11,08	8,0116	1,46417	-,253	,319	-,456	,628
LettersSec_Category	56	1,0	3,0	2,018	,8200	-,034	,319	-1,511	,628
likeability	56	2,0	5,0	4,009	,7537	-,593	,319	,412	,628
SyllSec	56	1,50	3,46	2,6441	,49016	-,362	,319	-,529	,628
SyllSec_Category	56	1,0	3,0	2,036	,8304	-,068	,319	-1,550	,628
willingsness	56	2,00000000000	5,00000000000	3,8869047612	,78951918829	-,668	,319	,441	,628
WPM	56	71,06	161,65	117,1177	22,13465	-,080	,319	-,409	,628
WPM_Category	56	1,0	3,0	2,000	,7628	,000	,319	-1,254	,628
Valid N (listwise)	56								

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for international students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	16	3,688	,4425
	2,0	24	4,042	,7649
	3,0	16	4,281	,8938
	Total	56	4,009	,7537
willingsness	1,0	16	3,68750000	,938625867
	2,0	24	3,95833333	,818343443
	3,0	16	3,97916667	,563964144
	Total	56	3,88690476	,789519188
directness	1,0	16	2,31536241	,193278359
	2,0	24	2,38024673	,336169676
	3,0	16	2,34042773	,189771337
	Total	56	2,35033150	,260851378
intensity	1,0	16	1,95676153	,266370460
	2,0	24	2,02088889	,252326826
	3,0	16	2,13210572	,225184007
	Total	56	2,03434303	,253802578

Table 2: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	2,067	2	53	,137
willingsnes s	1,805	2	53	,175
directness	1,475	2	53	,238
intensity	,765	2	53	,470

Table 3: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with words per minute

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	2,865	2	1,433	2,675	,078
	Within Groups	28,380	53	,535		
	Total	31,246	55			
willingsness	Between Groups	,895	2	,447	,710	,496
	Within Groups	33,389	53	,630		
	Total	34,284	55			
directness	Between Groups	,043	2	,021	,305	,738
	Within Groups	3,700	53	,070		
	Total	3,742	55			
intensity	Between Groups	,254	2	,127	2,043	,140
	Within Groups	3,289	53	,062		
	Total	3,543	55			

Table 4: One-way ANOVA (N=55) of words per minute on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	18	3,778	,4918
	2,0	18	4,139	,8190
	3,0	20	4,100	,8675
	Total	56	4,009	,7537
willingsness	1,0	18	3,68518519	,881711217
	2,0	18	3,83333333	,894792487
	3,0	20	4,11666667	,543703996
	Total	56	3,88690476	,789519188
directness	1,0	18	2,33720045	,192400455
	2,0	18	2,29857196	,350569555
	3,0	20	2,40873302	,218157340
	Total	56	2,35033150	,260851378
intensity	1,0	18	2,00745952	,290573954
	2,0	18	1,96077775	,217568473
	3,0	20	2,12474693	,232708204
	Total	56	2,03434303	,253802578

Table 5: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	1,243	2	53	,297
willingsness	2,394	2	53	,101
directness	1,382	2	53	,260
intensity	1,687	2	53	,195

Table 6: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with syllables per second

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	1,432	2	,716	1,273	,289
	Within Groups	29,814	53	,563		
	Total	31,246	55			
willingsness	Between Groups	1,840	2	,920	1,503	,232
	Within Groups	32,444	53	,612		
	Total	34,284	55			
directness	Between Groups	,120	2	,060	,874	,423
	Within Groups	3,623	53	,068		
	Total	3,742	55			
intensity	Between Groups	,274	2	,137	2,220	,119
	Within Groups	3,269	53	,062		
	Total	3,543	55			

Table 7: One-way ANOVA (N=55) of syllables per second on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	18	3,778	,4918
	2,0	19	4,184	,8201
	3,0	19	4,053	,8643
	Total	56	4,009	,7537
willingsness	1,0	18	3,68518519	,881711217
	2,0	19	3,84210526	,870422212
	3,0	19	4,12280702	,557889833
	Total	56	3,88690476	,789519188
directness	1,0	18	2,33720045	,192400455
	2,0	19	2,31794537	,351002191
	3,0	19	2,39515757	,215281281
	Total	56	2,35033150	,260851378
intensity	1,0	18	2,00745952	,290573954
	2,0	19	1,97903641	,225921349
	3,0	19	2,11511823	,234956085
	Total	56	2,03434303	,253802578

Table 8: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	1,182	2	53	,315
willingsness	1,751	2	53	,184
directness	1,645	2	53	,203
intensity	1,430	2	53	,248

Table 9: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with letters per second

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	1,582	2	,791	1,413	,252
	Within Groups	29,664	53	,560		
	Total	31,246	55			
willingsness	Between Groups	1,828	2	,914	1,492	,234
	Within Groups	32,456	53	,612		
	Total	34,284	55			
directness	Between Groups	,061	2	,031	,441	,646
	Within Groups	3,681	53	,069		
	Total	3,742	55			
intensity	Between Groups	,195	2	,098	1,544	,223
	Within Groups	3,348	53	,063		
	Total	3,543	55			

Table 10: One-way ANOVA (N=55) of letters per second on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

Group Statistics

	HardSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
WPM	H	16	123,8506	18,94464	4,73616
	S	12	103,9592	25,32779	7,31150
SyllSec	H	16	2,7362	,43061	,10765
	S	12	2,4042	,56989	,16451
LettersSec	H	16	8,2238	1,39303	,34826
	S	12	7,2758	1,65307	,47720

Table 11: Means and standard error of the speaking rate of hard and soft conflict situations (the second round).

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
WPM	Equal variances assumed	1,194	,285	2,381	26	,025	19,89146	8,35317	2,72128	37,06164
	Equal variances not assumed			2,283	19,633	,034	19,89146	8,71145	1,69790	38,08501
SyllSec	Equal variances assumed	1,835	,187	1,759	26	,090	,33208	,18878	-,05596	,72013
	Equal variances not assumed			1,689	19,778	,107	,33208	,19660	-,07832	,74249
LettersSec	Equal variances assumed	1,068	,311	1,645	26	,112	,94792	,57608	-,23623	2,13206
	Equal variances not assumed			1,605	21,388	,123	,94792	,59076	-,27929	2,17512

Table 12: Independent sample t-test for speaking rate on hard and soft conflict situations (the second round).

11.2 Appendix 2: Statistical results for native-speaking students

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
directness	60	1,000000000000	3,00000000000	1,98756004749	,526261210243	-,087	,309	-,259	,608
intensity	60	1,00000000000	3,000000000000	1,785163729956	,559770612711	,313	,309	-,456	,608
LettersSec	60	6,99	15,11	11,4008	1,93775	-,286	,309	-,607	,608
LettersSec_Category	60	1,0	3,0	2,050	,8321	-,095	,309	-1,553	,608
likeability	60	2,0	5,0	4,325	,7000	-1,182	,309	2,204	,608
SyllSec	60	2,42	5,08	3,8665	,64961	-,345	,309	-,691	,608
SyllSec_Category	60	1,0	3,0	2,067	,8410	-,129	,309	-1,582	,608
willingsness	60	2,000000000000	5,000000000000	3,922222222223	,995974320544	-,598	,309	-,707	,608
WPM	60	101,02	217,33	171,2040	27,62700	-,456	,309	-,335	,608
WPM_Category	60	1,0	3,0	2,050	,8115	-,093	,309	-1,472	,608
Valid N (listwise)	60								

Table 13: descriptive statistics for the Dutch students

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	18	4,333	,5145
	2,0	21	4,262	,9030
	3,0	21	4,381	,6306
	Total	60	4,325	,7000
willingsness	1,0	18	4,11111111	,800326731
	2,0	21	3,96825397	,918360628
	3,0	21	3,71428571	1,20777902
	Total	60	3,92222222	,995974320
directness	1,0	18	1,99317250	,431558047
	2,0	21	1,92110044	,535862845
	3,0	21	2,04920898	,602407063
	Total	60	1,98756005	,526261502
intensity	1,0	18	1,63715327	,410916844
	2,0	21	1,81903087	,581060660
	3,0	21	1,87816270	,642809496
	Total	60	1,78516373	,559770613

Table 14: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	1,477	2	57	,237
willingsness	3,816	2	57	,028
directness	1,212	2	57	,305
intensity	1,318	2	57	,276

Table 15: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with words per minute

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	,151	2	,075	,149	,862
	Within Groups	28,762	57	,505		
	Total	28,913	59			
willingsness	Between Groups	1,595	2	,797	,798	,455
	Within Groups	56,931	57	,999		
	Total	58,526	59			
directness	Between Groups	,173	2	,087	,305	,738
	Within Groups	16,167	57	,284		
	Total	16,340	59			
intensity	Between Groups	,600	2	,300	,956	,390
	Within Groups	17,887	57	,314		
	Total	18,487	59			

Table 16: One-way ANOVA (N=59) of words per minute on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	19	4,184	,6914
	2,0	18	4,333	,8044
	3,0	23	4,435	,6271
	Total	60	4,325	,7000
willingsness	1,0	19	4,01754386	,765568329
	2,0	18	4,12962963	,971077758
	3,0	23	3,68115942	1,16114825
	Total	60	3,92222222	,995974320
directness	1,0	19	1,96475409	,545740787
	2,0	18	1,99074439	,402228373
	3,0	23	2,00390765	,610979961
	Total	60	1,98756005	,526261502
intensity	1,0	19	1,64578538	,499141696
	2,0	18	1,85337798	,511068891
	3,0	23	1,84691729	,640378418
	Total	60	1,78516373	,559770613

Table 17: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	,734	2	57	,484
willingsness	3,701	2	57	,031
directness	1,797	2	57	,175
intensity	1,426	2	57	,249

Table 18: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with syllables per second.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	,655	2	,328	,661	,520
	Within Groups	28,257	57	,496		
	Total	28,912	59			
willingsness	Between Groups	2,284	2	1,142	1,157	,322
	Within Groups	56,242	57	,987		
	Total	58,526	59			
directness	Between Groups	,016	2	,008	,028	,972
	Within Groups	16,324	57	,286		
	Total	16,340	59			
intensity	Between Groups	,541	2	,270	,858	,429
	Within Groups	17,947	57	,315		
	Total	18,487	59			

Table 19: One-way ANOVA (N=59) of syllables per second on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
likeability	1,0	19	4,132	,6634
	2,0	19	4,421	,8039
	3,0	22	4,409	,6294
	Total	60	4,325	,7000
willingsness	1,0	19	4,07017544	,750135357
	2,0	19	4,07017544	,959545593
	3,0	22	3,66666667	1,18634203
	Total	60	3,92222222	,995974320
directness	1,0	19	1,96475409	,545740787
	2,0	19	1,99123153	,390901482
	3,0	22	2,00408527	,625357320
	Total	60	1,98756005	,526261502
intensity	1,0	19	1,66971041	,495855044
	2,0	19	1,79988920	,523775541
	3,0	22	1,87215596	,643633375
	Total	60	1,78516373	,559770613

Table 20: N, Mean and Standard Deviation for the four dependent variables

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
likeability	1,313	2	57	,277
willingsness	4,485	2	57	,016
directness	2,420	2	57	,098
intensity	1,146	2	57	,325

Table 21: Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity with syllables per second.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
likeability	Between Groups	1,042	2	,521	1,065	,351
	Within Groups	27,871	57	,489		
	Total	28,913	59			
willingsness	Between Groups	2,269	2	1,134	1,149	,324
	Within Groups	56,257	57	,987		
	Total	58,526	59			
directness	Between Groups	,016	2	,008	,028	,972
	Within Groups	16,324	57	,286		
	Total	16,340	59			
intensity	Between Groups	,424	2	,212	,669	,516
	Within Groups	18,063	57	,317		
	Total	18,487	59			

Table 22: One-way ANOVA (N=59) of letters per second on likeability, willingness to collaborate, directness and intensity.

Ranks

	WPM_Category	N	Mean Rank
willingsness	1,0	18	32,86
	2,0	21	30,81
	3,0	21	28,17
	Total	60	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	willingsness
Chi-Square	,748
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,688

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: WPM_Category

Table 23: Kruskal Wallis Test for words per minute on willingness

Ranks

	SyllSec_Category	N	Mean Rank
willingsness	1,0	19	30,84
	2,0	18	34,44
	3,0	23	27,13
	Total	60	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	willingsness
Chi-Square	1,875
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,392

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: SyllSec_Category

Table 24: Kruskal Wallis Test for syllables per second on willingness

Ranks

	LettersSec_Category	N	Mean Rank
willingsness	1,0	19	32,00
	2,0	19	33,00
	3,0	22	27,05
	Total	60	

Test Statistics[a,b]

	willingsness
Chi-Square	1,463
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	,481

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: LettersSec_Category

Table 25: Kruskal Wallis Test for letters per second on willingness

Group Statistics

	HardSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
WPM	H	22	176,4200	20,93542	4,46345
	S	8	159,1600	33,75541	11,93434
SyllSec	H	22	3,9477	,52643	,11224
	S	8	3,5813	,85881	,30364
LettersSec	H	22	11,7027	1,51521	,32304
	S	8	10,5338	2,42914	,85883

Table 26: Means and standard error of the speaking rate of hard and soft conflict situations (the second round).

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
WPM	Equal variances assumed	5,252	,030	1,688	28	,103	17,26000	10,22677	-3,68858	38,20858
	Equal variances not assumed			1,355	9,036	,208	17,26000	12,74170	-11,54608	46,06608
SyllSec	Equal variances assumed	7,935	,009	1,417	28	,167	,36648	,25857	-,16318	,89614
	Equal variances not assumed			1,132	8,988	,287	,36648	,32371	-,36597	1,09892
LettersSec	Equal variances assumed	8,996	,006	1,584	28	,125	1,16898	,73821	-,34318	2,68114
	Equal variances not assumed			1,274	9,060	,234	1,16898	,91758	-,90462	3,24258

Table 27: Independent sample t-test for speaking rate on hard and soft conflict situations (the second round).

11.3 Appendix 3: Conversation B1

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Total	2	6	14	5	6	14	2	12	8	3	16	6	399	341	573	493	1705	1469
Dutch Leather: Okay, ehm. The first sample did not pass a single test, that the aviation industry demands. Even though we invested a lot of money in it and used your handbook to make sure that it should have passed all the tests, it still failed.		1							1				44		58		182	
[00:00:30]																		
Yankee Leather: Alright, so the investment did not deliver the hoped result you wanted.					1						1			12		19		58
[00:00:39]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: Yeah. Ehm. So we have to make sure the next sample will pass everything. Because this takes a lot of time and costs a lot of money. Ehm. Let's see. We used your handbook. We invested money. But what do you think might be a good idea to make sure that next time we pass the test? Because your company knows everything about the aviation industry.			1						1				66		90		269	
[00:01:12]																		
Yankee Leather: I think we need to get some measures which we can both ... [inaudible]					1						1			14		17		52
[00:01:21]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: Yeah. I think maybe we can bring someone from your company to our company to see the whole production process of the sample. Somebody who knows everything about it.		1					1						29		45		133	
[00:01:32]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, that would be good. And. So. Maybe not just management person but also someone from production who actually knows all the steps. And ehm, he or she will supervise the process or first observe the process and then see where things go wrong.					1						1			44		195		60

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:01:55]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, okay. All right.			1										4		5		16	
[00:01:58]																		
Yankee Leather: This is not a measurement.														5		7		21
[00:02:00]																		
Dutch Leather: Measure. You can say measure is bring somebody from Yankee.													10		16		48	
[00:02:04]																		
Dutch Leather: But whats measure.													3		4		15	
[00:02:07]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: Like what do you do to make sure it goes right next time.														13		14		44
[00:02:10]																		
Dutch Leather: Okay.													1		2		4	
[00:02:15]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay, I'll write it down.														5		6		18
[00:02:17] - [00:02:47] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: What about involving the avion industry itself? So maybe contact them and ask them for their help so we have integration of their opinion. I mean, they				1						1				53		78		230

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
are in this business, they know how this... [00:03:01] - [00:03:03] [inaudible] is necessary for the product. And yes integrate them as well. So buyer integration.																		
[00:03:12]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah okay. But final buyer.			1					1					5		8		21	
[00:03:15]																		
Yankee Leather: Final buyer integration to production.						1					1			5		12		33
[00:03:18]																		
Dutch Leather: [inaudible] [00:03:23]													2					

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:03:24] - [00:04:30] Silence with some laughter in-between.																		
Dutch Leather: Integrate the final buyer into the production process.		1						1					8		16		46	
[00:04:34]																		
Yankee Leather: That is not a measure, this is a solution.														9		12		32
[00:04:44]																		
Dutch Leather: A solution? Yes it would be a solution.													8		12		30	
[00:05:05]																		
Yankee Leather: Maybe we should also				1						1				18		27		72

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
put a cost limit, a budget. Maybe we involve a certain amount of money.																		
[00:05:15]																		
Dutch Leather: Set a budget for the project.			1					1					6		8		23	
[00:05:17]																		
Yankee Leather: Exactly the same amount that we invested beforehand. 300.000.						1						1		9		15		44
[00:05:23]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah. Was it Dollars? No, Euros.			1					1					6		8		23	
[00:05:23] - [00:05:37] Silence																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: Then maybe a time limit				1						1				5		7		19
[00:05:38]																		
Dutch Leather: And a time limit.		1						1					4		5		13	
[00:05:39]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, another eight weeks.						1						1		4		6		21
[00:05:41] - [00:05:49] Silence																		
Dutch Leather: So you don't make.. So if its a fail you are not going to invest any more money.			1						1			1	18		22		59	
[00:05:56]																		
Yankee Leather: Yes.						1								1		1		3

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:05:58] - [00:06:34] Silence																		
Dutch Leather: Maybe we can, because the first sample took 8 weeks, maybe we can check for mistakes earlier and not after eight weeks? So, continues checking.	1							1					25		33		107	
[00:06:46]																		
Yankee Leather: Yes. But this is with the observation					1						1			7		10		30
[00:06:50]																		
Dutch Leather: Yes this is true. But [inaudible]			1						1				6		9		25	
[00:06:53] - [00:07:11] inaudible																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: We can create it. We have the batch size big enough to create on demand. And you have the knowledge and the network.			1						1				23		29		91	
[00:07:19]																		
Yankee Leather: Alright.						1					1			1		2		7
[00:07:23]																		
Dutch Leather: Okay. ehm.													2		3		7	
[00:07:24] - [00:07:50] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: We can also discuss how much we communicate about this and through which channels. So we should meet at least once a month in person.					1						1			25		33		107

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:08:03]																		
Dutch Leather: Have more meetings and better communication.			1					1					6		12		38	
[00:08:05]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah.						1					1			1		1		4
[00:08:06] - [00:08:44] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: If something goes wrong we say something right away to the other company and inform. And don't just try to fix it and it doesn't work but say something right away so everybody can work on fixing the problem.						1						1		39		53		165

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:08:59] - [00:09:41] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: Maybe also hire someone who knows about waste and pollution.				1							1			10		17		50
[00:09:47]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, we did that. We are economic friendly.			1						1				8		12		34	
[00:09:51]																		
Yankee Leather: okay. Espacially hire or take someone from your department to look at waste and pollution that we produce so we don't poison the environment with chemicals					1						1			26		42		128

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:10:08]																		
Dutch Leather: No, i think thats fine. It said somewhere that we are good with that.								1					14		15		53	
[00:10:20]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay.						1					1			1		2		4
[00:10:23]																		
Dutch Leather: But maybe we can some like integration manager who knows everything from both companies and puts together both project but I don't know how to explain that.	1							1					27		41		128	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:10:33]																		
Yankee Leather: [Laughter]														1		2		8
[00:10:33]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, I don't know how to put it in words.			1				1						10		10		30	
[00:10:41]																		
Yankee Leather: Alright, I don't know. I have no more ideas.						1						1		9		12		32
[00:10:43] - [00:11:30] Orders from NP																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: Anyway, maybe we can assign someone from both companies as project leader. Like, I assign someone who oversees that thing and you also assign someone for the project and they work together and oversee everything together and inform us.		1							1				39		65		193	
[00:11:55]																		
Yankee Leather: But should it only one person or a team?						1						1		9		11		31
[00:11:58]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, like a team, but really one person responsible at both companies.			1						1				12		19		57	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:12:06]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah.						1					1			1		1		4
[00:12:09]																		
Dutch Leather: How do you call them? Project manager?		1						1					7		10		30	
[00:12:12]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, I guess.				1							1			3		3		10
[00:12:13] - [00:13:03] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: I am actually out of ideas.						1					1			6		11		21

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	M	H	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:13:06]																		
Dutch Leather: So am I.			1					1					3		3		5	
[00:13:07]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay, that's decided.						1					1			3		6		16
[00:13:07]																		
Dutch Leather: Do you agree?			1					1					3		4		10	
[00:13:10]																		
Yankee Leather: Yes, totally.						1					1			2		4		10

11.4 Appendix 4: Conversation B2

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Total	8	9	10	3	11	16	3	14	10	3	18	9	433	545	589	725	1785	2245
Yankee Leather: Alright. So the second batch has failed as well. And we have to come to a						1						1		81		108		354

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
better agreement this time, otherwise this might be even more, bigger waste of money. Ehm. The U.S. airlines are still waiting for the samples and they announced to order larger batches this time. So we have some pressure, we really need to solve this problem. And I really don't understand, how, after this huge investment, we still can't make the sample work. What went wrong?																		
[00:00:38]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, we integrated everything together and looked at it	1							1					16		28		81	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
together. Okay, ehm. Yeah, this is difficult.																		
[00:00:55]																		
Yankee Leather: I think this time I will send more representatives of my company in your company and I want them to be part of the project teams to supervise your project teams.						1						1		31		43		130
[00:01:08]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: Yeah we already that, so that's not working anymore. So I'd rather don't have that. Ehm. It might, like to, I don't want to start from scratch because you already made such a huge investment. But like, ehm, for the requirements maybe do something with that, like.. It is important that you pass all the tests and I still don't understand how we still haven't passed a single test.		1							1				69		90		293	
[00:01:52]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, I'm not sure. Did you even follow all the promise					1							1		25		32		102

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
actions that we discusses last time? Since we could not control it, I guess.																		
[00:02:03]																		
Dutch Leather: I think so. I don't know.		1						1					6		6		17	
[00:02:13]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, but I mean you are not sure about this, but you need to be sure about it. How can we make sure that there is vertical communication from your project managers to your factory to you. We need someone who is at the sight and really						1						1		51		69		208

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
controls what is happening.																		
[00:02:33]																		
Dutch Leather: We had that.			1					1					3		3		9	
[00:02:36]																		
Yankee Leather: Then why is it not working?!						1						1		6		7		21
[00:02:36]																		
Dutch Leather: I don't know. We took someone from your company. We even placed him at our		1						1					22		31		91	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
company and it's still not working [laughter].																		
[00:02:47]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay. Maybe I should replace the person I sent with somebody else. Maybe send two or three people so they can actually spread their expertise and talk to each other and solve the problem.				1							1			34		49		151
[00:03:08]																		
Dutch Leather: No, you can replace them but I don't want more people.			1						1				11		13		41	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
[00:03:11]																		
Yankee Leather: Why not?					1						1			2		2		6
[00:03:12]																		
Dutch Leather: Because I don't want it.			1						1				5		6		18	
[00:03:15]																		
Yankee Leather: But that's no reason.						1						1		4		5		16
[00:03:22]																		
Dutch Leather: So okay, okay. We can replace one person,like the person of your company and exchange him for someone else from your company. But		1							1				35		53		148	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
don't add any more. It is not necessary to have two people.																		
[00:03:34]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, but the problem is at hand. How are we going to solve this if we don't cooperate on this? I mean, what is something that you would suggest that would do it now?						1						1		34		41		127
[00:03:51]																		
Dutch Leather: Eh. Do our own research. See if we come up with the same reasons why the sample failed. Maybe that's an idea?	1							1					22		29		83	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
[00:04:01]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeha, but. I mean your own research, okay. But how ... [interrupted]						1					1			12		17		48
[00:04:06]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah then you have two different results and then you can compare them. So you have the results from the second lab and maybe completely different reasons or some kind of overlap why the sample failed again.	1							1					37		53		169	
[00:04:16]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: Okay, so you think that you should do research and that we should do research and then see if we come to the same conclusion.					1						1			25		30		99
[00:04:27] - [00:04:55] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: But we need to limit the time for this, otherwise it would take forever. We need to set a deadline of how long this can take.					1			1						26		32		97
[00:05:03]																		
Dutch Leather: Maybe a week.		1									1		3		4		10	
[00:05:06]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: I think this is too short term. Ehm. Let's say two and a half weeks.						1					1			15		15		50
[00:05:14]																		
Dutch Leather: Two and a half. Yeah, two weeks.		1						1					7		7		23	
[00:05:16]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay, two weeks.						1				1				3		4		10
[00:05:21]																		
Dutch Leather: And then have another meeting so that we can compare everything. See if we have the same results, and if we			1				1						24		34		105	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
have different reasons..																		
[00:05:37]																		
Yankee Leather: Yeah, but if we have different reasons, if they are both reasons why this doesn't work, then..				1						1				17		21		72
[00:05:45]																		
Dutch Leather: Come to an agreement to solve it again.			1					1					8		11		31	
[00:05:50]																		
Yankee Leather: What about the person that we hired from the airline company. I gave you						1						1		30		37		111

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
the contact. Did that help at all? I guess it didn't, but what did he do?																		
[00:06:01]																		
Dutch Leather: He just went to our factory and that's it. He looked like 'Ah yeah it's fine'			1						1				16		19		57	
[00:06:07]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay, so maybe we should replace that person later on as well.					1						1			12		17		49
[00:06:11]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah. Or maybe call for more.	1							1					6		7		22	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
[00:06:17] - [00:06:45] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: And how are we going to conduct this research? Are you going to hire someone that actually knows how to do this research or are you just taking personnel from your firm?						1					1			32		45		136
[00:07:01]																		
Dutch Leather: I think personnel from my firm.	1							1					6		7		22	
[00:07:03]																		
Yankee Leather: Okay. Do they know how to do research					1						1			13		19		53

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
with this reliable and valid?																		
[00:07:08]																		
Dutch Leather: They should. Our R&D should know how to make it pass everything. They should all the requirements, they should know how to pass it. Now they have to find out why it doesn't.	1								1				33		38		134	
[00:07:22]																		
Yankee Leather: Maybe we should also make a simplified overview over the criteria.				1							1			11		21		55
[00:07:29]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Dutch Leather: Yeah. And see how it doesn't pass, or how much, like, a percentage. Make an overview..	1						1						16		20		63	
[00:07:37]																		
Yankee Leather: But simple. So it's clear						1					1			5		6		19
[00:07:38] - [00:07:52]																		
Yankee Leather: So, how to achieve them? Simplified overview of requirements and how to achieve them.					1						1			14		22		69
[00:07:58]																		
Dutch Leather: Yeah, and to what amount		1						1					9		12		38	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
we achieved them, maybe.																		
[00:08:01]																		
Dutch Leather: And use research we did to see what caused us not to achieve it.			1						1				14		16		50	
[00:08:17]																		
Yankee Leather: Hmhm.														1		1		4
[00:08:18] [00:08:30] Silence																		
Yankee Leather: We also should do a budget again for this.					1						1			9		12		38
[00:08:36]																		
Dutch Leather: Maybe half of the	1						1						8		12		35	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
initial investment, like 150.000?																		
[00:08:48]																		
Yankee Leather: Alright						1					1			1		2		7
[00:08:49]																		
Dutch Leather: Okay.Ehm. What will we do after we did... Yeah, we will discuss the results from our individual research. But how do I make sure that next time it actually passes everything?		1							1				31		48		136	
[00:09:10]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: Well, we have to, maybe we have to give a workshop to the shop-workers. And really say what are the requirements for the seats. And maybe motivate them somehow with incentives. Or punishment.					1						1			33		48		152
[00:09:29]																		
Dutch Leather: No no no, no punishment.			1						1				5		7		18	
[00:09:30]																		
Yankee Leather: No punishment?						1						1		2		4		12
[00:09:31]																		
Dutch Leather: Nah.			1						1				1		1		3	

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee						Yankee		
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch		Dutch	Yankee
[00:09:31]																		
										1								
Yankee Leather: Okay. [sigh]						1								2		3		4
[00:09:32]																		
Dutch Leather: Like, if you make sure a sample meets a certain requirement, you get a bonus.		1						1					15		20		60	
[00:09:47]																		
Yankee Leather: HmHm.					1									1		1		4
											1							
[00:09:57]																		
Dutch Leather: Well, nice.													2		2		8	
[00:10:02]																		

	Directness						Intensity						#Words		#Syllables		#Letters	
	Dutch			Yankee			Dutch			Yankee								
	low	Medium	High	Low	M	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee	Dutch	Yankee
Yankee Leather: Yes, I think thats all we can do for now.					1						1			10		10		30
[00:10:06]																		
Dutch Leather: Alright, okay than.			1					1					3		5		15	
[00:10:08]																		
Yankee Leather: Let's sign it.						1					1			3		3		10