Speaker & Gavel

Volume 45 | Issue 1 Article 8

January 2008

Complete Volume (45)

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 45—2008

Speaker & Gavel, Vol 45 (2008) www.dsr-tka.org/

Journal of
DELTA SIGMA RHO—TAU KAPPA ALPHA
www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Editor's Note:
S&G went to an entire online format with volume 41-2004 of the journal. The journal will be available online at: www.dsr-tka.org/ The layout and design of the journal will *not* change in the online format. The journal will be available online as a pdf document. A pdf document is identical to a traditional hardcopy journal. We hope enjoy and utilize the new format.

Speaker & Gavel

http://www.dsr-tka.org/ Volume 45 / 2008

Table of Contents

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Submission Guidelines

S&G publishes refereed articles addressing all aspects of communication theory and practice. Authors should submit three copies of their manuscript prepared according to the latest edition of MLA or APA guidelines. Use minimal end-notes only for exposition or explanation, not as bibliographic citations. Include a cover letter identifying author(s) and affiliation(s). Remove all references in the manuscript to author and affiliation to facilitate blind review. S&G encourages and promotes undergraduate and graduate research. Submissions from under-graduate and graduate students should be identified as such on the cover letter. Enclose a computer disk with an accurate copy of your manuscript. Clearly label the the disk with OS platform (e.g., Macintosh, Windows) and word processing software.

Editor's Special Section

Larry Schnoor
A Celebration of His Impact on Intercollegiate Forensics

A Streaming Video Presentation

Richard E. Paine, Karen R. Morris, Daniel L. Smith, R. Randolph Richardson, JoAnn M. Edwards, Daniel Cronn-Mills, Larry Schnoor

Note: A panel titled "Larry Schnoor: A Celebration of His Impact on Intercollegiate Forensics" was held at the 2007 National Communication Association annual convention to honor the lifetime forensic involvement of Larry Schnoor. The panel was organized by Karen R. Morris, sponsored by the National Forensic Association, and held on Saturday, November 17, 2-3:15 p.m. in the Red Shellac Room of the Palmer House Hilton. The abstract reads:

> This panel is honoring Professor Larry Schnoor for his lifelong contributions to Intercollegiate Forensics. National Individual Events Tournaments have continued to flourish under his direction. In addition, his constant mentoring has guaranteed the life of this activity. Panelists will describe Professor Schnoor's impact on the AFA-NIET, NFA, IOC and both his mentoring of forensic coaches and programs. Professor Schnoor will help to clarify and add to this oral history. Audience participation is encouraged. (NCA, 2007, p. 325)

Such celebratory sessions are not new to NCA or forensics. However, once presented the words and sentiments expressed quickly become only memories of the participants and the audience. The participants on this panel did not wish to lose this special moment. The event was recorded and is available online as a streaming video. Viewers will not the quality of the video is not perfect. The technology used to record the session was done in an unobtrusive way as possible. We hope you enjoy reliving this special moment in forensics history.

Session participants include:

- Richard E. Paine, North Central College, chairs the session
- Daniel L. Smith, Bradley University, addresses Professor Schnoor's impact on the American Forensic Association—National Individual Events Tournament (AFA-NIET)
- R. Randolph Richardson, Berry College, addresses Professor Schnoor's impact on the National Forensic Association (NFA)

- Karen R. Morris, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, addresses Professor Schnoor's impact on the Interstate Oratorical Association (IOA)
- JoAnn M. Edwards University of Mississippi, addresses Professor Schnoor's impact on mentoring forensic programs
- Daniel Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato, addresses Professor Schnoor's impact on mentoring individuals
- Larry Schnoor, Minnesota State University, Mankato has closing comments

Reference

National Communication Association. (2007). Communicating worldviews: Faith-intellect-ethics. Washington, DC: NCA.

Richard E. Paine is a professor and the director of forensics at North Central College, Naperville, Illinois.

Daniel L. Smith is the director of forensics at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois.

R. Randolph Richardson is an assistant professor and the director of forensic at Berry College, Mt. Berry, Georgia.

Karen R. Morris is a Senior Lecturer and the director of forensics at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

JoAnn M. Edwards is the director of forensics at the University of Mississippi.

Daniel Cronn-Mills is a professor and chair in the Speech Communication Department at Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Larry Schnoor is faculty emeriti at Minnesota State University, Mankato.

"I am a Candidate for President" A Functional Analysis of Presidential Announcement Speeches, 1960-2004

William L. Benoit, Jayne Henson, Sheri Whalen, P.M. Pier

Abstract

This study investigates the nature of presidential announcement speeches, messages that introduce the current crop of contenders for the White House to voters and the news media. Announcement speeches are typically voters' initial exposure to these politicians *as* candidates for the White House. Seventy-five presidential announcement speeches from 1960 through 2004 were analyzed with the Functional Theory of Campaign Discourse. Acclaims were over three times as common as attacks; defenses were quite rare. Republicans and winners were more positive than Democrats or losers. These speeches were evenly split between policy and character. Democrats discussed policy more, and character less, than Republicans. Candidates emphasized issues owned by their political party more than candidates from the opposing party.

Key Terms: Presidential Announcement Speeches, Functional Theory, acclaims, attacks, defenses, policy, character

Introduction

When contemplating the beginning of the presidential campaign season, attention often focuses on the primaries and caucuses. However, voters and the news media usually first meet those seeking the presidency in the pre-primary campaign phase (labeled "surfacing" by Trent & Friedenberg, 2004) through announcement speeches in which candidates publicly declare their intention to run for the White House. This pre-primary phase clearly merits scholarly attention. The announcement speech provides candidates with their initial opportunity to introduce themselves to voters and the news media as a candidate for office, revealing the themes (policy and character) on which they intend to base their campaign. This is an important opportunity to create an initial impression of the candidate with voters that could influence how he or she is perceived throughout the remainder of the campaign. Although it is possible to change initial impressions, "first impressions can have considerable effect on person perception" (Bromley, 1993, p. 36), so clearly it is better to begin with a favorable impression than an unfavorable one. Furthermore, the declaration of intent to run appears to have become generally accepted as a key event in the modern campaign. Voters and the media expect to learn something about candidates in this speech. Finally, the announcement speech is an opportunity for candidates to attract media attention and coverage, which is crucial at the beginning of a run for the presidency. Indeed, in the 2000 campaign Dan Quayle appeared on Larry King Live to announce that he soon would be giving an announcement speech! Unfortunately, there is a dearth of systematic research investigating the content of these key political campaign messages.

This study investigates presidential announcement speeches from 1960-2004 using the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse (Benoit, 1999, in press; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Benoit et al., 2003; Benoit, Wells, Pier, & Blaney, 1999) to content analyze the functions (acclaims, attacks, defenses) and topics (policy, character and the subdivisions of each topic) in these persuasive campaign messages. Petrocik's (1996) Issue Ownership theory is also tested with these texts. Although work has investigated primary campaign messages such as television spots (Benoit, 1999), debates (Benoit et al., 2002), or direct mail advertising (Benoit & Stein, 2005), heretofore this theory has not addressed the pre-primary or surfacing phase of the political campaign. This study will extend these theories to the surfacing phase of presidential campaigns. First, the literature on surfacing and announcement speeches is reviewed, then the method outlined and the sample of speeches is described. Results will then be presented followed by a discussion of the implications of the findings.

Literature Review

Announcement speeches must be understood as part of candidates' pre-primary activities, the surfacing phase of the primary campaign (Trent, 1978, 1994, 1998). Trent and Friedenberg (2004) argued that there are seven functions of the surfacing phase of a political campaign. First, announcement speeches are a vehicle for indicating a candidate's "fitness for office" (p. 25). Second, the surfacing phase marks the beginning of political ritual. A third function is to convey the candidate's "goals, potential programs, or initial stands on issues" to voters (p. 28). Fourth, voters learn about the candidate's personal style during surfacing. A fifth function is to identify a campaign's main themes. Sixth, the serious contenders are identified during the surfacing phase. Finally, relationships between candidates and the news media are developed during this phase. Although the surfacing phase encompasses more than just the announcement speech, it is fair to say that these messages are the most prominent component of this element of presidential campaigns. At this point in time, quantitative content analysis has not been utilized to systematically investigate the nature of announcement speeches. Nor is there a body of work using rhetorical criticism or case studies which analyze the nature or content of these messages.

Given the fact that contenders for the most important elective office in the world may be able to create an important initial impression with voters and the news media in these messages, they clearly merit scholarly attention. We will begin by describing the theory that under girds this analysis. Then we present the research questions posed in this study. Next, we explain the content analytic procedures employed in this study. We will present the results of our analysis and then discuss the implications of our findings.

Theoretical Underpinning

The Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse (Benoit, in press) and Petrocik's (1996) Issue Ownership theory will provide the theoretical underpinning for this study. Functional Theory begins with the assumption that, rather than seek an ideal candidate (every candidate has some flaws), citizens cast their votes for the candidate who appears *preferable*. Campaign discourse thus can be likened to an informal form of cost-benefit analysis, with utterances that tout a candidate's own benefits (acclaims), remarks that criticize an opponent's costs (attacks), and statements that attempt to reduce a candidate's alleged costs (defenses). In other words, campaign discourse is designed or *functions* to make the candidate appear preferable to opponents. These three functions can occur on two possible topics, policy and character. Pomper (1975) argued, for example, that some voters "change their partisan choice from one election to the next, and these changes are most closely related to their positions on the issues and their assessment of the abilities of the candidates" (p. 10). We will discuss first the three functions and then the two topics of political campaign discourse.

Functions of Political Campaign Discourse

The discourse candidates use to persuade voters that he or she is preferable to an opponent can enact one of three functions. First, a candidate may *acclaim* or engage in self-praise, discussing their own strengths (see Benoit, 1997). Acclaiming informs or reminds voters of a candidate's benefits. Second, candidates may *attack* their opponents, criticizing or providing unfavorable information about or evaluations of another candidate. Attacks can increase the apparent costs (drawbacks or disadvantages) of an opponent. Finally, when candidates are attacked, as they almost always are, they may choose to *defend*, or to rebut or refute those attacks. Defense has the potential to restore desirability lost from attacks. Each type of utterances furthers the function of making a candidate appear preferable to other candidates with voters (Benoit, in press). We have learned that in presidential campaign discourse acclaims are the most common utterance (and defenses the least) in key campaign message forms: television spots, debates, and direct mail brochures in the primary campaign phase; acceptance addresses; and television spots, and direct mail brochures from the general election campaign (Benoit, in press).

Topics of Political Discourse

These three functions can occur on two broad topics: policy (issues) and character (image or personalities). Policy positions–governmental actions and problems amenable to such action–are important because presidents implement policy at the federal level of government. Many voters are interested in knowing what the candidates for the Oval Office will do (or attempt to do) if elected. Will the president strive to implement public school vouchers? What will he or she do to protect us from terrorist attacks? Will the president assure funding for Social Security and Medicare? Functional Theory divides policy utterances into *past deeds* (past accomplishments by the candidate, or past failures by an opponent), *future plans* (specific campaign promises, or means to an end), and *gen-*

eral goals (policy ends or objectives). Each of these forms of policy can be the basis of an acclaim or an attack (and, for that matter, a defense).

The second possible topic of political campaign discourse is character. Candidates vary on many dimensions that are unrelated to policy, such as courage, industriousness, compassion, honesty, competence. Functional Theory subdivides character utterances into *personal qualities* (character traits like honesty, compassion, determination), *leadership ability* (competence and experience in office), and *ideals* (basic principles or core values). This can be an important topic because many citizens believe that our elected officials should be positive role models. We argue that character is important even for those voters who stress policy, because we must *trust* candidates to follow through, to the best of their ability, with their campaign promises (future plans and general goals). We must also believe they possess the requisite skills to implement their policy positions. Furthermore, we believe that unexpected crises could easily arise in a president's term of office. Precisely because these situations are unexpected, candidates have no reason to take a stand on the appropriate reaction to these crises during the campaign. When such situations arise, as in the tragic events of 9/11, voters must believe that the elected president will take the appropriate action even though no occasion arose during the campaign to make campaign promises about the proper policy for dealing with terrorism. Research (Benoit, in press) has established that presidential campaign discourse emphasizes policy more than character in television spots, debates, and direct mail brochures in both phases of the campaign as well as in nomination acceptance addresses. The Appendix provides examples of acclaims and attacks on the three forms of policy and of character.

We will also use Petrocik's (1996) Issue Ownership Theory to investigate the relative emphasis on various policy issues in announcement addresses. Petrocik observed that over time each of the two major political parties has acquired a reputation for being better able to handle a certain group of policy problems. For example, most people think that Democrats do a better job handling such issues as jobs, education, Social Security, and the environment. On the other hand, a majority of citizens believes that Republicans can better deal with such problems as national defense, foreign policy, crime, and taxation. Petrocik argues that a candidate can obtain a competitive advantage by stressing the issues on which his or her party is believed to do a better job handling by most voters. Table 1 illustrates why in 2002 Republicans would likely have preferred that voters would be more concerned with terrorism and crime than with Social Security or health care – and why Democrats probably would have preferred the opposite. A candidate starts with a "built-in" advantage with voters on issues his or her party owns.

Table 1. *Which political party do you trust to do a better job handling this issue?*

	Democratic	Republican
Terrorism	30	**51**
Crime†	27	**40**
Social Security	**50**	33
Health Care	**50**	35

Poll by ABC 9/23-26/02 except †Princeton Research Associates, 10/24-25/02.

Research Questions

Using the concepts from Functional Theory and Issue Ownership Theory, we pose the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the relative frequency of the three functions of political campaign discourse in announcement speeches?
RQ2: What is the relative frequency of the two topics of political campaign discourse in announcement speeches?
RQ3: What is the relative frequency of the three forms of policy in announcement speeches?
RQ4: What is the relative frequency of the three forms of character comments in announcement speeches?
RQ5: Do Democratic announcement speeches emphasize Democratically-owned issues more, and Republican-owned issues less, than Republican announcements?

Answering these questions we will advance our knowledge of presidential primary announcement speeches and extend Functional Theory to the surfacing phase of the campaign. We will also contrast the functions and topics of Democrats versus Republicans and winners versus losers.

Method

Analytical Procedures

Four steps were employed in the analytic procedure used in this study. First, the candidates' statements in the announcement speeches were unitized into themes, or utterances that express a coherent idea. Berelson (1952) defined a theme as "an assertion about a subject" (p. 18). Holsti (1969) considered a theme to be "a single assertion about some subject" (p. 116). Themes vary in length (from phrases to a few sentences) due to the enthymematic nature of the discourse. Second, each theme was identified as an acclaim, attack or defense, utilizing these rules:

Acclaims portray the candidate favorably.
Attacks portray the opposing candidate unfavorably.
Defenses respond to, or refute, attacks.

The third step was to identify the topic of the theme (policy or character), according to these rules:

Policy utterances concern governmental action (past, current or future) and problems amenable to governmental action.

Character utterances concern characteristics, abilities or attributes of the candidates.

Fourth, a judgment was made about which specific form of policy (past deed, future plan, general goal) or character (personal quality, leadership ability, ideal) was present in the theme. Acclaims and attacks on each form of policy and character are illustrated in the Appendix with examples from the announcement speeches analyzed.

To illustrate our coding procedure consider the following excerpt from Al Gore's 2000 announcement speech:

> <1> While some want to raise the cost of Medicare <2> and force seniors into HMO's, <3> I will make sure that Medicare is never weakened, never looted, never taken away. <4> I believe it's time also to help seniors pay for the prescription drugs they need.

This excerpt contains four themes. The first and second themes attack others for wanting to increase the cost of Medicare and to force seniors into HMO's (these themes attack future plans proposed by others). The third theme is an acclaim by Gore about his general goals (protecting Medicare). Incidentally, Gore's use of repetition ("never weakened, never looted, never taken away") does not constitute three themes. The fourth theme is an acclaim by Gore on his general goal of helping seniors pay for their prescription medicines.

Four coders separately analyzed the texts of the announcement speeches. To determine inter-coder reliability, Cohen's (1960) *kappa* was calculated on a randomly selected sample of about 10% the speeches. Separate *kappa'*s were calculated for classifying themes by function (.93), as policy or character (.87), for classifying character themes as personal quality, leadership ability, or ideals (.84), and for classifying policy themes as past deeds, future plans, or general goals (.92). Landis and Koch (1977) explained that values of *kappa* from .61-.80 reflect substantial agreement and values from .81-1.0 indicate "almost perfect" agreement (p. 165). Thus, these values provide confidence in the reliability of our analysis.

Research question five was answered by performing computer content analysis on the texts of Democratic and Republican announcement speeches. We followed the procedures established in previous research on issue ownership of presidential campaign messages (Petrocik, Benoit, & Hansen, 2003/2004): The computer content analysis program Concordance was employed to count the frequency with which words related to Democratic (e.g., job, jobs, employed, unemployed, unemployment, health, doctor, medicine) and Republican (e.g., terrorist, al-Queda, 9/11, tax, taxes, taxation, budget, deficit) issues occurred in Democratic and Republican announcement speeches.

Sample

This study analyzed 75 presidential candidacy announcement speeches from 1960 through 2004 (see Table 2 for a list of the speeches included). Most of the texts were obtained from a webpage devoted to announcement speeches (www.4president.org); some were obtained from candidate web sites. The sample includes 41 speeches from Democratic and 34 from Republican candidates, 15 from nomination winners and 60 from losers. The mean number of words is 2093 (with a range of 373 to 4619). *Spearman's rho* reveals that these speeches have become longer over time (*rho* [n = 75] = .462, p < .0001) and they have been given earlier in the campaign over time (*rho* [n=72] = .451, p < .0001; we could identify the campaign but not the specific date for three speeches in our sample). Speeches from Democrats are significantly shorter than those from Republicans (1889, 2340; χ^2 [df = 1] = 47.88, p < .0001); speeches of winners are shorter than those of losers (1875, 2148; χ^2 [df = 1] = 18.4, p < .0001).

Table 2. *Announcement Speech Sample*

	Candidate	**Date**	**Party**	**Words**	**Days before Convention**
1960	John F. Kennedy	1/2/60	D	442	195
	Lyndon B. Johnson	7/5/60	D	1443	10
1964	Barry Goldwater	1/3/64	R	541	195
1968	Hubert H. Humphrey	4/27/68	D	2079	124
	Robert F. Kennedy	3/16/68	D	711	166
	Eugene J. McCarthy	11/30/67	D	805	273
	Richard M. Nixon	1/31/68	R	377	190
	George Romney	11/18/67	R	1056	264
1972	Shirley Chisholm	1/25/72	D	1128	211
	Fred R. Harris	9/24/71	D	568	334
	Hubert H. Humphrey	1/10/72	D	1673	226
	George McGovern	1/18/71	D	1600	583
	Edmund S. Muskie	1/4/72	D	1101	232
	John Ashbrook		R	513	
1976	Jimmy Carter	12/12/74	D	3130	582
	Frank Church	3/18/76	D	2130	120
	Fred Harris	1/11/75	D	461	552
	Terry Sandford	5/19/75	D	2894	424
	Sargent Shriver	9/20/75	D	2517	300
	Gerald Ford	7/8/75	R	373	408
1980	Howard Baker	11/1/79	R	936	259
	George Bush	5/1/79	R	1082	443
	Bob Dole	5/14	R	2854	430
	Ronald Reagan	11/13/79	R	3685	247
1984	John Glenn	4/21/83	D	2251	455
	Gary Hart	2/17/83	D	1800	518
	Jesse Jackson	1/16/84	D	662	185
	George McGovern	9/13/83	D	2708	310
	Walter Mondale	2/21/83	D	1994	514
1988	Bruce Babbitt	3/10/87	D	2659	499

	Joe Biden	6/9/87	D	559	408
	Dick Gephardt	2/23/87	D	1921	514
	Gary Hart	4/13/87	D	1095	465
	George Bush	10/12/87	R	2963	311
	Bob Dole	11/9/87	R	2878	283
	Pete DuPont	9/16/86	R	2606	702
	Jack Kemp	4/6/87	R	2530	500
1992	Edmund G. Brown	10/21/91	D	3374	264
	Bill Clinton	10/3/91	D	3118	287
	Tom Harkin	9/15/91	D	2607	306
	Bob Kerrey	9/30/91	D	2508	290
	Paul Tsongas	4/30/91	D	1077	474
	Paul Wilder	9/13/91	D	2240	307
	Pat Buchanan	12/10/91	R	1421	254
1996	Lamar Alexander	2/28/95	R	2802	534
	Pat Buchanan	3/20/95	R	2719	514
	Bob Dole	4/10/95	R	2119	493
	Robert Dornan	4/13/95	R	4619	490
	Steve Forbes	9/22/95	R	2854	328
	Phil Gramm	2/24/95	R	2835	538
	Alan Keyes	3/25/95	R	4341	509
	Dick Lugar	4/19/95	R	2771	484
	Arlen Specter	3/30/95	R	1963	504
2000	Lamar Alexander	3/9/99	R	2574	519
	Gary Bauer	4/21/99	R	3447	470
	Pat Buchanan	3/2/99	R	2289	520
	George W. Bush	3/7/99	R	2033	515
	Elizabeth Dole	3/10/99	R	432	512
	Steve Forbes	3/16/99	R	1044	506
	John Kasich	2/15/99	R	4273	535
	Alan Keyes	9/20/99	R	3294	318
	John McCain	9/25/99	R	2717	313
	Dan Quayle		R	2804	
	Bob Smith		R	3819	
	Bill Bradley	12/4/98	D	802	622
	Al Gore	6/16/99	D	2800	425
2004	Wesley Clark	9/17/03	D	1089	316
	Howard Dean	6/23/03	D	2232	402
	John Edwards	9/16/03	D	2368	317
	Dick Gephardt	2/19/03	D	4179	526
	Bob Graham	5/6/03	D	1766	450
	John Kerry	9/2/03	D	2956	331
	Dennis Kucinich	10/13/03	D	4018	290
	Joe Lieberman	1/13/03	D	1056	563
	Carole Moseley-Braun	9/22/03	D	2041	311
Total			41D; 34R	2108.3*	385.7*

*mean

Results

The first research question concerned the proportions of the three functions of political campaign discourse in these messages. Overall, acclaims were most common (78%), followed by attacks (22%), and, rarely, defenses (0.3%). A *chi-square* goodness of fit test confirmed that the difference between acclaims and attacks is significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 1508.46, $p < .0001$; defenses were excluded from the analysis). Democrats acclaimed less (73% to 84%) and attacked more (27% to 16%) than Republicans (χ^2 [df = 1] = 76.9, $p < .0001$, $\varphi = .13$; defenses were excluded from this analysis). Winners also acclaimed more (82% to 77%) and attacked less (18% to 23%) than losers (χ^2 [df = 1] = 12.05, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .05$; defenses were excluded). These results are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. *Functions of Announcement Speeches and Acceptance Addresses, 1960-2004*

	Acclaims	Attacks	Defense
Announcement Speeches			
Democrats	1926 (73%)	702 (27%)	4 (0.2%)
Republicans	1818 (84%)	351 (16%)	6 (0.3%)
Winners	840 (82%)	184 (18%)	1 (0.1%)
Losers	2904 (77%)	869 (23%)	9 (0.2%)
Total	3744 (78%)	1053 (22%)	10 (0.3%)
Acceptance Addresses			
Democrats	1026 (79%)	271 (21%)	4 (0.3%)
Republicans	965 (74%)	321 (25%)	16 (1%)
Winners	1054 (78%)	284 (21%)	6 (0.4%)
Losers	937 (74%)	308 (24%)	14 (1%)
Total	1991 (76%)	592 (23%)	20 (1%)

The second research question addressed topic of utterances. The themes in these announcement speeches were divided evenly between policy and character (50% each); this difference was not statistically significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 0.04, $p > .8$[1]). Democrats discussed policy more (55% to 43%) and character less (45% to 57%) than Republicans (χ^2 [df = 1] = 65.14, $p < .0001$, $\varphi = .12$). Although winners seemed to discuss policy more and character less than losers, these differences were not significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 3.01, $p < .09$). See Table 4 for these data.

Research question three concerned the distribution of the three forms of policy (these data are reported in Table 5a and 5b). Past deeds comprised 32% of the policy utterances, future plans constituted 16%, and general goals were most common at 53%. Research question four dealt with the forms of character. Personal qualities constituted 34% of utterances, leadership ability comprised 18%, and ideals were the most frequent character utterance with 48%. Table 5a and 5b reports these data.

Table 4. *Topics of Announcement Speeches and Acceptance Addresses, 1960-2004*

	Policy	Character
Announcement Speeches		
Democrats	1449 (55%)	1179 (45%)
Republicans	942 (43%)	1227 (57%)
Winners	535 (52%)	489 (48%)
Losers	1856 (49%)	1917 (51%)
Total	2391 (50%)	2406 (50%)
Acceptance Addresses		
Democrats	749 (58%)	548 (42%)
Republicans	685 (53%)	601 (47%)
Winners	798 (60%)	540 (40%)
Losers	636 (51%)	609 (49%)
Total	1434 (56%)	1149 (44%)

Table 5a. *Forms of Policy in Announcement Speeches, 1960-2004*

	Policy					
	PastDeeds*		FuturePlans		GeneralGoals	
Democrats	105	380	161	13	724	66
	485 (33%)		174 (12%)		790 (55%)	
Republicans	98	146	182	2	498	16
	244 (26%)		184 (20%)		514 (55%)	
Winners	30	86	103	4	298	14
	116 (22%)		107 (20%)		312 (58%)	
Losers	173	440	240	11	924	68
	613 (33%)		251 (14%)		992 (53%)	
Total	203	526	343	15	1222	82
	729 (32%)		358 (16%)		204 (53%)	

*acclaims/attacks

Table 5b. *Forms of Character in Announcement Speeches, 1960-2004*

	Character					
	PersonalQualities		Leadership		Ideals	
Democrats	282	115	146	81	508	47
	397 (34%)		227 (19%)		555 (47%)	
Republicans	319	97	177	37	544	53
	416 (34%)		214 (17%)		597 (49%)	
Winners	110	32	71	34	228	14
	142 (29%)		105 (21%)		242 (49%)	
Losers	491	180	252	84	824	86
	671 (35%)		336 (18%)		910 (47%)	
Total	601	212	323	118	1052	100
	813 (34%)		441 (18%)		1152 (48%)	

*acclaims/attacks

The final research question concerned the political party issue ownership. Candidates from both political parties discussed Republican issues more than Democratic issues; Petrocik et al. (2003/2004) explain that the Republican Party owns more national issues (e.g., national defense, a Republican issue, is a federal issue; education, a Democratic issue, is financed and regulated more by state and local than federal government). The important question, however, is the relative emphasis by candidates of the two major political parties. As issue ownership theory would predict, Democrats emphasized Democratic issues more than Republicans, 43% to 35%. Similarly, Republicans stressed Republican issues more than Democrats, 65% to 57%. Statistical analysis revealed that these are significant differences (χ^2 [df = 1] = 32.62, p < .0001, φ = 0.08). See Table 6 for these data.

Table 6. *Issue Ownership in Presidential Candidacy Announcement Speeches*

Candidates	Issues	
	Democratic	Republican
Democratic	**1056 (43%)**	1402 (57%)
Republican	807 (35%)	**1506 (65%)**

χ^2 (df = 1) = 32.62, p < .0001, φ = .08

Note: Democratic issues included in this analysis were education, health care, jobs, poverty, and the elderly; Republican issues were national defense, foreign policy, deficit, taxes, and illegal drugs.

Implications

Because we have no baseline data (no record of the content of announcement speeches from previous research), the figures reported in the results exist to a certain extent in a vacuum. Should 22% attacks, or 55% character, be considered high or low? For this reason we will offer a comparison to help interpret these data. Because announcement speeches serve to kick off the primary campaign, just as nomination acceptance addresses initiate the general campaign, we will compare announcement speeches with acceptance addresses (Benoit, in press). To be sure, there are important differences (e.g., the candidate has chosen to seek the party's nomination in announcement speeches; the candidate has won the nomination when acceptance addresses are presented). Nevertheless, it makes sense to compare the two campaign message forms.

In the years of this study, announcement speeches used functions in almost the same proportions as acceptances: acclaims were 78% of announcements and 76% of acceptances; attacks were 22% in announcements and 23% in acceptances (defenses were quite rare in both, but slightly more common in acceptances). These differences are not statistically significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 0.91, p > .3). It seems likely that candidates are overwhelmingly positive in both message forms because they want to appear positive and upbeat to voters (and because voters dislike mudslinging; see Merritt, 1984; Stewart, 1975). Thus, the distribution of functions in announcement speeches parallels the distribution in acceptance addresses.

Defenses are relatively infrequent in both announcement speeches and acceptance addresses, probably for several reasons. Defenses take the candidate off message (Benoit & Wells, 1996), make the candidate appear reactive rather than pro-active, and, because one must identify an attack to refute it, a defense may inform or remind voters of the attack. One might expect even fewer defenses in announcement speeches than acceptance addresses because there would be fewer attacks to prompt defenses at that stage of the process.

Previous research on the functions of discourse by Democrats and Republicans is mixed. Most message forms (primary and general debates, primary and general direct mail, general TV spots) show that Republicans acclaim more than Democrats. However, no difference was found in primary TV spots and Democrats were more positive than Republicans in Acceptances (Benoit, in press). These data, therefore, are consistent with most studies of function and political party.

Research (Benoit, in press) indicates that winners acclaim more, and attack less, than losers in several message forms (primary and general TV spots, primary and general direct mail, general debates, and acceptances). However, this effect was not detected here. It is possible that the news media pay more attention to these speeches than do voters–particularly given the fact that these speeches appear earlier in the campaign as time goes on (citizens may have little interest in the campaign when these speeches are given). Furthermore, there is a long period of time, with many events and other messages, between the announcement speech and the nomination, so it would perhaps be unusual if the announcement speech dictated the outcome of the primary campaign.

Both announcement speeches and acceptances were roughly split between policy and character. However, announcements devoted more utterances to character (50% to 44%), and fewer to policy (50% to 56%) than acceptances (χ^2 [*df* = 1] = 21.64, $p < .0001$, $\varphi = .05$). Presidential candidates, many of whom are not well-known to voters, naturally focus on introducing themselves to the public in their announcement speeches (consistent with this trend of focusing more on character in the earlier phases of the campaign, primary messages discuss character more than general messages in debates [Benoit et al., 2002] and in television spots [Benoit, 1999]). Similarly, Diamond and Bates (1993) argued that phase one of the advertising campaign typically emphasizes biographical spots. Furthermore, it is possible that many candidates simply have not had time to develop many issue stands prior to their announcement, so they may have less policy to discuss. In fact, general goals–probably the easiest form of policy to use–is more common in announcements than in acceptances (53% to 44%).

The data for discussion of topics by candidates of the two major political parties is more consistent than the data for functions. Democrats discuss policy more than Republicans in most message forms (primary and general TV spots, debates, and direct mail); the difference for Acceptances, however, was not significant; see Benoit, 2004, in press). Benoit (2004) explained that "Republicans. . . tend to argue for smaller government, which means less governmental policy to discuss" (p. 92). This tendency appears in announcement speeches, with Democrats slightly stressing policy more than character (52% to 48%) but Republicans emphasizing character over policy (57% to 43%).

This study confirmed predictions from Issue Ownership theory (Petrocik, 1996): Candidates discussed their own party's issues more than their opponents. This effect is quite consistent, occurring in primary and general TV spots, primary and general debates, direct mail advertising, and acceptance addresses (Benoit, in press). Candidates tend to stress the issues on which they are advantaged; i.e., the issues their party owns. Again, Table 1 vividly illustrates why this phenomenon would be likely to occur. It is not surprising that this effect would occur in announcement speeches; however, now we have confirmed this suspicion and quantified the size of the effect.

We noted earlier that Trent and Friedenberg (2000) identified several important purposes of announcement speeches (formal declaration, discourage opponents, outline reasons for seeking office; and introduce themes of campaign). However, none of these goals lead us to expect an equal emphasis on character and policy in these speeches. In fact, as just noted, the candidates begin with an emphasis on character in announcement addresses and then devote somewhat less time to character as the campaign progresses from surfacing (announcement speeches) to the primary and then on to the general campaign. This study reveals that biographical (character) information is even more important in the surfacing phase than current accounts suggest.

Conclusion

This study content analyzed 75 speeches announcing presidential candidacies to voters and the news media from 1960 through 2004. These speeches, like acceptance addresses, were primarily positive, with relatively few attacks and even fewer defenses. The topics of utterances in announcement speeches are about evenly split between character and policy, which means that they discuss character more (and policy less) in announcements than acceptances. These speeches discussed general goals most commonly, followed by past deeds and then future plans. Ideals were the most common character comment, followed by personal qualities, and, least often, leadership ability. Candidates do tend to stress the issues owned by their political party in their announcements. Previous research has investigated the nature of primary and general campaign messages (e.g., Benoit, 1999; Benoit et al., 2002). Now we have extended this understanding of campaign messages to an important event in the surfacing phase of a presidential campaign.

Footnote

[1]Cohen's (1988) power tables stop at *n* of 1000; the *n* for this test is 4797. The power of a χ^2 with an *n* of 1000 to detect small, medium, and large effects is .89, .99, and .99, respectively. Thus, this test has very high power. Each non-significant *chi-square* reported here has an *n* of over 1000 and the same power.

References

Benoit, P. J. (1997). *Telling the success story: Acclaiming and disclaiming discourse*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Benoit, W. L. (1999). *Seeing spots: A functional analysis of presidential tv advertisements from 1952-1996*. New York: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L. (2003). Presidential campaign discourse as a causal factor in election outcome. *Western Journal of Communication, 67,* 97-112.

Benoit, W. L. (2004). Political party affiliation and presidential campaign discourse. *Communication Quarterly, 52*, 81-97.

Benoit, W. L. (in press). *Political campaign communication*. New York: Peter Lang.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (1998). *Campaign '96: A functional analysis of acclaiming, attacking, and defending*. New York: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (2000). Acclaiming, attacking and defending: A functional analysis of nominating convention keynote speeches, 1960-1996. *Political Communication, 17,* 61-84.

Benoit, W. L., & Brazeal, L. M. (2002). A functional analysis of the 1988 Bush-Dukakis presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 38,* 219-233.

Benoit, W. L., & Harthcock, A. (1999). Functions of the Great Debates: Acclaims, attacks, and defense in the 1960 presidential debates. *Communication Monographs, 66,* 341-357.

Benoit, W. L., McHale, J. P, Hansen, G. J., Pier, P. M., & McGuire, J. P. (2003). *Campaign 2000: A functional analysis of presidential campaign discourse*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Benoit, W. L., & Stein, K. A. (2005). A functional analysis of presidential direct mail advertising. *Communication Studies, 56*, 203-225.

Benoit, W. L., & Wells, W. T. (1996). *Candidates in conflict: Persuasive attack and defense in the 1992 presidential debates*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Benoit, W. L., Wells, W. T., Pier, P. M., & Blaney, J. R. (1999). Acclaiming, attacking, and defending in nomination convention acceptance addresses. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85,* 247-267.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bromley, D. B. (1993). *Reputation, image and impression management*. Chichester: Wiley.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20,* 37-46.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Diamond, E., & Bates, S. (1993). *The spot: The rise of political advertising on television* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hansen, G. J., & Benoit, W. L. (2001). The role of significant policy issues in the 2000 presidential primaries. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*, 2083-2101.

Holsti, O. (1969. *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrica, 33*, 159-174.

McCain, J. (September 27, 1999). *Presidential announcement speech: New Hampshire*.

Merritt, S. (1984). Negative political advertising: Some empirical findings. *Journal of Advertising, 13*, 27-38.

Petrocik, J. R. (1996). Issue ownership in presidential elections, with a 1980 case study. *American Journal of Political Science, 40*, 825-850.

Petrocik, J. R., Benoit, W. L., & Hansen, G. J. (2003-2004). Issue ownership and presidential campaigning, 1952-2000. *Political Science Quarterly, 118,* 599-626.

Pomper, G. M. (1975). *Voters' choice: Varieties of American electoral behavior*. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company.

Stewart, C. J. (1975). Voter perception of mud-slinging in political communication. *Central States Speech Journal, 26*, 279-286.

Trent, J. S. (1978). Presidential surfacing: The ritualistic and crucial first act. *Communication Monographs, 45*, 281-292.

Trent, J. S. (1994). The early campaign (pp. 43-64). In R. E. Denton (Ed.), *The 1992 presidential campaign: A communication perspective*. New York: Praeger.

Trent, J. S. (1998). The beginning and the early end (pp. 50-75). In R. E. Denton (Ed.), *The 1996 presidential campaign: A communication perspective*. New York: Praeger.

Trent, J. S., & Friedenberg, R. V. (2004). *Political campaign communication: Principles and practices* (5th ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger

Appendix
Acclaims and Attacks on the Forms of Policy and Character

Policy

Past Deeds

Acclaim: Now the budget is balanced and we've run a surplus and the interest rates have come down, I've come to realize that the efforts we made in '89 and '90 and '91 and '92 and '93 (and then when we finally passed it in 1997) have changed the world. It's made people's lives better. It's given us more prosperity and better jobs (Kasich, 2000).

Attack: The costs of the war [include] over 15,000 combat dead and nearly 95,000 wounded [and] a monthly expenditure in pursuit of the war running somewhere between $2 and $3 billion dollars (McCarthy, 1968).

Future Plans

Acclaim: Within the first few days of my administration I will send Congress a bill defining life as beginning at fertilization (Smith, 2000).

Attack: [President Nixon is] calling for the early enactment of a Family Assistance Plan that will easily double the already swollen cost of welfare to the taxpaying citizens of this country (Ashbrook, 1972).

General Goals

Acclaim: We'll be prosperous if we reduce taxes (Bush, 2000).

Attack: He [Bush] advocates economic policies which beggar the middle class *and* raise property taxes so that income taxes may be cut for those who run Enron (Dean, 2004).

Character

Personal Qualities

Acclaim: I've spent my life listening to the voices of America. I've worked construction and taught in our schools. I've worked as a short-order cook and a security guard. I've worked on the docks and on assembly lines (Graham, 2004).

Attack: Today, the politicians take polls to find out where they should go (Smith, 2000).

Leadership Ability

Acclaim: I have the strength, the vision, and the values to lead our nation to higher and safer ground (Lieberman, 2004).

Attack: Presidential delay, timidity, vetoes, divisiveness will not do the job (Humphrey, 1972).

Ideals

Acclaim: I seek the support of all who believe in the fundamental values of duty, decency, and constructive debate (Ford, 1976).

Attack: As a rule, one party has favored the extension of government power (Goldwater, 1964).

Note: The date denotes the campaign (some announcement speeches occur a year or more before the election). For texts, see http://www.4president.org

William L. Benoit (Ph.D., Wayne State University) is a professor of communication at the University of Missouri; Jayne Henson (M.A., Ball State University) is a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri; Sheri Whalen (M.S., State University of New York at Buffalo) is a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri; P. M. Pier (Ph.D., University of Missouri) is an Associate Professor of Communication at Wartburg College.

Intertextuality and Apologia: Rhetorical Efficacy through Shared Values as Illustrated through the Firing of Coach Bobby Knight

Karen L. Hartman

Abstract

This study uses the firing of Coach Bobby Knight from Indiana University as a case study in order to analyze the rhetorical efficacy of adapting to the audience's shared values through attendance to the intertextual context. By adhering to the intertextual context, Knight successfully played on certain audience values and beliefs and, as a result, managed to repair his image and help save his career. Knight's farewell address invoked the themes of hard work, family, and thankfulness. This study extends Achter's (2000) and Ware and Linkugel's (1973) research in apologia in order to emphasize the importance of the intertextual context.

Introduction

Sports are influential in shaping society and establishing heroes and role models. The popularity of sports in American culture leads to the unrelenting media coverage of athletic competitions as well as sports figures' personal actions. Because of this constant coverage, numerous events become major news stories and sometimes force athletes and coaches to defend themselves from varying accusations through the use of apologia. These defenses, typically in the form of interviews, speeches, and formal statements, provide an extensive supply of material that can be analyzed to illustrate what makes apologia successful or unsuccessful, as well as to analyze how outside factors can intertextually affect how apologia is received by an audience.

This study uses the firing of Bobby Knight as a case study in order to analyze the rhetorical efficacy of adapting to the audience's shared values through attendance to the intertextual context. Bobby Knight, Indiana University's (IU) head coach for 29 years, was an icon in a state where basketball is treated as a religion. Under his tutelage, Indiana won three National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) National Championships and 11 Big Ten Conference titles (Bynum, 1991). Knight, however, was fired in 2000 when he violated a zero-tolerance policy stemming from years of high tempered antics and accusations of physical abuse and racial comments. Knight's career survived his fiery outbursts and eventual firing from Indiana. Now, in fact, Knight is the head coach of the relatively successful Texas Tech men's basketball program. The question of how Knight continued with his successful career after such a public firing looms large. I argue that through adhering to the intertextual context, Knight successfully played on certain audience values and beliefs and as a result managed to repair his image and help save his career.

Analysis of Knight's apologetic rhetoric is conducted on his farewell address to the university's students upon his departure. This speech is chosen for analysis as it is the only public and prepared speech that Knight gave to explain his actions. Although Knight made several apologetical statements through a variety of interviews, Knight's response in this speech was his only opportunity to strategically formulate what he wanted to say in a manner that he felt appropriate. Although his other apologetical statements were influenced by outside factors such as reporters' questions determining how and what Knight addressed, the farewell address did not have to adhere to such limitations.

The intertextual factors worked to formulate a frame through which people in Indiana viewed basketball, thereby producing a unique rhetorical situation between Knight and his audience. Ultimately, the effectiveness of Knight's apologia depends on the level to which he took advantage of this rhetorical situation through adherence to the intertextual factors. This, however, is not meant to establish or argue that Knight intentionally or unintentionally stressed these factors; instead it is an analysis of how the content and style of his responses adhered to the context.

Literature Review

Apologia is defined as a speech given in self-defense (Ware & Linkugel, 1973) and modern research has produced a vast amount of information pertinent to its study. Much of the research focuses on political speeches such as Senator Edward Kennedy's "To the People of Massachusetts" (Ling, 1969), Marcus Garvey's "Address to the Jury" (Ware & Linkugel, 1973), and Richard Nixon's "Checkers" speech (Benoit, 1995). Beyond analyzing speech texts, additional research formulated and analyzed prescriptive frameworks of what characterizes apologia (e.g. Abelson, 1959; Kramer & Olsen, 2002; Ryan 1982, 1984; Ware & Linkugel, 1973), analyzed image restoration strategies through apologia (e.g. Benoit, 1995; Benoit & Hirson, 2001; Brinson & Benoit, 1995), and refined apologetic theory (e.g. Burkholder, 1991; Kruse, 1977, 1981).

Ware and Linkugel's (1973) watershed essay on apologia, however, consistently is used as a starting point for modern day apologia study (e.g. Achter, 2000; Hearit, 1997; Hoover, 1989). They argue that apologetical statements are identifiable by four factors or modes of resolution: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. Denial is defined as a negation of facts, sentiments, objects, or relationships. The second mode of resolution, bolstering, is the opposite of denial as it reinforces the existence of a fact, sentiment, object, or relationship. Through bolstering, a speaker attempts to identify himself/herself with the audience. The third mode of resolution is differentiation and is used to divide the old context into two or more new constructs of reality that take on a meaning distinctively different from their meaning in the old homogeneous context. The fourth mode of resolution is transcendence. This strategy joins some fact, sentiment, object or relationship with some larger context in which the audience does not presently view that attribute.

By understanding these modes of resolution, Knight's speech can be analyzed to show how he utilizes these apologetical strategies, as well as how extending on these modes can lead to better rhetorical efficacy. It is not enough to portray the situation in a new perspective; Knight needs to do so in a way that appeals to the values embedded in the cultural context that are a result of the intertextual issues.

Research by Hoover (1989) broadened Ware and Linkugel's focus from apologia's structural makeup to the analysis of what factors are important to the overall success or failure of apologia. Hoover argued that apologia is constrained by a complex hierarchy of cultural and personal values, and rhetorical failure results from a mismatch of values between the accused and the audience. Hoover suggested that a speaker who holds the same cultural values as the audience has a better chance of successfully passing through a rhetorical situation rather than one whose values are opposite of those the audience holds. Therefore, in order to analyze apologetic strategies, research needs to reach beyond the immediate situation and include additional factors such as cultural discourse and values.

Hoover's (1989) research thereby is used to show the relative success of Knight's apologia through his ability to communicate shared cultural values through an adherence to the intertextual context. In order to analyze Knight's apologia, it is critical to understand how values originate and how they are communicated through intertextuality. Intertextuality focuses on the belief that works of literature develop from systems, codes, and traditions established by previous works of literature (Kristeva, 1984). Kristeva (1984) stated:

> If one grants that every signifying practice is a field of transpositions of various signifying systems (an inter-textuality), one then understands that its "place" of enunciation and its denoted "object" are never single, complete, and identical to themselves, but always plural, shattered, incapable of being tabulated. (pp. 59-60)

Reading a text, consequently, presents the reader with a network of textual relations which the reader traces in order to understand the text. Thus, reading becomes a process of moving between texts, and meaning "exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text into a network of textual relations" (Allen, 2000, p. 1). Stemming from the definition of the term, a variety of studies developed; for example, intertextuality studies addressed marketing campaigns (e.g. Dewhirst & Sparks, 2003; Kong, 2001), literary practices (e.g. Jones, 2002; Kristeva, 1984; Miczmk, 2000; Turski, 2001), and even branched out to include film studies (e.g. Dunne, 2000; Metz, 1997).

Achter's (2002) study analyzed the effect of intertextuality on apologia through the method of analyzing popular texts and intertextual factors that create unique situations and thus frame the audience in a certain way. Achter used the 1990 Minnesota gubernatorial campaign as a case study in which Independent Republican candidate Jon Grunseth is accused of sexual misconduct by several women and argued that, in the late 1980's, the narrative of men who cheated on their wives gained particular presence through the public sphere and popular culture. In the public sphere, Gary Hart, Jimmy Swaggart and Jim Bakker and others disgracefully fell from public life as they were accused of or caught in adulterous affairs. Furthermore, through popular culture, the movie Fatal Attraction and several best-selling books "reinforced the increasing intolerance for infidelity and offered women a way to respond" (p. 322). Achter argued that the combination of these factors created a "public vocabulary" and an intertextual frame for interpretation when the Grunseth scandal broke.

Similarly, this study analyzes the intertextual factors in relation to Knight by first describing Indiana's intertextual factors such as the state's basketball "monuments," the high school playoffs setup, and the film Hoosiers. The study then analyzes Knight's apologetic statement through Ware and Linkugel's modes of resolution. These modes illustrate the techniques Knight used to redirect the situation in an attempt to produce successful apologia. Finally, the analysis looks at Knight's adherence to the intertextual context to illustrate how successful apologia was produced through the communication of shared values with the audience.

Intertextual Factors

The importance of basketball in Indiana has grown over the years to make the two virtually synonymous. This union of sport and state began forming during the years leading up to and while Bobby Knight coached at IU. Throughout the later half of the 20th century, there were several intertextual factors that framed basketball in the state and associated Knight and Indiana basketball with hard work, family, and thankfulness. Three factors in place were basketball "cathedrals," the state high school playoff system, and nationally screened movies. These intertextual factors illustrate and construct the importance of the sport and provide a framework to view the sport.

Basketball "Cathedrals"

For many towns in Indiana, communities have developed around basketball arenas. Basketball stadiums and gymnasiums both represent and construct the importance of basketball due to their physical presence, their ability to unify communities, as well as the material and cultural capital expended in order to construct them. These structures bring thousands of fans together and provide a place where communities can gather to support their teams in a unified effort. Communities even donate large amounts of money to have arenas built in their area. Two specific examples of arenas in Indiana that communicate these values are the Hinkle Fieldhouse and the Chrysler Center.

Built in 1928, the Hinkle Fieldhouse was originally the largest basketball arena in the United States and since then has been the setting for numerous state high school championship games. Currently, it is a center for collegiate basketball as it is the home of Butler University's basketball team. Besides high school and college games, however, it also served as the site for the United States

Olympic basketball trials, the first USA-USSR basketball games, as well as All-Star basketball games for the National Basketball Association (NBA) and the American Basketball Association (ABA).

Hinkle Fieldhouse's community worth is best described through the 1954 boy's state basketball playoffs final (an event memorialized in the motion picture Hoosiers). The fieldhouse was packed as Milan High School (enrollment: 161 students) defeated the state's basketball powerhouse Muncie Central (enrollment: over 1600 students) in arguably one of the most exciting high school games in history. As 1:18 ticked down to 18 seconds with the score tied, Milan took the final shot to win the state championship 32-30 (Merron, para. 18). Fifty years later, the high school still displays the state championship trophy and the winning game net. Hinkle Fieldhouse's ability to bring the Milan community together as the setting place for a proud moment that is still remembered and glorified, demonstrates the structure's cultural worth and importance to the state. The gymnasium, as an epicenter of where fans gather to adore and venerate their teams, becomes similar to a place of worship and a symbol of unity.

The Chrysler Center is another example of a monument devoted to basketball. Indiana is home to nine of the ten largest high school basketball gymnasiums in the nation and New Castle, IN, is home to the largest one of them all. New Castle Chrysler High School's Chrysler Center was built in 1959 and officially seats 9,325 people – enough to seat half of the town's population. A February 25, 2004 USA Today article clearly described how important the arena is to the town and state:

> Rome has St. Peter's, Paris has Notre Dame and New Castle has the Fieldhouse. All three cathedrals reflect their respective cities' history, culture and aspirations. In New Castle, population 18,000, the past, present and future are centered on Indiana high school basketball. Officially, The Fieldhouse has room for 9,325 spectators, but there have been times when more than 10,000 fans squeezed into the 81,000-square-foot building while a thousand more stood outside in the chilly evening air. (Rubail, 2004, p. C3)

Even the manner in which the Fieldhouse was built in 1959 illustrates its importance. During that time, members of the New Castle community were tired of making the 18-mile drive to the nearby Muncie Central gymnasium which held 6,500 people. The community rallied together and raised over $1 million to have a new and closer arena built. The fact that a town of approximately 18,000 people in the late 1950s raised such a large amount of money so they would not have to drive less than 20 miles to another town clearly emphasized how much the New Castle community loved the game and its players.

Basketball monuments such as the Hinkle Fieldhouse and the Chrysler Center demonstrate the importance of basketball in Indiana through their cultural worth. The buildings accomplish this through their physical presence, their ability to unify communities, and the material and cultural capital used to construct them. This intertextual factor, therefore, affects the rhetorical situation Knight is in as basketball is framed in a way that associates community and importance with the sport.

Indiana's High School Basketball Playoffs

The history and uniqueness of Indiana's high school playoff system is critical in expressing the association between Indiana basketball and hard work and perseverance. In traditional high school playoffs throughout the nation, schools are divided into a division based on their size and location. Throughout the playoffs, schools only play other schools within their division until a championship game decides who the state champion is for that division. Therefore, a state could have numerous state champions, and many teams never have the opportunity to play against each other. Up until 1997, however, every school in Indiana entered the same playoff system. Small schools played big schools and the best team was declared champion. Oscar Robertson, one of Indiana's most famous high school athletes who continued to be a successful college and professional athlete, expressed on his personal website just what people thought about Indiana's unique playoff arrangement:

> I think single class basketball was one of the things that made Indiana the No. 1 high school basketball state in the country, and the state tournament was something everyone eagerly anticipated because of the possibility that a school of any size could go all the way. (Robertson, 2004, FAQ section)

Because the playoff system offered all schools, regardless of their size, the opportunity for success, the idea of working hard and equal opportunity was driven home to the players and everyone who watched. Basketball, therefore, turned into the chance to prove that hard work and skill could turn the "underdog" into the biggest winner of them all. Indiana's unique basketball playoff system produced champions that were truly the best out of the state and communicated to the players, the fans, and everyone who was familiar with the playoffs, that an equal opportunity for success existed for those who worked hard, were diligent, and persevered.

Hoosiers

The movie Hoosiers is a third intertextual factor that frames Indiana basketball. The 1986 production offered the American audience a vision of Indiana basketball featuring hard work, discipline and commitment. The film's depiction of the 1954 Milan High School team was popular throughout the nation, grossing over $28 million, and garnering three Best Supporting Actor nominations for Dennis Hopper and one Academy Award nomination for Best Score. Through the extent this film was viewed and the way it portrayed the sport, Hoosiers produced an additional intertextual factor by influencing and producing an image of Indiana basketball.

The themes of hard work, discipline, and commitment are synonymous with the basis of the movie as the small town team overcomes the larger opponents to win in the end. Beyond the overall main idea of the film, however, these themes are illustrated through relationships between certain characters. For example, the film revolves around a middle-aged man named Norman Dale (Gene Hackman) who just moved to Hickory to take over the head coaching position. The challenge of the job and the expectations of the small town are illustrated in a town meeting at the local barbershop where the townsmen tell Dale how he should coach the team. Dale's unwillingness to follow their advice and implementation of his own coaching techniques produces a volatile situation in which the town soon votes to have him fired. Dale avoids being fired through the help of the team's star player, and continues to coach the team by stressing commitment, hard work, and discipline. Through his devotion to his team and hard work, Dale quickly gains the loyalty of his team and the town as his coaching techniques lead to an eventual state championship.

Another theme stressed in the movie is the idea of helping others in need. This is illustrated through Dale's character as his opportunity to coach is a favor from an old friend. The movie eventually discloses that Dale, once an NCAA coach, was permanently suspended from the college ranks after punching a player. Hickory High School's principal offers the coaching job to his friend as a way to help Dale out. Helping others is also shown through Shooter (Dennis Hopper), the town drunk and father of one of the team's players. Dale offers Shooter an opportunity to become the team's assistant coach with the stipulation that he remains sober. Through the position, Shooter begins his road to recovery and stops embarrassing his son through his drunken antics. Shooter's recovery is due to Dale who offered him help, just as the school's principal had helped him. Therefore, these characters and the opportunities given to them exemplify the theme of helping others out.

Finally, family is another theme stressed in the movie. This is shown through Shooter's recovery and eventual reconnection with his son. During the evolution of their relationship, Shooter and his son develop a bond where the son moves from being embarrassed about his father to loving and respecting him. This is typified as Shooter is recovering in the hospital when his son tells him: "You're going to get better. Couple of months when you get out of here, we're going to get a house… both of us. I love you dad" (Hoosiers, 1986). Shooter and his son survive the problems that threatened to destroy their relationship and reconnect through the familial bond of love and togetherness.

Hoosiers, through the story of the Hickory Huskers championship and the individual relationships that evolve around the team, communicates the ideas of hard work, discipline, commitment, helping others, and family. The movie illustrates the importance of basketball to these ideas and the importance of these ideas to basketball. By illustrating how basketball relates to these themes, the audience makes the connection between the stories and how they view basketball in the state. Therefore, as millions of people watched Hoosiers, basketball in Indiana is framed in such a way as to promote these themes. Through this intertextual factor, the values that the movie communicates are engrained in the minds of Indiana residents, thus affecting Knight's rhetorical situation.

Through intertextual factors in the state such as huge basketball gymnasiums, the high school playoff system, and Hoosiers, basketball in Indiana is framed in such a way as to communicate certain values. These factors combine to communicate the importance of the sport, hard work, equal opportunity, family, perseverance, teamwork, helping others in need, and success. Therefore, Knight is in a unique rhetorical situation as his audience's perception of basketball in Indiana is already framed to associate the sport with these values. Knight has the opportunity to focus on these themes as he finds himself in front of an audience of thousands as he delivers his apologia in response to his firing.

Knight's Farewell Address

On the evening of September 13, 2000, Knight delivered a farewell speech on IU's campus in order to address his firing and the events surrounding it. This speech resulted from Knight's dismissal from Indiana University on September 10, after he was accused of grabbing a student. This act was treated as a breaking point for the university's administration which had repeatedly handled 25 years of questionable incidents caused by the coach. In the few days following his firing, Knight delivered several apologetic statements in the form of interviews, press conferences, and speeches in an attempt to explain his reasons behind his actions. This apologia was often conducted with little notice and the majority of his statements were in response to questions from the media. As early as the night of his firing, however, Knight knew that he had to publicly explain his actions without the influence of media reporters and questions. On the evening of September 13, therefore, Knight addressed over 6,000 students, alumni, fans, townspeople, and critics who had converged at Dunn Meadow on IU's campus to hear him.

Throughout Knight's speech, he highlighted and emphasized certain themes that are important to himself and his audience. Specifically, Knight focused on family, hard work, and helping others. These themes had been communicated through the intertextual factors that were in place and Knight plays on them throughout his speech. By doing this, Knight highlights a variety of values that his audience can identify with and are illustrated through his farewell address.

Family

One theme that Knight continually stresses throughout his address is the concept of family. Knight's idea of family, however, extends beyond the traditional definition of blood relatives to include his players, as well as his audience who constitutes a "basketball family." Through this technique, Knight turns the situation from one of separating himself from his audience through his actions into a speech that reinforces the familial bond that he and his audience share.

Knight's strategy of shifting attention from himself to the bond between him and his audience is an illustration of Ware and Linkugel's concept of bolstering. This concept is a source of identification and, in order to be effective, bolstering reinforces a relationship that has already been established. Knight's use of this technique, therefore, reinforces his link to his audience. Knight identifies with the audience by emphasizing that the audience's interests are a factor in how he and his family functions, by stressing how important his family is to him, and by including his audience in the basketball family that has been created through the unified support of Indiana's program.

In his farewell address, Knight identifies with the audience by emphasizing how his wife has always been there to make sure that he keeps students a priority. This is illustrated at the beginning of the farewell address as Knight begins his speech:

> And when I, uh, when I uh … sometimes when maybe I slip a little bit or I don't or I might not have that at the top of priorities, my wife Karen always reminds me, because I guarantee you, in the 12 or 13 years that she's been here, there's nobody that has been more concerned or give me more ideas, on what could be done as far as basketball is concerned for you the students, than my wife Karen can. (Knight, 2000, para. 1)

Knight, through the help of his wife, relates how she was constantly there to remind him of the importance of keeping students as a priority. The audience thus becomes linked to his family as they are a priority in the decisions that he and his wife discuss.

Knight again stresses his bond with the audience at the end of the speech, but he rhetorically deepens the family theme by moving beyond himself and his wife to include his entire family. This is illustrated as Knight ends the speech by asking the audience to wish him and his entire family good luck in the future:

> Now … now as I wish each of you the very best, and I thank each of you for your support of myself, Karen, and the rest of our family, I ask something from you …. And as I leave here I'd like each of you to just take a minute, a full minute, to bow your heads in whatever way you do, wish myself and my family the very best, as I wish you, the very best. (Knight, 2000, para. 14)

In this statement, Knight expresses his sincere best wishes to those in the audience, but then asks the audience to do the same for him and his family and return the well wishes. Through this technique, Knight further establishes the family theme by portraying himself and his family as one group desiring the audience's support, as well as including the audience within the idea of his family. Interestingly, Knight requests that the audience "bow" their heads as they wish his family the best. This action reflects what one would do when one is praying and, thereby, Knight identifies with the audience by suggesting that their relationship is so strong that that they would include one another in their requests to God.

The theme of family, however, does not stop with those related to Knight or the current students in the audience. Knight also includes those who are arguably even more important to him within this rhetorical situation: the Indiana University basketball family. Throughout Knight's speech, he refers to and stresses the importance of the fans to the university as a whole, as well as to his personal experiences at IU. This is shown specifically at the beginning of the speech:

> You know, we're … I'm here, uh, talking to you as students in the year 2000. But what I think I'm really doing is talking to all students who have attended this university since 1971. How … how many of you … how many of you students had a mom or a dad or a brother or a sister who have attended Indiana since 1971? I mean, I've been here so long, have any of you have [sic] grandparents that attended Indiana? (Knight, 2000, para. 3)

In this address, Knight refers six separate times to the students who attended IU since 1971 as moms, dads, brothers, sisters, and grandparents. Through this technique Knight stresses the long relationship that he has had with both the current students at Indiana, and with those people closest to them. This also stresses the closeness of the relationship that Knight and the audience's relatives have shared together, thereby turning the situation into a "family matter"—an experience and a disappointment to be shared with him and the entire Indiana basketball family.

Once he establishes that this matter involves all of the IU students and further identifies with them and their family members, Knight goes on to stress how that relationship transcended into support for players that were close to him. Knight highlights the support that the student body had for the Indiana basketball program over the years:

> I mean, you had parents and brothers and sisters that rooted for (players) May and Benson and Buckner and Cruise and Abernathy and Woodson and Tolbert and Turner and Kitchell and Whitman and Chaney and…and [cheers] and the Grahams and Steve Isle and everybody we've had here. (Knight, 2000, para. 4)

By relating the audience with his players, Knight categorizes the audience and their family members as supportive of people that mean the most to him. This support, therefore, translates into an identification between Knight and his supporters that has a long and deep tradition through the experiences that they all have encountered through basketball.

By stressing the theme of family throughout his speech, Knight focuses attention away from his firing to the identification that exists between him and his audience. Knight accomplishes this by illustrating the role the audience has in his life and how they influence his actions, and by stressing the familial bond that has developed through their support of Indiana basketball. Therefore, a situation is created in which the audience members identify with Knight in a manner similar to what families experience. In the same fashion as families go through conflicts and success together, so too do Knight and his basketball family.

Furthermore, Knight's use of this theme is rhetorically effective as Knight is attentive to the rhetorical situation and the intertextual context. Indiana basketball's intertextual factors, specifically communicated through Hoosiers, put Knight in a situation in which he could repeatedly emphasize the idea of family and how important it is to him. His adherence to what the movie communicated in relation to Indiana basketball and family, thereby, allows Knight to move beyond the situation and establish a relationship that can exist beyond his firing.

Hard work

Another theme that Knight emphasizes in his speech is the theme of hard work. Knight stresses that this is not only important to his success as a coach and the success of his teams, but that it is important to the overall success of his audience members. Through stressing this theme, Knight reinforces an additional bond that exists between him and his audience. Similar to Knight's use of identifying with his audience through family, Knight's focus on hard work is an example of Ware and Linkugel's concept of bolstering. In the address he emphasizes that not only was the team's success due to the hard work of the players, but he connects their success to the hard work of the fans. This reinforces the bond between Knight and his audience by identifying with each other through a shared appreciation of hard work. In the speech, Knight uses this theme by stressing the importance of hard work to the success of IU's basketball team, as well as to the success of the individuals in his audience.

The theme of hard work, and Knight's appreciation of it, is illustrated in the speech through his emphasis on how it helps him and his team. In fact, Knight credits the hard work of the fans in making the team succeed at crucial times:

> And the one thing I've taken great pride in, with the student body, is how hard the students have always rooted for us. How…I remember games when we were trying to get back from having lost, or maybe we'd lost a couple of games, and the students sensed that we needed something a little bit extra, and they gave it to us. There were times when we had to win two or three games in a row, and as the players rose to the occasion, so too did the students. (Knight, 2000, para. 4)

By acknowledging the hard work of the students, Knight shows how important it is to him, as well as gives credit to those audience members who have contributed to the success of the team. Knight also acknowledges the power that his audience has in relation to the team by suggesting that some of Indiana's success is beyond anything that he could do as a coach. Instead, a part of the success of the program was credited to his audience members, thereby reinforcing the identification between them as both Knight and the hard work of the fans were integral in the success of Indiana's team. Knight reiterates the theme of hard work at the conclusion of his farewell address:

> I want to wish you all the best, at whatever you do, but to be the best, and not even to be the best, but to have the best opportunities, you've gotta work to be the very best student that you can. (Knight, 2000, para. 13)

In this quotation, Knight stresses the importance of hard work beyond basketball and into their academic lives. Success as a student, Knight states, will ultimately lead to success in whatever the students choose to do in life. Rhetorically, this allows Knight to further identify with the audience as it suggests that he has a vested interest in their personal lives. Therefore, Knight transcends from a distant coach to a close friend who truly cares about the audience members' lives beyond their years at Indiana.

Through Knight's focus on hard work in his speech, his apologia is effective as Knight creates a sense of identification with his audience. Furthermore, adhering to this theme is effective as Knight attends to the intertextual context that communicated the importance of hard work through Hoosiers and the high school playoff system. Intertextually, the association of hard work and basketball had been established and Knight took advantage of this shared cultural value by stressing the theme throughout his speech.

Helping Others

One final theme that Knight stresses throughout his speech is helping others; he does this by portraying his actions as being meant for the benefit of others as opposed to being mean spirited, and by asking the audience to help others through their participation in a walk/run for cancer that his wife is helping set up. Through this theme, Knight employs Ware and Linkugel's concepts of transcendence and bolstering. Knight's use of transcendence moves the audience from viewing his incident as an abusive gesture to an attempt to try to teach the student manners and he identifies with his audience through bolstering by offering his audience an opportunity to help others through participating in a charity event.

One way Knight portrays his desire to help others is through his interpretation of the incident with the student he grabbed, Kent Harvey. Knight provides his audience with an explanation of how his behavior towards Harvey was an altruistic attempt to teach Harvey a valuable lesson rather than a violent altercation:

> You've got a kid that was a student here that, that uh [boos]. Just, just a second; whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. You got a kid who was a student here that I tried to show something to about courtesy, and I really believe that he got caught in a real surprise situation. I think he was a kid who was a little bit flustered, maybe a little bit more than a little bit flustered. I think he's been kind of led astray by … by … by … kind of led astray by a father, a step-father, that's the only penance that kid ever needs. So … so, let that kid be a student, and let him get on with life. (Knight, 2000, para. 11)

In this account, Knight justifies his action by asserting that it was something that he felt "morally" obligated to do. In doing so, Knight reframes the situation in such a way that portrays his behavior as right and good rather than abusive or deviant. By depicting himself as someone who was trying to teach a young man a beneficial lesson, Knight gives the audience an opportunity to view the physical reaction as an attempt to help someone as opposed to hurting him and thereby view Knight as a positive role model.

Knight not only shows how he helps others through his actions, but he provides the opportunity to his audience to identify with him and also help others through their own actions. For example, in the beginning of the speech Knight asks his audience to participate in a walk-run for cancer that his wife has helped set up for the following month:

> Now, what she's done, and what I hope all of you students will take part in, is a walk/run for cancer, that Karen has worked hard on, that will be set up here in Bloomington on the morning of the 14th of October. And she really wants you students to participate in it because there aren't any of us anywhere that haven't been touched, in some way, by cancer. (Knight, 2000, para. 2)

In this statement, Knight describes an opportunity for his audience to participate in an activity that helps their "neighbors" and presents it as a chance to help people they personally know. Furthermore, Knight's strategic placement of this request at the beginning of his speech immediately establishes his willingness to help others. The audience gathered to hear Knight explain his actions, but he starts the speech with a seemingly unrelated call for charity participation. Through this, Knight instantly portrays himself as caring and compassionate and sets the stage to then address his physical confrontation with a student.

Knight's emphasis on helping others is also effective as it adheres to the intertextual context. For example, helping others is especially evident in Hoosiers. In the movie Dale went out of his way to help Shooter overcome his alcoholism. Furthermore, Hickory High School's principal helps Dale start a new life with a new basketball career by offering him the coaching position at the school. Therefore, Hoosiers is able to construct several stories, all in connection with basketball, that offer the audience a consistent way of viewing basketball with the theme of helping others. This connection helps frame Knight's remarks in such a way that his speech plays on what the intertextual factor communicates.

By expressing his obligation to teach manners, showing his concern for others' health, and asking the audience to support Indiana basketball, Knight clearly illustrates the theme of helping others. All of these are unselfish requests and are for the benefit of others – a young man, cancer patients, and the hard working Indiana basketball players. Knight, therefore, reinforces the theme of helping others and transcends the immediate situation that portrays him as abusive into one that portrays him as courteous and having others' intentions at heart. Furthermore, this theme allows Knight to identify with his audience by establishing that together they can help others through participating in the cancer walk, as well as through continued support of Indiana basketball. This theme is effective as it adheres to what had intertextually been established through Hoosiers. By associating basketball with helping others within the movie, Knight's emphasis of this theme in his speech coincides with the intertextual factors and, therefore, is effective.

Conclusion

This paper argues for the rhetorical efficacy of intertextuality as a way of analyzing the case study of Bobby Knight's major apologia. I argue that Knight found success by using themes that adhere to the intertextual context. Ultimately, this study extends Achter's (2000) and Ware and Linkugel's (1973) research in apologia in order to emphasize the importance of the intertextual context. Such factors in Indiana including basketball "cathedrals," the high school playoffs, and the movie Hoosiers, frame the way basketball is viewed in the state. Through the themes he uses, Knight communicates values that adhere to the intertextual context. Knight's appreciation of family, hard work, and helping others appeals to the established framework of how basketball is portrayed in Indiana. The themes Knight uses employs Ware and Linkugel's modes of resolution. Knight uses transference to avoid addressing the specifics of the situation and instead turns the audience to see other sides of his character. Additionally, he uses bolstering to identify with his audience and differentiation to give the audience a positive portrayal of himself. Through these themes and the modes of resolution that he uses, Knight produces successful apologia that adheres to the values that he shares with his audience.

Knight's speech demonstrates Ware and Linkugel's concept of bolstering through the themes of family and hard work. Knight uses the theme of family to identify with his audience through their mutual love of family and Indiana basketball. The theme of hard work connects with his audience by emphasizing how they both worked hard for the success of the program over the years. Differentiation appears when Knight uses the theme of thankfulness to portray himself as gracious and appreciative as opposed to the abusive and angry man illustrated through his interaction with Harvey. Knight depicts himself in a positive and generous way rather than the negative and harmful way the audience might previously have viewed him. Finally, Knight uses transcendence and bolstering through the theme of helping others. Knight transforms the overall incident of grabbing Harvey into a positive attempt to teach a young man courtesy and manners. Transcendence allows Knight to move the audience away from the particulars of the situation and present his interaction with Harvey in a new way, and bolstering is used to identify with the audience through their shared appreciation of helping others.

Through this case study, therefore, the importance of intertextual and contextual issues for the construction of apologia can be extended. This case study offers particular insight into the effectiveness of bolstering and transcendence, as Knight uses these techniques to help him transcend the immediacy of the situation. The key to these strategies, therefore, is an attendance to the values produced through intertextual relations. It is not enough for Knight to avoid the particularities of the situation or simply identify with the audience, but he must do so in a way that appeals to the values embedded in the cultural context.

Ware and Linkugel's (1973) modes of resolution can, consequently, be extended to incorporate a domain outside of the immediate situation. Ware and Linkugel's research demonstrates how the modes of resolution work within the apologetical genre, but only by analyzing the immediate rhetorical situation. By reworking the framework of apologia and accounting for contextual issues, a better and more accurate assessment of what constitutes apologia and how its components work together can be attained.

Additional study could also expand from local addresses in order to illustrate how intertextual factors work through apologia at the national level. Finally, by extending our understanding of the context beyond the immediate situation, we can use it as a springboard for the future analysis of public address and other rhetorical genres. This analysis and the findings in relation to intertextuality and apologia illustrate the importance of outside factors in rhetorical success and failure. It is the ultimate goal that through a better understanding of rhetorical success and failure in the past, the rhetoric field as a whole can grow and improve in the future.

References

Abelson, Robert P., (1959). Modes of resolution of belief dilemmas. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3, 343-352.

Achter, P.J., (2000). Narrative, intertextuality, and apologia in contemporary political scandals. *Southern Communication Journal, 65,* 318-332.

Allen, G., (2000). *Intertextuality.* London: Routledge.

Anspaugh, D. (Director). (1986). *Hoosiers*. [Motion Picture]. United States: Orion Distribution.

Benoit, W. (1995). *Accounts, Excuses, and Apologies: A Theory of Image Restoration Strategies.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Benoit, W. & Hirson, D., (2001). *Doonesbury* versus the Tobacco Institute: The Smoke Starters' Coupon. *Communication Quarterly, 49,* 279-294.

Brinson, S. & Benoit, W. (1996). Dow Corning's image repair strategies in the breast implant crisis. *Communication Quarterly, 44,* 29-41.

Burkholder, T. (1991). Symbolic martyrdom: The ultimate apology, *Southern Communication Journal, 56,* 289-297.

Bynum, M. (1991). *Woody Hayes: The Man & His Dynasty.* Columbus, OH: Gridiron Football.

Dewhirst, T., & Sparks, R. (2003). Intertextuality, tobacco sponsorship of sports, and adolescent male smoking culture. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 27,* 372-398.

Dunn, M. (2000). 'Barton Fink': Intertextuality, and the (almost) unbearable richness of viewing. *Literature-Film Quarterly, 28,* 303-312.

Hearit, K.M. (1997). On the use of transcendence as an apologia strategy: the case of Johnson Controls and its fetal protection policy. *Public Relations Review, 23,* 217-232.

Hoover, J.D. (1989). Big boys don't cry: The values constraint in apologia. *Southern Communication Journal, 54*, 235-252.

Jones, J.T. (2002). Depending on memory: Intertextuality in popular fiction. *Journal of American & Comparative Cultures, Spring-Summer*, 81-85.

Knight, B. (2000, September). *Coach Bob Knight's farewell address to the IU student body.* Retrieved October 28, 2003, from http://www.indiana.edu/~rterrill/Text-KnightFarewell.html

Kong, K. (2001). Marketing of belief: intertextual construction of network marketers' identities. *Discourse & Society, 12*, 473-504.

Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kramer, M. & Olson, K. (2002). The strategic potential of sequencing apologia stases: President Clinton's self-defense in the Monica Lewinsky scandal. *Western Journal of Communication, 66,* 347-369.

Kruse, N. (1977). Motivational factors in non-denial apologia. *Central States Speech Journal, 28,* 13-23.

Kruse, N. (1981). The scope of apologetic discourse: Establishing generic parameters. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 47,* 278-291.

Ling, D. (1970). A pentadic analysis of Senator Edward Kennedy's Address to the People of Massachusetts, July 25, 1969. *Central States Speech Journal, 21,* 81- 86.

Merron, J. (n.d.). 'Hoosiers' in reel life.' *ESPN Page 2.* Retrieved April 3, 2004 from http://espn.go.com/page2/s/closer/020327.html

Metz, W. (1997). Toward a post-structural influence in film genre study: Intertextuality and 'The Shining.' *Film Criticism, 22,* 38-62.

Miczmk, V. (2000). Of ways of telling, intertextuality, and historical evidence in Berlioz's Romeo Juliette. *19th Century Music, 28,* 303-312.

Robertson, O. (n.d.). *FAQs – Ask The Big O.* Retrieved April, 2, 2004 from The Big O Web site: http://www.thebigo.com/FAQs/questions2.html

Rubail, S. (2004, February 25). Fieldhouse a cathedral to high school hoops. *USA Today*, p. C3.

Ryan, H. (1982). Kategoria and apologia: On their rhetorical criticism as a speech set. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 68,* 254-261.

Ryan, H.(1984). Baldwin VS. Edward VIII: A case study in kategoria and apologia. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49,* 125-134.

Turski, M. (2001). Intertextual competence: The reader's key to the treasure. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: International Review of English Studies, Annual*, 311-324.

Ware, B.L., & Linkugel, W. A. (1973). They spoke in defense of themselves: On the generic criticism of apologia. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59,* 273-283.

Karen L. Hartman (MA, University of South Carolina) is a doctoral graduate student at Louisiana State University in Rhetoric and Public Address.

This paper was originally written as part of her thesis at the University of South Carolina under the direction of Dr. Mindy Fenske.

The paper was previously presented at the 2006 Southern States Communication Conference.

Gender Bending and Bending Gender (Re)Creating Aesthetic Realities of Organization Practices

Michael E. Reardon
Nikki C. Townsley

Abstract

The following paper incorporates various writing genres including fiction, narrative, and scholarly discourse to demonstrate the potential importance of aesthetic theory for transforming gendered organizational practices. It starts off with Kelly's, a student of organizational communication, "final exam" essay, which explores the gendered politics of promotion. Her professor's response explores the gendered politics of "doing feminism." Taken individually, Kelly and Dr. McGuire (re)create an aesthetic reality of traditional, essentializing organizational practices. Taken together, they (re)create aesthetic meanings that pose formidable challenges and potential transformations for the way we "do gender" organizationally. In the end, this paper or "petite narrative" stands as an aesthetic challenge towards transforming the way we "do (feminist organization) scholarship" organizationally.

Introduction

To: Dr. K. J. McGuire, COMM 574, Organizational Communication
From: Kelly Ryan
Re: Final Exam Essay

Dr. McGuire,
I felt like I should write a little note about my paper—I feel that I completed the assignment you gave us, but I did so in somewhat of an alternative format. As you'll see, I wrote the paper in the form of a short story about a woman named Kathleen, who may or may not be loosely based on my own experiences. ☺ Interestingly, in the story, Kathleen is finishing up a paper about the aesthetic perspective and structuration theory (sound familiar?), and in doing so brings together literature on the topics as well as her own personal experiences. I remember hearing once that if a movie has to have a voice-over, then the director didn't do her job. Well, I know this memo is sort of a voice-over, but I felt like the paper was a bit out there, so I thought I would give you a little heads-up as to what you were reading. I hope you like it. See you in class. KAR

Aesthetic Perspective and Structuration Theory:
Teaming Up To Understand the Politics of Promotion

"Some days are harder than others," Kathleen told herself as she looked at the blank computer screen with the same blank stare she had three hours earlier. "This is a learning experience," she said, this time aloud to dozens of books and articles that were strewn across her small, dusty apartment. It was always this way at the end of the semester--it seemed that no matter what advanced planning had occurred, it was always this way--working late, working frantically, working under pressure. It was this way when she was an undergraduate, it was this way when she earned her master's degree, and it was this way now that she was working towards her Ph.D. Come to think of it, even in her "working" days before returning to school, it was this way. Kathleen had never been one to have her work done well before the deadline like many of her graduate school friends or even coworkers. She never felt as though she fit in (was she better than the others—or not as good?), and in her mind, this way of working was her own act of irreverence for the academic system in which she found herself. "I'll show them," she thought, "I'll show them that I can do the same work in my own way—not theirs. I'll write the paper—but not in the same cookie-cutter academic fashion like everybody else."

Still, she felt unfulfilled. She knew that ultimately she was doing it their way (she did say "same work")—going to class, taking notes, talking to professors, researching the literature, writing papers—this was all part of the reality of the organization. But she also felt that by doing her academic work on her schedule and in her way, even though she did it her way in the context of their system, was valuable (or did everyone feel this way? Was she part of the majority because she felt so alone?). She was confused. She was tired. And she was working under a deadline. So, partially out of habit, and partially out of the obligation of an assignment, she turned to the literature to try and make sense of the situation.

"Aesthetic theory," she read, "now that sounds more my speed." Kathleen had picked up Robin Clair's (1998) Organizing Silence, and as was her habit, scanned through the text to find something that caught her eye. Her scanning had brought her toward the back of the text in which Clair describes aesthetic theory and then goes on to propose an alternative way of viewing it/using it in an organizational sense. "What is this all about," she was thinking. She read on.

Kathleen found that the aesthetic perspective had been developing for centuries, and, according to Clair (1998), is still in the process of becoming. She found that one could trace aesthetic theory to classical Greece (although it probably existed even before then) and the division between Plato and Aristotle. Clair noted that "according to Plato, art fails to provide us with knowledge, and is, generally speaking, a poor substitute for reality" (p. 173). Aristotle, on the other hand, believed that aesthetics was not only a reflection of reality, but also commented upon what might become reality—it has potential to help us know. Kathleen thought about the way reading fiction or literature while reading academic texts helped her understand those scholars—helped her contextualize and feel what to her was so cold and methodical. She wanted to understand more about aesthetic theory. She read more of Clair.

Clair (1998) described how several different authors had taken traditional forms of expressing themselves and recreated them to offer a dual meaning or a self-contained opposite. Kathleen read about how Daly's work both represents resistance and is resistance, about how Robert Indiana's artwork both represents a target and is a target, and about how Tillie Olsen's book on interruptions is an interruption in its own right. "This is interesting," she thought. Kathleen continued to read, now about Marx, and how he believed that "our every activity is a creative extension of our being" (Clair, 1998, p. 176). Or, as Strati (1996) put it, "aesthetics are a form of knowledge and they have their own truth" (p. 216). She read about Nietzsche, and how he believed that we are always in a state of Becoming—because Being is just an illusion. "I see," she thought, "in other words, Nietzsche would say that we are always participating in creating our own realities. That's a cool way to look at it." She read more, now about feminists and aesthetics—and learned about the masculine bias that has permeated the "historic concepts of creativity, excellence, and artistic purpose" (Korsemeyer, 1993, p. viii). She was really interested now. She had read the book by Tillie Olsen, but had never thought about it in that way. As a woman who used to work in a male-dominated industry, Kathleen often wondered if she had really done anything to demonstrate her resistance to the status quo. She wondered if she could view some of her actions as creating a new reality for herself and others. Aesthetic theory was really sounding like something to learn more about. She pulled out her highlighter and continued to read on.

"It seems that the self-contained opposite is at the heart of the alternative aesthetic perspective that Clair argues for," she thought to herself. "I like that idea." She read how Clair (1998) stated that the aesthetic perspective can allow one to look at everyday occurrences and actions as "artful expressions" (p. 186)—not as an alternative to other existing theories, but rather as a companion to perspectives such as critical, feminist, or postmodern. The everyday occurrences can now be interpreted as illustrations of resistance, of framing, or of Becoming. The aesthetic perspective, according to Clair and Kunkle (1998), "provides a unique philosophy as it is grounded in paradox, defies closure, acts as resistance, and intensifies plurality and confusion" (p. 27). She was now hooked—but the book had prompted her to remember again her days as a customer service representative at O'Malley Medical Supply Company, about her promotion to outside sales representative, and how hard that decision was. She thought about the frustration of it all. She thought about her old friends and how they were doing. She thought, "I'm not concentrating. Time to take a break." She put down Clair's book and shuffled off to the kitchen to make a pot of coffee.

After a cup of coffee and a smoke out on the front porch (her roommate hated her smoking in the apartment), Kathleen curled up on the couch in the living room with her favorite blanket and picked up the book again. Her cat, Felix (it sounded cute when she named him at age eight), tiptoed across her knees, and wedged himself between her elbow and her chest. She looked down and knew what the cat was trying to tell her. "I know, Felix," she said, "time for bed. But this is good stuff and I've got that paper to write." She started to page through the text, remembering that she had read some of the earlier chapters when they were in journals, and how that she had loved Clair and Kunkle's (1998) piece on the stories of child abuse—but she had never quite caught on to the fact that they were using an aesthetic perspective throughout that article (or maybe she did—"maybe that's why I loved it," she thought now). She started to think about what she was going to write for her paper, and remembered that she had told her friend Sheila that she would call her tonight. She was not quite ready to start working again, so she grabbed her smokes from off the television, went back to her room, lit a cigarette ("it is my room") and dialed the phone.

"Hey," Kathleen said, "How's it going over there?" Sheila needn't be told what she was talking about. She had the same assignment.

"Not bad," Sheila replied, "I'm doing my spell check now."

"That's excellent!" Kathleen said with as much conviction as she could, knowing she was behind once again.

Sheila asked about her paper, and Kathleen explained that she was really getting into the aesthetic perspective that Clair (1998) wrote about. Sheila was familiar with it ("surprise, surprise," Kathleen thought), and told her that it had always reminded her of structuration theory.

"What do you mean?" Kathleen asked.

"Well," Sheila explained, "you know how in Clair's (1998) book she explains aesthetics being about a paradox--and how traditional aesthetics incorporates some of Marx and Nietzsche, and she uses that quote from Strati (1996)—something about aesthetics being a form of knowledge and its own truth?"

"Yeah, sure, I just read that," she replied.

"Well, think of the idea of Being and Becoming—now think of structuration theory. Remember how Giddens (1979) talks about systems and structure? It is sort of like the same thing. Giddens explains how structures are the rules and resources people use in interaction. Rules are sort of like norms, and resources are things that people 'bring to the table' in an interaction—knowledge, wealth, power—that kind of stuff. He said that systems are "regularized relations of interdependence between individuals and groups" (Giddens, 1979, p. 66). Well, what Giddens says is that people use these rules and resources—these structures—to constantly create and recreate systems. See the connection?—both the aesthetic perspective and structuration theory talk about creating your own reality--Being and Becoming at the same time!"

"Sheila is a little too into this school thing," Kathleen thought, "but she does know what she is talking about."

"Sure, they are not the same thing," Sheila continued, "but they do have parallels. And I think that if you take the aesthetic perspective along with structuration theory, you could really start to see even some of those little structures that Giddens talks about in a different light. You could show how even silence could be an "artful expression" (Clair, 1998, p. 198) by someone. In fact, Poole (1996) used structuration theory and showed how even the smallest of interactions between people could change the reality in which they were situated. And then later, Scott, Corman, and Cheney (1998) used structuration to show how organizational identification can be both a process and a product at the same time. So I think that there are ways that the aesthetic perspective is similar to structuration—both ideas reinforce Being and Becoming, or process and product!"

Kathleen interrupted Sheila before she could really get going. “Listen, friend, I think you are reading way too much--you are starting to make too much sense! Now go to bed—I’ve got a paper to write.”

“Hold on,” Sheila said, and Kathleen could hear her shuffling through some papers. “Uhhh...got it! Listen to this--remember how Clair (1998) said that there was a paradox in the aesthetic perspective--well, Giddens (1976) also talked about the duality of structure. He said that “social structures are both constituted by human agency, and yet at the same time are the very medium of this construction” (p. 121). See what I mean? There are some similarities there!”

“All right, all right, you’ve given me enough to go on. Now go to bed!”

Sheila reluctantly agreed because now she was getting into this idea, said good luck, and told Kathleen she would see her in class tomorrow.

Now the wheels were spinning. “Structuration theory and the aesthetic perspective. I guess I do see the parallels.” Kathleen picked up Clair’s book again, this time determined to finish her reading so she could start writing. Still, she couldn’t quite focus. As she waited for the coffee and nicotine to kick in and give her the push she needed, she felt herself zoning out. As she struggled to keep her eyes open, she thought back again to her “working” days and when she was promoted from her customer service position to an outside sales representative. She thought of the oddness of the situation—how it had frightened her as well as excited her. How it had surprised her as well as made her feel accomplished.

The day after they had offered Kathleen the promotion, she found out why she got the offer instead of her coworker, Liam, who had worked in their department longer and even in her eyes was more prepared to move from the inside sales position to the outside one. O’Malley and his managers had promoted her because she was a woman.

“Nurses like to deal with women,” Cele had told her.

Cele was the both the matriarch and the gossip of the customer service department--she had been there since the company originated and personally knew every one of the employees that Mr. O’Malley hired. Often Cele’s information was helpful or insightful or just plain good gossip, but this information disturbed her.

“A woman!” she roared to herself. Immediately the excitement and feeling of self accomplishment that she had only the previous day was squeezed out of her like a camper deflating an air mattress. She felt like that deflated mattress too—empty inside, too shriveled to move, and easily carried away by someone else—in this case, Mr. O’Malley. “I’m going to quit—I’d rather quit than take a job that they gave me just because I’m a woman!”

Cele looked at Kathleen in her motherly way, put her arm around her shoulder, and told her, “Now, now. Don’t do anything rash. You are just as ready as Liam. You would do great. And think about the money—this is a great opportunity for a young woman.”

“A young woman who earned it,” Kathleen shot back, still fuming.

"At least think it over," Cele said, and then added, "Oh, and don't say that I told you anything."

Kathleen remembered how she went back and forth about the decision. She remembered how she felt trapped—taking the job would only perpetuate the patriarchy of the organization—but not taking it meant that yet another man would get to be the outside sales rep. She remembered calling her friends to get their opinions, all the while knowing that she was simply looking for someone to tell her that it was all right to tell Mr. O'Malley to shove it. "None of them understand," she thought. She knew she couldn't talk to anyone at work—everyone wanted the job, so they would think she was an idiot for even thinking twice about it. Then it hit her. "I will take it," she said aloud, "but on my terms, not O'Malley's." She knew that by taking the job it would afford her the chance to create new opportunities for other women like her. She knew that if she didn't take it, she would probably perpetuate O'Malley's thinking even more than if she did. "At least this way," she thought, "I am controlling my own destiny."

As Kathleen woke herself from this reverie, she realized that the clock was ticking on her paper. She was tired, but she felt that she could unite her thoughts and memories of the evening into an essay for her class. She thought about Clair, about Giddens, and about her life before she went back to school. She glanced down at her book, and saw that it was turned open to the final chapter, in which Clair (1998) argues that the alternative aesthetic perspective can offer additional insights to Conquergood's (1994) piece: (1) expressing hidden ironies; (2) exposing the silence within the silenced; (3) looking for realities that are woven within realities; and (4) exploring the role of the scholar as artist, art, and audience (pp. 194-196). "I like the aesthetic perspective more and more," she thought. "I could work all of this into my paper. First, the hidden irony of my situation is that by offering me the job, O'Malley was undercutting the very system he sought to reinforce. Second, I could talk about how the nurses are the silenced within the silenced. Cele had said that "nurses like to deal with women." What does that say about our take on nurses and the position they are in? I could really offer them a chance to have their voices heard. Third, the reality within the reality is that my struggle with O'Malley's ideology was woven into the capitalist, patriarchal society in which he was raised. My experience was a reality that was rooted within a larger reality. Fourth, I could demonstrate the scholar as artist through my work on this paper by perhaps writing it in a non-traditional fashion. I could write up the paper as a short story or something like that—it might be a stretch, but then again, it might work!"

As Kathleen sat down to her computer, she reflected upon these additional insights and all of the other things she had read that night. She thought about her conversation with Sheila. And she thought that she should have started earlier on her paper. But most of all she thought back to her job at O'Malley Medical, and how the events of the evening offered her a different way to understand her actions of five years ago. She remembered how she had once read that women's view of the world was one that was constructed by men, and how that idea made so much more sense in terms of the promotion at O'Malley Medical. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1997) had argued that "conceptions of knowledge and truth that are accepted and articulated today have been shaped throughout history by male-dominated majority culture" (p. 5) and now Kathleen realized that O'Malley had been perpetuating that culture. Kathleen thought of some of the stories that Belenky and her colleagues had recounted, especially of those who had been silenced in different ways. They concluded that "the actions of these [silent] women are in the form of unquestioned submission to the immediate commands of authorities, not to the directives of their own inner voices" (p. 28). "Well, I guess in my own way, I did listen to my inner voice back then," Kathleen thought.

Now all Kathleen had to do was put it down on paper. She thought more about writing her essay in an alternative fashion, and still wasn't sure what to do. She knew she had read something about it before—she paged through her book again, and found that Clair (1998) had said "an aesthetic perspective relishes creativity and encourages escape from the very boundaries and limitations it self-imposed" (p 186). She remembered how Clair had also written about Daly (1973, 1984, as cited in Clair, 1998) twisting "dominant discourse into alternative ways of speaking or writing that grant us new ways of knowing and participating in our realities" (p. 171). She also thought of Laurel Richardson (1994), who urged scholars to write in experimental fashions. "I've always wanted to write a different kind of paper," she said to herself, "and this seems like the perfect opportunity." She decided she would write an essay that was part fiction, part narrative, and part scholarly work—it might be more work, but she knew it would certainly be more fun.

As she began typing, the merging of what she had read and what she had experienced started forming on the page. "What Mr. O'Malley didn't understand," Kathleen thought as she lit another cigarette (it was finals week!), "was that by promoting me instead of Liam, he was creating a new reality for the organization. Even though his intentions were horribly misguided, he had promoted me." It reminded her of a passage that Clair (1998) wrote: "an alternative aesthetic perspective allows us to bring into relief the ironic relationships between...organizations and organizational communicative practices" (p. 202). "That was irony," she thought, "O'Malley promoted me because I was a woman, which is prehistoric, crude, and insulting. But, on the other hand, O'Malley was too dense to realize that by promoting me, even with his misogynistic motives, he was creating and did create a new reality for that organization. The promotion, no matter how small in his eyes, changed the nature of promotions for O'Malley Medical. It was like Giddens' (1979) structuration theory or Nietzsche's take on aesthetics—both Being and Becoming in the same breath." She typed as the thoughts poured into her head.

Kathleen had known even then that her taking the job was, on the surface level, condoning O'Malley's behavior—but deeper, she knew that she could also use that opportunity (however misguided O'Malley's reasons were for giving it to her) as a chance to change the organization. She took a drag of her cigarette and continued to type. She thought more about what she had read by Clair (1998): "when the subjugated group is unable to assert direct challenges to the dominant and oppressive powerholders, they may instead consume the practices and products of the predominant group in ways that reappropriate the intended meanings" (p. 166, emphasis in original). "That's it!" Kathleen thought, "Clair nailed what I did right on the head." She glanced at her watch and typed more quickly.

Kathleen thought more about her journey, and about her reading of aesthetic and structuration theory. Then she remembered how Poole (1996) emphasized how communication creates and recreates the reality in which we live. She thought about how Clair (1996) wrote about how grand discourses (Lyotard, 1984) are reinforced through everyday talk. "How can I let people know that I am making a stand by accepting this job?" she remembered asking herself back when she was with O'Malley Medical. Kathleen realized now that the way she had talked to the other representatives at the sales meetings, how she had talked to her customers, and how she had talked about her job to Mr. O'Malley made a difference. A small one, perhaps, but one all the same. She knew now that both by talking about her situation to these people she was demonstrating her stance, and at the same time, her action was a stance in and of itself. Once she got the ball rolling, she knew now she made a difference. She remembered wondering how she could perpetuate the talk of why she took the job—and how she could start others talking about her somewhat quiet, but nevertheless significant, stand against Mr. O'Malley. It hit her as she was going around the corner of her office to tell Mr. O'Malley that she would accept the position. Actually, it didn't hit her—Cele did. Kathleen ran into Cele—literally—and knew that a passing comment to her would be all that it would take to start the talk. People would recognize that her acceptance of the job was not a reinforcement of the gendered politics that got her the offer—it was a stand for resistance against it. As she had read in Clair (1998), she was "reappropriating" (p. 166) her own meaning through the structure and the reality that O'Malley had provided.

"Wow!" Kathleen thought as she typed up the last page, "this is an alternative paper--and a long one at that! But I think it does connect how Clair's aesthetic perspective could be used with structuration theory to understand the organizational politics of promotions. It shows that although there are parallels between aesthetics and structuration, they are not substitutes for each other, but rather complements of each other. And, more than anything, this paper at least helped me sort out my feelings about the old O'Malley Medical days. I almost hate to say it, but this was a learning experience! I always say that, but now I believe it! Oh my God! I think I'm turning into Sheila!"

After calming herself down and performing the requisite spell check/quick read, Kathleen printed off her paper and got ready for bed. As she crawled into bed (Felix was already dead to the world), she rolled over to the nightstand to set her alarm. "8:00 a.m. ought to do it," she said, and chuckled to herself as she glanced down to her clock. It was already 5:30. Well, she told herself, "Some days are better than others!"

. . .

(a week or so later. . .)
To: Kelly

From: Professor McGuire

Your irreverence for the knowledge factory rules has served you (and the factory) well, Kelly. You have painted a realistic, compelling aesthetic of the relationship between aesthetic and structuration theory through the all too familiar tale of end-of-the-semester pressures experienced by PhD students, and I might add, faculty members too. Someone must read the (often interminable) final exam essays after all. Your essay, however, was a joy to read, not only because I found myself saying, "Yes! Kelly has got it! She is demonstrating a higher-order understanding of aesthetic and organization theories—through aesthetics!" but also because your story generated yet another level of understanding. In the spirit of the aesthetic tradition of (re)creating realities in order to expand our potential for knowing and social change, I would like to contribute to your already richly layered account by sharing a personal tale of gendered organizational life.

But first, let me offer a few accolades regarding your aesthetic of the gendered organizational practice of promotion. I appreciate your reference early on in your essay to Nietzsche. I agree with his and others' (e.g., Foucault, de Beauvoir, etc.) notion that identity is best conceived of as a dynamic and fluid process. Indeed, one is never a "finished" or "complete" self but rather an organizational member who continually creates, maintains and even transforms realities, aesthetically, in order to negotiate (contradictory) experiences, to make sense of the mundane and the extraordinary. As you deftly note by drawing from Clair (1998), the aesthetic perspective takes "artful expressions" of the everyday/ everynight world not as antagonisms but as companions to critical, feminist theories. Everything, act of resistance, frame, way-of-being, comportment, etc., is part of Becoming, at the same time, everything, act of resistance, frame, way-of-being, comportment, etc., is paradoxical, at times, contradictory.

Further, as you illustrate through your "case study" of female promotion in a male dominated industry, our irreverence to dominant ways-of-being (e.g., smoking, writing papers at the last minute, being a woman in a patriarchal work world, etc.) creates a paradox whereby one can simultaneously challenge and maintain power relationships. Kathleen's credibility as an intelligent and capable salesperson is challenged when she learns, through the "gossip" of another woman, that she "earned" the job in large part because of her gender. After all, dominant organizational ethos suggests that nursing is women's work and, some would say, that sales is men's work. In an effort to regain composure, she attempted to assuage sexist promotional practices by redefining the promotion as a larger step for womankind, i.e. women entering the ranks of external sales. I would say that you are coming at this from a gender reform feminism perspective, as Lorber (2005) would put it. Wonderful! Here you provide another layer of interpretation that can come only with reflection of this "alternative" aesthetic. Kathleen begins to "see" the hidden ironies (O'Malley's undercutting of his own work system), the deafening silence (of the nurses voices not heard), and the interwoven realities of promotion politics (gendering bases of capitalism) at the same time as she recognizes the promotion practices of O'Malley Medical were changed forever upon her promotion. Lorber would likely say that Kathleen is a liberal feminist—trying to shine the light on discriminatory hiring and rationale for promotions. This retrospective sense making goes beyond mere account making into artistry, the art of deconstructing false bifurcations of scholarly work, fiction, and narrative through the reappropriation of meanings not intended by dominant groups. That is, not only did Kathleen use Cele to reappropriate and spread new meanings of her promotion but, Kelly, your depiction of her experience reappropriates the role of narrative and fiction in organizational communication research. I couldn't have done it better myself (but more on this later. . .).

However, if I can offer one suggestion, it would be to explore in more depth the potential limits of aesthetic theory in so far as dismantling societal, economic, political, even cultural structures that shape the available sets of discourses that we draw from in order to create realities, identities, at least initially. I cannot help but wonder how many female outside sales representatives are currently working at O'Malley Medical (you did say this was five years ago). Moreover, are they selling in stereotypically women's industries such as nursing supplies? Was your supreme act of resistance successful in the long term? Or, are we kidding ourselves through the scholarly rhetoric of aesthetic theory that reappropriation equates change? I don't have all the answers to these questions but have been exploring possibilities myself—through alternative writing—much as you have.

Kathleen, if you would allow me, let me tell you a story that you may find interesting . . .

Untitled

It started off as an innocuous morning full of predictable rituals for Professor O'Neill. Sitting at his custom-built cherry desk drinking a hot cup of Starbucks coffee and checking e-mail, O'Neill began to drift beyond his university office window. The snow on the ground made him think of better weather, and vacations, and he thought, "I better check the rates on travelocity.com if I'm going to take Becky and the girls snorkeling in Mexico for spring break. Becky is going to be so surprised. She so hates the snow." He smiled at his sensitivity and ability to be able to anticipate his wife's needs, and makes a mental note to shovel the sidewalk when he got home that evening.

O'Neill's thoughts begin to wander back to the realities of academia as he sifted through endless CRT-Net messages, praying that there won't be another belabored dialogue on whether or not we live in a modern or postmodern age. Quickly deleting mass e-mails, he noticed a message from the university's Sexual Harassment Network. Double-click.

To: KJONeill@college.edu
From: YNT@college.edu
Professor O'Neill,

Based on your recent publication on sexual harassment and academic culture, we invite you to join the University Sexual Harassment Network as a faculty advisor. Your role would be to provide counsel, information, or direction for students seeking to file a complaint of sexual harassment. Please call . . .

"Oh my, someone actually read my article!" O'Neill smiled inwardly. He'd been despondent as of late, worrying that his critical organizational research wasn't actually emancipating, but boring folks instead. "Becky will be proud to know that those endless nights at the office writing that article have paid off with public recognition," he thought as he picked up the phone to call the Network director to schedule what the email referred to as an "unofficial" interview.

"Dr. O'Neill, what a pleasant surprise! What can I do for you?" asks the Director.

"I just finished reading your invitation to become part of the university Network, and am returning your call for an informal interview," he offered wondering why the Director did not know his motivation for this call. She sent the letter after all!

"Well, of course. Dr. O'Neill. Um…this is a bit embarrassing, but since I sent you the invitation to join the Network I have received strong messages of concern from the Board . . ."

"What kind of concerns?" O'Neill wondered silently.

She continued, ". . . and, I actually thought you may have heard the news. . . "

There was a long silence as he remembered the past week—one of the kids had been sick and he cancelled classes to stay home and play nursemaid. Becky had been attending a professional conference presenting her research on digital technology and medical surgery. "What, I leave for a week to play Dad and I am cut out of the loop?" he fretted silently.

"Well, the Board thought long and hard but despite your impeccable research, they feel that students might not feel comfortable bringing their concerns of sexual harassment to a male faculty member. They feel horrible about rescinding their invitation as student advisor, and in order to make up for any discomfort or embarrassment, they would like you to consider a new position on the Network, as an informational resource for faculty members."

O'Neill's thoughts started to wander outside his office window again, not to the sands of Mexico this time, but to his first research presentation on feminist theory. In front of several dozen "prolific" feminist (female) scholars in the field, O'Neill remembered describing the mundane and egregious forms of gender oppression that men experience, and how feminism must reconsider the perils of masculinity in order to truly change gender relations. The audience responded or, more accurately, reacted with hostility, "How dare he cry about wounds of gender oppression, when his wife is at home cooking dinner and caring for his kids? How dare a man ask for our empathy at the point in time when women's voices are finally being heard? Are you suggesting, Dr. O'Neill, that you know how it feels to be a woman?" Yes, he painfully recalled, it was at that point in time when he began the arduous task of being a feminist in a man's body. The Board's decision only reminded him that despite his ideology, he was often essentialized because of his biology. "Don't they realize that I am on their side?" he mused for the zillionth time.

"Dr. O'Neill, are you there? . . .Dr. O'Neill? . . ."

"Yes, yes, I am sorry. I was just a little taken aback. No I had not heard about the Board's decision but I must say that I disagree. As you may know, I have served on several committees related to issues of gender and student concerns . . ."

"Yes, I am sorry, but the Board feels . . ."

"I need a little bit of time to think through my decision of whether, in good faith, I can serve the Network in that capacity. I'll give you a call . . ."

It seemed as if time stood still. O'Neill recollected so many of his conversations with Becky about his feminist research. She didn't seem to understand his need to investigate the effects of gender since he was a man. In fact, many of his colleagues felt similarly, accusing him of professionalizing feminist theory in the academy. "Why is that such a bad thing anyway!?" he fumed. "Isn't that what feminist scholars have wanted for years—to be accepted as a legitimate form of inquiry?" At the same time, however, he knew. He knew that because he was a man, his feminist scholarship was given more weight, more credence, and more accolades than many of the so-called "whiny female feminists." Did that mean that he shouldn't pursue feminist scholarship? Or, is Audre Lorde right when she says that the Master's house can never dismantle the Master's tools? Am I a Master simply because I am white and male? What do I need to do to prove my devotion to gender issues? Why am I to blame because I want a safe space for the women in my life—Becky and the girls?

O'Neill's eyes roamed around his office, a space Becky helped decorate and he filled to capacity with his scholarly books. He figured that he better close down his e-mail and get some fresh air to help clear his mind. While putting on his coat, the professor inadvertently knocked a pile of books off his cluttered chair that he used as a makeshift bookshelf. "Dammit..." he said exasperatingly as he stooped to clean up the mess. bell hooks (1984) Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center was in the pile and it caught his attention. "God, how long has it been since I've read this. . . ," O'Neill reflected as he thumbed through the worn, yellowed pages full of marginalia.

"There it is, the passage that first got me thinking that I could contribute to the conversation amongst feminists," O'Neill whispered to the stale air. He spoke it aloud, even though he was alone in the room: "Men are not exploited or oppressed by sexism but there are ways in which they suffer as a result of it. This suffering should not be ignored" (p. 72). A smile appeared on his face. "I never claimed to be oppressed and, in fact, I agree that saying man's suffering does not excuse women's oppression at the hands of men. However, how are we to know of male suffering if we men continue to be silent in shame?" O'Neill could feel his lost passion for feminism starting to boil over again, and then he remembered the last five minutes.

O'Neill was excited and upset at the same time, now pacing his office. "How can the Board dismiss my contributions based on my gender when bell hooks says that men should be comrades with women in struggle to end sexist oppression? As a man, am I supposed to be a comrade on the side . . . or right in the line of fire with the female feminists?" Then it hit him like a bulldozer hits a brick wall. "And, wait a minute, what about intersectionality (Lorber, 2005)? Many feminists have already acknowledged that not all women experience woman's oppression the same. Lots of conflating variables such as race, class, sexual orientation, age, or ability play a role in the experience of oppression. So how come I am essentialized because of my body? Doesn't my different perspective add to the conversation, rather than take away from it? Aren't we all an 'other' in some regard?"

O'Neill was getting pretty revved up and wanted to call the Director to give her a piece of his mind. He quickly grabbed the phone and started to pull out the number, but then replaced the receiver and sat down in his chair. "But if I say no to the informational resource position, who is going to education the male faculty members about sexual harassment?" It says it right here in hooks, "men have a tremendous contribution to make to feminist struggle in the area of exposing, confronting, opposing, and transforming the sexism of their male peers" (p. 81).

O'Neill sat back in his leather recliner and wandered what Becky would advise. He so missed her presence when she was traveling to this and that conference. "Maybe they are right. I can't even make a decision without seeking the help of my wife. She who does the majority of the childcare, shopping, . . . oh shit, she even decorated my office. What kind of feminist am I?" As he reconsidered his paternalistic behavior toward his wife and daughters (after all, he presumed to know what "she wanted" for holiday break!), he reread hook's argument again. "She says that men can expose the sexism of their peers. How could I do this if I didn't take the job with the Network? They want me as an informational resource, well by God, I am an informational resource, at minimum. Not only do I know the policies and legal treatments, but can we honestly say I won't be called on at various points in time as a student advisor? Who is silencing whom? Men too are sexually harassed, and although I would never purport to speak for their experience . . ."

Just then the phone rang. "Honey, are you there?" Becky asked across the phone line 3,000 miles away.

"What a joy to here your voice. You'll never believe my . . ."

"Honey, I can't talk long. Several researchers from Lucent are waiting for me to join them. They really like my idea and want to fund some additional . . ." The rest of Becky's words drifted from O'Neill's consciousness as he sat back and smiled once again. He knew the solution to his dilemma already, and this point in time was for Becky's professional success. It might be read as paternalistic but he didn't know how to extend himself otherwise, and, left with few alternatives, action is better than stagnation. So he listened intently and made a mental note to log on to travelocity.com right after he speaks with the Network Director.

And so the innocuous morning full of predictable rituals was anything but. O'Neill felt as if he had passed some sort of test of why he was allowed to be a feminist and a feminist scholar. He had taken a journey through his original inspiration for his work, to his frustrations of being a man in a woman's world, and, ultimately, to perhaps a new avenue for him to apply his scholarship. It was only 11:00 am, and he was already tired. Getting up to finally take his walk, O'Neill's coat, again, brushes a mess on the floor. "Oh, for the love of…" He stoops, again, to pick up the mess and, again, his eyes fall to a certain piece of the pile. No bell hooks this time. His eyes go right for the brochure for Mexico.

The end.

So you may have noticed, Kelly, some similarities between Professor O'Neill and me (And, if I may be so bold, I would think that those similarities are not unlike those between you and Kathleen . . .). Your essay got me thinking, Kelly. I have been tinkering with writing (my) O'Neill's story up for a journal submission. Like your essay, I wanted to include my (fictional) narrative to illustrate the complexities of gender in organizational practices. Perhaps we could combine the two stories under the umbrella of aesthetic theory in order to create a more nuanced, and leading-edge, piece that describes both you (Kathleen's) experience as a woman in a man's world and my (O'Neill's) experience as a man in a woman's world. To answer one of the questions I posed earlier, I do think that reappropriation can equal change—and the way you demonstrated the connection between aesthetic theory and structuration essentially demonstrates this point. Remember how when Poole used structuration theory in small groups he talked about the fact that it has a critical edge? What he meant was that because Being and Becoming happen simultaneously, things are never really stable—and that constant motion, if you will, offers us opportunities to effect change. So, by you (Kathleen) taking the job at O'Malley Medical, by me (O'Neill) taking the job here, or even if we put this paper together in an alternative format, we are effecting some kind of change, don't you think? Anyway, if we decide to do this paper, we could tentatively title the collaboration:

Predictable Essentializing & Unpredictable Aesthetics:
Recreating Meanings of a Woman in a Man's World
& a Man in a Woman's World

Why don't you get back to me with your thoughts on all of this. Again, I really enjoyed your essay—I hope I wasn't too long-winded in my comments, but I felt like we were on the same page. I'll look forward to hearing from you…

(the next day….)
TO: KJONeill@college.edu
FROM: KRyan@college.edu

I AM SO GLAD YOU LIKED MY PAPER!! I was really worried that I was too far out there—but after reading your comments, clearly I wasn't. Great minds! ;-) I really think that your idea is excellent—combining our stories into one paper and sending it off to a journal or something. Not to be too academic here, but it would be a great paper to get out there because aesthetic theory suggests that our sharing these stories would present yet another hidden irony of gender bending in organizations. Just think about it. . . if we get to tell our stories, who knows how many other women and men will recreate or renarrativize their gender bending experiences so that more of us can engage aesthetics as a tool for social change…unearthing the layers of predictable essentializing toward more unpredictable organizing that breaks gender rules. So, as you can tell, I am excited about it. One thing, though. If I may be so bold, professor, may I suggest a different title? I liked yours (I swear!), but I was thinking that it should be a bit more alternative, you know? Sorta like the paper. What would you think about….

Gender Bending and Bending Gender:

(Re)Creating Aesthetic Realities of Organizational Practices

I'm not married to it, but I think it is more fun. I'll stop by your office tomorrow and we can talk about what we need to do. Thanks again for all the great comments and the invitation to work with you on this! See ya' tomorrow…

Kelly

PS--I was glad to read that you took that job . . .

References

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1997). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Clair, R. P. (1996). The political nature of the colloquialism, "a real job": Implications for organizational socialization. *Communication Monographs, 63*, 249-267.

Clair, R. P. (1998). *Organizing silence: A world of possibilities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Clair, R. P., & Kunkle, A. W. (1998). "Unrealistic realities": Child abuse and the aesthetic resolution. *Communication Monographs, 65*, 24-46.

Conquergood, D. (1994). Homeboys and hoods: Gang communication and cultural space. In L. R. Frey (Ed.), *Group communication in context: Studies of natural groups* (pp. 23-55). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies*. London: Hutchinson & Co. Publishers Limited.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Korsmeyer, C. (1993). Introduction: Philosophy, aesthetics, and feminist scholarship. In H. Hein & C. Korsmeyer (Eds.), *Aesthetics in feminist perspective* (pp. vii-xv). Bloomington and Indianapolis: University Press.

Lorber, J. (2005). Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics (3rd ed.). Cary, NC: Roxbury.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

Poole, M. S. (1996). Group communication and the structuration process. In R. S. Cathcart, L. A. Samovar, & L. D. Henman (Eds.). *Small group communication: Theory & practice* (pp. 85-95). Chicago: Brown & Benchmark.

Poole, M. S., & McPhee, R. (1983). A structurational theory of organizational climate. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp.195-219). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identifycation in the organization. *Communication Theory, 8*, 298-336.

Strati, A. (1996). Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics. *Organization, 3*, 209-218.

Michael E. Reardon is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication, College of Charleston.

Nikki C. Townsley is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Revisiting Cicero in Higher Education Cultivating Citizenship Skills through Collegiate Debate Programs

Annette Holba

Abstract

Higher education is in the midst of a paradigm shift from the Professing Paradigm to the Learning Paradigm approach in pedagogical strategies. The Learning Paradigm privileges a co-producing of learning between the student and the teacher. This essay argues that collegiate debate programs can be one example of the Learning Paradigm engagement that also helps to cultivate the Greek and Roman ideal of citizenship in students. Ciceronian rhetorical theory explains how citizenship skills are developed through collegiate debate practices.

Introduction

Civic engagement is sometimes disconnected from classroom experience in contemporary higher education (Bok, 2003; Rhodes, 2001; Harris, 1998). The Learning Paradigm (Barr and Tagg, 1995) is slowly replacing the Professing or Teaching paradigms that historically prevailed in higher education. Where Professing and Teaching paradigms focused on the telling or teaching aspects of higher education, the Learning Paradigm focuses on assessment and learning that occurs in higher education (Barr and Tagg, 1995). Academic experience within the Learning Paradigm approach invites cultivation of co-curricular and extra curricular activities such as collegiate debate programs, which can ultimately develop and shape the Greek and Roman ideal of citizenship skills in students.

This essay considers what it means to be a citizen through classical and contemporary notions of citizenship. Second, this essay explores how collegiate debate experience, as an exemplar of the Learning Paradigm, is equipped to teach, develop, and cultivate citizenship understanding and skills applicable within our diverse and cosmopolitan world. Third, implications linking academic debate and citizenship development are considered through Ciceronian rhetorical theory. A central component of this paper begins with a discussion on the notion of citizenship.

Citizenship

We can learn a lot about the notion of what it means to be a good citizen or to learn about citizenship skills from the Greeks. Aristotle (2001) described citizenship to be a type of moral training. He argued that in order to be a good citizen, a man must be able to "take part in the deliberation or judicial administration of any state […] for the purpose of life" (p. 1177-1178). Isocrates' rhetorical education advocates the teaching of citizenship (Poulakos, 1997). He argued that good leaders should be good citizens and lead by example for others to follow. Therefore, a rhetorical education should teach what it means to be a good citizen. For Isocrates, citizenship meant political engagement conducted within a framework of social responsibility imbued with temperance and justice (Poulakos, 1997). Isocrates advocated the marriage between wisdom and eloquence as a prerequisite of the ideal citizen. The skills that are the foundation of Greek and Roman citizenship are 1) the ability to engage critical thinking, 2) the ability to speak well, and 3) the development of phronesis (practical wisdom). In this framework, students are invited and encouraged to more fully engage their academic experience.

Greek ideals are helpful as one contemplates what citizenship means but how does one actually learn these ideals? John Dewey (1981) advanced that "experience is pedagogical" (p. 421), which means that citizenship can be learned through doing. Dewey advocated that "the school itself shall be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set a part in which to learn lessons" (p. 459). School is where one learns citizenship, as long as school is not disinterested in civic life (Ewbank and Auer, 1951). School must be actively connected with the community otherwise, the pragmatic aspect of education is lost. Furthering this pragmatic connection to everyday living, Arthur Holmes (1999) suggested that we find citizenship through a liberal education that cultivates understandings, skills, and value development to equip one for a lifetime of living and working with other human beings.

Media ecologist, Neil Postman (1996), asserted that we can learn about civic responsibility today from our ancient roots and he suggested that students can be taught civic mindfulness by giving them a "sense of responsibility for one's own neighborhood" (p. 100). In other words, get them involved with something in the campus community. By getting them involved, students don't just play at life but they are actually engaged in life (Thoreau, 1995). Citizenship in its broadest sense is when we are able to respond appropriately to others with whom we live. It is essential that college students recognize this responsibility of citizenship because they live closely among others and they are training to participate in public settings with even more 'others.' Campus life provides "essential opportunities" for developing citizenship-like qualities (Katz and Henry, 1993, p. 9). Therefore, as educators, we ought to be teaching citizenship qualities to students through our in-classroom and out-of-classroom encounters with them. Many other scholars and critics of higher education agree that citizenship skills and development ought to be taught in the college or university setting (Astin, 1993; Lawy and Biesta, 2006; Williams and McGee, 2000). Teaching students how to live among and with the 'other' is central to teaching citizenship. From contemporary scholarship on citizenship education, the ideal of "responsible citizenship" emerges.

"Responsible citizenship" is a couplet used by Eugene Lang (2000) who suggests that as an active ethical agent, it can breathe new life back into a liberal arts mission. Lang argues that "citizenship, social responsibility, and community are inseparable" (p. 140). Therefore, an "educated citizenry" (p. 140) is necessary for responsible social interactions among other human beings. In Lang's (2000) critique of American Liberal Arts Colleges, he advocates in order to remedy some of the challenges facing liberal arts institutions today, that new vitality can be added to their life by explicitly excavating the notion of responsible citizenship as a discrete and specific undergraduate dimension. Colleges and universities have an interminable connection to society because citizens of tomorrow are trained in these institutions. It is then essential that citizenship education be an explicit part of the education of all students. By teaching citizenship through academic debate programs focus shifts away from civic 'separateness' to a more connected and harmonious relationship to others through shared ideas and concerns in a public forum. This shift lends to the positive outcomes of the learning paradigm.

Collegiate Debate and the Learning Paradigm

The Learning Paradigm can cultivate the ideal and lived experience of citizenship to students in higher education. In comparison to the Professing Paradigm or Teaching Paradigm, the Learning Paradigm focuses on the assessment of learning of the students. The idea of teaching as an 'end' is a mistake of the two earlier paradigms (Barr and Tagg, 1995). The Learning Paradigm ends the privilege of the lecturer experience and focuses on the learning experience, which does not end outside the classroom. This is a more holistic approach to learning in higher education.

In the Learning Paradigm students and faculty are co-producers of learning at two levels, the individual level and the organizational level [the self and the other] (Barr and Tagg, 1995). So the aim of an institution that cultivates the Learning Theory concept suggests that knowledge should not just be transferred (as in the old paradigms) but the institution itself "creates environments and experience that brings students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems" (Barr and Tagg, 1995, p. 15). This is the bridge that invites the engagement of both the student and the professor. The connection to a community of learners and the critical attributes that cultivate one's ability to discover and solve problems is key to the development of citizenship. Collegiate debate experience provides the opportunity for that connection to emerge and be a fruitful experience for both the community and the student. In collegiate debate, participants discover and work toward solving real local and global community problems. This attention to learning, discovery, and contribution to the public good is demonstrative of how citizenship skills are developed in debate participants.

Students engage and learn by embracing the "different" (Terenzini, 1999, p. 34). Without the notion of "the different" there is a risk to negotiate the world through scripts or patterns that cultivate laziness and lack of discovery. In "the different" a student can reflect and become involved in situated learning which is social and interactive learning – the opposite of disinterestedness. The Learning Paradigm allows for an encounter with "the different" that is not necessarily part of a particular body of knowledge. The encounter with “the different” is what helps to cultivate citizenship ideals because one encounters the other and learns ethical civic responsibilities in that engagement. Therefore, a co-producing of learning occurs in the moment and over time because the ‘engagement’ is privileged not the body of knowledge – as a canonical experience. A look at a real world example of the experience of collegiate debate can help to offer evidence of the main claim that the co-producing and co-sharing of learning, which is inherent in the Learning Paradigm, cultivates citizenship in students.

Citizenship and Academic Debate

Cultivating citizenship ideals and skills in the classroom emerges out of the Learning Paradigm. This section considers how collegiate debate programs, as instruments of the learning paradigm, enable students to gain praxial insight to understanding what it means and how to be a ‘good citizen’. The process of debate or argumentation provided a significant contribution to the establishment of our country (Ryan, 1985). The history of collegiate debate in our country tells us that students formed literary societies that met outside the classroom to discuss issues that fell outside of the faculty-approved reading list. Often these debates addressed relevant ethical and social issues of the historical moment (Ryan, 1985). As history reveals, collegiate debate found a home in many institutions of higher education as an extra-curricular activity, often with no supporting or related courses within the curriculum. However, the skills learned through participating in collegiate debate can be utilized in almost every other discipline and industry. These skills include critical thinking, articulate speaking, and phronesis (practical wisdom) in general. All of these skills are the foundation of the Greek and Roman ideal of citizenship. We learn about these skills from one of the most well known Roman orators who enlightens the centrality of academic debate for participants in the 21st century.

Cicero, Oratory, & Citizenship

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.) is known by many to be the greatest forensic orator to have lived (Fausset, 1890). Cicero’s critics give him that same distinction when they consider his temptation of ethical borders, as they “reserve praise only for his superlative mastery of tactics and techniques” (Volpe, 1978, p. 118). Known for his famous defenses in forensic oratory, Cicero was a Roman statesman, orator and letter writer who was significantly influenced by Greek orators. While academic debate generally engages policy or deliberative oratory, Cicero’s ideas set the theoretical framework for the ‘ideal’ orator in any setting.

Cicero is considered to be the guiding figure of the contemporary procedure of formal collegiate argument and debate (Enos, 1979; Rolfe, 1963). In fact, Cicero has been identified as “our only source for this goal of the academic procedure of arguing” (Powell, 1995, p.133). Cicero is considered a revolutionary because he revolutionized the art of oratory. Invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery are the five canons of rhetoric that Cicero posits in de Inventione. While he wasn't the first rhetorician/orator to denote these five divisions of rhetoric (Herrick, 2004) Cicero develops these components through several of his primary works making his discussion rich and textured.

Invention, arrangement, style, and memory are all significant in cultivating the citizenship skills of critical thinking and being able to engage and articulate ideas. Through invention one investigates and gathers ideas on all sides of an issue, through arrangement one organizes these ideas in a comprehensible and rhetorical framework, through style one decides upon particular language that will aid the audience in understanding and hold some kind of persuasive appeal, and through memory one will have a wide base of knowledge at her or his reach when needed to respond to particularities. All of these canonical steps cultivate the lived action of the ideal citizen.

Delivery, the last of his five canons is central to the practice of academic debate and cultivation of citizenship skills. Cicero's De Inventione, De Oratore, Brutus, and Orator present his primary components and concerns with delivery.

Cicero (2000) spoke least of delivery in De Inventione, however, he did lay the groundwork for future texts by defining what he meant by it. He referred to delivery as, " [t]he function of eloquence seems to speak in a manner suited to persuade an audience" (I. V. 6). He defined delivery as a control of the voice and body appropriate to maintain the integrity of the matter at hand. Cicero (1897) also asserted that delivery should be ordered by movement of body, gesture of body, glance, and variation in voice intonation. He also tempered the emphasis of the action of delivery by suggesting that a perfect orator, without acquiring some level of knowledge, can potentially create more problems than good. Cicero admitted a good orator is not only an effective deliverer of speech but also has the knowledge of evidences to support the argument presented. But he also indicated that sometimes delivery can mask empty words as he described his contemporary orator:

> In a manner not very different Publius Lentulus covered up his slowness of thought and speech by dignity of bearing; his action was fully art and grace and he possessed a strong and pleasing voice; he had in short nothing but delivery. (1xi.216)

Cicero is not saying that substance is not important but he does suggest that even if the substance is lacking sufficiency the orator can still be effective if the delivery is good.

Delivery encompasses a distinction between styles of oratory. A plain style of delivery is best for establishing proof of something. A middle style of delivery is best used for pleasure or entertainment, and a vigorous style of delivery for persuasion that requires the ultimate virtue of the speaker (Cicero, 1953). Natural talents are good to be born with and it is also good to learn about and know the topic of your speech rather than relying on the action of delivery, however, Cicero (2000) argued:

> [the] one who had acquired eloquence alone to the neglect of the study of philosophy often appeared equal in power of speech and sometimes superior […] such one seemed in his own opinion […] I am sure that whenever rash and audacious men had taken the helm of the ship of state great and disastrous wrecks occurred. (I. ii.4)

Cicero (1897) called for the orator to exert power of thought, a force of language, and a delivery exercising energy, spirit, and fullness of one's feelings. The orator should embrace oratory and not just use it without truly understanding it. If oratory is done incorrectly the delivery can be a detriment to the appeal of the argument. As an example, Cicero described the oratory style of his contemporary, Sulpicius, "[h]is mode of speaking was quick and hurried, which was owing to his genius, his style animated and somewhat redundant" (c.xxi). While there is genius behind the argument, if the delivery lacks the qualities the appeal can end up being futile. To further this issue, a critique of Crassus' speech by another citizen claimed "the rapidity of words was such that his oration was winged with such speed, that though I perceived its force and energy I could scarcely see its track and course" (c.xxxv). In this case, while much energy was emitted the meaning behind the message was lost because the audience was unable to follow it.

Cicero (1897) described traits of a good orator to include, rhythmic breathing; fluctuation of voice at appropriate junctions in the oration; clear articulation and diction; combining body movement and gesture at regular intervals; and ability to crescendo and decrescendo according to emotionality of subject matter. The ability to be a successful orator is often the result of being a naturally gifted speaker – born with the talent itself. This talent includes, "volubility of tongue, tone of voice, strength of lungs and a peculiar confirmation and aspect of the whole countenance and body" can be improved upon (c.xxv). Additionally, even with these gifts rude orators, regardless of their talents, will never be reckoned as an accomplished speaker.

In commenting on the oratory skill of Marcus Piso, Cicero (1953) said, "[h]e possessed a nature acumen which he sharpened by training […] ill tempered, not infrequently forced and frigid, yet sometimes witty" (ixvii. 236). This means that while a good orator may have a natural ability he still must develop it in order to be most effective. Since body movements are such a significant part of delivery, one needs to be fully aware of the exact movements and their impact upon the oration. Cicero described another contemporary orator, Curio, as reeling and swaying his whole body from side to side in such a manner that the movement itself distracted the message or content of the issue at hand. Cicero used this example to suggest that the action was too overt, which led to it being viewed as a jest or unimportant. In this case, Curio over exaggerated movement and alienated the audience.

One of the greatest orators of Cicero's time was Crassus. In the Brutus, Cicero (1897) presents Crassus as an individual who had little natural ability and only a moderate amount of rhetorical training. However, Cicero described Crassus as having disciplined himself through hard work and practical application, enough to gain respect within the oratory community. Crassus' oratory style can be characterized by a sufficient vocabulary that is not vulgar or commonplace. Crassus carefully arranges the matter of discussion without having to rely upon the potential tricks of the voice or delivery and his entire oration is appropriately uniform.

Aspects of delivery that should be explicitly considered include fluency of language and volubility clearly marked by pause and timed or rhythmic breathing. Cicero (1953) suggested that some orators spend their practice time on smoothness and uniformity or what can be considered cultivating a pure and clear style but other orators practice developing a harsh presentation based on severity of language and an almost gloomy approach to subject matter. This is one way to distinguish between a good and bad orator. In many ways, this test can also be applied to identifying the good citizen. A good citizen cares about issues and intends to contribute in a positive manner that invites ethical responses instead of quelling other voices or initiating negative confrontation.

Regarding the skill in the use of voice, Cicero (1953) stated, "The one who seeks supremacy in eloquence will strive to speak intensely with a vehement tone and gently lowered voice and to show dignity in a deep voice and wretchedness by a plaintive tone" (xvii. 57). By this Cicero connected emotion to voice and delivery. He described the superior orator as being able to know when to modulate or vary voice intonation, with access of a complete scale of pitches. One's emotionality is central to the ideal citizen because according to Isocrates, a good citizen is fully connected to a community (Poulakos, 1997). The superior orator avoids excess, stands erect, and monitor's body movement appropriately. Cicero continued:

> As for darting forward, he will keep it under control and employ it but seldom. There should be no effeminate bending of the neck, not widdling of the fingers, no marking the rhythm with the fingerjoint. He will control himself in the pose of his whole frame and the vigorous and manly attitude of the body, extending the arm in moments of passion. (xvii. 60)

Cicero overtly connected voice, delivery, and now gesture to emotion. Cicero placed a standard of commitment to being a good orator and this commitment included time, study, practice, and ultimately the development of skills. Raymond DeLorenzo (1978) states that "Rhetoric is practical knowledge, expressed through precepts and examples, of the techniques of persuasive utterance. The orator utilizes rhetoric" (p. 249). Clearly, Cicero considers the ideal orator as one who uses the breadth of knowledge with techniques in his utterances.

One can ignore or overextend these notions on delivery by demonstrating a lack of calm in speaking, paying no attention to arrangement of ideas, lacking precision, clarity, and pleasantry, and failing to adequately prepare the audience for the forthcoming message. Cicero recognized that his ideas about delivery could be overextended by focusing more upon the rate of delivery than the substance of the argument and the consideration of the audience. Overextending or misrepresenting Cicero's ideas on oration can impede the cultivation of citizenship. Adhering to his ideas as a foundation for collegiate debate, in a modest way can help to teach citizenship skills through collegiate debate practices.

Cicero's discussion of delivery can be adaptable to forensic, deliberative, and epideictic oratorical situations. In his description and prescription of delivery, Cicero advocates ideals consistent with the Isocratean notion of citizenship because he advocated a reasonable and authentic communicative encounter with others. Additionally, Cicero's teachings cultivate 1) one's ability to critically think and evaluate evidences, 2) develop one's ability to be articulate and influential in a public forum, and 3) permit one to develop phronesis through an active public engagement process. Cicero also warned against being abrasive or alienating one's audience. So, while Cicero's critics might question his perceived use of 'relativism' in forensic oratory, he does advocate integrity imbued in one's communicative messages. By engaging public communication with integrity one is a leader and one provides a good example for others to follow. Additionally, because Cicero advocated 'practicing' oratory and speaking from a knowledge-base (in stead of an off-the-cuff approach) he supported the type of rhetorical education that Isocrates advanced for the development of the good citizen.

The Ciceronian notion of oratory promotes the idea of a "responsible citizen" through a call for integrity in public speaking which allows the speaker to be an active, ethical agent. When the academic/collegiate debate experience richly supports these ideals of the good citizen it is exemplified by the philosophy of the Learning Paradigm. These skills are experienced in the classroom setting and outside the classroom setting, as the collegiate debate experience is also situated outside a structured classroom setting through debate competitions and the public marketplace. Participation in collegiate debate programs that adhere to Isocratic and Ciceronian rhetorical ideals helps students develop wisdom, by conducting research from multiple perspectives; eloquence, by practicing appropriate delivery style; and emotionality, that connection between the orator and the community, all of which are necessary to be a good citizen.

Implications

In order to participate in a formal debate, students need to be knowledgeable of current and controversial issues, develop a textured understanding beyond the obvious issue, and be able to develop reasoning skills that focus on real issues. This basis of knowledge enables the participant to clearly articulate issues and participate in dialectical exchange for the good of society. Argumentation skills can be cultivated by conducting thorough research, learning argumentation theory, argument construction, and having opportunities to practice speaking in public forum settings. Students gain this insight through a co-producing of learning between the professor/coach of the debate program because the debate coach becomes part of the process as students create, test, practice, and perform their arguments. Often the debate classroom environment is more invitational to the Learning Paradigm because students not only create arguments but they also have to test them in public settings. This function invites particular interestedness of the debate coach or professor that is not often present in a traditional classroom setting – there is more at a public risk in collegiate debate performance which invites this co-interestedness that is inherent in the Learning Paradigm. Additionally, the process of debate permits assessment of learning as the public debate is negotiated. Also, if collegiate debate is part of the curriculum and not outside the curriculum, students and faculty have the opportunity to discover emerging and controversial social issues together, focus on emergent issues related to their own campus community, and have legitimate time for class meetings, discussion, and practice for participation in civic-mindedness that is meaningful. This is an interactive learning experience in the "different" (Terenzini, 1999, p. 34). The collegiate debate experience need not be part of any external debate association that privileges competition and win/lose strategies. A collegiate civic argumentation program can be explicitly tied to curriculum and civic responsibility, which in turn, cultivates citizenship ideals and skills in our students to better prepare them to be civic partners in the marketplace. If a collegiate debate program as described here is not feasible for some institutions of higher education, the integration of citizenship into introductory courses can be another means of cultivating these skills. In this experience, students fully and actively participate in the classroom setting.

There are at least two implications that emerge from this discussion. First, citizenship education is a holistic endeavor that should be embraced by faculty, departments, and institutions of higher education themselves, which has the potential to invite further scholarship of an interdisciplinary nature. If citizenship is not being embrace by faculty or individual departments, it could be a result of a disconnect between the discipline and the literature already posited on citizenship education. Showing individual disciplines that citizenship is an important concept that ought to be integrated into a Learning Paradigm can increase the interest in interdisciplinary research into the matter. Further research to support this claim is necessary as we ought to know where collegiate debate programs are situated within the academy. Presently, debate programs are house within diverse disciplinary departments – encouraging interdisciplinarity of debate programs can enhance future debate scholarship. The second implication is that this discussion allows the tradition of citizenship and the present status of citizenship education to inform how we can continue to retool higher education. Additionally, through faculty involvement in collegiate debate programs, the learning of citizenship skills is not limited to students. Through faculty involvement, faculty themselves can be reminded of the moral and ethical responsibilities of citizenship as well. This is an open-ended project. Learning from tradition and examining present conditions of a situation is a hermeneutical approach that offers unique insight as we continue to look for bridges that will encourage engagement of students and faculty. As we continue to assess different approaches to higher education we realize that we need insight from both past and present so that as we look ahead, we foreground the best possible contributions.

This essay considered how the learning paradigm provides an opportunity to explicitly teach citizenship ideals through academic debate programs. By considering citizenship ideals based upon Greek ideals, Roman orators, and contemporary philosophers, an examination of the Learning Paradigm, and an explicit connection between citizenship skills and academic debate, this essay offers hope that a reintegration of citizenship ideals in higher education and its continued pursuit can build a bridge that ultimately encourages a reciprocity of engagement between students and their communities. This is certainly an exciting time to be engaged in the conversation integrating the theory and practice of higher education with the teaching-learning of citizenship ideals and skills.

References

Aristotle. (2001). Politics. In R.M. McKeon (Ed.), *The basic works of Aristotle* (pp. 1113-1316). New York: Modern Library.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, 79(1), 4-14.

Barr, R. B. and Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning—a new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*. 27(6), 12-25.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cicero, M. T. (2000). *De Inventione, De Optimo, Genere, Oratorum, Topica*. Trans. H.M. Hubbell. Great Britain: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, M. T. (1953). Brutus and Oratore. London: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, M. T. (1897). *De Oratore*. PA: David McKay Publishers.

DeLorenzo, R. (1978). The critique of Socrates in Cicero's De Oratore: Ornatus and the nature of wisdom. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 11, p. 247-261.

Dewey, J. (1981). Experience is pedagogical. In J. J. McDermott (Ed.), *The philosophy of John Dewey* (pp. 421-523). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Enos, R. L. The advocates of pre-Ciceronian Rome: Cicero's standard of forensics oratory. *Communication Quarterly*. 27, p. 54-62.

Ewbank, H. L., Auer, J. J. (1951). *Discussion and debate: Tools of a democracy*. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc.

Fausset, Rev. W.Y. (1890). *The student's Cicero*. NY: MacMillan & Company.

Gotoff, H. C. (1979). *Cicero's elegant style: An analysis of the Pro Archia*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Harris, C. B. (1998). The downsizing of the American mind: Academic citizenship and the current crisis. *ADE Bulletin*. 121, 25-28.

Herrick, J. A. (2004). *The history and theory of rhetoric: An Introduction.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Holmes, A. F. (1999). *The idea of a Christian college*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Hutchinson, G.O. Rhythm, style, and meaning in Cicero's prose. *Classical Quarterly*. 45, p. 485-499.

Katz, J. and Henry, M. (1993). *Turning professors into teachers: A new approach to faculty development and student learning*. ORYX Press.

Lang, E. M. (2000). Distinctly American: The liberal arts college. In S. Koblik and S. R. Graubard (Eds.) *Distinctly American: The residential liberal arts college.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Lawy, R. and Biesta G. Citizenship-as-practice: The educational implications of an inclusive and relational understanding of citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 54 (1), 34-50.

Postman, N. (1996). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York: Vintage Books.

Poulakos, T. (1997). *Speaking for the polis: Isocrates rhetorical education*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Powell. (1995). *Cicero the philosopher: Twelve papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rhodes, F. H. T. (2001). *The creation of the future: The role of the American university*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rolfe, J. (1963). *Cicero and his influence*. NY: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc.

Ryan, H. R. (1985). *Persuasive advocacy: Cases for argumentation and debate*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Terenzini, P. T. (1999). Research and practice in undergraduate education: And never the twain shall meet? *Higher Education*. 38, 33-48.

Thoreau, H. D. (1995). *Walden*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Volpe, M. (1978). Cicero's dust: Deception, diversion, or different perspective? *Central States Speech Journal*. 29, p. 118-126.

Williams, D. E., McGee, B. (2000). Negotiating a change in the argumentation course: Teaching cooperative argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*. 36(3), p. 105-119.

Annette Holba is Assistant Professor in the Communication and Media Studies Department at Plymouth State University, New Hampshire.

Editor's Section

[Note: at the request of the DSR-TKA executive board, this article is presented in *Speaker & Gavel* so the AFA-NIET process explained here has a permanent record in forensic archives.]

A Guide to Scheduling the AFA-NIET

Daniel Cronn-Mills

Introduction

The American Forensic Association—National Individual Events tournament (AFA-NIET) is one of the largest intercollegiate speech tournaments in the country. The tournament had been for decades scheduled by hand. A few years ago, Larry Schnoor approached me with a task: a way to streamline scheduling the NIET using computers. The traditional "by-hand scheduling" process was a 3-5 day affair involving numerous people committing a vast number of hours to preparing the schedule for the tournament.

The computerized process takes one person about three hours to schedule the students into all the flights and events, and prepare the tabsheets for all 11 events, individual sweeps and team sweeps. However, the computerized process has resulted in relatively few people who fully understanding how the computer does this work. My purpose is to explain how MS Excel templates were constructed to replicate and streamline the NIET scheduling process.

- This guide assumes the reader is familiar with the AFA-NIET.
- This guide assumes the reader is familiar with MS Exce (the Excel documents are functional in both Macintosh and Windows OS environments).

I. Pre-Scheduling Process

1. Filling in the Master Entry Form. The first step happens many days before the actual scheduling of the tournament takes place.

2. The tournament director collects the entries for the tournament.
   - 2.1. The tournament director transfers all the data from the entries into the Master Entry Form creating a master list of entries for the tournament.
   - 2.2. The tournament director assigns codes to schools and students in the order the entries are received, thus ensuring the codes are random (see 2.7 for instructions on assigning codes).
   - 2.3. Each Dramatic Duo entry has its own separate code from a student's code for all other events (see 2.7.4 for an example of assigning codes)

2.4. The tournament director is responsible for copying the Dramatic Duo code(s) into the "Duo1" and "Duo2" columns. This is necessary for proper functioning of individual sweeps.
2.5. The Individual Sweeps column is automatically tallied for each student.
2.6. The tournament director fills in the Dist (district code) column.
2.7. The tournament director fills in the Code column. Coding uses a 5-digit sequence.
  2.7.1. First three digits designate the school.
  2.7.2. Last two digits designate the student.
  2.7.3. All school codes end in "00"
  2.7.4. Example:
    2.7.4.1. 10200 – Minnesota State, Mankato
    2.7.4.2. 10201 – Heather Kaiser
    2.7.4.3. 10202 – Chad Kuyper
    2.7.4.4. 10203 – Laurel Waldock
    2.7.4.5. 10204 – Seth Michael Smith
    2.7.4.6. 10205 – Kaiser/Kuyper
    2.7.4.7. 10206 – Kuyper/Smith
    2.7.4.8. 10300 – South Dakota State
    2.7.4.9. A visual example of the above codes entered into a Master Entry Form.

3. The Master Entry Form automatically tallies and tracks a number of variables important to the tournament.
  3.1. the number of participants in each event.
  3.2. the number of sections needed for each event.

4. The tabs at the bottom of the page provide other forms and data for the tournament director
  4.1. The "Judges" tab provides a fillable form for keeping track of the tournament judges.
  4.2. The "Confirm and Fees" tab provides a fillable form for creating confirmation page for entries.
  4.3. The "Entries by District" tab is automatically populated from the "Entries" tab and provides:
    4.3.1. the total at-large entries per district
    4.3.2. the total district entries per district
    4.3.3. the total qualifiers per district

II. Scheduling the AFA-NIET

Flash demonstration of the scheduling process.

[Adobe Flash Player plug-in required for viewing Flash Demonstration]

1. Sort by an event.

2. Open up three documents.
   2.1. The completed Master Entry Form.
   2.2. The "Entry Count" document.
   2.3. An appropriate scheduling grid for the event (link is a zipped folder holding all the scheduling grids used for the NIET).
      2.3.1. Select a scheduling grid based on the number of sections in the event (number of sections is provided at the top of the Master Entry Form.
      2.3.2. The AFA-NIET does not schedule more than six students per event.
      2.3.3. The scheduling grids are named by the number of students per section by the number of sections. For example:
         4.3.3.1. 6x18 = six students per section with 18 sections in the event.
         4.3.3.2. 6x24 = six students per section with 24 sections in the event.

3. Switch to the Master Entry Document.
   3.1. Sort all data by an event.
   3.2. Copy the codes for the event from the Codes column.

4. Switch to the "Entry Count" document.
   4.1. Paste the codes for the event into the Codes column.
   4.2. Select the cells and sort by the A column—this will sort all students from the same school together.
   4.3. Select the cells and sort by the B column—this will sort the entries from the school with the most entries to the school with the least entries.

5. Switch to the appropriate scheduling grid (the layout of the grid is described below in pt. II.6).

6. Use the column-school scheduling process to input student codes for round 1. Copy/paste the codes from the "Entry Count" document into the scheduling grid for the event using the school-column method of scheduling an individual events tournament. Rounds 2 and 3 will be automatically populated based on the scheduling of Round 1.
   Flash demonstration of the scheduling process.
   [Adobe Flash Player plug-in required for viewing Flash Demonstration]

7. The scheduling grid is divided into five (5) sections separated by vertical gray bars (visual example of a completed scheduling grid).
   7.1. Section 1 (columns A-F) is for copying the codes from the "Entry Count" document (see pt. 6 below).

7.2. Section 2 (columns H-I) is for typing in the school code (only first 3-digits) for the judges assigned to each section.
7.3. Section 3 (columns K-L) will automatically identify any conflicts between students and the judges assigned to each section. The word "Conflict" (in red) will automatically appear if a judging conflict exists in that section.
7.4. Section 4 (columns N-V) are the columns printed out for distribution to students and judges.
  7.4.1. Column N identifies the section number.
  7.4.2. Column O is for typing in the room assigned to that round/section.
  7.4.3. Column P is for typing in the last names of the two judges assigned to each section.
  7.4.4. Columns Q-V are automatically populated and the speaking orders sorted by the data provided in columns A-F.
7.5. Section 5 (columns X-AE) is computing space for operating the automatic judge conflict process described earlier.

8. Save the scheduling grid by the name of the event and the year of the tournament. For example:
   8.1. Prose-sched08
   8.2. Impromptu-sched08
   8.3. Duo-sched08

9. IMPORTANT: *ALL* TABSHEETS (INCLUDING SWEEPS) *MUST* BE SAVED IN THE SAME FOLDER FOR SWEEPS TABSHEET TO PROPERLY INTEGRATE ALL DATA.

10. Repeat this process to schedule the remaining events.

11. Schedule the judges using the traditional "by hand" approach.

12. Schedule the rooms using the traditional "by hand" approach.

III. Prepping the Individual Event Tabsheets for the AFA-NIET

1. Open the "Tabsheet" template (note that Dramatic Duo has its own tabsheet template since the event has two participants).

2. Open the Master Entry Form.

3. Select, copy, and paste the Code and Student columns in to the "Tabsheet" template.

4. Resort by the Code column to ensure all students are listed in correct code order.

5. Save the document in the name of the event in the following way "event-tab-year". For example:
    - 5.1.1. Prose-tab2008
    - 5.1.2. Impromptu-tab2008
    - 5.1.3. Duo-tab2008
        - 5.1.3.1. Dramatic Duo has its own tabsheet template since the event has two participants. The need for the special tab-sheet will become evident when the individual event tab functions are explained later on this process.

6. Repeat this process to set up the tabsheets for the other events.

IV. Prepping for Individual Sweeps and Team Sweeps

1. Open all eleven (11) individual events tabsheets you created in steps III.3.

2. Click on the "Indy Pts." Tab (located at the bottom of the page) in each tab-sheet.
    - 2.1. Select cell A:6 in each tabsheet.
    - 2.2. Open the Master Entry Form document.
    - 2.3. Sort by the IS column (Individual Sweeps).
        - 2.3.1. Copy the Code and Student cells for each student in Individual Sweeps.
        - 2.3.2. Paste the code and Student cells into all eleven (11) individual events tabsheets.
            - 2.3.2.1. <u>All</u> students in Individual Sweeps must be copied into each tabsheet, regardless of whether the student is competing in the event or not.

3. Click on the "Team Pts." Tab (located at the bottom of the page) in each tabsheet.
    - 3.1. Select cell A:6 in each tabsheet.
    - 3.2. Open the Master Entry Form document.
    - 3.3. Sort out the Schools from the student entries.
        - 3.3.1. Copy the code and school-name cells for each school entered in the tournament.
        - 3.3.2. Paste the code and school-name cells for each school into all eleven (11) individual events tabsheets.
            - 3.3.2.1. <u>All</u> schools must be copied into each tabsheet, regardless of whether the school has a student competing in the event or not.

4. Open the NIET Sweeps document.
    - 4.1.1. Select the Individual Sweeps tab.
        - 4.1.1.1. Paste the code and Student cells into the NIET Sweeps document.

4.1.2. Select the Team Sweeps tab.

4.1.2.1. Paste the code and Team cells into the NIET Sweeps document.

5. Syncing the individual event files to the sweeps file. The specialized names you gave each of the event tabsheets in step III-5 requires re-setting the NIET Sweeps document so it will draw data from the correct files.
   5.1. Open the NIET Sweeps document
   5.2. For Excel 2007. Follow this path: Data→Edit Links
   5.3. For Excel 1997-2003. Follow this path: Edit→ Links→Change Source

You are now ready to start the American Forensic Association—National Individual Events Tournament

V. Running the Tournament

1. The tabsheets may be copied to other machines in whatever pairings are desired by the national tournament director.

2. Be sure to continually save the tabsheets to the tab station computers and continually backup the data.

3. Data integration for sweeps is accomplished by copying the filled-in tabsheets back into the master folder holding the sweeps tabsheet.

4. Open all tabsheets, including the sweeps tabsheet.

5. Check all event tabsheets to ensure no error codes are present. An error code will indicate a mismatch in codes between an event and the sweeps tabsheets. If an error code appears, doublecheck the relevant tabsheets until the error is rectified.

A complete set of tournament documents for the 2007 AFA-NIET
Provided with permission of Larry Schnoor, AFA-NIET tournament director
[file has been compressed/zipped]

Daniel Cronn-Mills is a professor and chair in the Speech Communication Department at Minnesota State University, Mankato