The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

published by the

Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Spring 1985

Volume XI Number I

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Volume XI Number I

The Speech Anxiety Program at UTK: A Class for Students with High Public Speaking Anxiety

Bob Ambler

An ever increasing body of literature in Speech Communication points to a group of students who experience difficulty with the act of communication.[1] We have begun to be concerned about understanding a broad range of phenomena frequently referred to as communication apprehension, reticence, shyness, unwillingness to communicate, and speech anxiety. We have also raised the issues of what can be done about them and whether, when, and how we should undertake to facilitate change in the patterns of communication avoidance and negative attitudes which some of our students hold toward communication.[2] This latter force allows us to focus the power of our research tools on human actualization rather than viewing "communication apprehension," "reticence," or "shyness" as some kind of illness which must be treated by an "expert." It tends to place the responsibility for one's attitudes and behaviors back on oneself, and as such make the avoidance of communication and negative attitudes about communication problems more amenable to classroom consideration, especially the classroom in which the degree of positive achievement is rewarded rather than the distance from a theoretical norm being punished.

Results of a 1982 survey by Foss[3] demonstrate the existence of a substantial number of special programs for helping communication avoidant persons at U.S. colleges and universities, even though the percentage of schools having such special communication programs is only around 10%. Some of these programs are noncredit activities which may or may not support a specific communication class, while other programs integrate the special training into either an elective course or a special section of a required communication course. While the survey does not clearly specify, it implies strongly that the focus of most of these programs is on communication apprehension or communication avoidance at the **interpersonal** level rather than the **public speaking** level.

This focus of concern on the interpersonal level probably reflects the fact that many departments tend to have a basic course that is more general in nature, including communication phenomena from interpersonal to public communication. There are, however, schools where the communication course required for most students is basic public speaking. This is the case at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and I suspect this may be true for other Tennessee colleges and universities. The public speaking orientation of the basic course has led to several differences in the special program for communication avoidant students at UTK as compared to programs at schools where the basic course is more oriented toward communication as applied to a variety of contexts. For that reason, I want to describe the context and development of the Speech Anxiety Program at the University of Tennessee. Included herein will also be discussion of the methods we have found helpful and a general discussion of the perceived effectiveness of the program.

History of the Program

"Speech Anxiety Program" is the label we have used to designate the efforts made by a handful of faculty members and graduate students from the Department of Speech and Theatre, the Department of Educational Psychology, and the UT Counseling Services Center to assist highly speech anxious students to feel more comfortable about giving a speech, and attain requisite skills for the presentation of a speech. The program primarily supports the speech communication course most commonly required by UTK students, namely the public speaking course (Speech 2311). While the program has grown from an interdisciplinary base, the primary responsibility for its direction is currently placed upon the Department of Speech and Theatre, where a special section of the public speaking class for speech anxious students is offered every quarter except during the summer. The size of the class varies, but usually ranges between 20 and 30 students, which is roughly 5% of the total enrollment in the regular sections of the speech classes.

In the past, the special section class had the same course number as the regular public speaking class (Speech 2312), even though the course title is the same (Public Speaking). The change in the school's General Catalog has not yet reflected the change, but in the revision for 1985-1986, Speech 2312 will follow Speech 2311 in the listing of Speech courses offered by the Department. The regular public speaking course will be described as "Basic principles of speech preparation and delivery," while the description for Speech 2312 will indicate that it covers the same material as Speech 2311 "with additional work on methods for coping with anxiety." Both descriptions will indicate that credit for only one of the two courses can be counted toward graduation. The description of Speech 2312 will indicate that the student needs the permission of the instructor to enroll. This change in course numbering and description was made in order to make the special section class more visible to advisors and students in departments which require a basic speech course.

The main activity of the Speech Anxiety Program has not always been the offering of a special section of our basic course. When we began the program nine years ago in the Summer of 1973, students enrolled in the regular public speaking classes who scored high on the PRCA-C (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-College Form)[4] were given the opportunity to participate in a noncredit six hour workshop which was designed to help the student reduce anxiety about giving a speech. The workshops were taught by Counseling Center staff, Speech Department faculty, or graduate students, and provided training in systematic desensitization as applied to the public speaking situation. Such workshops were our primary medium for helping highly speech anxious students until the Spring of 1977. At that time we offered the first special section of public speaking for speech anxious students. We reasoned that it would be more cost-efficient to integrate the training into the curriculum, and we thought that the training might be more effective if the instructor were more directly associated with the special kinds of training. Pre-post measures using the PRCA-C had indicated that the workshop training had been effective in reducing the participants' anxiety[5], but several difficulties bothered us. One was the time required to schedule the special workshop times and notify the participants. A great amount of time was spent trying to accommodate the class schedules of 15 to 30 students in order to find free time to assign them to 4 or 5 groups for meetings twice weekly. A second difficulty was while the systematic desensitization training employed in the workshop was effective in reducing the anxiety of those completing the workshop, our dropout rate from the first to the second meeting was fairly high. We theorized at least part of this effect was a motivational problem. Given the press of other class activities and extracurricular concerns, many students will choose not to take on additional noncredit training unless it is very clear the training is providing some immediate and directly needed improvement. The relaxation training offered in the workshops is the type of skill that requires consistent practice over a period of time. My experience with teaching systematic desensitization indicates while an initial session of relaxation can be very rewarding, it can also be difficult for the student to see how lying on a carpeted floor with a pillow behind the head, and how doing relaxation exercises can be effective in getting one to feel more comfortable giving a speech. This takes an act of faith that students who lack confidence in their ability to negotiate effectively the public speaking situation is sometimes not willing to make, regardless of how credible the facilitator may appear. In short, we felt that some other kind of motivation which could be mediated by the classroom environment would help to keep the students in the systematic desensitization training long enough for them to begin to experience the potentially positive effects.

Identification: Who Should Be in the Class?

A critical question for any program providing communication training for anxious students is how to identify and select students for the program. Our primary means for identifying students involves a high degree of self selection. The Timetable of Classes, which the students use for preregistration and registration, identifies the special section of the public speaking class by a message which indicates that this particular section is for "speech anxious" students only. It further indicates that enrollment requires the permission of the instructor, whose name, office, and phone number are listed. I have been the instructor of the special section class since we started teaching it. In that sense, our program is very much like the majority of programs for communication avoidant students in that it is staffed by one person.[6], even though a number of people from our Counseling Center and from our graduate and undergraduate students have provided support to it in the past. We have also been fortunate to have a graduate student assigned to help with the class during the last two academic years. During preregistration, the computer treats the class as if the limit for enrollment is one person, such that all students, but one, who attempt to enroll receive a computer feedback that the class is closed. If the students do as recommended, and contact me for permission to enroll, and if it appears that the course would be appropriate for them, then I take their names and relevant information. I alert them to the message which will probably tell them that the class is closed, and I emphasize the importance of showing up for the first day of class so that I can add them to the official roll.

In selecting among those students who request entry into the class, I have two basic concerns: (1)That the students understand what the class is about, and (2)That the students indicate verbally that they experience an above average amount of anxiety about giving a speech. At this time, I do not ask students to complete a paper and pencil test, and I do not extensively interview them. A reason for this is that I believe the students know more about their experiences than I, and I want us to decide jointly about whether the class seems to be the kind of experience that would benefit them. Second reason for the nature of the preregistration procedure is to control the number requesting the class in order to maintain manageable class size.

A second step to identify students for the special section of the class occurs during the first week of class. While 60 to 75% of the enrollment for the special section class is determined during the preregistration period (which is usually the fifth or sixth week of the quarter preceding the one in which the students will take the class), we also recognize that some students who are required to take the class, but who are especially nervous about giving speeches will not notice during preregistration the announcement of the special section in the Timetable. Consequently, during the first day of class, the instructors of the regular public speaking classes will announce the special section class and/or administer a self-scoring instrument designed to measure a person's anxiety about giving a speech, usually the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA)[7]. Students who take the PRPSA are told that if they have higher scores (one standard deviation or more above the mean) they may consider taking the special section of the public speaking class for speech anxious students, and that they must get the permission of the instructor of that section if they wish to enroll. We emphasize that the scores are only a general indicator of whether the students would find the special section helpful, and we encourage anybody who has doubts about the appropriateness of the class to speak with me. At this point in the enrollment process I exercise more selectivity than previously, because although I will allow a total of 25 students into the class, the demand often exceeds that number. The primary question I ask myself is: How much does this student need to get the public speaking course this particular quarter? This, of course, gives priority to upperclassmen, and it also gives priority to students who would have a number of required oral presentations in upcoming required courses. Students who cannot get into the course are advised to preregister for the course in a subsequent quarter. If they determine to attempt the regular section of the class in which they are enrolled, we offer to provide the noncredit training in relaxation training or behavioral rehearsal using videotape, if they are interested. There are usually some students who score high on the PRPSA who stay in the regular section of the class and complete it successfully without any visible negative effects. I do not think this indicates that the special section is unnecessary. I see it as a tribute to good teaching and to applying common sense and directed effort in relating to students' needs.

The Class: How is it Different?

While the essential goals of teaching students to understand better and to apply the principles of public speaking are common for all our public speaking classes, the special section speech class differs from the regular public speaking classes in several ways. The main differences are determined by the greater emphasis the special section places on helping students cope more effectively with anxiety about speaking. Consequently, the first few weeks of the course are spent trying to develop a more positive attitude about communicating. This has been partially accomplished by systematic desensitization (or a related form of relaxation called cue controlled relaxation), a rough form of cognitive restructuring[8], a graduated series of progressively more complicated and more anxiety provoking communication exercises (partially achieved by gradually increasing the size of the audience), and training in specific skills necessary for an effective presentation (especially delivery skills such as how to prepare an effective set of usable notes). The strategy followed early in the course is to help students feel more positive about approaching the communication situation by teaching skills for coping with feelings as well as skills which will allow them to present a speech more effectively. At this point, my concern is as much with the students' attitude as it is with the actual performance, because attitude and performance are especially transactive with speech anxious students. A positive attitude is more likely to encourage students to attempt a speech, thus allowing them to be able to say 'I can do it.' With appropriate skills, instruction, and rehearsal, performance can lead to a more positive attitude toward communication. Ultimately, the concern of our program is with performance, but one aspect of performance is whether a person continues to approach or chooses to avoid future speaking opportunities after finishing the course, and because attitude plays such an important part in the students' approach-avoidance tendencies, we cannot avoid dealing with their attitudes about communicating.

About the third or fourth week of the course, all students in the class are asked to deliver a two to three minute speech in which they define a term or phrase. The speech is delivered to a lab group of eight to ten students with whom they have previously engaged in several interpersonal or small group exercises. These speeches are videotaped and in the subsequent lab period are played back to the students and to the other members of the lab group to whom the students delivered the speeches. My purpose in playing back the speeches is to give the students a basis for measuring improvement in specific speech skills. I attempt to motivate them by assigning a portion of their course grade (approximately a fifth) to how much improvement they make on specific delivery skills. The goal analysis procedure, which has been used in the Penn State reticence program[9], is adapted to specific speech delivery skills such as looking at the audience more, using gestures to emphasize main points, and pausing between sentences without using articulated pauses. Consequently, the group viewing of the students' previously videotaped definition speeches allows the students to begin to see specific delivery skills which need improvement. It also gets students used to seeing themselves on videotape, which can be intimidating. During the group viewing, we stop between speeches and ask all students to respond to seeing themselves. We encourage other students in the group to identify aspects they liked about each speech. In general, we encourage the groups viewing the speeches to be realistic, but positive, and the instructor attempts to do the same. Very rarely will we discuss specific goals on which the students want to improve during the group videotape viewing, and then usually only at the participants' request. This function is performed later in a conference with the instructor. After seeing their definition speeches in the lab group setting, the students set a conference time with the instructor. At this conference each student must state two or three goals for self-improvement. Together with the instructor, students again view the videotape of their definition speeches, and students and teacher negotiate what specific delivery goals they will attempt to achieve. During the conference, the instructor points out possible areas for improvement they may not have observed, confirms or helps to modify the statement of goals the students have initially selected, suggests specific ways of determining whether the goals have been met, and suggests special strategies for working on the goals. After the conference, the students complete and turn in a goal analysis form, much like the one used in the Penn State program.[10] On this form the students state the goals in behavioral terms, indicate what specific performances will have to take place to say that the goals have been achieved, and outline the strategies for attempting to accomplish the goals. Finally, the students are asked to evaluate their goal achievement following each of the three graded speeches in the class (these speeches begin two or three weeks after the videotaping of the definition speeches). The students observe videotapes of the graded speeches and write an analysis in which they compare their actual performance to the standards set in the goal analysis procedure completed earlier.

While the goal analysis procedure described here makes it appear that our primary concern in teaching/learning is with speech delivery, this is not the case. The course deals with other aspects of speech preparation, including the development of effective supporting material, organization of the speech, and audience analysis. As previously noted, the goal analysis procedure counts only 20% of the students' overall course grade, and the instructor attempts to make delivery considerations a minor part of the evaluation of the three graded speeches. The inclusion, however, of the goal analysis procedure that focuses on delivery makes the course different from our regular sections of the public speaking class.

The special section places slightly more emphasis on delivery. Our reason for this comes from the assumption that speech anxious students are more concerned about personal appearance and lack confidence in ability to deliver a speech (more so than for speech preparation skills). In addition, we have observed that many of the people who come through the class have an unrealistic view concerning how they come across to an audience. We view the use of the videotaping and the correspondent goal analysis procedure as a means of helping students develop a more realistic, positive, and coping view toward communicating in the public speaking setting.

One of the other techniques we use in the speech anxiety class is a generalized use of modeling. Before each of the graded speeches, we show the students example speeches of the type they are required to deliver. The example speeches were delivered by former students in the class and appear to the instructor to be successful achievements of that particular assignment. In addition, students are encouraged to listen critically to their classmates to identify qualities they like about their classmates' speaking so they may emulate those qualities. The instructor of the class also attempts to provide a model. As an example of this, early in the quarter, just prior to the videotaped definition speech, the instructor gives a lecture on the effective use of note cards. In this case, I choose to "give a speech" in which I define some term the students need to understand, i.e., "extemporaneous speaking." I use a note card to assist me, and we videotape my presentation. Then we play back the videotape of the speech, and the students are given a mimeographed copy of the note card I used to deliver the speech. Then we talk through why I prepared my notes as I did, with an effort made to encourage the practice of the concept I have just defined, "extemporaneous speaking." In this particular case I choose the topic, "how to effectively use note cards," partly because I believe this is a critical skill for speech anxious students.

My own experience tells me that many of the students who are nervous about giving a speech are overly concerned about saying what they have to say "the right way." They attempt to memorize their speech from a manuscript. Consequently, I believe that it is necessary to spend more time encouraging "extemporaneous" speaking for speech anxious students than for the average student in the regular public speaking class.

Evaluation of Course

With these descriptions about our special section of public speaking for speech anxiety, let me now turn to some evaluational data of the program. I will begin by reporting which aspects of the class students report they have found most and least useful.

At the end of almost every quarter, we ask students to rate or comment on the elements of the special section class which have been especially helpful or not helpful to them. Our purpose is to give us another perspective for improving the class, and the results have been instructive. By far, the most commonly mentioned helpful aspect of the course is the "graduated approach" to giving a speech. As explained earlier, this consists of starting students speaking in small informal groups requiring uncomplicated goals and gradually moving them to speaking before larger groups and making the assignments incrementally more difficult. Thus, students in the special speech class give more speeches than students in the regular speech class, though none of the first few speeches are difficult. This is an application of the underlying principle of systematic desensitization to the real situation (or *in vivo* desensitization). It is my belief that this is not only the element of the class that students report as being singularly most helpful, but it is also the element most responsible for allowing the students to reduce their anxiety about giving a speech so they can focus on things to improve their communication effectiveness.

Other aspects of the course students report as being helpful include receiving videotape feedback of their speeches, seeing sample speeches delivered in previous quarters, emphasis on using note cards appropriately, and the use of the goal analysis procedure to identify areas for improvement and to chart the improvement. The use of cognitive restructuring is listed as helpful to some students, but is listed by the overall group as lower in helpfulness than the previously listed items. Interestingly, the systematic desensitization and cue controlled relaxation, which were the basis of the training in the workshop stage of development of our overall program, are ranked similarly with the cognitive restructuring. The relaxation training appears to be helpful to some people, but others found it of little use. This has led us to consider this part of the course as optional. Instead of requiring all the students in the class to participate in the cue controlled relaxation sessions, we now tell them about the procedure at the beginning of the class. We indicate the personal characteristics of the people we think would be most likely to benefit from it, and offer the relaxation training outside the class on a voluntary basis in a noncredit workshop as we did before we started the special section of the class. Usually, not more than one-fourth of the students in the class will elect to be in the cue controlled relaxation group. This probably is a more efficient way of using the cue control training because the students have increased involvement created by personal choice in the matter. If we find speech anxious students in a regular speech class but who cannot take the special section during a given quarter, we attempt to place them in the out of class cue control relaxation group set up for the students in the speech anxious class. There are other aspects of the special section class which students report as being particularly helpful, but the ones mentioned above are the main ones.

Besides student evaluations, we administer a verbal report of public speaking anxiety (PRPSA)[11] both at the beginning and at the end of the class. The PRPSA is a 34 item questionnaire which requires students to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 different aspects of how they feel about giving a speech, such that overall scores on the test can range from 34 to 170 with the larger scores representing greater intensity of public speaking anxiety.[12] A theoretically "average" score on the instrument would be 102 (a neutral or '3' response on all 34 items). The mean obtained from surveying all sections of the public speaking class has ranged from 104 to 109 at the beginning of the class. In contrast, the mean on the PRPSA for students beginning the special section class has ranged between 130 and 143 for the classes we have taught to date. That number is at least one full standard deviation above the average for all sections combined. It should be noted that students in the special section class (with the exception of those who come into the class through the regular sections where they are administered the PRPSA during the first day of class) do not complete the PRPSA until they have been admitted to the class. They have, therefore, no reason to inflate their scores to be admitted. The post course mean for the special section class ranges between 102 and 117 on the PRPSA, and the average decline in anxiety is 30 points or about one and a half standard deviations. Thus, the students' report about how they feel about giving a speech indicates that the special section class accomplishes its goal of reducing anxiety about speaking.

One might question whether training in public speaking in other sections of the class does not accomplish the same thing which the special section class does. We have data on decreases on the PRPSA for all sections of the public speaking class during the Spring quarter of 1976, and the decline was only 13 points, from 109 to 96. While the special section of public speaking had not yet begun in 1976, nine of the students taking the class that quarter had volunteered to go through the systematic desensitization noncredit workshop. Their drops on the PRPSA from the beginning of the course to the end were 20 points greater than matched students who had comparably high PRPSA scores at the beginning of the course, but who had not gone through the systematic desensitization training.

A second piece of information also suggests that the special section for speech anxious students is effective in helping those students better cope with the public speaking situation. In December of 1978, students completing the public speaking class (Fall, 1978) were surveyed as to the degree to which they thought they had accomplished a number of different goals which a course in public speaking might set, i.e., organizing a speech, finding supporting material, relating to an audience, etc. One of the goals listed on the survey was "Feeling more comfortable or relaxed about giving a speech." On a 3 point scale (3=Learned nothing and 1=Learned a lot), students in the special section class averaged 1.29 on the degree to which they had learned to relax or to feel comfortable about giving a speech. Students in the other sections averaged 1.50 on the same item. This indicates that the students in the special section speech class thought they had learned more about relaxing while giving a speech than did the students in the regular sections of speech.

Finally, anonymous student evaluations done at the end of the special speech class indicate a greater positive change toward the class than occurred in the regular speech classes. During the 1978-1979 school year, the instructor of the special section class administered a post course anonymous questionnaire for each of the classes (Fall, Winter, and Spring). The questionnaire was a modification of the one developed by the Learning Resource Center at UTK (SRI-2) for course evaluation. The questionnaire was scored by the instructor after the grades had been turned in. It asks two questions which deal with the student's attitude toward the class, both before and after the class. The results on this question indicated that students substantially improved their attitudes toward the class. The average on the before class item was 3.30 (n=44) and the average on the after class attitude was 1.84 (n=44) (scores could range from 1-exceptional to 5-poor). The instructor of the class then examined previous evaluations of public speaking classes he had taught, and in which he had administered the SRI-2. These were regular sections of the public speaking class. In those classes, the students averaged a 3.04 on the pre-class attitude and 2.56 for the post-class attitude. This indicates that the special section seems to be starting with students who are less positive toward the public speaking class and leads to more positive attitudes.

The special section of the public speaking class for speech anxious students is, therefore, the main activity within the overall Speech Anxiety Program at UTK. The program, because of its focus on helping students who are highly anxious about giving speeches and who are also required to take a basic public speaking course, differs in many ways from other programs designed to assist students who are avoidant of communication or who have negative attitudes toward communication. Our departmental focus on public speaking limits us in some ways, and there are plans to extend our training to the interpersonal communication classes. We believe, however, that the program has been moderately successful in accomplishing its goals, and that it can serve as a base for relating to other communication difficulties.

NOTES

[1]William Work, "On Communication Apprehension: Everything You've Wanted to Know But Have Been Afraid to Ask," **Communication Education**, 31 (1982) 248-257.

[2]See for example Gerald M. Phillips (ed.), "The Practical Teachers' Symposium on Shyness, Communication Apprehension, Reticence, and a Variety of Other Common Problems," **Communication Education**, 29 (1980) 213-263, and Gerald M. Phillips (ed.), "Coming of Age in the Academy: A Symposium," **Communication Education**, 31 (1982) 177-223.

[3]Karen A. Foss, "Communication Apprehension: Resources for the Instructor," **Communication Education**, 31 (1982) 195-203.

[4]James C. McCroskey, "Measures of Communication Bound Anxiety," **Speech Monographs**, 37 (1970) 269-277.

[5]The results of the workshop stage of the Speech Anxiety Program are discussed by Richard Nash and John Edgerly, "Accountability Efforts Which Have Worked (?) and Not Worked (?)," Paper presented at the Annual Conference of University and College Counseling Center Directors, Snowbird, Utah, 1976.

[6]Jan Hoffman and Jo Sprague, "A Survey of Reticence and Communication Apprehension Treatment Programs at U.S. Colleges and Universities," **Communication Education**, 31 (1982) 187.

[7]McCroskey, 1970, 276-277.

[8]As a technique, cognitive restructuring is based on the idea that what we say to ourselves affects the way we feel and how we behave. Thus, people who are highly nervous about speaking are quite often saying things to themselves that enhance their anxiety and thus decrease the chance they will be able to do an effective presentation. For a description of applying this technique, see William J. Fremouw and Michael D. Scott, "Cognitive Restructuring: An Alternative Method for the Treatment of Communication Apprehension," **Communication Education**, 28 (1979) 129-133. A very similar perspective but with a different twist can be found in rational-emotive therapy, which is described in Albert Ellis and Robert A. Harper, **A New Guide to Rational Living** (North Hollywood, CA: Wilshire Book Co., 1975). This technique has been carefully applied to the reduction of anxiety about speaking in Arden K. Watson, **Handbook with Activities for Confidence in Speaking** (Bowling Green, KY: Barnard Press, 1980), which is an instructional text for special speech classes for communication apprehensive students. The September, 1984 issue of the **Communication Apprehension and Avoidance Newsletter**, which is an in house publication of the SCA Commission on Communication Apprehension and Avoidance, indicates that a revised and expanded edition of Watson's Handbook with a separate teacher's guide is now available. I highly recommend both the **Newsletter** and the **Handbook**. For information about either, you should write: Dr. Arden Watson, Department of Speech Communication, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881-0801.

[9]Herman Cohen, "Teaching Reticent Students in a Required Course," **Communication Education**, 29 (1980) 222-228.

[10]Cohen, 1980, 227.

[11]The data that follows is based on results from 1977 to 1982. In the Fall of 1982, we began using another measuring instrument, the PRCA-24, to assess initial anxiety and anxiety reduction during the time of the course. The PRCA-24 is a 24 item instrument, developed initially to offset the bias of the PRCA-C toward public speaking items, which measures the anxiety experienced by a person across several different contexts, public speaking, group interaction, meetings, and two person interactions. Like the PRPSA, each of the items on the test have rating values of from 1 (strongly agree with the statement presented) to 5 (strongly disagree). Thus, overall scores can vary from 24 as a low to 120 as a high for the overall test. In addition, each of the four contexts mentioned above, public speaking, groups, meetings, and dyadic communication, is represented by six of the items on the overall scale, and so apprehension scores for each of the contexts can be determined. The model on which the PRCA-24 is based, as well as initial data on means, standard deviations, and reliability figures are presented by James C. McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look at Measurement," Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago, April, 1981. Pre-post measures on the PRCA-24 for the special section class between Fall, 1982, and Winter, 1985, reflect similar results to those using the PRPSA in the sense that beginning scores on the instrument are reduced by one to one and a half standard deviations between the beginning and the end of the course. In addition, though, the results also show that the greatest decline is for public speaking anxiety as opposed to anxiety about communicating in groups, meetings, and dyads. Initial scores for students in the class show that the public speaking anxiety is relatively higher for those who are selected for the class than is their anxiety about communicating in other situations. This is probably reflective of the nature of the course.

[12]McCroskey, 1970, 275-276.

Radio Pioneer: Victor H. Laughter

Dr. Marvin R. Bensman

We know rather little about the earliest history of wireless development other than stories about those particular pioneers whose efforts were influential or successful. It should not surprise those who study that history to discover that many individuals did not achieve success but contributed much. One fascinating story that has never been told is that of Mr. Victor H. Laughter.

Victor H. Laughter was born January, 1888, in Byhalia, Mississippi.[1]

At the age of 12, Laughter and his sister Belva boarded with Andersen W. Meely of Byhalia, Mississippi, while attending the Waverly Institute.[2] They may have been orphaned. It was during this time, in 1900, that Laughter built his first experimental wireless set. Later, Belva married a Mr. Joseph Thompson and moved to Memphis.[3]

We have no direct record of Victor H. Laughter's further education in the field of wireless or electricity, but he most likely attended some college or institute between 1906 and 1909.

In 1909, his book, **Operator's Wireless Telegraph and Telephone Handbook**, was published by Frederick J. Drake and Company. The book was written ". . .with the end in view of leading the student through the experimental stage, on up to the more complicated types of wireless telegraph and telephone instruments."[4] The book was a well written and complete description of the wireless field up to that time, with a section on Dr. Lee deForest's audion which had only been patented that year. Laughter noted: "The Audion has proven very sensitive for use in wireless telephony, yet it is doubtful that it will ever come into wide use, owing to the difficulty in manufacture and short life."[5] This was a true statement for that time. The book went into a second printing in 1918 and finally went out of print in 1929 after selling some 30,000 copies.[6]

At the age of 21, Laughter took the post of Technical Director and Secretary for the American Wireless Institute of Detroit, Michigan, an early electrical engineering school.[7]

It was in 1909 from Detroit that Victor H. Laughter patented his first three inventions in the wireless field. The first, filed on April 28, 1909, was for a transmitting system for space telephony. His second patent was filed July 10, 1909, for further improvements on his earlier patent. The third patent, filed October 20, 1909, was for a transmitter condenser for obtaining high frequency oscillations. All three of these inventions were assigned to Dr. Lee DeForest's North American Wireless Corporation. DeForest's company went bankrupt in 1911, and its assets eventually were acquired by the Radio Corporation of America.[8]

Laughter had by that time corresponded with and met some of the early pioneer influences upon a whole generation of young men; Mr. H.W. Young, editor of **Popular Electricity** magazine in Chicago; and Mr. Hugo Gernsback, publisher of **Modern Electrics** magazine in New York.[9] In 1909 Gernsback also had opened a wireless parts company, the Electro Importing Company, on Fulton Street, New York, which sold both foreign and domestic devices by mail-order to amateur experimenters. In order to interest young people in purchasing these devices, Mr. Gernsback set out to educate his potential customers on the early art of wireless telegraphy and telephony.[10]

Laughter apparently so impressed H.W. Young with his knowledge of radio that, in 1909, his second book, **Wireless Telegraphy Made Simple**, was published by Young's company.[11]

Then in 1910, at the age of 22, Laughter left Detroit for New York to become the first editor of Gernsback's first magazine, **Modern Electrics**. The magazine had begun publication in 1909, with Gernsback editing the first few issues himself.[12] For some reason four years later Laughter left the magazine, and the next we learn of him he was in Memphis, Tennessee in the Spring of 1913.[13]

In Memphis, as elsewhere, interest in wireless technology was high. There was some amateur activity but the first serious commercial effort was launched by a group of professional engineers, electricians and businessmen who formed the Tri-States Wireless Association to share information and promote wireless communication. By May, 1912, the association was the first tenant of the Falls Building on a top tenth floor suite, directly across from the Falls family's office. An antenna for the **Tri-States** transmitter was attached to the elevator penthouse on the Falls Building roof.[14] Their call letters were T.A.M. (Tri-States Association-Memphis).

December 1912 they requested an exemption from the then new Radio Act of 1912 to operate on a wavelength of between six and seven hundred metres (499.7 - 350 kHz) with an estimated power of 2 kilowatts. It was estimated their signal could be heard no more than 60 miles. The closest governmental or commercial station at that time was located at New Orleans, Louisiana, some 400 miles away. The department of Commerce reminded the association that general amateur stations had to operate on 200 metres with no more than one kilowatt of power and needed a license. No further record of the station was located in the files of the Department of Commerce Radio Division, but they must have obtained a commercial license because they began wireless operations.[15]

The connection of **Tri-States** with the Falls Building was likely due to the wireless interest of John W. Falls II. Falls had graduated from Yale University in 1900 with a B.S. in Electrical Engineering.[16] Dr. Lee deForest had earned his Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from the same institution in 1899, and since classes were small it can be supposed that Falls knew deForest.[17] Laughter must have known deForest as Laughter's 1909 patents would not have been assigned to one of deForest's companies without deForest's knowledge.

The first known wireless contact with a vessel on the Mississippi River was accomplished by the **Tri-States Wireless Association** on May 16, 1912, with the gunboat **U.S.S. Petrel** when it was some eighteen hours out of Memphis. The gunboat was docking at most of the major riverports of the Mississippi to Cairo, Illinois, for training and public relations. The station transmitted statements of welcome by the **Commercial Appeal** and Mayor Edward H. Crump. The **Petrel** responded with thanks and requested the assistance of the **Commercial Appeal** in setting up a recreational baseball game between the crew and a local team. After several calls a game was arranged for Saturday, May 18, 1912, with the Christian Brothers College Baseball Team.[18]

The first known voice and music broadcast in Memphis took place from the Falls Building approximately one year later.

Victor H. Laughter apparently had developed an acquaintance with the electrical engineers who comprised the membership of the **Tri-States Wireless Association.**[19] Laughter arranged to have his wireless telephony equipment installed at the **Tri-States** station in the Falls Building over the summer of 1913 and held a demonstration for reporters from the **Commercial Appeal**. The demonstration on June 14, 1913, at 8:30 p.m. consisted of a test broadcast from the station to a receiver located at the home of his brother-in-law Joseph Thompson, some two miles away. The receiver was operated by Thompson's younger brother, Vance.

The first sounds heard over considerable atmospheric disturbances by the reporters were the strains of a waltz being played on a gramaphone. Over the next hour or so. Laughter and his brother-in-law Thompson sang, whistled, told stories and played more recorded music. Laughter noted that the signal would travel some 25 miles from Memphis. He admitted that he had demonstrated the equipment for others earlier and felt he had improved upon the work of earlier inventors by suppressing static through the use of a nickle-coated tube as oscillator and using an alternating current with a frequency of 100,000 cycles.[20] Nearly all wireless work at that time was with spark, arc, or motor-generator type transmitters. The three-element vacuum tube patented by Lee deForest in 1908 had only recently been determined to be an effective oscillator.

An article by E.J. McCormack on Laughter's equipment appeared in the May-June 1914 issue of **Technical World** magazine. The **Commercial Appeal** reported that McCormack had received a letter from a South American who desired to purchase three of Laughter's devices "good for a radius of 81 miles." The article also noted that the man was interested in the qualities of the prototype which had subsequently been bought by the **Tri-States Wireless Association.**[21]

In April of 1914, a receiver was set up on the excursion steamboat **G.W. Robertson**. Messages were sent back and forth from passengers to friends or relatives by Edward Baily and Clarence DeLaHunt, members of **Tri-States**. While still out on the river the operator of the excursion boat had ordered, by radio, a taxi to meet him. The reporter predicted, "It is probable that several other boats will be fitted up with wireless apparatus, and the time is not far distant when steamboats will be operated like trains by a dispatcher."[22]

Another first, certified by the Baseball Hall of Fame, occurred when on April 5, 1914, the inning-by-inning scores of a baseball game involving a major league team were sent from the Falls Building to the **G.W. Robertson**. The game was an exhibition contest between the New York Giants and the Memphis Turtles, playing at Red Elm Bottoms. "The wireless room on the boiler deck of the Robertson was the center of interest throughout the trip, and the operator's table had to be roped off to keep the crowd away." The game information was telephoned from the ball park to the Falls Building, and then sent by the station to the **Robertson**. The Giants won the game, 3-2.[23] Memphis physician Louis LeRoy, who witnessed the broadcast, ordered a Laughter transmitter and receiver for installation on his private yacht.[24] It seems that this was publicity to demonstrate a practical and commercial value for voiced wireless on the river.

In November, 1914, the W.C. Handy band was employed to play from the Alaskan Roof Garden of the Falls Building, and it was there that Handy introduced the **St. Louis Blues.**[25] There is no direct evidence that the band was broadcast by **Tri-States**; but, this might have been the case. However, the **Tri-States Wireless Association** disappeared from the Falls Building and from city directories after 1914.[26]

Victor H. Laughter also apparently did not stay in Memphis. The next record we have is his request to serve in the U.S. Signal Corp. as a First Lieutenant.[27] He was accepted and served from July 17, 1917 to July 21, 1919, when he received an honorable discharge.[28] Laughter claimed that while serving in France he assisted Edwin H. Armstrong in the perfecting of the "super-hetrodyne" while they were stationed at the Sorbonne.[29] Captain Armstrong did demonstrate his super-circuit at the Sorbonne, after an extensive period of experimentation and development in Paris, with the participation of the members of his signal corps group.[30]

Laughter returned to Memphis to become a dealer in radio parts and supplies. In January of 1924, he filed his fourth patent for a "Radio Frequency Amplification System." The object of this invention was to "adjust individually the capacity of a series of electron tubes to secure balance and insure uniformity in quality of a series of electron tubes [and] to secure balance and insure uniformity in quality of receivers manufactured on a quantity production basis."[31]

Early in 1925 Laughter moved to St. Louis to work for the Valley Electric Company, and he assigned to the Valley Corporation that patent and another filed November 5, 1925, described as preventing undesirable oscillations in tube circuits.[32] It should be noted that the Falls family businesses were often named "Valley," i.e., Valley Oil Mills, Valley Constructions Company, etc. It was reported that Laughter had a drinking problem which may account for the number of positions he held for short periods of time.[33]

His connection with the Valley Company was severed in 1929, and Laughter announced that he would work for the Radio Corporation of America. he noted that his primary task would be on creating loudspeakers which ". . .will contain a diaphragm that responds equally to all notes."[34]

In 1934, at the age of 46, Laughter returned to Memphis where he joined with Otto Lyons to form the L & L Electric Company at 337 Madison Avenue, and he resided with his sister's family.[35] He never married.[36]

In 1931, Memphian Clarence Saunders, developer of the first self-service supermarket, "Piggly Wiggly," began plans for the "Keedoozle" (for "Key Does It All"); an automated grocery store. In 1934, Saunders enlisted the engineering talent of Laughter and Harry T. Wilson for the next three years. Laughter and Wilson patented a "tube testing apparatus" on April 5, 1937.[37] The first "Keedoozle" opened May 15, 1937. The mechanical marvel received national attention, but because of the complex machinery only canned or boxed goods could be handled. The machinery required too many electrical circuits and used relatively unreliable tubes (which was the need for the tube tester). In February of 1938, the equipment was replaced by human employees and it finally closed in December of 1940.[38]

The Laughter connection with Hugo Gernsback's magazine continued until Laughter's death. He contributed articles to **Radio-Electroncis** magazine, the successor title to **Modern Electrics**. In 1948, he used his earlier tube tester patent as the basis for an article on "Automatic Ballast Control in a New Tube Tester."[39] His work for Clarence Saunders provided the material for an article in 1949 about "Lead-Pencil Mark Sets Off Relay."[40] In 1948 and 1950, he described "Electret Construction" and "Making Large Electrets." The electret was an unbelievable device to many scientists at that time, and Laughter was probably the first to show how to make specimens that were as large as pie-plates.[41]

Later Laughter applied what he had developed for Clarence Saunders to the problem of automating the stockroom system of the Hitchcock Belt Company, filing a patent on October 11, 1955, for "a conveyor release mechanism."[42] His electronic inventiveness did not cease. On March 21, 1961, he filed a patent for a "transistor amplifier" which was small enough to be used as a hearing aid.[43] Earlier, in 1957, he had written an article for **Radio-Electronics** on the hearing aid.[44] In 1963, he wrote "What's Your Equalization?", and in 1965 his last published article appeared under the title, "New Transistor Voltmeter is Stable and Drift-Free."[45]

Victor H. Laughter died at the age of 78 on September 30, 1966, at the Kennedy Veterans Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee. He was survived by his sister, Belva, who passed away five months later.[46]

Victor H. Laughter had a number of small "firsts" of which he could be proud: two early excellent books on wireless technology; the first voiced radio transmission in Memphis, Tennessee; the first editor of **Modern Electrics** after founder Hugo Gernsback; the first inning-by-inning transmission of a major league baseball game over his equipment; a number of patents; work associated with such giant names as Dr. Lee deForest and Edwin H. Armstrong; the first automated grocery store equipment design; the development of means to make large electrets and an early transistorized hearing aid.

Yet, like so many other pioneers he seemed to have fallen between the cracks of radio history. This type of person, doing these types of activities, made modern radio broadcasting possible.

NOTES

1 Obituary of Belva Laughter Thompson, **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, February 28, 1967.

2 Obituaries of Victor H. Laughter, **Memphis Press-Scimitar**, September 30, 1966; and **Commercial Appeal**, October 1, 1966.

3 Obituary of Belva Laughter, **op.cit.**

4 Laughter, Victor H., **Operator's Wireless Telegraph and Telephone Handbook**, Frederick J. Drake and Company, (Chicago, Ill), 1909; p.iii.

5 **Ibid.**, p.82.

6 Obituaries of Victor H. Laughter, **op.cit.**

7 Letter from Mrs. Alice C. Dalligan, Chief, Burton Historical Collection, Detroit Public Library, February 8, 1984.

[8]Patents 492,763 "Transmitting System for Space Telephony" (April 28, 1909); 957,852 "Transmitting System for Space Telephony" (July 10, 1909); 1,067,179 "Wireless Telephony" (October 20, 1909); see Maclaurin, W. Rupert, **Invention and Innovation in the Radio Industry**. (New York: Arno Press Reprint), 1971, p. 84.

[9]Laughter, **Operator's Handbook**, **op.cit.**, p. iv.

[10]Interview with Mr. Stephan Phelan, Memphis, TN., amateur radio pioneer, June 18, 1984.

[11]Laughter, Victor H., **Wireless Telegraphy Made Simple**, Popular Electricity Publishing Company, (Chicago, Ill), 1909.

[12]Correspondence with Mr. Fred Shunaman, former editor of **Radio-Electronics** magazine, March 6, 1984.

[13]"Memphian Invents a Wireless Telephone, " **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, June 15, 1913.

[14]Interview with Harry D. Nichols, December 3, 1983.

[15]Letter from Tri-States Wireless Association to Department of Commerce, Record Group 173-#63534, December 12, 1912; and reply from Department of Commerce Radio Division, December 16, 1912.

[16]Obituary of John W. Falls II; **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, September 1, 1948.

[17]Archer, Gleason L., **History of Radio to 1926**, (New York: Arno Press Reprint), 1971, p.70.

[18]"Gunboat Has Wireless Talk with Memphis," **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, May 17, 1912.

[19]Interview with Mr. Stephan Phelan, **op.cit.**

[20]"Memphian Invents a Wireless Telephone," **op.cit.**

[21]"Wants Memphis Wireless," **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, July 19, 1914.

[22]"Wireless Message Sent from Boat," **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, April 6, 1914.

[23]**Ibid.**; Letter from Mr. Thomas R. Heitz, Librarian, National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum, March 3, 1984.

[24]**Ibid.**

[25]Handy, W.C., **Father of the Blues**, (New York: McMillan Publishing), 1914.

[26]Polk, R.L. and Co., **Directories of the City of Memphis**, 1914—

[27]National Archives, Adjutant General's Office, Record Group 94-#2627626, Letter from Victor H. Laughter to Signal Corps.

[28]Letter from Department of the Army, Paul J. Scheips, Chief of Military History and the Center of Military History; **Victor H. Laughter's Certificate of Military Service**, September 8, 1984.

[29]"Engineer Sees Too Much Optimism Over Television," **Memphis Commercial Appeal**, March 30, 1929.

[30]Lessing, Lawrence, **Man of High Fidelity: Edwin Howard Armstrong**. (New York: J.B. Lippincott), 1956.

[31]Patent 1,731,012, "Radio Frequency Amplification System" (January 16, 1924).

[32]**City Directories of St. Louis** list Laughter as "Radio Engineer for Valley Electric, 1925-1927, and as "Salesman for American School of Correspondence, 1928; Patent 1,731,013, "Radio Frequency Amplification System" (November 5, 1925).

[33]Interview with Mr. Stephen Phelan, **op.cit.**

[34]"Engineer Sees Too Much Optimism Over Television," **op.cit.**

[35]Polk, R.L. and Co., **Directories of the City of Memphis**, 1934-1935.

[36]Interview with Mr. Stephen Phelan, **op.cit.**

[37]Patent 2,196,466, "10 Tube Testing Apparatus" (April 5, 1937).

[38]"Keedoozle Equipment Removed," **Memphis Press-Scimitar**, February 2, 1938; and "Keedoozle Closes Doors," **Memphis Press-Scimitar**, December 17, 1940.

[39]"Automatic Ballast Control in a New Tube Tester," December 1936; Correspondence with Mr. Fred Shunaman, **op.cit.**; author cards courtesy of Mr. Harvey Gernsback, present editor of **Radio-Electronics** magazine, February 24, 1984.

[40]**Radio-Electronics**, December 1949, p.35.

[41]Correspondence with Mr. Fred Shunaman, **op.cit.**, **Radio-Electronics**, May 1948, p. 20; January 1950, p.8.

[42]Patent 2,926,815 "Conveyer Release Mechanism," (October 11, 1955).

[43]Patent 3,140,348 "Transistor Amplifier," (March 21, 1961).

[44]**Radio-Electronics**, April 1957, p.35.

[45]**Radio-Electronics**, January 1963, p.41; June 1965, p.34.

[46]Obituaries of Victor H. Laughter and Belva Laughter Thompson, **op.cit.**

Toward the Exoskeletal: the Development of Exposition as a Structuring Device in the Modern Theatre

Thomas A. Pallen, Ph.D.

Following the completion of the Centre National d'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou in Paris, Rudolph Chelminski referred to the modernistic structure as "exoskeletal."[1] This term, coined to describe a building in which, "everything that is usually hidden inside is on the outside,"[2] might also be employed to portray the positioning of exposition in the structure of a drama by some modern playwrights. What follows is an examination of some traditional and modern uses of expository material that traces the movement of exposition from a skeletal to an exoskeletal position in dramatic structure. In the interest of creating a common ground as a starting place, the examination begins with a brief look at the functional necessity of exposition.

Regardless of the degree of familiarity that an audience may have with the dramatic situation, events, or characters of a play, playwrights must present their work within a specified context. The context shaped by the writer may contain elements of myth, history, or fantasy in either pure or mixed states, may indeed encompass any combination of elements that an audience will believe and accept. The playwright may summon context from a revered past, as did the Greek dramatists, from a more recent past, as have the creators of many history plays and docudramas, or from an invented past, present, or future, as Karl Capek did for **R.U.R.** Whether factual or fictional, historic or fantastic, the context must possess credibility, and in this necessity lies the importance of exposition.

No script contains in its events the entire context of those events. Even a work as massive as Eugene O'Neill's **Mourning Becomes Electra** does not hold sufficient dramatic space for presentation in action of the full environment and history of its story; even a cosmos as detached and seemingly closed as that of Samuel Beckett's **Waiting for Godot** cannot exist completely without explanation; the playwrights had to include exposition. Nor does an audience's familiarity with the subject matter diminish the need for exposition. On the contrary, it frequently increases that need. The original audiences of the Greek drama knew the situations and characters presented in the plays, yet these dramas contain a good deal of exposition, because the manner of telling the story determined the play's value and the dramatist had to lead the audience to that particular understanding of the common pool of knowledge.[3]

In the traditional sense, then, exposition exists to acquaint the audience with that part of the context of the play not directly present in the on-stage action. Various texts on the subject of playwriting have defined this crucial term in slightly by significantly different ways. To give a selection, Josephine Niggli identifies as exposition, "everything in a play that takes place offstage (before the curtains open or during the run of the action)" and further states that, "it is always told to the audience, never shown."[4] Kenneth Macgowan narrows this field somewhat to include only "things out of the past that the audience needs to know in order to understand the characters or plot," without the restriction of oral presentation.[5] Sam Smiley includes as exposition "any information in the play about circumstances that precede the beginning, occur offstage, or happen between scenes," and subdivides it according to its description of the distant or the recent past.[6] None of these definitions includes (and one of them specifically excludes) any consideration of visual exposition. Yet nearly all modern playwrights have placed in their scripts descriptions, sometimes quite extensive and explicit, of scenery, lighting effects, furniture and hand props, costumes, and even of the physical appearances and activities of the characters.[7] All of these descriptions, whether on the page or realized by the director and designers, belong in the category of exposition. Aside from their non-verbal nature, they certainly conform to the principles set forth by Niggli, Macgowan, and Smiley by providing the audience information about the situation and characters not contained in the action proper.

Of course, directors and designers do not always choose to follow to the letter a playwright's delineation of the stage environment, but even the greatest departure from the written directions must in some way convey their spirit in order to communicate the complete concept of the author to the audience. Otherwise, the production either becomes a different play altogether or, worse, degenerates into a play about the technical elements, in which the relationship between action and exposition reverse in a most unfortunate manner. In order to prevent this from happening, the various production elements must form a coherent statement, a single context in which the active and passive dialog, the actions of the characters, and the various technical elements, all in a state as close as possible to the playwright's wishes, have a share proportional to their moment-to-moment importance.

Niggli, Macgowan, and Smiley have formulated definitions of exposition that have a literary core. Another possible definition concentrates on the work as produced rather than as written. In this case, exposition includes those verbal or visual elements that serve more to inform and illustrate than to advance the action.

This definition encompasses both basic categories of exposition, verbal and visual. A playwright employs verbal exposition in a number of ways and uses a variety of agents to communicate it to the audience. Macgowan, who attempts an historic survey of the uses of verbal exposition, claims that the Greek dramatists used the Chorus to set forth the "basis of the play, explain the characters, and cover the antecedent action."[8] Yet anyone who has read or experienced a play from this period knows that the Greeks' use of exposition does not slip so neatly into a pigeonhole. True, the Chorus often presents the exposition, but it also enters into the action at times, while the actors frequently provide passive information. For example, in the opening speeches of Sophocles' **Antigone**, we encounter an Ismene who does not know as much about recent events as does her sister. Antigone explains the situation both to Ismene and to the audience. Other characters also convey exposition, particularly the messengers that occur in this and nearly every other Greek play. Indeed, despite the fact that the audience knew the mythic background of the plays, the action sequences in Greek dramas float like small islands in seas of exposition, probably due to the fact that these works remained quite close to their presentational, dithyrambic relatives despite the presence of actors as representational elements.[9]

Again, Macgowan offers a rather simplistic bit of history by writing that Shakespeare embodied his exposition in prologues and soliloquies while the seventeenth-century playwrights introduced the "confident" character as a receptor of expository information.[10] Here, too, the fact is that neat categories do not exist, nor will an historical survey such as Macgowan's provide a workable classification that asks how characters convey the exposition will work.

The most obvious method of conveying verbal exposition to the audience involves direct address. Information presented in this manner may take the form of a prologue spoken by a distinct character or by one of the regular **dramatis personae.** The distinctly expository character may also occur as a narrator, who presents information when and as the action requires it, as in Thornton Wilder's **Our Town.**

Characters within the action may step out of it and present exposition directly to the audience in the form of narrations, soliloquies, or asides. With the exception of the aside, direct exposition of this nature generally appears in blocks of information. The narrative may come from a single figure or from a group of any size, and the character or characters who deliver it may become a chorus, as is the case with the Women of Canterbury in T.S. Eliot's **Murder in the Cathedral**. Sometimes, the playwright prefers to disguise narrational exposition as a letter that either the writer or the recipient or both read to the audience, or as some modern analog of a letter, such as a dictated message, a tape recording, or one end of a telephone conversation.[11]

As opposed to the narrational form, associated primarily with presentational theatre, conversational exposition, which may occur in either presentational or representational plays, remains on stage, with the audience eavesdropping. At its most vacuuous level, conversational exposition takes place between two or more characters, frequently servants, who chat about facts already known to themselves for the purpose of enlightening the audience.[12] On a level of interest only slightly higher and less obvious than this, one character confides the information to another who, like the audience, does not already know its content. Such confidences attain a greater level of interest when the ignorant character questions the knowledgeable one, and achieve their highest level when neither one of the characters possesses the whole of the information and a true conversation results from their mutual assembly of the pieces of the puzzle.

A similar type of exposition comes about when a stranger enters the scene and seeks information, or when a character who for some reason has been separated from the action for a period of time returns to it. This type works best when the stranger or pseudo-stranger brings information from outside the scene that interacts with the facts elicited by the stranger's presence to create an expository synthesis, as, for example, in Arthur Miller's **All My Sons**.

As with narrational exposition, the conversational form may occur scattered throughout the play or in block form at the beginnings of acts or scenes. Generally speaking, conversational exposition has a more subtle and natural effect upon the audience than the narrational type, except in the case of a poorly used confidant or a character inserted for a solely expository purpose.[13]

The requirement for exposition can be fulfilled by physical as well as by verbal action. Particular gestures, ranging from a limp to a special way of holding or using a prop, may indicate something about the situational past or present of a character that dialog alone does not reveal. Since, with few exceptions, gestures tend to convey a more ambiguous message than words, they occur less frequently as expository elements and, when they do occur, often represent a directorial rather than an authorial choice.

Scenic descriptions provided by the playwright constitute another type of visual exposition, although they seldom reach the audience directly, but filter through the artistic efforts of the director and the production's designers. Audience members who have not read the original text (as opposed to the acting version, in which visual descriptions recorded by the stage manager of a particular production frequently augment or supplant the playwright's visual instructions) have no way of judging the playwright's intentions in regard to visual exposition and can only trust the production staff not to violate the script.

Conversely, a director or designer may deliberately choose to alter the playwright's directions concerning visual exposition in order to produce the script in an alternate format or to relate it to an audience other than that for which the script was originally intended. The former frequently happens when a play written for the proscenium undergoes an arena or thrust stage production. The latter occurred, for instance, in 1971 at the University of Missouri, when director Sam Smiley and designer James Hooks decided to separate **Death of a Salesman** from the traditional theatrical realism described by Arthur Miller and realized by Jo Mielziner. Smiley and Hooks turned to an open stage backed by a large projection screen in an attempt to bring to the audience a different perspective on Miller's intent and to explore the application of modern scenographic techniques to a basically realistic play. The projections used by Hooks depicted the interior of the human body and, in a sense, returned to Miller's own early intention for **Death of a Salesman**, an early version of which carried the title, **The Inside of His Head.**[14] The production thus rejected the playwright's written scenic descriptions in favor of offering the audience an insight into Miller's intentions.[15]

In some cases, items of either visual or verbal exposition may become "plants." Sam Smiley defines a plant as "an item of information, one that the playwright inserts early in the play and that turns out to be significant later;" although not always expository, "plants establish the basis for. . .credibility."[16] The plant may occur as a physical object brought into the setting, or as a statement introduced narrationally or conversationally that sets up a character trait, a significant object, or a coming event.[17]

This discussion has thus far dealt with exposition as used by playwrights from the fifth century, B.C., to the nineteenth century, A.D. As stated in the definition offered above, the basic form of exposition during these twenty-four centuries involved the communication of information not contained in the dramatic action but essential to the audience's comprehension of that action, a form that can be labeled skeletal, in that it serves to support the dramatic structure and, at its best, provides that support from a concealed position. Most of the plays of Arthur Miller build firmly upon this foundation. Following the trail blazed by Ibsen, Miller uses exposition carefully and subtly, preferring the scattered to the block form, the conversational to the narrational type. Miller also employs the plant with consummate skill.

In **All My Sons**, for example, he plants the importance of the tree several times before revealing its true meaning and associative significance, thus transforming it from mere visual exposition into a visual symbol. With each plant, the audience learns a little more and simultaneously becomes more curious. Expository plants that develop information about Larry accompany those concerning the tree, so that the character and the object become linked in the minds of the audience members. These plants create the expectation of an emotional outburst from Mrs. Keller, and expectation that Miller realizes in reverse through her first on-stage reaction to the broken tree: "So much for that, thank God."[18]

Miller also introduces a rememorative form of conversational exposition. Characters speak nostalgically about past events rather than relate them objectively, and thus set an overall mood for the play. Two characters, Annie and George, act as returning familiars and achieve the expository synthesis described earlier. Annie's conversation with Joe Keller provides the information that her father is in prison for a crime of which Keller was acquitted, and describes that crime. It also contains a plant of Joe Keller's eventual admission of guilt. In his first exchange with Annie, Keller states his case in terms that justify his acquittal and her father's conviction:

> **Keller:** All of a sudden a batch comes out with a crack. That happens, that's business. A fine hairline crack. All right, so. . .so he's a little man, your father, always scared of loud voices. What'll the major say?—Half a day's production shot. What'll I say? You know what I mean? Human. (**Slight pause.**) So he takes out his tools and he. . .covers over the cracks. All right. . .that's bad, it's wrong, but that's what a little man does. If I could've gone in that day I'd a told him—junk 'em, Herb, we can afford it. But alone he was afraid. But I know he meant no harm. He believed they'd hold up a hundred per cent.[19]

Later, in Act II, Keller provides a different version of the same exposition during a conversation with his son, Chris:

> **Keller:** I'm in business, a man is in business; a hundred and twenty-one cracked, you're out of business;. . .what could I do, let them take forty years, let them take my life away? (**His voice cracking**) I never thought they'd install them.[20]

The symmetry of these two passages embodies, in the form of exposition, a central action of the play, Joe Keller's admission of guilt. The second version of this exposition results in part from another chain of expository information.

At the end of Act I, Annie receives a telephone call from her brother, George. Miller very subtly diminishes the importance of this call and then uses it to plant the essence of George's information without revealing its exact nature. Ensuing conversations build upon this plant, establishing the threat that Joe Keller and his wife feel from George. At the start of Act II, a conversation between Mrs. Keller and Chris again plants this threat. When George finally arrives, as another returning familiar, his exposition reveals another piece of the puzzle, a version of the crime as related to him by his father. The entire plot thus turns upon skillful exposition, and by placing the events on this level Miller heightens the importance and value of their effect upon the actions of the Keller family.

Miller has stated that, in **All My Sons**, it "seemed necessary to prove the connections between the present and the past, between events and moral consequences, between the manifest and the hidden."[21] He established most of those connections through the careful use of exposition.

Improving upon but still following tradition, Miller employed exposition as a connective device, a concealed skeleton that supported the structure of the play. Like the architects of the Pompideau center, however, other playwrights of this century have turned to exoskeletal forms of exposition, frequently using this previously concealed element as a disconnective device. Rather than providing the audience with exposition, they have turned it against the audience in order to create a dialectic, to confuse, or to disinform.

In his 1931 text on playwrighting, Kenneth Rowe stated in regard to exposition that "the audience should never become aware that it is receiving information."[22] In 1951, Kenneth Macgowan espoused that "the secret of good exposition in the ordinary course of dialogue is to avoid the direct statement and provide the information obliquely."[23] And, in 1977, Sam Smiley warned that "obvious expositional devices impair the excellence of any play."[24] Yet the work of some twentieth-century playwrights points toward increasingly obvious uses of exposition, a trend similar to the exoskeletal movement in architecture in that it exposes the framework on which the play hangs and the devices that make the drama work.

Bertolt Brecht comes to mind most readily as a user of exoskeletal exposition, since it forms the very core of the **Verfremdungseffekt**. Brecht wanted actors to present rather than to represent their characters, so that each actor would serve as a narrator, an expositor, using verbal and visual exposition to communicate the text.

As many critics have noted, however, Brecht's plays in production often evade any attempt to realize the **Verfremdungseffekt** through acting. Nevertheless, the process appears in the texts. In his "Short Organum," Brecht thus describes the proper structure of a play:

> As we cannot invite the audience to fling itself into the story as if it were a river and let itself be carried hither and thither, the individual episodes have to be knotted together in such a way that the knots are easily noticed. The episodes must not succeed each other indistinguishably but must give us a chance to interpose our judgment. . . .The parts of the story have to be carefully set off one against another by giving each item its own structure as a play within the play.[25]

Nowhere has Brecht better carried out this plan of nesting a series of plays within each other than in **The Caucasian Chalk Circle**. The final action of this play, the test of the chalk circle, occurs in the last of three sections or plays and occupies far less than a quarter of the work's running time in production.[26] But in order to tell this story in a form with more depth than that of the simple folk-drama from which it springs, Brecht decides to also give us the stories of its two principle characters, Grusha and Azdak. The play of the chalk circle nests within the plays that contain their stories. Nor does this double structure satisfy Brecht, for mere presentation of the stories of Grusha, Azdak, and the trial would allow the audience to perceive them as simple, entertaining tales, unrelated to its own existence. So Brecht creates another level of nesting by constructing a prologue that demonstrates the chalk-circle principle as used in a contemporary situation. The contemporary characters of the prologue take part in the inner plays, thus creating a participatory unity. One can easily see that the prologue serves as a justificational exposition of the rest of the play. By extension, then, the stories of Grusha and Azdak become illustrative expositions of the story of the chalk circle. Viewed from another perspective, the story of the trial and its accompanying explications of Grusha and Azdak become illustrative expositions of the prologue situation, a complex of exoskeletal knots that satisfies Brecht's own demands from the "Short Organum."

Within each of these nestings, with the exception of the prologue, Brecht uses the Story-teller (Narrator) to introduce the action, to provide transitions from one episode to another, and to comment upon the action and its characters. The Narrator, sometimes joined by the Chorus, allows Brecht to move his scene quickly from place to place and to work rapidly through transitions in favor of more completely developed dialectical scenes. Thus, in the second section of Part One, "The Flight into the Northern Mountains," the prologue characters who represent Grusha and other characters act out some parts of the story and the Narrator describes other parts.

The use of expository narrative allows Brecht to concentrate upon the scenes in which confrontation occurs between characters and their ideologies rather than between a character and an external force. The Narrator makes the exposition visible and prevents it from intruding upon the true action. At the same time, the presence of the Narrator and the Chorus serves to remind the audience of the contemporary frame created in the prologue.

Brecht sets the pattern for an expository style of acting by introducing the Story-teller in the prologue and stating, in the stage direction that precedes Part One, that this Story-teller and a Chorus of listeners sit on the stage and that, "with appropriate gestures, [the Story-teller] gives the signal for each scene to begin."[27] A director who wished to preserve the expository frame throughout the performance might keep the characters of the prologue on stage as audience-actors, who take part in the Story-teller's presentation as he calls upon them. To make a success of this, the director would have to turn to plainly theatrical and expository effects to replace Brecht's seemingly realistic stage directions. In theory, an argument might exist for the juxtaposition of expository devices such as the Narrator and Chorus against such stage directions as,

> A wind has risen. The bridge on the glacier is visible in the dark. One rope is broken and half the bridge is hanging down the abyss. . . .One man is trying to catch the hanging rope with a stick.[28]

Particularly in a production that would properly emphasize the prologue frame and preserve it throughout the performance, some presentational props would have to come into play here, perhaps in the form of a board laid between two boxes with a rope stretched between it by the actors, to suggest the bridge and its one good handrope.

No such directorial decisions become necessary for Friedrich Durrenmatt's **The Marriage of Mr. Mississippi**. The opening stage direction sets up a visual exposition that immediately creates dialectical situations for the audience. According to the playwright, the upstage wall contains two windows, one opening onto a view of Northern

Europe, the other onto a Mediterranean site.[29] Later, Durrenmatt exploits this device to an even greater extent by having characters cross or stand behind or enter through these windows despite the fact that the room does not lie on the ground floor. Through such visual exposition, reinforced by narrative explanations, Durrenmatt immediately prepares his audience for the oxymoronic nature of the entire play.[30]

In the course of **The Marriage of Mr. Mississippi**, Durrenmatt employs a number of other exoskeletal expository devices. The play opens, without verbal exposition, on an execution that involves characters totally unknown to the audience. The executioners depart immediately—this part of the scene might take a minute or two to play—and St. Claude, whom they have just shot, launches a lengthy narrative exposition that introduces the story, several of its characters, and the setting, especially pointing out its oddities. During this exposition, various set props and other bits of visual exposition fly in and out as needed. Once the scene proper begins, Durrenmatt turns to a more conventional style of exposition, although the very untraditional nature of the facts presented therein sets up an immediate dialectic between style and content that inverts the earlier relationship between conventional information and unconventional exposition.

As the opening scene ends, Florestan Mississippi takes over the role of narrator and, again assisted by items of visual exposition that appear and vanish as needed, introduces the next scene and its characters and situation after establishing the passage of time.

Between the second and third episodes, another character, Count Bodo von Ubelohe-Zabernsee, takes over the narrational role and provides an expository segue. Before the third episode can begin, however, Mississippi interrupts with his own narration, introducing a short segment during which he and Anastasia describe their actions in an expository mode as they perform them in an active mode:

> **Anastasia.** I thought for a moment, then I went up to Mr. Mississippi and solemnly knelt before him. (she kneels)
> **Mississippi.** Deeply moved, I said: Madame, do you not despise me?
> **Anastasia.** Thereupon, I kissed his hand. (she kisses his hand)[31]

Durrenmatt uses such self-narrating scenes more than once, thus creating, in combination with standard scenes and lengthy narrations, a flow of time along the edge of a möbius band that moves the play back and forth between the active and the passive. Like the Norns in **Gotterdammerung**, various characters take up the narrative thread, which leads at last back to the scene of St. Claude's execution so that, as Eliot suggested, we return to our point of origin and "know the place for the first time."[32]

A similar progression, presented in a more optimistic vein, occurs in Max Frisch's self-styled farce, **The Chinese Wall.**[33] In this play, Frisch presents us with an expository Janus, The Contemporary, who, explaining that he plays "An Intellectual," mediates between the audience and the characters, explaining each to the other. The play constitutes an exercise in Einsteinian writing, for time becomes unglued and fluid. The present time of the audience stands simultaneous with the past times of the various characters. Each character, along with the audience, brings an historical time to an unspecified neutral point, where The Contemporary presides as a temporal major-domo, neither a modern man nor a man of the past but a contemporary, an ambiguous title that describes his chronological universality.

In his opening exposition, a totally undisguised lecture illustrated by a realistic depiction of the Great Wall of China, The Contemporary describes the Wall as "another of those constantly repeated attempts to hold back time, to dam up history;" but "it has not succeeded. Time will not be held back."[34] The Contemporary speaks like a newscaster, at once reminiscent of the "You Are There" type of reportage and of Steve Allen's comic pseudo-documentaries. The historical characters (some fictional, some historical, some fictional versions of historical figures), some introduced by The Contemporary, others introducing themselves, bring their own times to the general scene, itself of ambiguous time, along with their own linguistic and historical mileau. Thus, characters from verse dramas tend to speak in verse, while Pontius Pilate declaims in the rhetorical style of the Bible. With a single exception, The Contemporary introduces the audience's time to these characters in terms of atomic physics. As the play progresses, the various characters become more conversant with the audience's time, so that Brutus actually foments a modern revolution.

To one character, Mee Lan, The Contemporary introduces the modern world in terms of Newtonian rather than atomic physics. To others, he brings the threat of destruction, to her, the promise of eternity. Thus, an intentionally expository character becomes involved with the characters he presents to us and finds himself enmeshed in this world-of-all-times.

As in an ideal Brechtian production, the actors remain aware of themselves as actors and introduce themselves as such to the audience through expository devices. For example, Romeo complains to Juliet, "I shudder at these people here. It seems/They've all ransacked their closets. Their costumes/Smell of mothballs. . ."[35] And Mee Lan, in scene 6, says to the audience:

> You think I don't know I am disguised, in costume? . . .You think I don't know that everything here. . .is nothing but theatre? But you sit and look at one another. You, who are grown and wise, you sit and no one comes forward and says what it really is. . .[36]

Conversely, The Contemporary, moved by his love for Mee Lan and his sympathy for The Mute, declares himself a character in rather than an expositor of the action [37] The overall application of this character-actor pattern occurs in the visual exposition created by juxtaposing historically costumed figures against a non-historical, theatrical setting.

Frisch uses extremely visible layers of visual and verbal exposition toward an informative purpose over and above their individual ends, for with them he confuses and compresses time and space. Like the elements of one of M.C. Escher's periodic designs, the various times of the characters and the audience flow amongst one another and define one another.

An even more external application of exposition to control time and space occurs in Eugene Ionesco's **Exit the King**. Here, the characters employ a hortatory form of exoskeletal exposition, a game of verbal control in which all but the King achieve success. Marie, for instance, imposes physical infirmities upon the King through exposition:

> **Marie**: My dear king, you're limping!
> **King**: Limping? *I'm* not limping. I am limping a little.
> **Marie**: Your leg hurts. I'm going to help you along.
> **King**: It doesn't hurt. Why should it hurt? Why, yes, it *does* hurt just a little.[38]

Hortatory exposition effects changes in the characters' perceptions of the world as well as of themselves, so that the Doctor can make Marie experience an earthquake:

> **Doctor**: . . .the earth is quaking rather more than usual.
> **Guard**: The Royal Meteorological Institute calls attention to the bad weather conditions.
> **Marie**: I can feel the earth quaking. I can hear it. Yes, I'm afraid I really can.[39]

Only the King cannot make this conjuration work: "**King**: I order trees to sprout from the floor. (Pause.) I order the roof to disappear. (Pause.) What? Nothing? I order rain to fall. (Pause—still nothing happens.)"[40] Lest these requests seem too far beyond the grasp of the King, the Guard's long expository speech near the end of the play describes in detail former royal exploits and subsequent exposition by the other characters depicts the King as the absolute creator and coordinator of the universe, a universe that, all narrationally, collapses and disappears as the King dies. Through their expository statements, the characters manipulate time and space. Exposition literally creates and destroys the universe of this play and the audience must accept that universe or at least react to it in order to experience the drama.

The question becomes, for the plays discussed above and the many others that employ exoskeletal exposition, how should the audience experience such universes? Traditionally, playwrights have asked their audiences to deal with the action of a play emotionally and with the exposition intellectually in order to experience the action in its proper emotional context. But the traditional theatre measures the virtue of exposition in terms of its subtlety: direct appeals to the intellect have little worth in such a value system. The playwrights of that theatre have therefore tended to disguise exposition not only concretely, by dovetailing it into the dialogue whenever possible, but also abstractly, by dressing it in emotional values. Thus, as noted above, Miller gives the exposition in **All My Sons** a rememorative, nostalgic flavor that influences the overall mood of the play.

When playwrights brought exposition into an exoskeletal position, they also intellectualized it. Particularly in so far as it offers dialectical choices to the audience, exoskeletal exposition demands thought, not feeling. In **The Marriage of Mr. Mississippi**, Durrenmatt employs an expository style with a high degree of intellectual appeal. The longer expository passages approach a lecture format (and, indeed, might be treated as such in production), complete with visual aids that descend from the flies. By extension some of the action scenes become illustrative of these lectures, expositions of exposition. Moreover, the scenes in which actors describe activities as they perform them clearly demand an intellectual response from the audience.

As the earlier discussion of **Exit the King** indicates, exposition also operates in that play on the intellectual plane. A production that attempted to physicalize to any degree, even through narrative-style projections, the range of natural disasters from cracks in the wall to colliding planets described by the characters would quickly become ludicrous and destroy the play's worth as a mental game in which the universe becomes a metaphoric extension of the King's dying body.

Ionesco does not even call upon the audience to use its imagination to create the catastrophies described. Rather, he reduces them to their imagistic state by having the Guard condense them into press bulletins. Images of the King's control, or lack thereof, over the physical universe as an extension of himself expand like balloons until the Guard punctures them with a journalistically condensed phrase and reveals their intellectually comic and symbolic nature.

Max Frisch gives his chief expositor, The Contemporary, a role to play as the Intellectual. In this guise, The Contemporary lectures in a manner befitting his character's name to both the audience and his fellow cast members, attempting to alert all present to the dangers of an atomically armed world. Frisch ultimately treats The Contemporary's futile efforts to the bitter twist of humor they deserve, as, having delivered his ultimate antinuclear diatribe, the character receives the "Kung Fu Tse" award for empty intellectual effort and a kiss from Cleopatra. The one character who seemed to have grasp of both past and present ends in confused silence.

Rudolph Chelminski concluded his description of the Pompidou Center by calling the exoskeletal structure "surprising, baffling, exciting—but undeniably stylish."[41] These same adjectives seem well suited to exoskeletal exposition. Directed at the intellect, this new style of exposition may baffle and surprise audiences, but it should also excite them. Traditional exposition serves the forces of Naturalism; the exoskeletal form enhances the power of Theatricalism. Faced with the presence of motion pictures and television, the theatre fails in any attempt to operate on their emotional, naturalistic level. Exoskeletal exposition points away from efforts to transform cloth and paint into houses and mountains and encourages the stage to celebrate its intellectually illusionistic abilities. Playwrights like Frisch, Brecht, and Ionesco seem to have learned, with the Contemporary, that intellectual appeals, although they may not change the course of history, can have a greater ultimate impact than the clash of wooden swords on silastic armor.

Notes

[1]Rudolph Chelminski, "Exoskeletal Art Container Is the Rage, Literally, and the Delight of Paris," **Smithsonian**, 8 (Aug., 1977), 20-29.

[2]Chelminski, 24.

[3]In his essay, "Problems of the Theatre," Friedrich Durrenmatt takes the opposite position, stating that, "the more invented a story is and the more unknown it is to the audience, the more careful must its exposition, the unfolding of its background, be." Rpt. in **Playwrights on Playwriting**, ed. Toby Cole (N.Y.: Hill and Wang, 1960), 134.

[4]Josephine Niggli, **New Pointers on Playwriting** (Boston: The Writer, 1967), 48; author's ital. deleted.

[5] Kenneth Macgowan, **A Primer of Playwriting** (New York: Random House, 1951), 31.

[6]Sam Smiley, **Playwriting: The Structure of the Action** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), 65.

[7]I refer to published scripts or unpublished manuscripts, not to the acting editions that frequently contain a potpourri of the playwright's intentions and a production promptbook.

[8]Macgowan, 146.

[9]In this sense, Greek drama existed primarily as a ritualistic story-telling enterprise that from time to time contained acted-out sequences.

[10]Macgowan, 146; He does not mention another expository character used in the latter period, the **raisoneur**, who usually brought the thoughts of the playwright directly onto the stage.

[11]Macgowan, 155.

[12]An intentionally blatant use of this type of exposition occurs in Thornton Wilder's **The Skin of Our Teeth**.

[13]Niggli, 53. Brecht deliberately uses obviously expository characters and blocks of exposition as Verfremdungseffekten.

[14]Toby Cole, ed., **Playwrights on Playwriting** (New York: Hill and Wang, 1961), 261.

[15]A Photograph of this production appears in Theodore W. Hatlen's **Orientation to the Theatre**, 3d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981), 9.

[16]Smiley, 66.

[17]Niggli, 55-56.

[18]Arthur Miller, **All My Sons**, in **Modern American Dramas**, ed. Harlan Thatcher (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), 284.

[19]Miller, 293.

[20]Miller, 315.

[21]Cole, 262.

[22]Kenneth Thorpe Rowe, **Write That Play** (New York: Funk & Wagnall, 1939), 59.

[23]Macgowan, 154.

[24]Smiley, 66.

[25]Quoted in Cole, 99.

[26]Fourteen of a total of eighty-nine pages in Bentley's translation, cited below.

[27]Bertolt Brecht, **The Caucasian Chalk Circle**, in **Seven Plays by Bertolt Brecht**, ed. and trans. Eric Bentley (New York: Grove Press, 1961), 505.

[28]Brecht, 531.

[29]Friedrich Durrenmatt, **Problems of the Theatre: An Essay and The Marriage of Mr. Mississippi: A Play** (New York: Grove Press, 1966), 45.

[30]An argument might be made for the "absurdist" nature of these windows, with their disparate geographical views, but I prefer to concentrate upon the function of the device and eschew easy labels, no matter how attractive.

[31]Durrenmatt, P. 81; these expositional devices also function, in Brechtian sense, as **Verfremdungseffekten**, and serve to remind the audience of the anachronistic nature of the play.

[32]T.S. Eliot, **Four Quartets** (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1943, 39: "We shall not cease from exploration/And the end of all our exploring/Will be to arrive where we started/And know the place for the first time."

[33]Trans. James L. Rosenberg (Hill and Wang, 1961); this translation first appeared in **Theatre Arts**, (Aug.-Sept., 1963), 32-60.

[34]Frisch, 19.

[35]Frisch, 25.

[36]Frisch, 44.

[37]Frisch, 104.

[38]Eugene Ionesco, **Exit the King** (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 21.

[39]Ionesco, 18.

[40]Ionesco, 33.

[41]Chelminski, 24.

The Many Symbolic Faces of Fred Smith

Charismatic Leadership in the Bureaucracy

Claire Perkins

According to Max Weber, charisma refers to a certain quality of an individual personality whereby he is set apart from the ordinary and treated as endowed with "supernatural, superhuman or at least exceptional qualities or powers;" further, such charisma is not accessible to the ordinary person, "being regarded as of divine origin."[1] Weber further asserts that on the basis of these remarkable powers, "the individual concerned is treated as a leader."[2] Others have noted that this relation of supreme trust in the individual has become a rare occurrence in a society that has turned to reliance on bureaucracy and technology , and that charismatic leadership finds appeal in societies with a primitive level of social consciousness.[3] Weber further underscores this view with his claim that charisma finds its antithesis in institutions—the antithesis being found in routine stability and in "regular, integrated, institutional procedures."[4] On the basis of these observations, Weber probably would contend that charisma cannot exist within institutional settings.

This essay, however, rejects this claim, and argues instead that primitive qualities of charismatic leadership can indeed exist within a bureaucracy. Moreover, such charisma can function as an essential element in the promotion of group identity within the organization. The impact of charismatic leadership upon the corporate culture of Federal Express Corporation, the Memphis-based national leader of the overnight package delivery business, will be examined as a case study in support of this argument. We shall look especially at the symbolism and imagery used by founder Fred Smith to reassure the group of its identity and its values. Implied symbolic roles and value expressions of each metaphorical image will also be addressed.

Several key observations which have been made regarding charisma in primitive societies may in turn be examined in light of their role within the bureaucracy in promoting group identity and reaffirming values. It has been suggested that the charismatic leader is strongest in appealing to basic needs, with the appeal of simplicity and primary virtues preferred over the contemporary dependence on complex technology.[5] Additionally, the rhetoric of charisma employs an "earthy" vocabulary of imagery to reassure the group of itself and its boundaries.[6] Smith's vocabulary of imagery consists of archetypal metaphors which promote a sense of group identity and shared humanity.[7] The metaphors he uses most frequently focus on war, animals, and family imagery. It has further been stated that socially significant charisma requires a span of relationships within a radical division of functions between men, such as "commander and commanded."[8] These relationships seem to be clearly established through a series of metaphorical images whereby certain symbolic roles emerge. Archetypal metaphors implemented by Smith perform one of their major functions in that they strengthen his position as a leader, putting him in an advantageous symbolic role.[9]

After examining publicized interviews, both printed and televised, it appears that the most pervasive imagery in Smith's discourse centers on the archetypal war metaphor. An ex-Marine fighter pilot who had flown over two hundred combat missions earning numerous medals, [10] Smith has imbued his company with an "iconoclastic, military personality."[11] The Darwinian "survival of the fittest" combined with a "kill or be killed" philosophy seems deeply entrenched in the Federal Express culture.[12] Competitiveness dominates the corporate mentality, corresponding to Osborn's observation that war imagery gives expression to aggressive tendencies and the desire to make others submissive.[13] This militant competitiveness seems to be exemplified through Smith's declaration during a *Sixty Minutes* interview, "I am always ready to wage war on the competition, both in the air and on the ground. . .we're not just a fly-by-night business like the hamburger wars."[14]

It has been noted that part of the militarism of the Federal Express culture stems from the perfected "field intelligence" devised by Smith to monitor the competitors' marketing, financing, and operating activities.[15] In 1973, Smith acknowledged the attempt on the part of Emery Air to launch its own rapid delivery small package service, "At that stage we could have gotten our brains blown out."[16] The intense price and advertising wars with the competition have seemingly spurred Smith on to innovation in the industry. Smith described an "innocent-looking envelope" which marked the first time a courier could deliver letters overnight in direct competition with the United States Postal Service, as "having the potential to completely destroy our competitors."[17]

Federal Express has been described as a "glorified Marine Corp."[18] The archetypal war metaphor has permeated the corporate ranks, being utilized by Smith's immediate subordinates. At a 1982 Family Briefing meeting, senior officer Frank Maguire spoke:

> The competition is out there and they are going to try to eat our lunch. The competition is tough and the outcome is not yet decided. It is a year of challenge, a year of risk. We face the most challenging competitive year in the history of this great company. I say bring the enemy on. Let's hit him between the running lights.[19]

Again, the spirit of "kill or be killed" emerged to strengthen its role in the corporate culture.

It is through the metaphorical war imagery that one sees Smith emerge as commander-in-chief, the persona of a general in full control keeping close watch over the enemy.[20] The enemy is embodied in the competition—those engaged in an intense advertising and price war with Federal Express. Some have speculated that Smith equates the enemy with the Viet Cong, in remembrance of his Vietnam days.[21] Employees of Federal Express emerge in force as a mighty army—they are the troops, the rank and file, whose mission is to "destroy the competition." One may infer from the frequent use of the archetypal war metaphor that company values might include obedience and competitiveness to win this war waged on the competition.

Heightening the extensive use of war imagery is the implementation of archetypal animal imagery. As Osborn has suggested, the use of animal imagery is useful in dehumanizing the enemy and perhaps in legitimizing the necessity to kill the opposition while uniting the group in anger and fear.[22] According to Smith, "We are bigger than anyone else; it would take a corporate behemoth to muscle its way into our business."[23] The image of the behemoth, a large hippopotamus-like beast mentioned in the Book of Job in the Old Testament, definitely dehumanizes the hypothetical competition as it is described as "having sinews of thighs like cables, bones like tubes of bronze, a frame like an iron rod. . .he is the taskmaster of his fellows and of all wild animals he makes sport."[24]

In addition to the image of the "corporate behemoth," a well-known allegory told by a former company president further exemplifies the use of animal imagery to promote militarism.[25] The allegory of the bear and the alligator, having been recognized and repeated by Smith, has been noted by some as being an integral aspect of the corporate culture at Federal Express.[26] The original allegory, according to past company president Art Bass:

> If there is going to be a fight between a bear and an alligator. . .the outcome is going to be determined more by the terrain than by the individual skill of the combatants. Now they are going to have to jump into the swamp to fight us and it's not going to be any contest. Much of the competition has jumped into the water with us alligators, and they are totally reacting to what we are doing. In marketing there is nothing I would rather see than a predictable competitor. You can make him do things you wouldn't do yourself. [27]

Some have noted that fighting the enemy at Federal Express is a heroic exercise.[28] The use of animal imagery, working in a unique confluence with the archetypal war metaphor, aids in enhancing the competitive spirit while legitimizing the killing of the bear in the murky swamp.

To counteract the violent war imagery that is abundantly found in the company culture, Fred Smith, while taking on a god-like role, seems to have the potential to exploit the family image. It has been observed that the families of Federal Express employees have been made to feel that they have been given an official role in the organizational decision process.[29] In 1975, when the Teamsters attempted to unionize his company, Smith invited not only employees, but their spouses to a local site to express his reasons for opposing unionization.[30] A veteran employee claimed, "Smith doesn't have to do much of a PR job on the families—he's like a god to many of them."[31] Smith has asserted, "I recognize my power as the Great Motivator."[32] In the midst of all of his "saving grace," Smith seems to be in a position to present a "sugar-coated scenario" that could go unquestioned, the exploitation of the family image discovered at a much later time.[33]

Possibly the most extensive use of the family image occurs at the annually televised Family Briefing meeting. Some have described the Family Briefing as having the atmosphere of a "faith healer's festival" where Smith is presented as a "demigod of package delivery."[34] In past meetings, Smith has been introduced as "our chairman, our founder, our friend."[35] Smith claims that he has always been able to "urge my people on to greater profits and efforts, while maintaining their loyalty."[36]

As in the case of the metaphorical war imagery, the implementation of the family image has also filtered down to Smith's higher level subordinates. At a 1981 national sales meeting, senior officer Frank Maguire greeted the audience:

> Welcome brothers and sisters from across the country! We have the ability to be open with one another! You aren't ordinary people! There is love and respect among you and for you![37]

It has been suggested that the family image serves to promote loving identification among people, directly opposed to the previously mentioned animal imagery, serving as a counterbalance to the hatred of "nonhuman" images.[38] Smith seems to amplify his implied persona of father to that of God the Father.[39] Moreover, Federal Express employees have been content to accept their roles as members of a corporate family, forsaking individuality.[40] The employees take on the implied roles of children—brothers and sisters. Employees seem to accept passively the "parent-child" imagery, which is considered to belong to an authoritarian nature.[41] In terms of Federal Express "religion," employees seem to take on the roles of followers and believers. Implied value expressions may include devotion, loyalty, faith, belief, and trust.

Why does this combination of family and religious imagery seem to operate with inordinate success at Federal Express? Some have speculated that perhaps the Protestant work ethic which dominates the Bible Belt may coincide with the work philosophy of Fred Smith, whereby one blends into the corporation with all traces of individuality obliterated.[42] It has also been observed that there may be less cynicism and more idealism in the Tennessee-Arkansas-Mississippi region as opposed to other parts of the nation.[43] Possibly a century ago, Henry W.

Grady may have been describing the present-day Federal Express employee when he depicted the South as "being of simple faith and of homogeneous people,"[44] and Southerners as "people who have fallen in love with work."[45] Ironically, Smith has been attacked as the "massah of the great Federal Express plantation," possibly by one who has recognized the value placed on submissiveness in his Southern corporation.[46]

If one acknowledges that charismatic leadership exists in the bureaucracy,[47] that it can exist through appeals to primitive needs and through an earthy vocabulary of imagery in a rhetoric replete with symbolism and imagery, then one must also recognize that the publicity and concern over projecting the "right" charismatic image must also exist. It has been suggested that the charismatic organizational leader is surrounded by a group of trained officials whose primary roles include guiding the charismatic movement to the appropriate corporate image.[48] Although Smith is the central persona of Federal Express, one cannot ignore the fact that there must exist a group of talented "image makers" who carefully nurture the corporate image projected through Smith.[49] Perhaps this is part of the phenomenon which Weber describes as a "paradox:" charismatic leadership, with its seemingly spontaneous nature, is actually harnessed to a concealed bureaucratic power which is its antithesis in the corporate setting.[50]

While many corporate employees never actually meet the founder of the company, they tell stories and myths about the founder which accumulate to the point whereby the leader begins to take on a role of mythic proportion that a real person would find impossible to fulfill.[51] It certainly appears that much of today's popular literature seems to focus on the accomplishments of Fred Smith; in actuality, these stories have become an integral aspect of the Federal Express corporate culture. Several stories seem to center on Smith's achievements, relating his always miraculous emergence to victory by overcoming the harshest of circumstances. One often-repeated story focuses on the difficult economic conditions encountered by Smith in the early years of the company's history. In order to pay his employees' wages on time, Smith supposedly flew to Las Vegas where he won twenty-seven thousand dollars at the black jack table to meet the payroll.[52] This story, which portrays Smith as the perpetual winner in the face of adversity, is representative of the many reiterated by employees. Moreover, in a 1982 study of Federal Express employees, a majority of 37% responded that their favorite Federal Express story centered around Fred Smith.[53]

Fred Smith, through symbolism and imagery, has enhanced his charismatic appeal. He has fulfilled his employees' needs by promoting a sense of unity and group identification. Employees seem to accept gladly the symbolic roles of "rank and file," "troops," "believers," and "followers." Smith has also heightened his symbolically advantageous position as "father" and "commander-in-chief." Value expressions, examined to the degree that they were implied through the various metaphors, included obedience, competitiveness, devotion, and faith.

In the examination of rhetorical devices in the corporate setting, future study along two pathways that actually merge could be of particular interest. One path may focus on the concept of Micheal McGee's ideograph[54] and its existence in corporate cultures. This concept could be viewed in conjunction with another path, Suzanne Osborn's concept of the third persona,[55] altering her concept from the depiction of the country to the depiction of a corporation as a whole. Both of these ideas in turn could be examined in light of how they function in the promotion of group identification and unity from a rhetorical standpoint.

NOTES

[1]Max Weber, **Theory of Social and Economic Organization** (Edinburgh: Hodge, 1947), p. 329.

[2]Weber, **Theory, p. 329.**

[3]Bryan R. Wilson, **The Noble Savages: The Primitive Origins of Charisma** (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975) p. 106.

[4]Weber, **Theory,** p. 66.

[5]Wilson, **The Noble Savages,** p. 104.

[6]Wilson, **Savages,** p. 105.

[7]Michael Osborn, **Orientations to Rhetorical Style** (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976) p. 16.

[8]Wilson, **Savages,** p. 25.

[9]Osborn, **Orientations,** P. 16.

[10]Kenneth Neill, "Federal Express: The Million Dollar Dream Machine," **Memphis Magazine, August 1978, p. 23.**

[11]Robert A. Sigafoos, **Absolutely Positively Overnight!** (Memphis: St. Luke's Press, 1983) **p. 118.**

[12]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 119.

[13]Osborn, **Orientations,** p. 17.

[14]"Fred Smith: Federal Express," narr. by Morley Safer, **Sixty Minutes.**

[15]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 120.

[16]Neill, "Federal Express," P. 27.

[17]Geoffrey Colvin, "Federal Express Dives Into Air Mail," **Fortune,** Reprint of June 15, 1981.

[18]Personal interview with Robert Sigafoos, January 1985.

[19]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 122.

[20]Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," **Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (1970) 109-119.**

[21]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 120.

[22]Osborn, **Orientations,** p. 18.

[23]Blaine Harden, "Overnight Success," **The Washington Post Magazine,** February 1981, p. 19.

[24]Book of Job, Old Testament, King James Version

[25]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 118.

[26]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 118.

[27]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 118.

[28]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 119.

[29]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 185.

[30]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 148.

[31]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 185.

[32]**Sixty Minutes,** Interview.

[33]Michael Osborn, **Speaking in Public** (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982), p. 179.

[34]Harden, "Overnight Success," P. 19.

[35]Harden, "Overnight Success," p. 19.

[36]**Sixty Minutes,** Interview.

[37]Sigafoos, **Overnight,** p. 145.

[38]Osborn, **Orientations,** p. 18.

[39]Black, "The Second persona," pp. 109-119.

[40]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 153.

[41]Osborn, **Speaking in Public**, p. 179.

[42]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 153.

[43]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 154.

[44]William W. Grady, **The New South and Other Addresses** (New York: Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1969), p. 128.

[45]Grady, **New South**, p. 33.

[46]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 147.

[47]Amitai Etzioni, **A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations** (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1961) pp. 303-364.

[48]Wilson, **Noble Savages**, p. 112.

[49]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 153.

[50]Wilson, **Savages**, p. 112.

[51]Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman Jr., **In Search of Excellence** (New York: Warner Books, 1982), p. 75.

[52]Sigafoos, **Overnight**, p. 68.

[53]Walter Kirkpatrick, "Final Report, Family Briefing Analysis," unpublished manuscript, September 1982, p. 56.

[54]Micheal C. McGee, "The Ideograph: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology," **The Quarterly Journal of Speech**, 56 (1980), 1-16.

[55]Suzanne Osborn, "Innaugural Imagery: The Icon of a Nation," paper presented at annual convention of Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL, November 3, 1984.

Media News Coverage As Political Rhetoric: Hart, Jackson, and Mondale in 1984

Paul D. Shaffer

This examination of the political rhetoric of selected media news coverage of the Gary Hart-Jesse Jackson-Walter Mondale Democratic Party's presidential nominating process researches ways in which media messages might influence the public's perceptions of candidates.

Our Dependence Upon Mass Media for Political Information

There is a pervasive belief by many in America that much of what the average person learns about political norms, roles, and values comes from the mass media systems.[1] Davis and Baran in their book, **Mass Communication and Everyday Life: A Perspective on Theory and Effects**, point out that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were years of great orators and people who were skilled in articulating the objectives of the communities in which they lived. Such orators, they believe, were capable of motivating public actions to accomplish those community objectives.[2] Since that time, the development of mass newspapers, then radio, and later television has not only changed the manner of political orators, but also has reduced the control of political parties over what the public learns about politics.[3]

Doris Graber, in her book, **Mass Media and American Politics**, suggests that peoples' opinions, feelings and evaluations about the political system may spring from their own processing of facts supplied by the media. She further argues that the attitudes, opinions and feelings explicitly expressed by the media also enter into a person's concept of the political system in America.[4] Candidates for political office over a period of time have come to realize that media coverage is more important than, for example, platforms provided by their political parties.[5] The implication seems to be that mass media delivers more votes than does a well organized political party during a national or primary election.

In America today, what we know of the world of politics comes largely through what we see, hear, and read through the mass media, and it appears that politics has become a sport for spectators.[6] It would seem that the organized political party no longer acts as the sole disseminator of political information and that mass media has become the purveyor of political information and political persuasion about candidates. While the political party of the past involved numbers of people in its workings, mass media coverage of politics does not require our active participation in a candidate's campaign for office. The problem is that we will mistake watching, reading or listening to communication with being involved in it. We mistake the media genre representations of political communication for political communication itself.[7]

Though most citizens would probably call media news reporting of politics "informative" rather than "persuasive," because the news adds to our knowledge, the fact is that the news media coats itself with the rhetoric of objectivity.[8] It often appears to be objective by being dull, factual, and wordy.

Craig R. Smith in his article, "Television News as Rhetoric,"[9] claims that since "informative" conjures a more credible image than does "persuasive," we tend to let newspersons work their spells unchecked. "The word 'persuasive'," says Smith, "is a Devil-term clustered with 'manipulation,' 'coercion,' and 'salesmanship'." The fact is, however, that what a viewer sees on television or what the reader derives from the newspaper or news magazine is quite different from what a live audience would experience.[10] Those who use media for their grasp of political news tend to believe that they are participating in the political process of the United States.

We sometimes think, by watching candidates on television, reading about them in the print mediums, or hearing them on the radio we can responsibly participate in politics. We think we can get to know candidates by watching political advertisements or newscasts. Our naivete simply encourages politicians to use media as a means of appealing to us.[11]

The Impact of Media upon Political Campaigns

Writing in the Spring 1980 issue of **Journalism Quarterly**, Richard A. Joslyn defines political campaigns as, "periods of time during which candidates for public office transmit information to potential voters in an attempt to create support for one's candidacy and to convince voters that they should vote in a particular way on election day."[12] To carry this a little further, it should be remembered that coverage by news media is a means of transmitting information to potential voters about candidates.

The disruption of traditional political parties and the political process that they controlled, which was discussed earlier, is only one example of how mass media may have transformed public communication.[13] For example, Swanson[14] feels that the increasingly elaborate and sophisticated use of television has been the most visible hallmark of presidential campaigns and candidates since 1956. Another way in which mass media has transformed public communication of politics is offered by Dan Nimmo. In his book, **The Political Persuaders,**[15] Nimmo suggests with impressive evidence that campaigns are geared primarily to images and only secondarily to discussion of issues.

Belquist and Golden carry this point further in their 1981 study of the 1980 presidential debates.[16] They suggest that the 1980 presidential debates were electronic media events in which a speaker's delivery, appearance, and over all manner - as filtered through the television screen - proved to be more important than substance. Supporting Nimmo and Belquist and Golden is Clark[17] who writes in his article, "An Exploration of Generic Aspects of Contemporary American Campaign Orations," that since most candidates are more concerned that they be elected than that they persuade audiences to agree with them on a range of substantive issues, campaign messages are usually "personal rhetoric" serving primarily to enhance the ethos of the candidate.

Journalists deem conflict as attractive and memorable and often help campaigners to create confrontations by pointing up existing conflicts that may lead to new battles.[18] Mass media coverage of politics tends toward several kinds of distortion. Gregg, in his article, "The Rhetoric of Political Newscasting," thinks that, ". . .there is the tendency to present the dimensions of governing, of decision-making and of leadership along the lines of clarity and conflict, romance and drama, Cameloteon heroes and Machiavelian villains."[19]

Graber[20] believes that over the years, the media are deliberately packed with symbols to convey stock messages quickly and easily. She gives as examples: showing candidates with old people, black workers, or college students, proclaims affinity for these groups; showing candidates in informal settings, surrounded by family members, attests to their being "regular" folk and good family people. Without question media devices and symbols speak to the reader, viewer, and listener.

Another way in which the mass media speak rhetorically to us is through agenda setting. Theodore White writes in his book, **The Making of the President,**[21] that the power of the press in the United States is a primordial one. White feels that the media sets the agenda for the public discussion of politics and that this sweeping political power is unrestrained by any law. "It determines," says White, "what people will talk and think about - an authority that in other nations is reserved for tyrants, priests, parties and mandarins. No major act of the American Congress, no foreign adventure, no act of diplomacy, no great social reform can succeed in the United States," concludes White, "unless the press prepares the public mind."

Prediction, as possibly set by mass media's agenda setting, is a powerful illusion builder. Predictions and agenda setting can become self-fulfilling prophecies.[22] Graber presents a chilling example of the power of the press to predict political outcomes and guide media users:

> The 1976 presidential debates provide an excellent example of the effectiveness of media opinion guidance in even comparatively simple evaluations. A telephone survey conducted immediately after the second debate showed that viewers, by a 9% margin, judged President Ford to be the debate winner. Following media commentary, which strongly attacked a statement Ford had made about Eastern Europe, viewers in increasing numbers called Carter the winner. Within 24 hours, Carter's lead over Ford had risen to 42 percentage points. A number of the later interviewees commented that they had originally judged Ford to be the winner, but felt that they must have been wrong because the media judged otherwise.[23]

Rhetorical Messages Sent By Mass Media

There are two major difficulties in criticizing the rhetoric of political media coverage. First, the media often has a lack of what is thought of as traditional discourse formats and, second, there exists a large number of "languages" used by the various media and within each medium. For example, the "languages" of camera angles, movement, type or print size, page location or any number of special media effects all speak rhetorically. Most, however, have not been considered rhetorical in nature, at least by speech communication scholars.[24] As mass media becomes more and more pervasive and mediated, it is unrealistic to ignore the rhetorical nature of mass media's presentation of political messages to the viewer, reader, and listener.

Here are some typical ways in which mass media speaks to us in a rhetorical manner:

1. Clearly, the arranging, cutting, emphasizing, and commenting in the media of politics is manipulation and persuasion on a sophisticated level.[25]
2. The pool of possible political candidates has been altered to eliminate people who are not telegenic.[26]
3. In order to hold audience and reader interest, political candidates design many of their campaign statements to fit in a 60 second commercial or news clip on the evening news.[27] Statements such as Mondale's "Where's the Beef?", and Jackson's "From the outhouse to the Whitehouse" fit into this area.
4. Typical rhetorical methods used by the mass media when covering politics are:[28]
   A. Use of metaphors (horse race, battle, etc.)
   B. Tone of voice of the reporters and anchorpersons in electronic media.
   C. Use of colorful graphics and charts.
5. The media uses stereotypes of the various candidates. Early in the campaign media reporters build their stories around these created stereotypes. In the 1972 primaries, for instance, Senator Hubert Humphrey was

stereotyped as "the politician of the past. . ." Senator Edmund Muskie was stereotyped as the "Front-runner," and Senator George McGovern was depicted as the "Anti-establishment populist." Alabama Governor George Wallace was "The creator of division and discord."[29] In the 1984 Democratic primary Mondale was often stereotyped as "the candidate of special interests"; Hart as "dissenter in the Eugene McCarthy/Jimmy Carter Mold"; and Jackson as the "Civil Rights candidate."

6. Davis and Baran[30] propose that the media has developed genres for representing campaigns to their audiences. Various types of campaign news stories have been developed, they suggest, including the genres of **Romantic Stories** which glorify particular candidates as political heroes and **Ironic Stories** which reveal that even heroes have feet of clay.
7. The segmenting of time on the typical media newscast creates a kind of flatness which gives equal importance and weight to all items which appear there.[31] This speaks to us rhetorically.

The Nature of the Study

This study investigated the general question, what were some of the ways messages produced by mass media news presentations might lead us to know and judge political candidates and political leadership? Specifically, this study examined two kinds and forms of rhetorical devices projected in national mass media news reporting.

The study and its findings were limited to national mass media political reporting of the Hart-Jackson-Mondale Democratic Party's presidential primary nomination-process, which took place between April 7, 1984, and April 9, 1984. Those media examined for their coverage of the three candidates during the selected period were: **U.S. News & World Report**[32], **Newsweek**[33], **Time**[34], **NBC Nightly News**[35], **The ABC Evening News**[36], and **CBS Evening News**[37].

This study could not examine all of the kinds and types of rhetorical devices used and projected by the three print and three electronic media which were selected as representative of national news media. This study assessed two of the more recurring rhetorical images and devices used by the media in their reporting of this period during the 1984 Democratic Party nominating process. Following the example of Kenneth Burke, this paper looked for "a general body of identifications that owed their convincingness much more to trivial repetition and dull daily reinforcement than to exceptional rhetorical skill."[38]

The content of the six national news media outlets was examined for rhetorical content, including written, spoken, and pictorial compostion of all six presentations of the primary during the selected period of time. From the many possible rhetorical devices which could have been examined, two were selected for systematic investigation in this study. Those chosen were: 1)**Conflict** projected to the reader or viewer from the selected media and 2)**Metaphor Images** projected to the reader or viewer by the selected media.

Through systematic examination of each of these two elements, a pattern and, perhaps, an explanation of what happens in reader/viewer perceptions based upon rhetorical information from mass media became clearer.

Conflict Projected by the Selected Media in This Study

That all six of the media news organizations attempted to create and promote conflict in their news reporting of the three candidates became immediately apparent. They relied heavily and with much repetition on phrases and words suggesting warfare and violence. **U.S. News & World Report** used lines suggesting warfare, such as, ". . .with battle lines. . .sharply drawn. . .," and ". . .both men. . .coming under fire. . . ." **Newsweek** told the reader, "Mondale has attacked Hart. . .," and "The battle for the party was waged. . . ." When speaking of Jesse Jackson **Newsweek** pointed out that he is ". . .mobilizing the black vote. . . ." **Time** projected the war theme in its reporting of the candidates by reporting that "Hart intensified his attacks on Mondale. . .," and spoke of "the attacks between them. . . ." While the three electronic news reporting networks (ABC, CBS, and NBC) did not emphasize the warfare aspect in their reporting, they did contain much reference to general violence and conflict in their newscasts of the study period.

NBC, for example, asked us to "Stay tuned as the Democratic candidates fight for the hard-hat vote. . . ." CBS, when speaking of Jackson, said he ". . .was angry at the timing. . .," and presented the conflict between Hart and Mondale as ". . .a cross between a generation gap and a family feud." ABC felt that one person was ". . .trying to force Mondale and Hart on to some dangerous ground. . ."

The print media also presented its share of references to general violence in their reporting of the three candidates. "Hart. . .then took a swipe at Mondale. . .," reported **U.S. News & Report**, as well as '. . .a bristling exchange erupted." **Newsweek** reported that "Hart and Mondale seemed wholly absorbed by their rock-'em, sock-'em rivalry." **Time** magazine suggested to the reader that "the conflict between Hart and Mondale" was a clash that ". . .was more than a family feud. . ."

From a rhetorical perspective, the emphasis on conflict and related reporting techniques played a significant role in the reporting about the candidates in this study. It seemed that the media commonly used references to warfare and conflict to enhance their reporting of the candidates and, perhaps, to convince the reader and viewer that a real war was being waged in the Democratic Party in 1984. The media tended to emphasize disagreement and conflict between candidates as well as conflict within the Democratic Party in their political reporting of the campaign. Relatively little space or time was given to reporting substance and issues.

Metaphors Projected by the Selected Media

Technically, two examples of metaphors were presented in the last section: one being a theme of general violence and the other being the warfare theme. They, however, reflect the media's preoccupation with conflict and were placed in the previous section rather than in this section, which is concerned primarily with the use of metaphors by the selected media.

Do the media use metaphors of natural phenomena? Yes, they do! There was a reference to volcanoes by **U.S. News and World Report**, when they reported that an ". . .exchange erupted. . . ." "**Newsweek** noted that Mondale and Hart had ". . .narrow but unmistakably real generational and ideological fissures."

Sports metaphors were used commonly by many of the six sources examined. **U.S. News & World Report relied** on track and field when they informed us that the '. . .Democratic marathon. . ." was nearing ". . .the halfway mark. . . ." Others, including **Newsweek**, which stated that ". . .positions will affect the race itself. . ." and ABC News which found the race ". . .very close between Walter Mondale and Gary Hart with Jackson third. . ." seemed to emphasize horse racing metaphors.

Boxing was a popular metaphor with **Newsweek** which reported, "Jackson chooses to fight for a peace policy. . .," and NBC News which showed a film clip of a Mondale ad proposing that Mondale was ". . .a fighter and a winner. . ." **Time** suggested to the reader that Jesse Jackson who was ". . .skillfully. . .playing. . .referee" would ". . .step in."

Metaphors related to show business were one of the more developed rhetorical techniques used by the print media in this study. Almost the entire **Newsweek** article which reported on the candidates was cloaked in the theatre metaphor. Examples used by **Newsweek** were: "Mondale cast himself. . ."; ". . .sneering at Hart's 'Peter Pan Politics.'"; ". . .the Rev. Jesse Jackson in a supporting role played with such verve that he threatened to upstage the other two,"; ". . .revival of the Democratic Party's quadrennial comedy. . .had clearly reached its second act"; and "The cast of characters had been narrowed to three." **Time** also used an occasional show business metaphor such as ". . .which Mondale melodramatically calls. . ."

It came as a surprise that there was much use of medical metaphors in the media's reporting of the campaign. **Time** pointed out that "Hart and Mondale offer very different prescriptions. . ." while NBC reported that Hart's campaign will soon be in the same shape as ". . .the ailing steel industry." NBC also ran a film clip of Jackson who stated that many lived in a ". . .democracy of pain." **U.S. News & World Report**, as well as **Newsweek**, seemed to have references to mercy killing when both reported problems between candidates about ". . .pulling the plug. . .in Central America."

There was some use of animal metaphors in the media aimed at or used by Jesse Jackson. For example, Jackson was quoted by **U.S. News & World Report** as saying ". . .you cannot embrace doves and missles at the same time" and **Newsweek** called him ". . .the most dovish of the three."

Vehicle metaphors were often used by both the media and the candidates. NBC quoted Mondale, ". . .there wouldn't be a rowboat in the. . .Navy Yard today. . ." if it weren't for him. **Newsweek** quoted Hart as saying the Chrysler loan guarantees were ". . .an instance of trying to patch up a leaking boat." **Newsweek** also referred to ". . .Federal bailouts. . ."

Metaphorical references to the military were used frequently with some of the more common being: ". . .to capture the Jewish vote. . ."; "battle lines on issues. . ."; "The real enemy is. . ."; ". . .intensified his attacks. . ."; ". . .enemy was global communism. . ."; and ". . .coming under fire. . ."

The media, particularly the print media, relied heavily upon the use of metaphors in their reporting of the 1984 Democratic party's primary campaign.

Conclusions From the Study

Based upon the limited scope of the study, several conclusions immediately become apparent. First, the mass media reporting during the period of the study created images of the candidates and the party by their extensive use of metaphors. Secondly, during the period of the study the print media made far more use of metaphors than did the electronic media. Third, during the period of the study there was an emphasis on conflict among candidates and within the party structure in the political news reporting of the mass media. Agreement among the candidates was de-emphasized while disagreement was maximized by the selected media involved in the study.

More research into the mass media's reporting of political news needs to be done, especially into the effects of media's use of rhetorical devices on the reader or viewer. Questions for research include: Do metaphors used by the media constitute a projection of values and/or arguments for or against a candidate or a political party? What part does this "mass media rhetoric" play in the selection or rejection of a candidate by the general voting public? What part, if any, does "mass media rhetoric" play in the projection of images of competence and leadership on the part of candidates to the voters? Does the amount of space given a candidate in the print media, or the amount of time devoted to a candidate in the electronic media have an influence on voter perceptions of that candidate?

This research demonstrated that, during the period studied, mass media relied extensively on the use of rhetorical devices in their political reporting of the 1984 Democratic Party presidential nominating campaign.

Notes

[1]Doris A. Graber, **Mass Media and American Politics**, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980), p. 123.

[2]Dennis K. Davis and Stanley J. Baran, **Mass Communication and Everyday Life: A Perspective on Theory and Effects**, (Belmont, California; Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1981), p. 103.

[3]Davis and Baran, p. 102.

[4]Graber, p. 122.

[5]Davis and Baran, p. 105.

[6]Davis and Baran, p. 107.

[7]Davis and Baran, p. 105.

[8]Craig R. Smith, "Television News as Rhetoric," **Western Journal of Speech Communication** 41 (1977), 147-159.

[9]Smith, p. 148.

[10]Goodwin F. Berquist and James L. Golden, "Media Rhetoric, Criticism and the Public Perception of the 1980 Presidential Debates," **The Quarterly Journal of Speech**, 67 (1981), 125-137.

[11]Davis and Baran, p. 106.

[12]Richard A. Joslyn, "The Content of Political Spot Ads," **Journalism Quarterly**, 57 (1980), 92-98.

[13]Davis and Baran, p. 105.

[14]David L. Swanson, "And That's the Way It Was? Television Covers the 1976 Presidential Campaign," **Quarterly Journal of Speech**, 63 (1977), 239-248.

[15]Dan Nimmo, **The Political Persuaders**, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[16]Belquist and Golden, p. 132.

[17]Thomas D. Clark, "An Exploration of Generic Aspects of Contemporary American Campaign Orations," **Central States Speech Journal**, 30 (1979), 122-133.

[18]Graber, p. 164.

[19]Richard B. Gregg, "The Rhetoric of Political Newscasting," **Central States Speech Journal**, 28 (1977), 221-237.

[20]Graber, p. 163.

[21]Theodore White, **The Making of the President**, (1972), p. 327.

[22]Smith, p. 152.

[23]Graber, p. 123.

[24]Charles U. Larson, "Media Metaphors: Two Models for Rhetorically Criticizing the Political Television Spot Advertisement," **Central States Speech Journal**, 33 (1982), 533-546.

[25]Smith, p. 151.

[26]Graber, p. 161.

[27]Gregg, p. 225.

[28]Smith, p. 148.

[29]Graber, p. 175.

[30]Davis and Baran, p. 105.

[31]Gregg, p. 225.

[32]John W. Mashek, "The Issues Sharpen," **U.S. News & World Report**, (April 9, 1984), 24.

[33]Tom Morganthau, et. al., "Battling For A Party's Soul," **Newsweek**, (April 9, 1984), 32-34.

[34]Evan Thomas, "Local Politics, Global Power," **Time**, 123 (1984), 20-22.

[35]**NBC Nightly News**, National Broadcasting Company Television Network, April 7, 1984 edition.

[36]**ABC Evening News**, American Broadcasting Company Television Network, April 9, 1984 edition.

[37]**CBS Evening News**, Columbia Broadcasting System Television Network, April 9, 1984 edition.

[38]Kenneth Burke, **A Rhetoric of Motives**, (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1962), p. 550.

1984 - 85 TSCA Membership List

Name and Address	Affiliation
Robert Ambler, Ph.D. Speech University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37916 Phone: (home) 615/574-8560 (bus.) 615/974-7070	University of Tennessee
David L. Appleby, MFA Theatre & Communication Arts Memphis State University Memphis, TN 38152 Phone: (home) 901/458-7349 (bus.) 901/454-2569	Memphis State University
John P. Bakke, Ph.D. Theatre & Communication Memphis State University Memphis, TN 38152 Phone: (home) 901/682-9509 (bus.) 901/454-2565	Memphis State University
David M. Briody, Ph.D. Communications/Chairman U.T. Martin 305 Gooch Hall Martin, TN 38238 Phone: (home) 901/587-9441 (bus.) 901/587-7551	U.T. Martin
Gary R. Cowan, M.Ed. Communications/Teacher Antioch High School 5050 Blue Hole Rd. Antioch, TN 37013 Phone: (home) 615/297-7368 (bus.) 615/832-0669	Antioch High School
Dury W. Cox, M.A. Communication/Associate Professor Tennessee State University 3500 John Merritt Blvd. Nashville, TN 37203 Phone: (bus.) 615/320-3216	Tennessee State University

Tully P. Daniel
English/Theatre Director
Bishop Byrne High School
1475 E. Shelby Dr.
Memphis, TN 38116
Phone: (home) 901/276-1398
(bus.) 901/345-3060

Bishop Byrne High School

Karen A. Dean, B.A.
Speech/Drama Director
Rosemark Academy
Rt. 1
Millington, TN 38053
Phone: (home) 901/683-7348
(bus.) 901/829-4221

Rosemark Academy

L. Reece Elliott, Ph.D.
Speech Professor
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, TN 37040
Phone: (home) 615/647-8733
(bus.) 615/648-7378

Austin Peay State University

Mrs. Vicki W. Foltz,
3108 Elm Hill Pk.
Nashville, TN 37214
Phone: (home) 615/883-1987

Gerald Fulkerson, Ph.D.
Dept. of Communication/Chairman
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, TN 38340
Phone: (home) 901/989-7197
(bus.) 901/989-4611

Freed-Hardeman College

Joan K. Gardner, MAT
Language Arts/Teacher
Hillsboro High School
3812 Hillsoboro Rd.
Nashville, TN 37215
Phone: (home) 615/292-0602
(bus.) 615/297-8600

Hillsboro High School

James M. Gotcher, M.A.
Director of Forensics
Austin Peay State University
P.O. Box 4446 APSU
Clarksville, TN 37044
Phone: (home) 615/648-7666
(bus.) 615/648-7378

Austin Peay State University

Ralph E. Hillman, Ph.D.
Speech & Theatre Associate Professor
Middle Tennessee State University
Box 373
Murfreessboro, TN 37132
Phone: (home) 615/890-2189
(bus.) 615/898-2300 Ext. 2640

Middle Tennessee State University

James N. Holm, Jr. Ph.D.
Communication
University of Michigan
326 CROB
Flint, MI 48503
Phone: (home) 313/767-6762
(bus.) 313/762-3286

University of Michigan

Sandra W. Holt, M.S.
Communication/Instructor
Tennessee State University
3500 John Merritt Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/822-3417
(bus.) 615/320-3228

Tennessee State University

Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
Communication/Assistant Professor
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, TN 38340
Phone: (home) 901/989-7725
(bus.) 901/989-4011

Freed-Hardeman College

Bettye C. Kash, M.A.
English/Instructor
Tennessee Tecnical University
P.O. Box 5053
Cookeville, TN 38501
Phone: (home) 615/526-2871
(bus.) 615/568-3343

Tennessee Technical University

Walter G. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/685-1987
(bus.) 901/454-2574

Memphis State University

James A. Knear, M.A.
Communication Studies
Travecca Nazarene College
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/331-9794
(bus.) 615/248-1394

Trevecca Nazarene College

Ruby E. Krider, M.A.
Speech & Theatre
Bethel College
Cherry Street
McKenzie, TN 38201
Phone: (home) 901/642-0973

Bethel College

Bob Luna, B.S.
Speech/Instructor
Tennessee Technical University
Box 5083 TTU
Cookeville, TN 38505
Phone: (home) 615/537-6665
(bus.) 615/528-7217

Tennessee Technical University

Barbara J. Mangrum, M.A.
Communication/Instructor
U.T. Martin
Martin, TN 38237
Phone: (home) 901/587-5423

U.T. Martin

Frank R. Martinez, M.A.
Languages/Head
St. Agnes Academy
4830 Walnut Grove Rd.
Memphis, TN 38117
Phone: (home) 901/755-1797
(bus.) 901/766-1377

St. Agnes Academy

Stanley K. McDaniel, Ph.D.
Speech
Johnson Bible College
Knoxville, TN 37998
Phone: (home) 615/577-6067
(bus.) 615/573-4517

Johnson Bible College

Joy Allen Meadows, B.S.
Via President American Home Care
Sparta, TN 38583
Phone: (home) 615/528-1300
(bus.) 615/836-2005

Zoe-Gabrielle Miroy, B.A.
Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/324-0056
(bus.) 901/454-2600

Memphis State University

Dorotha O. Norton, M.A./M.A.
Communication
U.T. Martin
Martin, TN 38233
Phone: (home) 901/749-5915
(bus.) 901/587-7552

U.T. Martin

Michael Osborn, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication Arts/Chairman
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/454-2565
(bus.) 901/682-4515

Memphis State University

Suzanne S. Osborn, Ph.D.
Literature & Languages
Christian Brothers College
East Parkway South
Memphis, TN 38104
Phone: (home) 901/682-4515
(bus.) 901/278-0100

Christian Brothers College

Donald C. Page, Ph.D.
Communications
Tennessee State University
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/385-9128
(bus.) 615/320-3377

Tennessee State University

Paul E. Prill, Ph.D.
Speech Communication
David Lipscomb College
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/832-8287
(bus.) 615/385-3855

David Lipscomb College

James G. Quiggins, Ph.D.
Communication Studies
Trevecca Nazarene College
333 Murfreesboro Rd.
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/833-2981
(bus.) 615/248-1393

Trevecca Nazarene College

Richard R. Ranta, Ph.D.
Communication & Fine Arts College
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/685-1465
(bus.) 901/454-2350

Memphis State University

Andy A. Sachs, B.A.
Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/454-3733
(bus.) 901/454-2600

Memphis State University

Mary C. Smith B.S.
Forensic/Drama Coach
Ezell-Harding Christian
574 Bell Rd.
Antioch, TN 37013
Phone: (home) 615/367-1634
(bus.) 615/367-2045

Ezell-Harding Christian

Gary L. Steinke, Ph.D.
Communication
U.T. Martin
Martin, TN 38238
Phone: (home) 901/587-4825
(bus.) 901/587-7550

U.T. Martin

J. Weldon Stice, Ph.D.
Communication/Associate Professor
Tennessee State University
3500 Centennial Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/292-0087
(bus.) 901/320-3228

Tennessee State University

Daniel R. Stupka, M.A.
Teacher
Memphis Catholic High School
61 N. McLean Blvd.
Memphis, TN 38104
Phone: (home) 901/725-9114
(bus.) 901/725-8277

Memphis Catholic High School

W. Keith Toler, B.A.
Communication Arts/Graduate Assistant
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/324-5715
(bus.) 901/454-2560

Memphis State University

David E. Walker, Ph.D.
Speech & Theatre/Professor
Middle Tennessee State University
Box 111 MTSU
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
Phone: (home) 615/896-9592
(bus.) 615/898-2300 Ext. 2640

Middle Tennessee State University

John K. Waller, M.A.
Communication/Assistant Professor
U.T. Martin
Martin, TN 38233
Phone: (home) 901/587-3788
(bus.) 901/587-7555

U.T. Martin

Paul A. Walwick, Dr.
Communication
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37601
Phone: (home) 615/928-0672
(bus.) 615/929-4323

East Tennessee State University

Jamye C. Williams, Ph.D.
Communication/Head
Tennessee State University
3500 John Merritt Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/254-7183
(bus.) 615/320-3500

Tennessee State University

Linda P. Wilson, M.S.
Speech/Teacher
Henry County High
Paris, TN 38242
Phone: (home) 901/642-0834
(bus.) 901/642-5232

Henry County High

Robert H. Woodland
English/Associate Professor
Tennessee Technical University
Cookeville, TN 38505
Phone: (home) 615/526-8066
(bus.) 615/528-3889

Tennessee Technical University

G. Allan Yeomans, Ph.D.
Speech & Theatre
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916
Phone: (home) 615/693-8984
(bus.) 615/974-7062

University of Tennessee

The Journal of the
Tennessee Speech Communication Association

published by

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Contributors

Robert Ambler, serves as Assistant Professor of Speech Communication, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Dr. Ambler directs the program for the speech-anxious students at UTK.

Marvin Bensman, serves as a member of the Department of Theatre and Communication Arts, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee.

Thomas A. Pallen, is a member of the Department of Speech, Communication and Theatre, Austin Peay State University.

Claire Perkins is currently doing graduate study in the Department of Theatre and Communication Arts at Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee.

Paul Shaffer has recently joined the faculty of the Department of Speech, Communication, and Theatre at Austin Peay State University. He teaches in the areas of broadcasting and mass communication.

Publication Information

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association
is published twice yearly in spring and fall.
Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to
Stan McDaniel, Editor
Johnson Bible College
Knoxville, TN 37998
Regular subscription price for non-members is $4.00 yearly, or $2.00 per issue.

The **TSCA Journal** is printed by the JBC Print Shop
Johnson Bible College
Knoxville, TN 37998
Special fourth class postage is paid at Johnson Bible College.

The purpose of the publication is to expand professional interest and activity in all areas of the field of speech communication in Tennessee. Articles from all areas of speech study will be welcomed, with special consideration given to articles treating pedagogical concepts, techniques and experiments.

All papers should be sent to the editor. Authors should sumbit two copies of their manuscripts, each under a separate title page also to include the author's name and address. Manuscripts without the identifying title pages will be forwarded by the editor to a panel of reader-referees who will represent the varied interests within the discipline.

All papers should be double-spaced, typed in standard type with a dark ribbon, and on standard typing paper. Margins should be standard and uniform. Notes need to be typed single-spaced on separate sheets following the last page of the manuscript proper. The first footnote should be unnumbered and should contain essential information about the author. This footnote will be eliminated by the editor from the manuscripts sent to the panel of readers. Any professional style guide, consistently used, is acceptable. Accuracy, originality and proper citing of source materials are the responsibilities of the contributors.

Institutions and individuals wishing to be patrons of the **Journal** may do so with a contribution of $25.00 yearly.

Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Fall Conference

The conference will be held on **September 27-28** at the **Sheraton Music City** in **Nashville, Tennessee.** The Sheraton Music City is a beautiful new hotel in the Opryland area. The Basic Course Workshop will be conducted on Friday by a well-known scholar from out of state. (We are extending an invitation through Mike Osborn to Karlyn Campbell of the University of Kansas.) The interest group programs will begin Friday afternoon at **4:00** and extend through Saturday.

Highlights of the Conference include:

(1) the **Basic Course Workshop** conducted by a visiting scholar,

(2) an **awards luncheon on Saturday**, which will include and address by the visiting scholar,

(3) the showing of an **award-winning film on Friday evening** entitled *The Old Forest*, which was produced at Memphis State,

(4) the participation of **Congressman Don Sundquist in the program of the Forensics interest group on Saturday morning**, and

(5) **a tour of the Nashville Network facility at Opryland on Saturday afternoon.**

Tickets to the Saturday evening performance of the Grand Ole Opry will be available to Conference participants.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION WRITE:

Gerald Fulkerson
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee 38340

Plan to attend!