The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

published by the

Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Spring 1986

Volume XII **Number I**

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Volume XII Number I

Lyndon Johnson. "We Shall Overcome"
A Rhetorical Analysis

Sandra W. Holt

This analysis of the *We Shall Overcome* speech, gives special attention to the audience, the occasion, and the kinds of proof used as designated by Aristotle. These proofs are logical, pathetic, and ethical. In addition, the speaker's delivery and the effectiveness will be discussed.

Occasion and Audience

In order to grasp the full flavor of Lyndon Baines Johnson's *We Shall Overcome* speech, it is necessary to recount the events that gave rise to the speech. Aristotle believed, and most writers since his time have concurred, that the occasion and audience determine the speech's end and object.[1] This section of the study, therefore, will be devoted to the occasion and the audience.

The speech was delivered March 15, 1965, at a critical point in the nation's history. It was just after the historic mass demonstration for voter registration in Alabama. Many peaceful marchers were attacked physically, and one was killed. The nation was in shock because much of the disaster had been seen on television. President Johnson used this particular time to speak before a joint night session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Not only did he bear witness to Congress, but also to those who viewed him over nationwide television.

The immediate audience for this speech was the men and women who made up Congress. The remote audience was the entire nation viewing television. The members of the immediate audience, no doubt, shared similar backgrounds and interests, except perhaps in the area of party politics. But the remote audience represented possibly every class of people in the United States. They were a cross section of every social as well as economic level. One thing both audiences had in common was a basic concern for what step the President was going to take in the sitiation.

Logical Proof

A critic can determine the relative integrity of ideas in a speech through three principal means: determination (1) of the intellectual resources of the speaker, (2) of the severity and strictness of the argumentative development, and (3) of the truth of the idea in functional existence.[2] The critic will first examine Johnson's intellectual stock or resources. Secondly, the critic will present his argumentative development. Next, the critic will give a functional appraisal of Johnson's ideas. Finally, the investigator will evaluate his refutative skills.

Thonssen, Baird and Braden informed us that "The preparation and background that the speaker brings to the process of logical invention figures strongly in the determination of argumentative soundness and integrity."[3] The investigator will first consider Johnson's preparation and background. Johnson's preparation began at an early age. He received some speech training in high school and college by participating on debate teams and in public speaking. He received a B.S. degree in history, but upon graduation he became a speech and debate instructor. According to Singer and Sherrod, "Through debate he taught his students the art of reasoning. He shaped personalities, guided attitudes, and planted ideas for future good citizenship."[4]

Singer and Sherrod also informed us that, "As a result of his educational status and experience, Lyndon is more comprehensive and his capacity for formulating ideas is great."[5]

All of this results in Johnson's effective use of reason. Eager to become involved in political life, Johnson moved from his home in Texas to Washington. Singer and Sherrod also said that, "His family's background consisted of traditionally politically minded people."[6] This gave Johnson faith in himself and his work. It is also said that "He never had to be told the same thing twice, he was inventive without imposing; a listener, and a talker when the right time came for him to express himself."[7] As time passed Lyndon gained the experience necessary to begin his political career.

Sound judgment on the part of the speaker is very important in the formulation of ideas. According to Thonssen, Baird and Braden the speaker should have "judgment to make fine discrimination between the essential. . .and the capacity to sense that which lies at the center of issues. . ."[8]

When Johnson served his first political position, secretary to a congressman, he would listen and observe conditions around him. He would debate and question those around him. He wanted to know the facts, to get to the bottom of matters, and hear the argument on both sides of the issue. Johnson quit his job as secretary to become assistant doorkeeper in the House of Representatives so he would be able to learn as much as possible about the personalities, issues, and intricate political life in Washington.

It has been said that a good speaker recognizes the pressing problems of his time. This can truly be said of Johnson. In 1965 when he was serving as President of the United States he recognized the pressing problems of the people. Showing his deep concern for them he said, "Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child."[9] Johnson made this statement during the time of the Selma crisis, when a minority of people weere concerned about voter registration in Alabama. The President, recognizing the problem, spoke in their behalf. He let the nationwide audience know how deeply personal the issue of Negro rights was to him.

He placed the problem of Negro rights in a broader frame, that of poverty, ignorance, and disease. He stated "Their cause must be our cause, too. Because it's not just Negroes, but really it's all of us who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome."[10] Johnson was trying to get across to Congress that they should stand with him to take action on a bill that would correct the weaknesses in the 1964 Civil Rights Bill, namely its failure to protect the right of Negroes to vote when local officials deny it. Johnson was successful in enforcing his point. As a result the Voting Rights Bill of 1965 was enacted.

The types of evidence used by Johnson were effective. He used comparisons, quotations and personal experiences to support his ideas. Through their use he kept his ideas tightly structured and consistent.

Johnson's first form of support was a comparison of historical events. He compared what had just happened in Selma to other events in history such as Lexington, Concord, and Appomattox. This comparison supported his statement that "History and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom." [11]

Lyndon Johnson used these three quotations in sequence: "All men are created equal." "Government by consent of the governed," and "Give me liberty or give me death." These quotations told the audience that they should mean something more than empty phrases. Quotations should suggest to the audience that the problem is deep. It is not a Black problem but an American problem. Blacks are Americans, and should be treated as such.

President Johnson's personal experiences are emotion-packed. Upon hearing them one could see how such a man could take up the cause of human rights.

He said, "As a man whose roots go deeply into Southern soil, I know how agonizing racial feelings are. I know how difficult it is to reshape the attitudes and the structure of our society."[12] He told the audience of his encounter with Mexican-American children when he was a young school teacher. "They knew even in their youth the pain of prejudice. They never seemed to know why people disliked them, but they knew it was so because I saw it in their eyes."[13] Johnson made the audience aware of how personal the issue of Negro rights was to him when he recalled, "Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child."[14]

Johnson used deductive reasoning in establishing his argument. He began with general assumptions and concluded with specifics. He assumed the problem in question was an American problem. Every American has a right to equal treatment, and every American has the right to vote. Johnson developed his argument by making his audience see and understand his assumptions. His argument was geared toward one conclusion, *We Shall Overcome.* Johnson used categorical and hypothetical syllogisms in setting up his argument, as the following illustrates.

Categorical syllogism:

All men are created equal
Negroes are men
Therefore, Negroes are created equal

Hypothetical syllogism:

If we overcome the crippling legacy
of bigotry and injustice, we shall overcome.
We must rid ourselves of bigotry and injustice.
Therefore, we shall overcome.

The third point the critic will consider is a functional appraisal of Johnson's ideas. Thonssen states that "The integrity of an idea can hardly be subjected to a more severe test than the practical fact that it worked."[15] This can be said for Johnson's speech. Matson says, "In terms of its immediate objective, at least, the President's address to Congress was a complete success.[16] Men and women of all races were allowed to vote. Rights of citizenship were extended to every citizen. Johnson was right as determined by an appeal to historical reality. His idea of equal rights was right. He stated that all men were created equal and yet some men were treated differently because of race. His ideas resulted in the passing of the 1965 Voting Rights Bill which is, indeed, a practical measure of the worth of his ideas.

Another component of logical proof is evidence of refutative skills. Among the factors accounting for competency in refutative skills are the speaker's ability (1) to pick out the relevant and significant points of clash; (2) to resolve the contested issues to their lowest logical denominators; (3) to reveal clearly the relation of the opponent's claims to his own; (4) to preserve the structural wholeness of the speech as a constructive enforcement of an idea.[17] Johnson met objections and defended his case. He picked relevant and significant points of clash such as, every American must have the right to vote. After picking his points of clash Johnson resolved the contested issues. He stated that "If we should defeat every enemy, double our wealth and conquer the stars, and be unequal, then we will have failed as a people and a nation."[18] Unequal rights being the issue, Johnson resolved the contested issue by setting up proposals in a bill. This is the Voting Rights Bill of 1965. This bill meant equal rights for all men. Johnson refuted the statements that the issue is state's rights or national rights, when he said, "There is no issue of state's rights or national rights. There is only the struggle for human rights."[19]

Johnson stated that his enemies are poverty, ignorance, and disease. These are the opponents that must be overcome. He also made it known that the opponents are those that contribute to the enemy, those who fight against equal rights for all men. He met and attacked his opponent with adequate argument and evidence.

Johnson's address fully enforced his ideas. He was a complete success. According to Matson, Johnson's address was "One of the most deeply felt, and deeply moving addresses ever delivered by an American president."[20]

Pathetic Proof

The second mode of proof designed by Aristotle is "pathetic" or emotional appeal. It includes all materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas.

George Campbell, a philosopher of rhetoric, recognized the existence of emotional proof when he stated:

> proofs may be conveyed through the audience, when it worked up by the speech to an emotional state.

Then he states that there is:

> a wide difference in our manner of pronouncing decisions, according as we feel pleasure or pain, affection or hatred. . .[22]

We see that both modern and ancient philosophers of rhetoric agree that emotion plays a significant role in rhetoric. As a result of these conclusions, the critic will discuss Lyndon Baines Johnson's use of emotional appeals. To be discussed are guilt and acceptance of blame, loyalty, shame, fighting, fear, and reverence.

According to Thonseen, Baird and Braden:

> The preanalysis of an audience is designed to furnish the speaker with information that will enable him to adapt his material to the hearers.[23]

There is evidence that Johnson analyzed his audience before the delivery of his speech. It is also evident that he adapted himself and his message to the audience. Johnson's audience included the members of Congress as well as the nation that viewed him on television. The audience was diversified, consisting of millions of people of all races and cultures. Johnson was discerning enough to realize he would have to appeal to the vast differences reflected in the audience in order to evoke the response he wanted. His opening statement included the entire audience.

> I urge every member of both parties, Americans of all religions and all colors, from every section of this country, to join me in this cause.[24]

Johnson kept in mind that the occasion was extraordinary, and that the audience was already in a highly emotional state. He knew how they felt, and he delivered his speech with determination and forethought.

In his appeal to guilt and acceptance of blame, Johnson wanted the audience to feel guilty about what had happened. He said:

> There is no cause for pride and self-satisfaction in the long denial of equal rights of millions of Americans.[25]

He wanted the audience to accept the blame for what has occurred and to have hope and faith for democracy in the years to come.

Johnson appealed to the audience's sense of loyalty when he said:

> to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race or religion or the place of birth is not only to do injustice, it is to deny Americans and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for American freedom.[26]

Here he said if we deny a man his hopes, we are guilty of injustice, and we are guilty of being disloyal to our ancestors who gave their lives for freedom. We must treat others with kindness and not deny them their rights.

In his appeal to the emotion of fighting Johnson said we should fight for human rights:

> We cannot, and we must not, refuse to protect the right of every American to vote in every election that he may desire to participate in.[27]

In Johnson's opinion, we cannot stand back and refuse to help people, but we must fight to pass the Voting Rights Bill of 1965. He further stated that Negroes should secure the full blessings of American life:

> Their cause must be our cause too. Because it is not just the Negroes, but really it's all of us, who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice.[28]

He tried to get the audience to realize that we must fight, we must struggle, to achieve our goal. We must overcome. We must understand how the Negroes feel about the problem and help them as well as ourselves.

Johnson used fear when saying:

> Should we defeat every enemy, and should we double our wealth and conquer the stars, and still be unequal to this issue, then we will have failed as a nation and as a people.[29]

We should be fearful of letting this issue of Civil Rights exist. If we fail we have only ourselves to blame.

Johnson used reverence as an appeal in the beginning and the conclusion of the speech. He quoted a passage from the Bible:

> When is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?[30]

He also said:

> God has favored our undertaking. . .I cannot help but believe that He truly understands and that He really favors the undertaking that we begin here tonight.[31]

These, then, were the motives to which Johnson appealed, and his rhetorical theory was admirably designed to induce persuasion.

Ethical Proof

The third mode of proof to be discussed is ethical proof. The constituents of ethical proof, as suggested by Aristotle, are the speaker's character, intelligence and goodwill.[32] Using these three constituents the critic will show how Johnson gave credibility to his message.

A speaker helps to establish the impression of sagacity if he uses what is popularly called common sense. Johnson demonstrated his common sense in the way he handled his material. His intellectual integrity and his wisdom are also proof of his common sense.

Johnson established sagacity by proposing action on a bill that would correct the weaknesses of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill. It was evident that the present bill was failing to protect the rights of Negroes to vote. Every citizen should be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. Johnson stated that many of the issues of civil rights are very complex and difficult, but common sense should let us know that there can be no argument about the issue. It was his belief that every American citizen must have an equal right to vote.

Another constituent of ethical proof is good moral character. Johnson demonstrated his good moral character by displaying the elements of virtue which are justice, courage, temperance, liberality, gentleness, prudence, and wisdom.

President Johnson showed the element of justice with concern about what is just for all people. His message was given to justify equal rights of Negro Americans. He stated that, "The time of justice has now come, and I tell you that I believe sincerely that no force can hold it back."[33] He displayed courage by challenging the nation. He had faith that we shall overcome and he was not afraid to stand up and fight for this cause. He had courage to take action on a bill when local officials were determined not to enforce the law. Johnson was determined that we shall overcome.

Johnson showed temperance or restraint when trying to present his bill to the audience. He did not become angry when giving his address, instead he used a moderate tone. There are many places in the speech where Johnson could have become violent, but did not. He remained gentle throughout the address.

He demonstrated his liberality by saying his cause is to fight to give the Negro complete freedom. Johnson's concern was freedom for all, and in this case, that of the Negro. He stated that "A century has passed—more than 100 years—since the Negro was freed. And he is not fully free tonight."[34]

Johnson showed prudence with the foresight to know that the country would unite for this cause. He told his audience that he had no doubt that good men from all over the country would rally together for freedom for all Americans.

The next point to cover is Johnson's bestowal of tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause. He said that they were there for a good purpose and everyone should join in this cause with him. He said further:

> I am grateful for this opportunity to come here tonight at the invitation of the leadership to reason with my friends, to give them my views, and to visit with my former colleagues.[35]

He bestowed tempered praise on them by saying, "I have not the slightest doubt what will be your answer."[36]

He knew they were good people and would do right. Johnson praises his client, the Negro, when he said:

> The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. His actions and protest, his courage to risk safety, and even to risk his life, have awakened the conscience of this nation.[37]

But, Johnson believed, there are those who will always try to hold on to the past. These are our opponents and they are not virtuous. What they are doing is not for the good of the country.

Lyndon Johnson tried to minimize or remove unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponents. He defended himself by saying:

> There have been many pressures upon your President and there will be others as the days come and go. But I pledge to you tonight that we intend to fight this battle where it should be fought. . .[38]

Johnson gives the impression of being sincere in his undertaking. The audience received a feeling that he would hold to his promises. He stated:

> I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion. I want to be the President who helped to educate the young, feed the poor, help the poor to find their own way, who protected the right of every citizen to vote, who helped to end hatred among his fellow men, who promoted love among the people of all races, and I want to be the President who helped to end the war among the brothers of this earth.[39]

The last point to be considered is Johnson's goodwill. He presented himself to the audience as their leader and a friend to what they consider good, and an enemy to what they consider evil. He said, "I came tonight to right wrong, to do justice, to serve man."[40] He was a friend because he wished to conquer the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice as did the majority of his audience. But he opposed poverty, disease, and ignorance, his enemies. Men who promote these things are our enemies. Johnson stated, "They are our enemies, not our fellow man, not our neighbor."[41] The audience could see goodwill in the character of Johnson. He established close rapport with his audience and tried to destroy any feelings of animosity they may have had toward him.

Lyndon Johnson used ethical proof frequently and skillfully throughout his speech. In developing his ethical proof he established that his selflessness, probity, goodwill, and concern in the area of civil rights. Johnson was highly successful, not only in meeting the demands of the situation, but also in furthering the acceptance of his ideas. He fulfilled the rhetorician's requirements of ethical proof, because his character was a cause of persuasion in his speech.

Notes

[1]Aristotle, as found in **Speech Criticism**, Thonssen, Baird and Braiden. (New York, 1970) p.347.

[2]Thonssen, et. al., op. cit., p.393.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Kurt Singer and Jane Sherrod, **Lyndon Baines Johnson, Man of Reason**.

[5]Ibid., p.124.

[6]Ibid., p.128.

[7]Ibid., p.131.

[8]Thonssen, et. al., op. cit., p.394.

[9]Lyndon Johnson, *We Shall Overcome*, in **Voices of Crisis**, ed. by Floyd Matson, (New York, 1967), p.154.

[10]Ibid., p.150.

[11]Ibid., p.146.

[12]Ibid., p.150.

[13]Ibid., p.154.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Thonssen, et. al., **Speech Criticism** (New York, 1970), p.412.

[16]Floyd Matson, **Voices of Crisis**, (New York, 1967), p.145.

[17]Thonssen, et. al., **Speech Criticism** (New York, 1970), p.413.

[18]Floyd Matson, **Voices of Crisis**, (New York, 1967), p.144.

[19]Ibid., p.149.

[20]Floyd Matson, **Voices of Crisis**, (New York, 1967), p.144.

[21]James Golden and Edward P.J. Corbett, **The Rhetoric of Blain, Campbell, and Whately**, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968), p.205.

[22]Lane Cooper, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, (New York, 1932), p.9, as found in Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, **Speech Criticism**, second edition (New York: The Ronald Press, 1970), p.421.

[23]Thonssen, et. al., **Speech Criticism** (New York, 1970), p.430.

[24]Johnson, op. cit., p.146.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid., p.147.

[27]Ibid., p.147.

[28]Ibid., p.150.

[29]Ibid., p.147.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p.155.

[32]Thonssen, et. al., op. cit., p.446.

[33]Ibid., p.151.

[34]Ibid., p.150.

[35]Ibid., p.147.

[36]Ibid., p.150.

[37]Ibid., p.152.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid.. pp.154-156.

[40]Ibid., p.146.

[41]Ibid., p.151.

Positive Scapegoating is Significant in Successful New Sitcoms

Valerie L. Schneider, Ph.D.

"Bill Cosby and his talented cast resuscitated the fading sitcom genre with a comedic approach that emphasized the loving relationships of a large family. Americans were obviously hungry for such a treatment as *The Cosby Show* went on to become the third most popular show of the year (1984-85)," stated Jeff Borden, a writer for the Knight-Ridder newspapers.

During 1985-86, *The Cosby Show* and *Family Ties*, paired with it by NBC on Thursday nights, have consistently week after week been the top two audience-draws.[1] A scapegoating technique is a prominent feature of *Family Ties*. It is a technique of some importance on *The Cosby Show* also. I believe that this use of positive scapegoating is a significant and largely new development. In the past negative scapegoating (at least in a mild form) was frequent in sitcoms.

Arts critics generally refer to a purging or scapegoating technique without any qualifiers. They do not differentiate between positive versus negative scapegoating.[2] I will analyze the concept of scapegoating in the beginning of this article. My purpose is to clarify the distinction between the two forms of scapegoating.

According to Harvard psychologist Gordon W. Allport in the classic study of scapegoating, **The Nature of Prejudice**, "The term 'scapegoat' originated in the famous ritual of the Hebrews described in the book of Leviticus (16:20-22). On the Day of Atonement a live goat was chosen by lot. The high priest, robed in linen garments, laid both his hands on the goat's head and confessed over it the iniquities of the children of Israel. The sins of the people thus symbolically transferred to the beast. It was taken out into the wilderness and let go. The people felt purged."[3]

Allport states that today we have two kinds of scapegoating—religious and secular—each with three similar steps. The holocaust was an example of secular scapegoating: (1) Frustration generates aggression (the Germans were frustrated over defeat in World War I). (2) Aggression becomes displaced upon relatively defenseless "goats" (Jews were physically easy to recognize, resented for professional success and have been frequent scapegoats throughout history). (3) This displaced hostility is justified and extended (Hitler extended the already existing verbal scapegoating to justify imprisonment and eventual murder of German Jews).

Religious scapegoating has these three steps: (1) personal misconduct, (2) a feeling of guilt related to one's misconduct, and (3) displacement of the guilt to a scapegoat.[4]

I believe that there is a positive fourth step in religious scapegoating regarding both the Jewish and Christian traditions. The fourth step involves admitting one's wrong-doing and resolving to do better in the future. The solemn ritual and fasting of the Jewish Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) contains this positive element. The Christian concept of Christ as savior (ultimate scapegoat) and master of one's life (and the related doctrine of a sanctification process which matures the believer) also includes this positive fourth step.[5] The scapegoating ritual provides a strengthened sense of self-worth, enabling one to face personal guilt.

In my opinion the most important distinction in considering an example of scapegoating should be whether it is the negative (responsibility—evading) versus the positive (responsibility—accepting) form. History has shown the negative form can lead ultimately to war and holocaust. According to psychiatrist Scott Peck, truly evil persons are those who continually blame others and refuse to accept responsibility for their mistakes. On the contrary, being realistic and responsible regarding personal errors or flaws is the epitome of good mental health.[6]

Positive scapegoating could provide positive role modeling for TV viewers that would inspire and aid them toward the mentally healthiest level of behavior. (Various studies show that youth, in particular, tend to imitate either the cooperative or the destructive behavior they see modeled on TV.)[7]

There are two major ways for positive scapegoating to occur in a drama. In both, a leading character ultimately scapegoats himself. He might do this by taking responsibility for his error or flaw. A variation is for a major character to make a self-sacrifice for the positive benefit of another character.

Many TV sitcoms, until the 1984-85 season, have depended on at least mild, negative scapegoating of ethnic, religious, or occupational groups, or situational roles. For instance, mother-in-law jokes and jokes about the masculinity of the man of the house have been common staples on many comedies. Sexist humor has also been a frequent fixture on these programs.

In **Changing Channels** Charren and Sandler comment on the extensive scapegoating of minority groups in present and past sitcoms. "Black viewers have found few positive role models in TV situation comedies or adventure shows, where black characters are often depicted as buffoons or placed in demeaning situations. . . . By continually airing old programs in which Hispanics are portrayed as lazy, shiftless and inarticulate, or American Indians are seen as drunken, cowardly savages, television is perpetuating stereotypes."[8]

Prime examples of negative scapegoating in the "old comedy" were contained in *All in the Family*. Archie Bunker scapegoated blacks, Jews and other ethnic groups. He also scapegoated his wife, Edith, whom he called "dingbat," and his son-in-law, whom he named "meathead." This was easier for Archie than facing the complexities of a changing world and his diminishing importance within it.

Creator Norman Lear designed Archie as a caricature of bigotry. His prejudices and his scapegoating of individuals and groups were supposed to be rejected—not emulated—by the viewing audience. However, a study in **The Journal of Communication** demonstrated that persons who agreed with Archie's world view and who watched *All in the Family* became more intensified in their prejudice against the groups Archie scapegoated. Only those who already agreed with Lear's viewpoint were slightly persuaded further in the direction of the attitude change he was trying to instill.[9]

As of 1984-85, *Family Ties* has been recast by principal writer and producer, Gary David Goldberg. It no longer emphasizes an intergenerational struggle. It stresses, instead, better self-understanding and better interpersonal relations among characters,[10] as does *The Cosby Show*. These are the "new positive comedies" of 1984-86.

Family Ties is interesting in that it features a major example of positive scapegoating in many episodes. It seems to me that this is the most significant technique of the revised series. The positive scapegoatings usually center around the chief character, Alex Keaton. Alex is a caricature of ultra conservatism and obsessive materialism. Alex, however, learns from his errors and excesses. Ultimately he scapegoats himself, rather than others.

In a recent episode Alex attacks a friend as too immature to get married, and he implies that his friend's fiancee is unsuitable. Alex finally states that he was wrong on both points. He admits his behavior was actually motivated by fear that he and the friend would end their friendship after the marriage.

In another episode, Alex signs up to work at a crisis center. He thinks he will earn three "easy" credits in psychology. Alex changes his mind about easy credits after he gets involved in talking a young man out of suicide. Alex humbles himself before this young man, and before his crisis center partner and college rival. He admits specific fears and feelings of inadequacy that he has experienced in meeting life's problems. Alex has sacrificed his pride and his "cool image" in order to try to save the young caller's life.

Several elements help to explain the success of *The Cosby Show*. Alex Haley comments on one of them. "The show's appeal and its laughs depend less on one-liners and intricate plots than on the affectionate ribbing between family members."[11]

Bill Cosby (who is creator, co-producer and executive consultant as well as the star) thinks audience identification is the key to the program's success. "So many people identify with what goes on in the Huxtable household. They ask themselves, 'How did they find out what's happening in **our** house?' Other times a situation will click and a parent will use it as a teaching tool."[12]

I believe that Cosby and Haley have found the two chief keys to the program's success. I have noted that occasionally positive scapegoating is an important additional technique to aid self-understanding and/or better interpersonal relations. The following example accomplishes both purposes, and provides Theo, Cosby's TV son, with significant insights about his father.

Theo wanted to buy an expensive high fashion shirt for an important date. Huxtable told Theo it was too expensive, and he could not buy it. Theo's sister, Denise, overheard this conversation. She offered to sew a shirt of the desired type, if Theo would buy the material.

Denise proved to be a poor seamstress. The shirt she sewed did not fit well and had numerous flaws. Theo became quite upset. At this point Dr. Huxtable had a talk with him. He told Theo he knew how the sewing project would turn out, so he had bought the high fashion shirt for Theo. Huxtable stated, however, that a few years earlier, Theo had given him a gift tie. It was quite outlandish, but Theo had wanted his dad to wear it when he gave an address to a medical convention.

Huxtable said he knew he would have to bear many strange and disapproving looks when he got up to speak. yet he decided he would put up with this to please his son and to show him that he valued his gift. Moreover, when he got to the substance of his talk people would realize that was the important thing, not what kind of tie he was wearing. At this point, Theo decided to wear the shirt that Denise had lovingly made for him.

Notes

[1]Jeff Borden, *"Cosby," "Miami Vice" Big TV Season Winners,* **Kingsport Times-News** (May 28, 1985), 10 B. and Fred Rothenberg (AP TV writer) *Same Ole Story: "Cosby" Leads NBC to No. 1,* **Johnson City Press** (February 19, 1986), 8.

[2]Kenneth Burke, **A Grammar of Motives** (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 406-408. Burke, who is an important theorist for rhetorical, literary and other arts critics, states that religious scapegoating has additional elements (which he implies could be more positive). He does not, however, go on to develop this aspect of scapegoating-purging. See also use of purging in general in an arts critique: Claude J. Smith, Jr., "Clean Boys in Bright Uniforms: The Rehabilitation of the U.S. Military in Films since 1978," **The Journal of Popular Film and Television** 11 (Winter, 1984), pp. 148-149.

[3]Gordon W. Allport, **The Nature of Prejudice** (New York: Anchor Books, 1958), p.236.

[4]Ibid., pp. 325-334

[5]Merrill F. Unger, **Unger's Bible Handbook** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), pp. 116-117 and pp. 612-618.

[6]M. Scott Peck, M.D., **People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil** (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), The entire book supports this line of interpretation, but see especially p. 129 and p. 162.

[7] Peggy Charren and Martin W. Sandler, **Changing Channels: Living Sensibly with Television** (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1983), pp. 6, 199, 208 and 220.

[8]Ibid., pp. 53, 54.

[9]John C. Brigham and Linda W. Giesbrecht, *"All in the Family:" Racial Attitudes,* **Journal of Communication 26** (Autumn, 1976), 69-74.

[10]Kenneth Turan, *When an "Ugly Runt" Upstages the Stars—and the Storylines Go Sour,* **TV Guide** 33 (April 27, 1985), 12-15.

[11]Alex Haley, *Talking with Cosby,* **Ladies Home Journal** 102 (June, 1985), p. 32.

[12]Ibid.

An Analysis of the Importance of Selected Course Areas to Television News Internships in Tennessee

Dr. Paul D. Shaffer

This study examines the importance placed on several selected course areas by television station news directors, higher education faculty, and television news interns within the state of Tennessee. The Tennessee based data was gathered as a part of a larger study which encompassed the states of Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Introduction

Collaborative efforts between the world of work and the world of academics appear at a time when there is a demand for degree programs in higher education which prepare students for employment. Kendall[1] pointed out that parents of students in higher education often place a high value on programs that feature experiential education and that focus on the students' vocational development, money earning potential, and the establishment of job contacts. Throughout this decade it appears, therefore, that a major concern of students will be employment after graduation.[2]

"We must begin to explore whether improved collaborative efforts can help us to integrate liberal education, work, and human development," suggested Chickering.[3] He wrote, even more pointedly, we must "lift ourselves to the level of competence and personal development required by the challenging world that we face in the decades ahead."

In his book, **Democracy and Education**, John Dewey supported Chickering's point of view when he stated, "As formal teaching and training grow in extent, there is the danger of creating an undesirable split between the experience gained in more direct associations and what is acquired in school."[4] Dewey's thought seems to suggest that educators must understand that knowledge gained through experiential development should not be separated from the student's cognitive development.

Mass Media Internships

Throughout the rather brief history of mass media internships, journalism departments have had the longest history of intership placement.[5] More and more universities and colleges have developed internship programs to give students academic credit for professional type experiences. These professional internships are widely prevalent in journalism and mass communication programs and they continue to grow.[6] By 1984, over one thousand colleges and universities in the United States offered some form of internship program, and many departments of communication or mass media found that their curriculums encouraged the establishment of such a program in their schools.[7]

Within the area of mass communication there has been a considerable variation in the levels and the types of internship programs.[8] As more amd more mass communication departments arranged for on-site internships, it became obvious that every internship is a unique experience, involving student, instructor, and on-site supervisor. The diversity of internships permits no ironclad rules applying to each internship and to all the people involved.[9]

Need for the Study

There is a need to determine, therefore, what the general background and course preparation should be for the broadcast student who undertakes a television broadcast news internship at a commercial television station. While several studies, including those by Fisher[10], Hudson[11], and Jankowski[12], attempted to determine what skills and competencies the broadcast student should have upon graduation, none dealt with what skills and competencies a student ought to carry into an internship at a commercial television station's news department.

The differences in perspectives which the broadcast educator, the on-site supervisor, and the news internship student bring to the television internship experience, concerning what they believe to be the important and necessary requisite course areas for the intern to have mastered, should be examined.

Study Questions

Two questions exist as priorities to studying requisite courses critical to student readiness for a television broadcast news internship. What course areas should the broadcast intern be required to take before the internship experience? What course areas are most beneficial to the broadcast news intern as viewed by the on-site supervisors, the television news interns, and the academic advisors?

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to higher education faculty active in television news education, broadcast students who had served television broadcast news internships, and commercial television station news directors who had acted as on-site supervisors of news interns. The scope of the original study, conducted between January and April of 1985, included the states of Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee.[13] This paper concerns itself with the responses of three

Tennessee constituencies. It deals only with their responses to a questionnaire requesting information about what they believed to be requisite courses needed by a television news intern. Attempts were made to get all television stations and all four-year college and university communication departments to respond to the questionnaire.

Description of the Population and Samples

Responses were sought from Tennessee broadcast educators and higher education departments of communication listed in the College Entrance Examination Board's, **The College Handbook** and **TV Guide Almanac**. **TV Guide Almanac** provided a listing of many colleges and universities with developed programs of broadcast education. Attempts were made to elicit responses from all four-year Tennessee colleges and universities.

A second group was made up of professional broadcasters. This group consisted of those who made their living by working professionally as television station news directors. The news director population was taken from **Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1984** and **TV Guide Almanac**. Personnel employed at non-commercial broadcast stations were not included in the study.

A third group, television news interns, was contacted for research information. Since there was no way the names and addresses of students serving internships could be known when the study began, questionnaires were sent only to those student interns whose names and addresses were supplied by faculty, internship coordinators, or departmental chairpersons. Included in the survey instrument sent to higher education communication faculty was a request for names and addresses of interns who had participated in their college internship program as television news interns at a commercial television station.

There is a precedent for such a technique to be used to identify the names of interns. A study by Hagen[14] successfully used this technique for gathering access to names and addresses of interns. As Hagen had earlier discovered, the faculty responses to this question gave legitimacy to the request for intern names and addresses on the faculty survey questionnaires.

The Survey Instrument

The questionnaire[15] included a section which listed 12 areas of course work. This section was developed to determine the importance of each of the areas of study to a student undertaking a broadcast news internship at a commercial television station. The areas ranged from general liberal arts courses to the more specific professional preparation courses. The 12 course areas, listed in alphabetical order on the questionnaire, were: American history, communication law, economics, English composition, English grammar, government, interpersonal communication, logic and reasoning, political science, television production, typing, and sociology.

Respondents were requested to use a Likert-type rating scale for each item. The scale was: 5 for "Of Utmost Importance," 4 for "Very Important," 3 for "Important," 2 for "Somewhat Important," 1 for "Not Important," and 0 for "Not Applicable."

Method of Statistical Analysis

A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the means of the three groups on each of the questionnaire items. The ANOVA tested the differences in the means of the samples to determine if any differences were large enough to conclude that the populations represented significantly differed in their responses. The study attempted to yield a "yes" or "no" answer to the question: are the means of the groups on each questionnaire item significantly different?

The level of significance selected for the statistical analysis of the data gathered for the study was established at the .05 level prior to completion of the data gathering and before the ANOVA for each questionnaire item was computed. If $p < .05$ was indicated for an item when the means were compared, the null hypothesis (that there would be no difference among the response means of the three groups) would not be accepted.

Analysis of the Findings

The responses of all three Tennessee groups concerning academic areas of importance to news internships indicated that each thought English grammar, English composition, and typing to be in the range of "Very Important" to "Of Utmost Importance." The standard deviations within each of the three groups also indicated that there was little question on the part of the respondents of the importance that should be placed by the news interns as well as colleges in those areas of study.

The results of the responses to the academic areas section of the questionnaire are presented in Table 1.

Of the 12 course areas listed on the questionnaire, the null hypothesis for 11 was accepted. The one course area where the null was rejected ($p < .05$) was Television Production. The student television news interns rated the television production course area extremely high and near the "Of Utmost Importance" level; faculty rated the study of television production at the "Very Important" level; while Tennessee television news directors saw the study of television production by the news intern as somewhat less important and near the "Important" level.

Faculty and television news directors rated the importance of a knowledge of American history near the "Very Important" range, but the TV news interns rated it lower.

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Ratios of Tennessee News Directors, Faculty, and Interns Concerning the Importance of Selected Academic Areas

	News Directors[a]		HIED Faculty[b]		TV News Interns[c]		F-	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Ratio	P
American History	3.88	1.32	3.76	.83	3.18	.87	1.60	p>.05
Communication Law	4.12	.78	3.71	.99	4.27	1.27	1.28	p>.05
Economics	4.00	.79	3.41	1.00	3.18	1.17	2.76	p>.05
English Composition	4.82	.39	4.65	.70	4.45	.69	1.28	p>.05
English Grammar	4.88	.49	4.65	.70	4.64	.67	.79	p>.05
Government	4.29	.77	3.59	1.28	3.91	.70	2.20	p>.05
Interpersonal Communication	3.47	1.12	4.00	1.00	4.18	1.32	1.57	p>.05
Logic & Reasoning	3.53	1.18	3.59	1.06	3.27	1.35	.25	p>.05
Political Science	4.06	.90	3.71	.98	3.73	.65	.81	p>.05
TV Production	3.29	1.21	4.00	1.06	4.64	.67	5.64	p<.05
Typing	4.18	1.01	4.53	.62	4.18	.75	.96	p>.05
Sociology	3.41	1.00	3.35	1.00	3.27	1.10	.06	p>.05
		[a] n=17		[b] n=17		[c] n=11		

The study of economics was rated at the "Very Important" level by news directors, lower by the faculty group and still lower by interns.

While all three groups indicated the study of government to be near the "Very Important" level in their ratings, the news directors gave it much more importance than did the faculty and the news interns. Television news directors rated the study of government between the "Very Important" and the "Of Utmost Importance" levels.

All 12 of the subject areas listed on the questionnaire were shown to be at or above the "important" level by the means of the three groups.

A ranking of the 12 subject areas using the mean scores of the three Tennessee groups is presented in Table 2. Illustrated in Table 2 is the relative importance each of the groups placed upon each course area. One of the more interesting aspects is the importance placed on course work in television production by each group's constituency. The interns gave top priority to the necessity of a course in television production, rating it equally with English grammar. The ranking for news directors, on the other hand, was twelfth. News directors did, however, rate the need for a course in television production above the "Important" level.

TABLE 2
Subject Areas Important to Television News Interns As Ranked by Tennessee News Directors, Faculty, and Interns

News Directors	X	Faculty	X	TV News Interns	X
1. English Grammar	4.88	1.5 English Composition	4.65	1.5 English Grammar	4.64
2. English Composition	4.82	1.5 English Grammar	4.65	1.5 TV Production	4.64
3. Government	4.29	3. Typing	4.53	3. English Composition	4.45
4. Typing	4.18	4.5 Interpersonal Comm.	4.00	4. Communication Law	4.27
5. Communication Law	4.12	4.5 TV Production	4.00	5.5 Interpersonal Comm.	4.18
6. Political Science	4.06	6. American History	3.76	5.5 Typing	4.18
7. Economics	4.00	7.5 Communication Law	3.71	7. Government	3.91
8. American History	3.88	7.5 Political Science	3.71	8. Political Science	3.73
9. Logic & Reasoning	3.53	9.5 Government	3.59	9.5 Logic & Reasoning	3.27
10. Interpersonal Comm.	3.47	9.5 Logic & Reasoning	3.59	9.5 Sociology	3.27
11. Sociology	3.41	11. Economics	3.41	11.5 American History	3.18
12. TV Production	3.29	12. Sociology	3.35	11.5 Economics	3.18

The responses of the three Tennessee groups, when ranked, fell into five general areas: writing, communication law, interpersonal communication, technical, and liberal arts.

All three of the groups rated the most important of the course areas to be writing skills. Those included the importance of sound backgrounds in English grammar and English composition. Typing skill was also included in the writing skills and was rated as "Very Important" by all three groups.

The responses of the three Tennessee groups, when ranked, fell into five general areas: writing, communication law, interpersonal communication, technical, and liberal arts.

All three of the groups rated the most important of the course areas to be writing skills. Those included the importance of sound backgrounds in English grammar and English composition. Typing skill was also included in the writing skills and was rated as Rasony Important" by all three groups.

A background in communication law was shown to be important to the prospective television news intern. A course in communication law was ranked seventh or higher by each group.

Communication skills were also indicated to be of importance to the prospective news intern. The rankings indicate the necessity for a course in interpersonal communication.

The ranking of the group means pointed out the importance of study in the technical area. All three groups rated a course in television production above the "Important" level. The television news interns indicated that they believed a television production course to be near the "Of Utmost Importance" level.

The rankings indicated that the three Tennessee groups believed that a liberal arts base was important to the television news intern. Such broad course areas as government, political science, American history, economics, logic and reasoning, and sociology were generally thought to be important by the groups.

Curricular Implications Derived from the Study

The study pointed to some important implications for the development of broadcast curricula in higher education. It demonstrated that a college program which was aimed at providing the necessary tools for a television news intern needed to assure that the intern would have developed, prior to the internship experience, sound language expression skills, strong writing competencies, technical competence in television production, strong interpersonal communication skills, a knowledge of communication law, and a strong liberal arts background. Broadcasting curricula, then, should assure that television news interns demonstrate proficiency with writing, personal communication, typing, language expression, communication law, and the liberal arts.

Need For Further Research

Further research should be done to identify specific courses area which ought to be required of the broadcasting student in preparation for the news internship. While this study succinctly demonstrated those general course areas of value to the intern, specific research needs to be done concerning more precise segments of study. For example, research into what special broadcast writing courses would benefit the intern should be conducted. Future research should investigate what order the curriculum should be presented to the student.

Notes

[1]J.C. Kendall, *Values As the Core of Institutional Commitment: Finding a Common Ground,* In T.C. Little (ed.), **Making Sponsored Experiential Learning Standard Practice,** New Directions for Experiential Learning, No. 20, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p.35.

[2]T.C. Little, *The Institutional Context for Experiential Learning,* In T.C. Little (Ed.), **Making Sponsored Experiential Learning Standard Practice,** New Directions for Experiential Learning, No. 20, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p.21.

[3]A.W. Chickering, *Education, Work, and Human Development,* In T.C. Little (Ed.), **Making Sponsored Experiential Learning Standard Practice,** New Directions for Experiential Learning, No. 20, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p.15.

[4]J. Dewey, **Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education,** (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916), p.11.

[5]D.C. Simpson, *Urban Internships Demonstrate Value in Tight Job Market,* **Journalism Educator,** 30 (1975), p.47.

[6]H.P. Cowdin, *More and More Schools Offer Internship Credit,* **Journalism Educator,** 33 (1978), p.11.

[7]J. Hanson, *Internships and the Individual: Suggestions for Implementing (Or Improving) An Internship Program*, **Communication Education**, 33 (1980), p.3.

[8]B. Garrison, *RE: Internships*, **Journalism Educator**, 36 (1983), p.3.

[9]L. Schager Gross, **The Internship Experience**, (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1981), p.1.

[10]H.A. Fisher, *Broadcast Journalists' Perceptions of Appropriate Career Preparation*, **Journalism Quarterly**, 55 (1978), 140-144.

[11]J.C. Hudson, *Radio-TV News Staff Employers Prefer Broadcast Degree, Strong Liberal Arts Foundation*, **Journalism Educator**, 36 (1981), 27-28, 46.

[12]L.T. Jankowski, *Broadcast News Curriculum Mirrors Stations' Needs*, **Journalism Educator**, 36, (1981), 56-60.

[13]The breakdown of the total responses to the original study which involved news directors, college faculty, and television news interns within the three-state area was as follows: 36 of 41 commercial television station news directors replied; 59 of 70 higher education faculty replied; and 30 of 46 news interns who were identified during the course of the study. The total response rate for the original study was 80 percent (125 responses out of a possible 157).

[14]S.J. Hagen, **Internship Problems and the Academic Advisor's Role**, (Anaheim, California: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, 1981), ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 695.

[15]The survey questionnaire was divided into four parts. The first section was made up of 19 statements designed to elicit responses to knowledge and skills which the news intern should have **prior** to beginning the internship experience. The second section consisted of eight statements related to possible activities in which the news intern might participate while at the TV station. A third section listed 12 higher education course areas which might be of importance to the news intern. There was also a fourth section of the questionnaire which requested written responses to two open-ended questions regarding television news internships.

Speech Communication: The Other Side — Communication Disorders

James Monroe Stewart

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to review the issues associated with the prevalence of communication disorders. As professionals in speech communication, we study the functions of content and relationships in communication. These functions serve our practical and social needs. The foundation of our studies is the communications model. The model serves as a basis for better understanding the communication processes and as a means for improving them. Oftentimes, however, we overlook the importance of the symbol system and their distortions.

Oftentimes, in teaching students about the components of a communication model, little emphasis is placed on the importance of the systems of symbols as they are reflected in sounds, words, and larger units. One of the reasons for this may be that other disciplines, linguistics and speech-language pathology and audiology, are concerned with them. They should be studied more, however, by speech communicators.

One of the most important reasons is that systems of symbols are a potential source of noise that detract from the communication process. A second reason is that speech communicators are able to identify (screen) persons who may have communication disorders; in these cases, persons can be referred to a speech-language pathologist or audiologist for professional evaluation. This second reason reflects the general orientation of this paper.

The purpose of this paper is to present and to introduce some current, available sources of data on the prevalence of primary communicative disorders. These data sources appear either in the professional literature on speech-language pathology and audiology or in other accessible, reliable sources.

The paper's contributions are several. First, it presents data which were overlooked in the development of current issues and resources on communicative disorders. This data would have influenced the apparent agreement on what appears to be known about prevalence estimates. Second, the study introduces data sources on language disorders and, third, on communicative disorders in preschool children. Space does not permit an analysis and evaluation of the overlooked data sources relative to the problematic sources. This study will focus, therefore, primarily on the validity of current thinking and discuss relevant issues.

The present paper takes issue with recent publications which discuss the status of prevalence data on communicative disorders. Leske (1981a) discusses the difficulty in obtaining prevalence data, with incidence data unavailable and even more difficult to obtain. She states also, "Despite the magnitude and socioeconomic impact of the communicative disorders, epidemiologic data on these disorders are limited and often of poor quality" (p.217). In addition, Healey et al. (1981) delineate areas on prevalence estimates where data are lacking and needed. For example, they state: "The incidence and prevalence of language and language learning problems in children and adults are not known" (p.3); and "As a general rule, little systematic data are available on preschool children, five years of age and under, that may be quoted with any measure of reliability" (p.5). Leske (1981b) agrees with these observations. They are initially found in ASHA (1977). The problem with these citations and the several sources is that they are misleading, if not incorrect and, therefore, do not reflect adequately the prevalence status of communicative disorders.

There are several reasons for the development of this paper. First, prevalence estimates remain one of the many elusive, challenging problems associated with the profession. Although other matters, such as acceptable, manageable caseloads, must be resolved, the prevalence of communicative disorders is one of the major dimensions necessary in understanding future personnel utilization, resources, and potential. Existing and implicit approaches on professional needs or estimates are currently found in Fein (1983a, 1983b, 1983c, 1983d). Fein and Synder (1983) and ASHA (1977) are inadequate because the foundations and underlying assumptions for these projections are unreliable. Some implicit or explicit limitations are found in Fein (1983c) and Punch (1983b, 1983c). Other limitations are explicit in McDermott (1981).

This position is contrary to what is generally accepted. For example, ASHA (1980) and some of their subsequent publications assert that 10% of the population have communicative disorders. On the other hand, the Panel on Communicative Disorders (1980) states that 10% of the population are affected in varying degrees with disorders of human communication. Although their statistics are the same, the latter is more tempered that the former. It implies secondary communicative handicaps while the former does not. Communicative disorders as related or secondary handicaps have been ignored in the literature.

Two other approaches to prevalence estimates are available. ASHA (1981) and Wilber (1982) present an approach which is least acceptable. They give the number of communicatively handicapped persons without reference to the total number in the population. The former citation clearly implies communicative disorders of a multiple nature (see ASHA, 1981, pp. 6, 7). The third approach involves the rate per 100 individuals. This approach can be seen in currently available ASHA brochures targeted for the public.

According to Leske (1981a, 1981b), Healey et al. (1981), ASHA (1977), Bensberg and Sigelman (1976), and others, the disparity in prevalence estimates found in the professional literature is due to inadequate experimental designs, including methodology, procedures, and definitions. On the contrary, Stewart and Spells (1982) found commonality for many of the studies they considered. It was necessary, however, to make adjustments in orientation.

The disparity in the reported results of many studies is not the problems of methodology and procedures; it is the problem of dimensionality. This problem includes the associated and/or confounding variables affecting prevalence estimates on communicative disorders. These variables include maturation and development relative to age and/or grade, race, sex, population size, learning disabilities, multiple communicative disorders, assessment instruments and criteria, the experience and depth of the evaluators, and cultural-linguistic diversity. Superficially, these variables are primarily concerned with methodological and/or procedural elements of the research design. Their individual effects on the prevalence estimate are unknown for the most part, hence, the lack of dimensionality.

Several illustrations may be helpful here. First, the rationales for early intervention are outlined by McConnell and Liff (1975) and others. Their results versus normal development are reported by Sax (1972), Helmick (1976), and others. Second, DesRoches (1976), Stewart (1981) and Stewart and Spells (1982) found sex ratios of 1.85:, 1.80:, and 1.80:1, respectively. Third, Stewart (1981) and Stewart and Spells (1982) found no quantitative differences between the races for communicative disorders. They found, however, qualitative differences for race and sex. For example, they discovered blacks were overassessed for language disorders. Thus, with the quantification of these several variables, as well as the others, the prevalence estimates for communicative disorders become more reliable and valid. However, there is more to the concept of dimensionality.

In addition to the variables listed above, three other major variables associated with dimensionality warrant special attention. First, is the type of estimate. There are large differences between prevalence versus service delivery estimates. Studies which include and/or contrast these perspectives are found in Stewart and Spells (1982), OSERS (1980), and DesRoches (1976). The more general, special education model and its consequences are discussed by McDermott (1981). She calls these perspectives unduplicated versus duplicated counts. The specific problem for speech-language pathology and audiology is discussed, in part, by Fein (1983a). In short, the former is a head count. It is smaller than the service delivery or duplicated counted. The latter counts the same child for each service needed and is, therefore, necessarily higher than the prevalence or head count. This lack of distinction leads to the erroneous conclusions drawn by GAO (1981a, 1981b) and the inadequate response to these reports by ASHA (1981). It is also reflected in Healey et al. (1981), Leske (1981a, 1981b), and ASHA (1977).

As an added dimension, it is preferrable to use the term duplicated rather than service delivery count. Service delivery, in addition to its denotative meaning, connotes the necessary components associated with it. These components include the served, unserved, and underserved. These dimensions are often unspecified. One exception is DesRoches (1976). This represents the major objection to the utilization of service delivery data as the basis of prevalence estimates. On the other hand, given a data structure which considers and coalesces the three components, the service delivery prevalence is the most ideal.

Service delivery has an associated problem involving the data systems. Ludlow, Healey, and Glassman (1977a, 1977b) and Healey et al. (1981) indicated that children enrolled in therapy do not reflect accurately prevalence estimates.

This assertion is accurate only to the extent that they do not include data on preschool and adult populations.

With the enactment of Public Laws 94-142 and 89-313, Massachusetts' Chapter 766 Law, and others like it, greater emphasis has been placed on the identification and the service delivery for the unidentified and underserved populations. Accountability now includes the served, unserved, and the underserved. This fact can be seen in DesRoches (1976) and Stewart and Spells (1982). Thus, by law, the data systems (potentially) are more reflective of prevalence.

Ludlow et al. (1977a, 1977b) did not discuss this issue. Healey et al. (1981) did not consider this fact when they stated: "The systems required for the acquisition of more valid and reliable prevalence data simply have not been implemented in spite of the fact that the knowledge and technology exist" (p.1). This assertion is accurate since Healey et al. (1981) did not consider the data gathered by DesRoches (1976) and the possible congruence between prevalence and service delivery; that is, they can be the same.

The second major area in consideration of dimensionality is the definition of communicative disorders. Historically, the formal definitions of the various disorders were initiated in 1978, proposed in 1980, and adopted in 1981 by The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA, 1982b). This recent adoption was significant in light of the projects implemented by Jones and Healey (1973, 1975). They considered the problem and its impact on data systems in their work. The further delineation of language (ASHA, 1983) and language disorders as it emanated from ASHA's Committee on Language (ASHA, 1982a) is unclear relative to their current formal definitions (ASHA, 1982b). Subsequently, Brown (1983) considered the definition of language shortsighted because the notion or concept of style was not included.

Prior to this, no one set of acceptable definitions was available. In addition to this lack of uniformity, there was no separation of language from speech disorders. For example, Public Laws 94-142, 89-313, and 91-230, subsumed language disorders under speech disorders. Other sources which reflected this inadequacy were NCHS (1981), GAO (1981a, 1981b), and OSERS (1980). Of late, the Head Start Bureau (1983, 1981) governed under P.L. 91-230, used both

speech impairment and communication disorders as the speech disorder category. This appeared to connote and to denote more than speech disorders. To a large extent this factor caused the lack of data on language disorders. In discussing the prevalence and incidence of communicative disorders, this fact was overlooked by Leske (1981a, 1981b) and Fein (1983a). It was interpreted earlier by Dublinske and Healey (1978) and considered by Healey et al. (1981).

In further consideration of dimensionality, the third variable is prevalence estimates based upon types of evaluation. This includes screenings versus full, diagnostic evaluations. The latter type is rare and preferrable relative to the former because screenings are prone to false positives. Studies that include and/or contrast them are Haller and Thompson (1975); Fay et al. (1970); and Melnick, Eagles, and Levine (1964) and Head Start Bureau (1983, 1981, 1980, 1979, 1978, 1977). Thus, dimensionality, as defined above, with the three other variables outlined, accounts for the disparate results found in the literature. In short, orientation and contribution of each variable must be considered before valid and reliable prevalence estimates can be outlined.

This issue is one side of another problem. The previous discussion indicates that full, diagnostic evaluations are preferred over screenings as an examination protocol. On the other side, both diagnostic and screening examinations are preferred over interviews. For example, both the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) and Health Examination Surveys (NHES) have weaknesses, and therefore, are weak indicators of prevalence and incidence of communicative disorders. Without question the NHES are the between data sources. To date, however, only current examination data are available on adults for hearing (NCHS, 1980). Speech and language examinations are not included in the protocols. This weakness forces reliance on the NHIS, which has serious inherent problems. Some of these problems can be found or contrasted in Fein (1983a) and Punch (1983a, 1983b). In addition, it would be helpful if these surveys were correlated, even though they have weaknesses. For example, the Survey of Income and Education (SIE) by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1976) reveals an overlap on multiple handicaps totaling 14.6%. This overlap precludes the determination of primary versus related handicaps. Although designed for a different purpose, this survey contradicts the primary diagnoses concept under P.L. 94-142. The data contained in the survey are more useful and meaningful than in the survey by Punch (1983c).

The second rationale for this paper involves the availability of valid and reliable data. Unlike Leske (1981a, 1981b), ASHA (1977), and Healey et al. (1981—representing one of ASHA's more current positions), some current, available prevalence estimates are valid and reliable. A representative, selected set of this data include Head Start Bureau (1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1979, 1978, 1977), Stewart (1981), Stewart, Martin, and Brady (1979), DesRoches (1976), Beck et al. (1981), and NCHS (1980).

These data may or may not be representative of the general population and, therefore, may be generalizable. They are germane, however, to the specific population under study. Leske (1981a) and Fein (1983a) make this point with specific reference to age. Their point is that validity and reliability are separate but associated concepts, much as language and speech are interactive. Generalization is a third element which is separate from, but interactive with validity and reliability. It is this element which should be questionable in the professional literature rather than validity and reliability.

The third rationale for this paper is to correct the erroneous assertions, by Leske (1981a, 1981b), ASHA (1977), and Healey et al. (1981), about the availability of current, reliable, and valid prevalence estimates. These studies, with specific positions on prevalence estimates, have two problems: the misleading notions, in and of themselves, and the unawareness of data, which set, at least, upper limits on prevalence estimates. Taken together, the several sources are incorrect technically. There is far more known about the prevalence of communicative disorders than they suggest. To a great extent, their shortcomings lie in their oversight of resources which make major contributions in this area, and in their lack of depth reviewing and orienting studies on prevalence estimates, along with their implication. Even more recently, Fein (1983a, 1983b, 1983c, 1983d) and Punch (1983a, 1983b, 1983c) have some of the same inherent weaknesses as the earlier, more influential citations, mentioned above.

Although Healey et al. state that their "report presents a comprehensive review and critique of the literature. . ." (p1), there are several major areas not covered or mentioned which are informative, instructive, and valuable. First, a major resource area which is totally ignored are the medical or health-care facilities. This area includes such studies as Stewart et al. (1979), Haller and Thompson (1975), Sigel (1975), and others. The oversight may appear to be caused by their concern for national and/or federal sources of data. Their review of literature, however, and purpose counterindicate this point. The national perspective is clearly the intent in Leske (1981a, 1981b). The second area neglected is the scope of communicative disorders from a worldwide perspective. Currently, the dominant, available resource is Taylor (1980). Based on her erroneous assertions, Leske (1981b) moved in this direction. The third area involves studies on the prevalence of communicative disorders among minorities. These studies include NCHS (1980), Taylor (1980), Stewart et al. (1979), Stewart (1981), Stewart and Spells (1982), Haller and Thompson (1975), and Fay et al. (1970). Fourth, and contrary to Healey et al. (1981), data are available on preschool children (Head Start Bureau, 1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1979, 1978, 1977).

These four major areas were overlooked in the development of current thinking on the prevalence of communicative disorders. They represented important challenges to the understanding of prevalence estimates.

This paper presented some resources and issues which were overlooked in the development of current thinking on the prevalence of communicative disorders. The overlooked resources are important because they represent counterpoints to the assertions found in the studies of Healey et al. (1981), Leske (1981a, 1981b), and ASHA (1977).

These major, influential investigations contradicted, in principle, the official 10% prevalence estimates reflected in ASHA (1980) and the Panel on Communicative Disorders (1980). Without the overlooked studies, all of the previous references are misleading, if not inaccurate. The misleading or inaccurate assertions stem from their lack of dimensionality. In general, each of these studies had the same fundamental weaknesses. First, they confused generalization or lack of it with reliability and validity, the latter more problematic than the former. Second, they failed to orient the existing data for reassessment. The present study asserted (a) its disagreement with current thinking on the prevalence of communicative disorders; (b) that major topical areas have been overlooked; (c) that reliable and valid data are available, and (d) that prevalence data are not in disarray, but are not straightforward either.

References

American Speech and Hearing Association. (1977).
Speech Pathology & Audiology: Manpower Resources & Needs. Bethesda (MD): National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke (NIH).

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1980).
Joint resolution. **ASHA, 22,** Front cover.

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1981, July).
Serving Speech Impaired Children Under P.L. 94-142: Response of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association to the United States General Accounting Office Report. Rockville (MD): American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Governmental Affairs Review Supplement.

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1982a).
Committee on Language Proposed Definition of Language. **ASHA. 24,** 143.

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1982b).
Definitions Communicative Disorders and Variations. **ASHA. 24,** 949-950.

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1982a).
Committee on Language Definition of Language. **ASHA. 25,** 44.

Beck, S., Brook, R.H., Lohr, K.N., & Goldberg, G.A. (1981).
"Conceptualization and Measurement of Physiologic Health for Adults," Volume 14: Hearing loss. Santa Monica (CA): Rand Corp.

Bensberg, G.J., & Sigelman, C.K. Definitions and prevalence.
In L.L. Lloyd (Ed.), **Communication Assessment and Intervention Strategies.** Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

Brown, C. (1983).
"Comments on Definitions" (Letter to the Editor). **ASHA. 25,** 5.

Bureau of the Census. (1976).
Source Survey of Income and Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Population Division.

DesRoches, C.P. (1976).
"Speech Therapy Services In A Large School System: A Six-Year Overview." **Language, Speech, Hearing Services Schools, 7,** 207-219.

Dublinske, S., & Healey, W.C. (1978).
P.L. 94-142: "Questions and Answers for the Speech-Language Pathologist and Audiologist." **ASHA. 20,** 188-205.

Fay, T.H., Hochberg, I., Smith, C.R., Rees, N.S., & Halpern, H. (1970).
"Audiologic and Otologic Screening of Disadvantaged Children." **Archives Otolaryngology, 91,** 366-370.

Fein, D.J. (1983a).
The Prevalence of Speech and Language Impairments. **ASHA. 25(2)** 37.

Fein, D.J. (1983b).
Population Data From the U.S. Census Bureau. **ASHA. 25(3)** 47.

Fein, D.J. (1981c).
Factors Related to State Service Levels. **ASHA. 25(7)** 31.

Fein, D.J. (1983d).
Projections of Speech and Hearing Impairments to 2050. **ASHA. 25(11)** 31.

Fein, D.J. & Snyder, N.O. (1983, May).
Final Report Alternative Estimates of the Supply of Speech-Language-Hearing Personnel. Rockville (MD): American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

General Accounting Office. (1981a, February 5).
Unanswered Questions on Educating Handicapped Children in Local Public Schools (HRD-81-43). Gaithersburg (MD): Document Handling & Information Services Facility.

General Accounting Office. (1981b, September 30).
Disparities Still Exist in Who Gets Special Education (IPE-81-1). Gaithersburg (MD): Document Handling & Information Services Facility.

Haller, R.M., & Thompson, E.A. (1975).
Prevalence of Speech, Language, and Hearing Disorders Among Harlem Children. **J. National Medical Association**, 67, 298-301, 325.

Head Start Bureau. (1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1979, 1978, 1977).
The Status of Handicapped Children in Head Start Programs Fourth Through Ninth Annual Reports of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to the Congress of the United States on Services Provided to Handicapped Children in Project Head Start. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

Healey, W.C., Ackerman, B.L. Chappell, C.R., Perrin, K.L., & Stormer, J. (1981). **The Prevalence of Communicative Disorders: A Review of the Literature. Rockville (MD): American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.**

Helmick, J.W. (1976).
Effects of Therapy on Articulation Skills in Elementary-School Children. **Language, Speech, Hearing Services Schools**, 7, 169-172.

Hull, F.M., Mielke, P.W., Willeford, J.A., & Timmons, R.J. (1976).
National Speech and Hearing Survey: Final Report. Project No. 50978 Grant No. OE-32-15-0050-5010 (607). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. 129045).

Jones, S.A., & Healey, W.C. (1973).
Project Upgrade: Model Regulations for School Language, Speech, and Hearing Programs and Services. Washington, D.C.: American Speech and Hearing Association.

Jones, S.A., & Healey, W.C. (1973).
Project Upgrade: Guidelines for Evaluating State Education Laws and Regulations. Washington, D.C.: American Speech and Hearing Association.

Leske, M.C. (1981a).
Prevalence Estimates of Communicative Disorders in the U.S. Speech Disorders. **ASHA. 23**, 217-225.

Leske, M.C. (1981b).
Prevalence Estimates of Communicative Disorders in the U.S. Language, Hearing and Vestibular Disorders. **ASHA. 23**, 229-237.

Ludlow, C.L., Healey, W.C., & Glassman, L. (1977).
National Evaluation of Education District Services I: A Review of Current Data Systems. **ASHA. 19(5)** 330-337.

Massachusetts, Commonwealth of (1972).
Special Education Chapter 766 Law.

Ludlow, C.L., Healey, W.C., & Glassman, L. (1977a).
National Evaluation of Education District Services I: A Review of Current Data Systems. **ASHA. 19(5)** 330-337.

Ludlow, C.L., Healey, W.C., & Glassman, L. (1977b).
National Evaluation of Education District Services II: A Plan for Designing Data Systems. **ASHA. 19(6)** 411-416.

McConnell, F., & Liff, S. (1975).
The Rationale for Early Identification and Intervention. **Otolaryngologic Clinics North America, 8**, 77-87.

McDermott, L.D. (1981).
The Effect of Duplicated and Unduplicated Child Count on Prevalence of Speech-impaired Children. **Language, Speech, Hearing Services Schools, 12**, 115-119.

Melnick, W., Eagles, E.L., & Levine, H.S. (1964).
Evaluation of a Recommended Program of Identification Audiometry with School-age Children. **J. Speech Hearing Disorders, 29**, 3-13.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1980).
Basic Data on Hearing Levels of Adults 25-74 Years: United States 1971-75 (Series 11, No. 215 U.S. Public Health Service). Rockville (MD): Health Resources Administration.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (1980).
"To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of All Handicapped Children." Public Law 94-142, Section 618—Second Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Panel on Communicative Disorders. (1980).
Report of the Panel on Communicative Disorders to the National Advisory Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke Council [Publication No. (NIH) 81-1914]. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Public Law 89-313. (1965, November 1).
An Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 236 et seq.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress.

Public Law 91-230. (1970, April 13).
Education of the Handicapped Act of 1970 (20 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress. (84 Stat. 121).

Public Law 94-142. (1975, November 29).
The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (20 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress. (89 Stat. 773).

Punch, J. (1983a).
The Prevalence of Hearing Impairment. **ASHA, 25(4)**, 27.

Punch, J. (1983b).
The Geographic Distribution of Speech-Language-Hearing Personnel. **25(5)**, 31.

Punch, J. (1983c).
Sociodemographic and Health Characteristics of the Hearing-Impaired Population. **ASHA, 25(8)**, 15.

Sax, M.R. (1972).
A Longitudinal Study of Articulation Change. **Language, Speech, Hearing Services Schools, 3**, 43-48.

Siegel, B. (1975).
A Racial Comparison of Cleft Patients in a Clinic Population: Associated Anomalies and Recurrence Rates. **Cleft Palate J.**, **16**, 193-197.

Stewart, J.M. (1981).
Multidimensional Scaling Analysis of Communicative Disorders by Race and Sex in a Midsouth Public School System. **J. Communication Disorders**, **14**, 467-483.

Stewart, J.M., Martin, M.E., & Brady, G.M. (1979).
Communicative Disorders at a Health-Care Center. **J. Communication Disorders**. **12**, 349-359.

Stewart, J.M., & Spells, V.R. (1982).
Current Trends of Communicative Disorders in a Public School System. **Australian J. Human Communication Disorders**. **10**, 33-57.

Taylor, O.L. (1980).
Communication Disorders in Blacks. In B.E. Williams & O.L. Taylor (Eds.), **International Conference on Black Communication A Bellagio Conference August 6-9, 1979**. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Wilber, L.A. (1982).
An Open Letter to the White House, Congress, Executive Department and Agency Officials.

Politics and Religion - Reagan and Mondale

David Walker

The title of this paper may conjure up in the audience's mind any of a number of images from the 1984 campaign:

President Reagan standing before the annual convention of the National Association of Evangelicals, declaring: *America has begun a spiritual reawakening;*[1]
Phyllis Schafley calling Geraldine Ferraro an *advocate of the radical feminist movement;*[2]
Geraldine Ferraro charging President Reagan with not being a good Christian;[3]
Jesse Jackson eloquently appealing at the Democratic convention: *In his appeal to the South, Mr. Reagan is trying to substitute flags and prayer cloths for jobs, food, clothing, education, health care and housing. But President Reagan is not even familiar with the structure of a prayer. He has cut food stamps, children's breakfast and lunch programs, the WIC program for pregnant mothers and infants, and then he says, Let us pray;*[4]
Republican Senator Paul Laxalt, sending a letter to 45,000 ministers in 16 states, addressing them as *Dear Christian Leader,* and declaring that Reagan *Has made an unwavering commitment to the traditional values which I know you share;*[5]
Archbishop Bernard F. Law of Boston describing abortion as *the critical issue in this campaign;*[6]
Cheryl Prewitt, Miss America of 1980, attacking Ferraro in a series of television spots sponsored by *Christians for Reagan;*[7]
Jerry Falwell proclaiming a National Day of Prayer and Fasting for the day before the election.;[8]
A heckler in a Teddy Bear outfit at a Ferraro campaign stop, holding a sign that said: *15 Million Babies will never hug a Teddy Bear;*
The voices of children singing the Pro-Life Anthem:

Let me live
Let me walk into the sunshine,
Let me live.
Feel my mother's arms around me,
Feel my father's arms around me,
Be a part of God's creation,
Let me live.

Ronald Reagan, responding to a question by Marvin Kalb in the final television debate: *Do you feel that we are now heading, perhaps, for some kind of nuclear Armageddon?*

Religious issues in Presidential campaigns are not new to American culture. Until and including 1960, for instance, a number of campaigns centered around a candidate's connection with the Catholic Church. The campaign of Jimmy Carter in 1976 raised the issue again. Kenneth A. Briggs contended that the question was *whether a deeply committed evangelical Christian can appeal to an overtly more secular culture with his frank admission of conservative Protestant piety.*[9] Four years later, Ronald Reagan took advantage of several highly emotional issues—two of which were the right to abortion and the right to prayer in public schools—to gain the support of the Moral Majority and other conservative religious groups. Jerry Falwell, leader of the Moral Majority, claimed credit for getting four million to vote. He called the results of the election the *greatest day for the cause of conservatism and American morality in my adult life.*[10]

During the first several years of his administration, Reagan paid only token attention to these issues as he concentrated on the economy and national defense. With the advent of an election year, however, he turned his attention to these issues again. When this writer began research on this paper, he thought the topic would be challenging and the search for materials a little difficult. Instead, the religious aspect of this campaign mushroomed into a highly volatile set of issues with tons of verbage on the subject.

A Little Chronology

The year started off rather slowly with minimal attention paid to Reagan's first address as a declared candidate for re-election, given significantly enough, to the convention of the National Religious Broadcasters. In this speech, he

equated the issue of abortion with the Civil War struggle to end slavery, charging that aborted fetuses suffer "long and agonizing pain." After his address, Pat Boone led the audience in a rendition of *God Bless America*, adding the words: "How wonderful to have a President who believes these words."[11] **The New York Times** editorialized that

> You don't have to be a secular humanist to take offense at that display of what, in America, should be private piety. The devoutest Christians, who warmly respond to those words, have a higher stake in not having them used for partisan gain. That stake is the separation of church from state.[12]

February was relatively silent, but in March President Reagan addressed the convention of the National Assocation of Evangelicals. Charging that in recent years "America did seem to lose her religious and moral bearings," he contended that "Americans are turning back to God."[13] As a result of these first two addresses, some critics began to pay attention to the President's church attendance patterns. In defending his record of having attended church services only nine times in his administration through February of 1984, Reagan responded that he disliked inconveniencing parishioners, and that furthermore, he did not intend to make morality a campaign issue."[14]

During the early months of the year, Reagan published a book — **Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation.** Actually, Reagan's part of the book is relatively short, using only twenty pages printed in large type. Writing in highly emotional language, the President argues that "Americans do not want to play God with the value of human life. It is not for us to decide who is worthy to live and who is not."[15] In June, the National Right to Life Committee endorsed Reagan's re-election.[16]

Up to this point, the religious issue seemed to belong to President Reagan. No sooner, however, had Geraldine Ferraro been chosen as Walter Mondale's running mate, than she decided to enjoin the issue. "President Reagan walks around calling himself a good Christian. I don't for one minute believe it." His policies, she explained, were "discriminatory" and "terribly unfair."[17] Jesse Jackson joined in the attack with the quotation noted earlier in this paper.

During the months of August and September, a heated exchange took place within the Catholic Church. Mario Cuomo, the Catholic governor of New York, became involved in a series of speeches and statements. Cuomo charged:

> You have a President who has wrapped himself in religiosity. Reagan has used religion aggressively as a weapon, as a tool. He has held himself out as offering the American people a religous value that will be a foundation for the Government. You have Reagan moving into what was a vacuum and brandishing religious values.

Only by debating the proper role of religion in politics, Cuomo advised, could Reagan's grip on the religious issue be loosened.[18]

Cuomo also became involved in a discussion with Archbishop John J. O'Connor of New York over the role of the church in politics. In the midst of that discussion, Bishop John W. Malone, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a statement including these excerpts:

> With regard to many issues, of course, there is room for sincere disagreement by Catholics and others who share our moral convictions, over how moral principles should be applied to the current facts in the public policy debate. But with regard to the immorality of the direct taking of innocent human life (e.g., by abortion or by direct attacks on noncombatants in war), our views are not simply policy statments of a particualr Catholic organization, the United States Catholic Conference. They are a direct affirmation of the constant moral teaching of the Catholic Church, enunciated repeatedly over the centuries, as in our day, by the highest teaching authority of the Church. . . .
>
> In proclaiming authentic Catholic moral teaching, therefore, we recognize at the same time the need to join the public policy debate in a way which attempts to convince others of the rightness of our positions. . . .It would be regrettable if religion as such were injected into a political campaign through appeals to candidates' religious affiliations and commitments. We reject the idea that candidates satisfy the requirements of rational analysis in saying their personal views should not influence their policy decisions; the implied dichotomy — between personal morality and public policy — is simply not logically tenable in any adequate view of both.[19]

Four days later, Ferraro responded by pointing out that the Roman Catholic Church has its right to state its position on moral-political questions, but that she had no obligation to follow them. Having no qualms about separating her religious attitudes from her political policies, she said; "I am convinced what I am doing is right." The same day,

Cuomo delcared that there was nothing in Catholic law that required him to work to impose the teaching of the church on others.[20]

Later that month, Archbishop O'Connor declared:

> It is my responsibility to spell out for Catholics what the church teaches. If anyone in public office wishes to differ, wishes to say that is not Catholic teaching, then that individual ought to prove it is wrong. And if an individual does attempt to articulate Catholic teaching and it is not truly Catholic teaching it is my responsibility to say something.[21]

In the early part of September, Archbishop Bernard Law of Boston entered the arena. While declaring that the Catholic Church was not trying to tell its members how to vote, he said: "But we are saying that when you make up your mind, this is the critical issue.[22]

Ferraro and Cuomo were joined in the dialogue by Senator Edward Kennedy. In an address titled *Faith and Freedom*, he claimed that what was at stake was "not a limit on religious expression, but the limits on public action itself."

> Religious leaders may say anything they feel bound in conscience to say, but they may not ask Government to do something which it cannot do under the Constitution or the social contract of a pluralistic society. Where decisions are inherently individual ones or in cases where we are deeply divided about whether they are, people of faith should not invoke the power of the state to decide what everyone can believe or think or read or do. In such cases—cases like abortion or prayer or prohibition or sexual identity—the proper role of religion is to appeal to the free conscience of each person, not the coercive rule of secular law. Archbishop O'Connor surely has every constitutional right, and according to his faith a religious duty, to speak against abortion. And just as surely Geraldine Ferraro and Mario Cuomo are equally right that faithful Catholics, serving in public office, can agree with his morality without seeking to impose it across the board. . . . Personal choices like abortion should be questions for public debate, but in the end the answers cannot be matters for public decision. The issues should be discussed before the widest audience, but they can be settled only in the depths of each individual conscience. There is a logical line of separation between private morality and public policy — and it is the line between the role of Government and the role of individual rights.[23]

A couple of days later, facing a large group of anti-abortion hecklers, Ferraro reitereated her stand that she would not impose her views about abortion on others. She quoted the words of John F. Kennedy; "I do not speak for my church on public matters, and the church does not speak for me." She added: "That is exactly my position today." Shortly after the speech, Bishop James C. Timlin of the Diocese of Scranton attacked her position on abortion as "absurd" and "not a rational position," saying her views amounted to "secular humanism."[24]

On September 13, Cuomo spoke at the University of Notre Dame on the subject: *Religious Belief and Public Morality: A Catholic Governor's Perspective.* Cuomo declared that "I protect my right to be a Catholic by preserving your right to believe as a Jew, a Protestant or nonbeliever, or as anything else you choose." Other excerpts include:

> I accept the Church's teaching on abortion. Must I insist you do? By Law? By denying you Medicaid funding? By a constitutional amendment? If so, which one? Would that be the best way to avoid abortions or to prevent them?. . . God should not be made into a celestial party chairman. . . .I believe that legal interdicting of abortion by either the Federal Government or the individual states is not a plausible possibility and even if it could be obtained, it wouldn't work. Given present attitudes, it would be "Prohibition" revisited, legislating what couldn't be enforced and in the process creating a disrespect for law in general. And as much as I admire the bishop's hope that a constitutional amendment against abortion would be the basis for a full new Bill of Rights for mother and children, I disagree that this would be the result.[25]

Another incident in the debate within the Catholic Church should be noted. On September 14, fifty-five Catholic theologians asserted that the Church's position on abortion was not monolithic. As members of Catholics for Free Choice, they had been advising Catholic members of Congress that, although the bishop consistently urged abolition of abortion, they were not required to follow that policy strictly in their official acts.[26]

The end of August also saw the convention of the Grand Old Party, at which Reagan made clear that religion would

play a major role in his campaign. Speaking to a prayer breakfast the morning before his acceptance speech, he declared:

> The truth is, politics and morality are inseparable. And as morality's foundation is religion, religion and politics are necessarily related. We need religion as a guide. We need it because we are imperfect. And our government needs the church because only those humble enough to admit they're sinners can bring to democracy the tolerance it requires in order to survive.

In the same speech, in speaking about those opposing voluntary prayer in schools, he asked: "Isn't the real truth that they are intolerant of religion?"

That same night, in his acceptance address, Reagan continued to include religious themes in his ideas:

> If our opponents were as vigorous in supporting our voluntary prayer amendment as they are in raising taxes, maybe we could get the Lord back in our schoolrooms and get the drugs and violence out. . . .Millions of average parents pay their full share of taxes to support public schools while choosing to send their children to parochial or other independent schools. Doesn't fairness dictate that they should have some help in carrying this double burden?[27]

Thus Reagan, as he accepted the Republican nomination, had completely forgotten his earlier declaration that he did not intend to make morlaity a campaign issue.

A little over a week later, Mondale accepted the challenge. In a radio speech broadcast nationwide, he declared that the Republicans had "raised doubts whether they respect the wall our founders placed between government and religion." He further declared that mixing politics and religion "will corrupt our faith and divide our nation."[28]

Two days later, in Salt Lake City, Reagan responded by using one of his favorite slogans that "some would. . .twist the concept of freedom of religion to mean freedom against religion." He also utilized what became a favorite straw man, as he declared that he "can't think of anyone who favors the government establishing a religion in this country."[29]

Two days later, both Mondale and Reagan spoke to B'nai B'rith, a major Jewish organization. Mondale, clashing directly with previous statements of Reagan's, charged that an extreme fringe was "poised to capture the Republican Party and tear it from its roots in Lincoln." He declared that he did not doubt Reagan's faith, patriotism, and family values, "and I call on him and his supporters to accept and respect mine." Reagan's speech, by contrast, spoke in terms of generalities on the subject of faith; the closest statement to the religious debate was his use again of the straw man that the Constitution guaranteed there would "never be a state religion in this land but at the same time it makes sure that every single American is free to choose and practice his or her religious beliefs or to choose no religion at all."[30]

Mondale's view on politics and religion was clarified somewhat by an exchange that took place between a street preacher and himself in Chattanooga. Mondale declared:

> I don't deny, but I affirm that there's a relationship. As a matter of fact I believe that the reason that I am in politics is because of my faith and what it teaches me about what Christianity should involve—nondiscrimination, freedom, reaching out to lighten the burden of the vulnerable, trying to create a society in which the word "love" leaps out.

In the same exchange, he had said, in talking about his Christian home, that "I don't brag about it. I don't talk about it because I was taught that my faith was between me and my family and my God."[31] A week later, in Mississippi, he defended his upbringing in a Christian family, but said that politicians should keep their "nose out of religion." Declaring that he did not want religion in the campaign, Mondale responded to hecklers who asked him how he could call himself a good Christian and defend the Democratic platform on social issues. Mondale responded:

> What makes America great is our faith is between ourselves, our conscience, and our God, and we don't have to clear our faith by passing muster with some politician who happens to be running against us.[32]

Mondale thus admitted that religion and politics are related; his distinction, however, is that a person's faith is a private matter and should not be forced upon others.

The intensity of the religious issues decreased in the latter part of the campaign, as far as the candidates were concerned. Other issues, such as international cooperation with the Soviet Union, and media events such as the

televised debates, crowded the religious perspectives out of the headlines. There were various groups, however, who continued to wage the religious wars.

Representative Henry J. Hyde, an Illinois Republican, in a speech to the Law School at Notre Dame University on September 24, urged Roman Catholic politicians to strive for a legal ban on abortions. "The duty of one who regards abortion as wrong is not to bemoan the absence of consensus against abortion, but to help lead the effort to achieve one." Arguing that the constitutional separation of church and state was "never intended to rule religiously based values out of order in the public arena," he questioned whether "the American experiment can survive the sterilization of the public arena that takes place when religiously based values are systematically ruled out of order in the public discourse."[33]

A different perspective on the Catholic approach to religious issues in the campaign was presented by Joseph Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago in early October. Bernardin approached abortion in the framework of a "broad range of issues" that he said threatened life; these included nuclear arms and poverty. In 1983, he had described the concept as a "seamless garment" which bound together several urgent concerns of the Catholic bishops.[34]

The candidates had to deal with the issue again in the first televised debate on October 7. Reagan tried to put the responsibility for the religious issue being injected into the campaign on the Democratic ticket's shoulders by charging that "religion became a part of this campaign when Mr. Mondale's running mate said I wasn't a good Christian" — a charge that should amaze even the most naive observer of the campaign. In the same debate, Walter Mondale asserted that the Republican platform was creating a religious test for judges before selection for federal court.

In the same debate, the issue of abortion was brought up. Reagan declared that it was a problem of the Constitution, not a problem of religion. At the same time, he declared that "it is a sin if you're taking a human life." Mondale on the issue came up with this statement:

> If it's rape, how do you draw moral judgments on that? If it's incest, how do you draw moral judgments on that? Does every woman in America have to present herself before some judge picked by Jerry Falwell to clear her personal judgment?[35]

The religious issues again came to the forefront during the debate between the Vice-Presidential candidates. George Bush took the lead from President Reagan in charging that "it wasn't our side that raised the question about our President whether he was a good Christian or not." Geraldine Ferraro responded by stating that "it started in 1980, when this Administration was running for office and the Rev. Jerry Falwell became very, very involved in the campaign." Bush and Ferraro made other statements pertaining to religious issues, but they were mostly restatements of previous stands.[36]

A few days later, Bishop James W. Malone, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, issued a statement contending that the bishops had no intention of creating a voting bloc. He also stated:

> As a nation we are constitutionally committed to the separation of church and state but not to the separation of religious and moral values from public life. . . Bishops are teachers in the Catholic Church entrusted with the responsibility of communicating the content of Catholic moral teaching and illustrating its relevance to social and political issues. We do not seek the formation of a voting bloc nor do we pre-empt the right and duty of individuals to decide conscientiously whom they will support for public office. Rather, having stated our positions, we encourage members of our own Church and all citizens to examine the positions of candidates on issues and decide who will best contribute to the common good of society.[37]

On October 15, Archbishop John J. O'Connor delivered a much-publicized address, "Human Lives, Human Rights," before a group of medical professionals, nuns, and priests at Cathedral High School in New York. In this speech, he declared:

> What do we ask of a candidate or someone already in office? Nothing more than this: a statement opposing abortion on demand, and a commitment to work for a modification of the permissive interpretations issued on the subject by the United States Supreme Court. It will simply not do to argue that "laws" won't work, or that "we can't legislate morality." Nor will it do to argue, "I won't impose my morality on others." There is nothing personal or private in the morality that teaches that the taking of unborn life is wrong.

O'Connor went so far in this speech as to appeal to the rape victim:

> Certainly rape is always a frightening possibility, and a crime to be abhorred in every way. It is understandable that many would feel that an abortion should be justifiable if a woman or a young girl becomes pregnant through rape. We in no way minimize the horror and the trauma of rape. Obviously, whether we are speaking of a thousand cases or one case, a woman's life, a family's future, can be virtually destroyed. But as we have asked before, will violence against an unborn child compensate for violence against the woman raped, or will it, in many cases, simply increase her suffering? Is it at least **possible** that bearing a child, however conceived, and either rearing it or offering it for adoption to the hundreds of thousands of couples pleading to adopt, might bring, even out of the tragedy of rape, a rich fulfillment?[38]

During the final weeks of the campaign, a new religious issue began to surface nationally, although its impact was apparently minimal. Joe Cuomo, unrelated to Governor Cuomo, made a documentary on *Ronald Reagan and the Prophecy of Armageddon,* in cooperation with Radio Station WBAI-FM in New York City. This 90 minute program was broadcast at various times in the campaign over about 175 public radio stations.[39] One of the early statements in the program was:

> Ronald Reagan said it as Governor and as President, in his home in the White House, over lunch, over dinner, in the car and over the phone, to religious leaders and lobbyists, to his staff, a Senator and even to **People** magazine. On at least 11 occasions Ronald Reagan has suggested that the end of the world is coming, and it may be coming soon.

Among the "eleven occasions" were:

1. In the 1980 Presidential campaign, Reagan appeared on the PTL television network with Jim Bakker, and said: "We may be the generation that sees Armageddon."
2. During the same campaign, Reagan told a group of Jewish leaders in New York City: "Israel is the only stable democracy we can rely on in a spot where Armageddon could come."
3. In 1981, Senator Howard Heflin is cited as hearing Reagan say in a conversation on Armageddon: "Russia is going to get involved in it."
4. In 1983, the **Jerusalem Post** *quoted Reagan as saying: "I turn back to your ancient prophets in the Old Testament and the signs foretelling Armageddon, and I find myself wondering if, if we're the generation that's going to see that come about."*[40]

The potential impact of such an issue could have been devastating. Some interpreters of the Biblical doctrine of Armageddon see the United States as the agent of God in a final nuclear holocaust. Obviously, if this were a President's interpretation, he would be committed to continuing nuclear buildup and the inevitability of nuclear war—making any attempts at peace worthless. Apparently, this was not Reagan's interpretation. In the second debate with Mondale, Reagan stated:

> But no one knows whether Armageddon—those prophecies—mean that Armageddon is a thousand years away or day after tomorrow. So I have never seriously warned and said we must plan according to Armageddon.[41]

The idea did get some press coverage, however. Jerry Falwell declared that it was a "thinly veiled attack on Ronald Reagan by liberal clergymen."[42] **Time** felt compelled to report Nancy Reagan's gasp of "Oh, no!" when the question of Armageddon came up in the second debate.[43] In a campaign filled with religious issues, the most this issue did was to inject some creativity into the dying minutes of a dying campaign.

The remainder of this paper will try to answer three questions:

1. Are religion and politics inseparable?
2. Did Reagan deliberately make this a major issue in the campaign?
3. What was the probable impact upon the election?

Some Observations

1. Are religion and politics inseparable?

The first of these questions cannot be answered adequately by just referring to philosophical statements. This paper has already observed a number of pronouncements and renouncements on the subject. It should be noticed that both candidates accepted the idea of a relationship between religion and politics — the difference is that Mondale insisted

that a person's faith is a private matter. Furthermore, a number of observers pointed out that liberal theologians used the pulpit in promoting civil rights and in opposing the Vietnam War. The critical question, however, is how the voting public regards the question.

But what did the voting public believe in 1984? **Religion in America**, Report No. 222 of the Gallup Report for March, 1984, revealed some interesting attitudes about what Americans were like. After revealing such statistics as the fact that only four adults in ten attended church during a week in 1983, and only six in ten attended once during a month, the same report pointed out: "The vast majority of the population say they wish their personal faith were stronger and that they want religion to play a greater role in society."[44] The report continued that "while religion has a powerful appeal for Americans, most of us fall into the category of nominal Christians."[45] The adult population of our country thus, while nominally Christian if at all, was apparently ripe for an appeal involving greater participation of religion in society.

The probable appeal of religious issues was further validated by the growth of the Moral Majority of Jerry Falwell. Achieving much publicity in the 1980 election with one million members, Falwell in 1984, claimed 6.5 million members [46] and planned to register one million voters each year.

2. **Did Reagan deliberately make this a major issue of the campaign?**

There were too many symbols in the 1984 campaign to conclude anything other than "yes." Obvious symbols which Reagan used include:

(1) Presenting his first campaign address to the convention of the National Religious Broadcasters.
(2) His address to the convention of the National Association of Evangelicals.
(3) Publishing, during an election year, **Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation**.
(4) Dining on church pasta at the St. Ann's Church festival while asking: "Why do those who claim to represent the most enlightened thought on Central America refuse to listen to the testimony of one of the greatest moral leaders of our time, his holiness Pope John Paul II?"[47]
(5) Addressing a prayer breakfast the morning of his acceptance speech at the Republican convention.
(6) The selection of Jerry Falwell to give the benediction after Reagan's nomination at the Republication convention.
(7) His visit to a religious shrine, the National Shrine of our Lady of Czestochowa, ringing the chapel bell, praising Pope John Paul II, and presenting a tapestry to the Pauline Fathers who care for the shrine—all of this at a time in which Reagan's aids had said he would ease up on the religious issue.[48]
(8) His film shown to the Republican convention, showing,
   a. Reagan talking about Terence Cardinal Cooke, described by Reagan as "a wonderful man, a most dedicated man, and one of the most kindly men I have ever met." and also identified as one of his hospital visitors after he was wounded in 1981 by John Hinckley.
   b. His declaration, following that shooting, that "Whatever time I've got left, it now belongs to someone else." The someone else, by the context, is obviously God.
(9) The publication of a paperback, **Ronald Reagan: In God I Trust**, a compilation of Reagan's statements about religion, maintaining that Reagan was motivated to seek the Presidency because of his religious beliefs.[49]

His frequent references to religious ideas, his use of religious symbols — all of these pointed to the inescapable conclusion that Reagan consciously decided to use the religious issue to his advantage.

3. **What was the probable impact upon the election?**

Time magazine made these observations in its article "For God and Country,"

> As a great campaign debate looms, the risks are substantial for the two candidates and for the country. Reagan may have misread a national hunger for moral and spiritual uplift as a desire for a specific religious regimen. Mondale could be hurt if he is perceived as insensitive to religious yearnings. In either case, new religious tensions could be stirred.[50]

The second of these was apparently the result. Mondale and Ferraro were stuck with a no-win dilemma. By insisting that religion not be a part of the campaign, Mondale overlooked what was a substantial desire on the part of the adult voting population for religion to play a greater role in society. Furthermore, he allowed Reagan to fill a vacuum and be the "religious candidate." When he did choose to talk about religion, however, he inevitably had to defend his stand upon abortion—a stand unpopular with the majority of the country. Only 30 percent of Catholics and 30 percent of Protestants, according to a recent national survey done by the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center, approve of abortion on demand.[51]

Did the discrepancy between Reagan's statements and his church attendance hurt him? Apparently not. As noticed earlier, the Gallup Poll shows that Americans are nominal church goers themselves. Jerry Falwell answered critics of Reagan's church attendance by saying:

"I think it's masterful. The fact that he's not close to any minister, the fact that he's not part of any church, allows him to say the things he's saying without seeming like a religious zealot.[52]

A second consideration about the handling of the religious issues also tilted the scales in Reagan's favor. Mondale talked too much in the abstract, arguing the philosophical relationship of church and state and the private nature of one's faith. Reagan, instead, generally talked to specific, emotionally-laded topics, such as abortion and school prayer. The vast majority of the voting public, too used to media-generated snappy spots, is not trained to think in the abstract.

More critically, however, the religious issue stalled the Mondale campaign. Not until the first television debate was Mondale able to create any excitement, and then it was too late for anything except a comeback against incredible odds, which Mondale was not able to handle. For a major part of the campaign, such issues as the Reagan deficit, poverty, civil rights, and the nuclear freeze, were pushed to the background.

In a **New York Times** exit poll conducted during the election, 80% of "white born-again Christians" indicated they voted for Reagan; 73% of white Protestants supported him; 55% of Catholics voted for him. He even gained 32% of the Jewish vote.[53] These figures seem too high to conclude anything other than the fact that the religious issues had a significant impact on the outcome.

But again, even more significantly, the religious issue's greatest impact came about from what it did not accomplish. Too busy from facing the hecklers and trying to refute charges brought about by conservative religious groups, the Democratic candidates were significantly stalled in presenting their agenda.

A Final Thought

To fragment a nation's culture into a series of air-tight, separate compartments, is neither realistic nor beneficial. In many ways, our understandings in one area will be a fundamental facet of our lifestyles in another. If a person is strongly motivated by religious convictions, he will be influenced in political decisions touched by them. Differences will arise over what is religious and what is not. Dangers will arise, on the one hand, when we deny to someone the right to express himself from a religious conviction, and on the other hand, when we misuse this right, picturing those who dissent from our view as anti-religious.

Notes

[1]**New York Times**, March 7, 1984.

[2]**New York Times**, July 13, 1984.

[3]**New York Times**, July 15, 1984.

[4]**New York Times**, July 18, 1984.

[5]**New York Times**, September 1, 1984.

[6]**New York Times**, September 6, 1984.

[7]**New York Times**, September 15, 1984.

[8]"Old Time Gospel Hour," September 23, 1984.

[9]**New York Times**, April 11, 1984.

[10]**New York Times**, January 31, 1984.

[11]**New York Times**, January 31, 1984.

[12]**New York Times**, February 3, 1984.

[13]**New York Times**, March 7, 1984.

[14]**New York Times**, March 7, 10, 1984.

[15]Ronald Reagan, **Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation, 1984, p.3.**

[16]**New York Times**, June 10, 1984.

[17]**New York Times**, July 15, 1984.

[18]**New York Times**, August 3, 1984.

[19]**New York Times**, August 10, 1984.

[20]**New York Times**, August 14, 1984.

[21]**New York Times**, August 25, 1984.

[22]**New York Times**, September 6, 1984.

[23]**New York Times**, September 11, 1984.

[24]**New York Times**, September 12, 1984.

[25]**New York Times**, September 14, 1984.

[26]**New York Times**, September 15, 1984.

[27]**New York Times**, August 24, 1984.

[28]**New York Times**, September 3, 1984.

[29]**New York Times**, September 5, 1984.

[30]**New York Times**, September 6, 1984.

[31]**Chattanooga Times**, September 8, 1984.

[32]**New York Times**, September 13, 1984.

[33]**New York Times**, September 24, 1984.

[34]**New York Times**, September 28, 1984.

[35]**New York Times**, October 8, 1984.

[36]**New York Times**, October 12, 1984.

[37]**New York Times**, October 14, 1984.

[38]**New York Times**, October 16, 1984.

[39]**New York Times**, October 21, 1984.

[40]Joe Cuomo, "Ronald Reagan and the Prophecy of Armaggedon."

[41]**New York Times**, October 22, 1984.

[42]**New York Times**, October 24, 1984.

[43]**Time**, November 5, 1984, p.73.

[44]p.12.

[45]p.12.

[46]**Time**, September 10, 1984, p.10.

[47]**New York Times**, July 26, 1984.

[48]**New York Times**, September 9, 1984.

[49]**New York Times**, September 28, 1984.

[50]**Time**, September 10, 1984, p.10.

[51]**New York Times**, August 12, 1984.

[52]**New York Times**, September 10, 1984.

[53]**New York Times**, November 8, 1984.

Contributing Authors for The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Sandra W. Holt serves as an Assistant Professor within the Department of Communication at Tennessee State University, Nashville. At this date no other information is available about Professor Holt.

Valerie L. Schneider, Professor of Speech Communication at East Tennessee State University, teaches primarily in the areas of speech persuasion and rhetorical criticism. She has taught at several institutions of higher learning, ans has published articles and delivered convention papers too numberous to list here. The title of her dissertation, earned at the University of Florida in 1969, is *The Development and Application of A Neo-Burkeian Framework for Thetorical Criticism*. Dr. Schneider was TSCA president during 1977, the first woman president of TSCA. Recently, Dr. Schneider has participated in programs a wide variety of educational programs for organizations other than academic. In addition, she has written and coordinated a newspaper course on persuasion, plus other newspaper series for non-traditional learners. Dr. Schneider has also served as Vice-president of the Tennessee Basic Skills Council.

Paul D. Shaffer serves as Director of Television Studies at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee. He has earned a BFA from Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, an MA in Communication and a Doctorate in Higher Education from the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. His main research interest concerns internships undertaken by higher education broadcast communication student.

James M. Stewart serves on the faculty of the Speech and Theatre Division of Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee. He has a Ph.D. in Hearing and Speech Sciences from Ohio University in Athens, Ohio, and has done post doctorate studies in the area of culturally and linguistically diverse populations and communication disorders, through Howard University, Washington, DC. His BA and MA degrees are in Speech and Speech Pathology and Audiology, both earned at Howard University. Dr. Stewart has published many articles and presented eighteen research papers at various professional conventions. His primary professional interests are working with students, helping them with their educational growth, and data analyses of speech apprehension in university and public speaking courses.

David E. Walker, Jr. serves as Professor of Speech and Theatre at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee. He has earned a BA from David Lipscomb College in Nashville, an MA and Ph.D. from the University of Florida. His thesis title is *Invention in Selected Sermons of Ministers Opposing the Election of a Roman Catholic Presidential Candidate: 1960*, and his dissertation title is *The Rhetoric of the Restoration Movement: The Period of Inception: 1800-1832*. Dr. Walker has a long list of publications, convention papers, and professional service to his university and TSCA. He has preformed several public service projects to develop communication skills in his community, conducted workshops for business organizations, and serves as a trainer for Zenger-Miller Training through the Continuing Education program at Middle Tennessee State University.

1986 - 87 TSCA Membership List

Name and Address	Affiliation
Robert Ambler, Ph.D. Speech and Theatre University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37996 Phone: (home) 615/475-8560 (bus.) 615/974-7065	University of Tennessee
R. Ambrester, Ph.D. Speech & Theatre Professor University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37938 Phone: (home) 615/922-1421 (bus.) 615/974-7070	University of Tennessee
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
Norma C. Cook, M.A. Speech & Theatre University of Tennessee 202 McClung Tower Knoxville, TN 37996 Phone: (home) 615/524-8547 (bus.) 615/974-7067	University of Tennessee
Lora J. DeFore, M.A. Dept. of Communication Freed-Hardeman College Henderson, TN 38340 Phone: (home) 901/989-3164 (bus.) 901/989-4611	Freed-Hardeman College
Michael R. Elkins, M.A. Speech & Theatre Instructor University of Tennessee 202 McClung Tower Knoxville, TN 37996 Phone: (home) 615/494-9344 or 579-5278 (bus.) 615/974-7065	University of Tennessee

L. Reece Elliott, Ph.D.
Speech Communication Professor
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, TN 37040
Phone: (home) 615/647-8733
(bus.) 615/648-7366

Austin Peay State University

Randall Fisher, Ph.D.
Drama & Speech
Vanderbilt University
Box 107B
Nashville, TN 37235
Phone: (home) 615/799-2258
(bus.) 615/322-2757

Vanderbilt University

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

Ralph Hillman, Ph.D.
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
Phone: (home) 615/890-2189
(bus.) 615/898-2640

Middle Tennessee State University

Judith D. Hoover, Ph.D.
Drama/Speech Assistant Professor
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235
Phone: (home) 502/542-6315
(bus.) 615/322-3460

Vanderbilt University

Lawrence B. James, Ph. D.
Dept. of Communication Associate Professor
Tennessee State University
3500 John Merritt Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/352-6051
(bus.) 615/320-3228

Tennessee State University

Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
Dept. of Communication
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, TN 38340
Phone: (home) 901/989-7725
(bus.) 901/989-4611

Freed-Hardeman College

Faye Julian
Speech and Theatre
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
Phone: (bus.) 615/974-6011

University of Tennessee

Bettye C. Kash, M.A.
English/Speech
Tennessee Technical University
P.O. Box 5053
Cookeville, TN 38505
Phone: (bus.) 615/528-3889

Tennessee Technical University

Joan C. Kennedy, MAT
Language Arts Teacher
Hillsboro High School
3812 Hillsboro
Nashville, TN 37215
Phone: (home) 615/292-0602
(bus.) 615/298-8400

Hillsboro High School

Walter G. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D.
Dept. of Theatre & Communication Art Associate Professor
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/685-1987

Memphis State University

Kassian Kovalcheck, Ph.D.
Drama & Speech
Vanderbilt University
6133 Station B
Nashville, TN 37235
Phone: (home) 615/353-0239
(bus.) 615/322-2060

Vanderbilt University

Lorain Lester
Speech and Theatre
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
Phone: (bus.) 615/974-6011

University of Tennessee

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

Johnson Bible College

Rachel R. Morgan
Speech Department
Bryan College
Dayton, TN 37321
Phone: (home) 615/775-3226
(bus.) 615/775-2041

Bryan College

Dorotha O. Norton, M.A./M.A.
Dept. of Communication Associate Professor
U.T. Martin
Martin, TN 38238
Phone: (home) 901/749-5915
(bus.) 901/587-7552

U.T. Martin

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

Memphis State University

Suzanne S. Osborn, Ph.D.
Dept. of Theatre & Media Arts
Rhodes College
2000 North Parkway
Memphis, TN 38112
Phone: (home) 901/682-4515
(bus.) 901/726-3858

Rhodes College

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

Tennessee State University

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

David Lipscomb College

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

Memphis State University

Ronald P. Rodgers, B.A.
Dept. of Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/454-3280
(bus.) 901/454-2600

Memphis State University

Andy A. Sachs, B.A.
Dept. of Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/458-5246
(bus.) 901/454-2600

Memphis State University

Claire Perkins Sachs, B.A.
Graduate Assistant
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/458-5246
(bus.) 901/454-2565

Memphis State University

Mary C. Smith, M.Ed.
Counselor/Forensic Coach
Ezell-Harding Christian
574 Bell Road
Antioch, TN 37013
Phone: (home) 615/367-1634
(bus.) 615/367-2045

Ezell-Harding Christian

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

Tennessee State University

Tamara T. Trexler, B.A.
Speech Graduate Assistant Instructor
Memphis State University
Central Avenue
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/377-9463
(bus.) 901/454-2600

Memphis State University

Walter A. Ulrich, Ph.D.
Drama & Speech Assistant Professor
Vanderbilt University
1616 Station B
Nashville, TN 37235
Phone: (home) 615/352-2384
(bus.) 615/322-2988

Vanderbilt University

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

Middle Tennessee State University

James R. Walker, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication Assistant Professor
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/272-9245
(bus.) 901/454-2571

Memphis 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 or 320-3228

Tennessee State University

G. Allan Yeomans, Ph.D.
Speech & Theatre Professor
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916
Phone: (home) 615/693-8984
(bus.) 615/974-7063

University of Tennessee

Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Richard Ranta, President
Memphis State University

Paul Prill, Executive Secretary
David Lipscomb College

Stanley K. McDaniel, Journal Editor
Johnson Bible College

Interest Group Officers

Religious Speaking
Steve Johnson, Chairman
Freed-Hardeman College

Mass Communication
Michael Osborn, Chairman
Memphis State University

Rhetoric & Public Address
Suzanne Osborn, Chairman
Indiana University (Fall, 1986)

Organizational Committee
Walt Kirkpatrick, Chairman
Memphis State University

Interpersonal Communication
Jim Quiggans, Chairman

Curriculum Interest Group
John Buckley, Chairman
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Forensic
Russell Church, Chairman
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Theatre & Interpretation
Debbie Zimmerman, Chairman
Matlow State Community College

Fall Convention

The convention will take place September 26 and 27 at beautiful Montgomery Bell State Park. This park is about 30 miles west of Nashville, and about 3 miles east of Dixon, Tennessee. It is just off US 70, with convenient exits from Interstate 40. It is a lovely state park with a lake and recreational opportunities (tennis, golf, etc.) which should be fun for the convention participants as well as their families. The room prices are $30 for a single, and $38 for a double, plus tax. I have asked them to hold ten double rooms for the evening of the 25th and 30th rooms for the evening of the 26th, and 10 rooms for the evening of the 27th for those who want to stay over and enjoy a leisurely Sunday. Reservations must be made by not later than August 1, 1986 in order to hold the rooms. Reservations should be sent to

Miss Donnie Pack
Montgomery State Park
Box 686
Burns, TN 37029

Burns is a small town near the park.

Besides the programs expected in all of the interest groups, I have asked Mike McGee (some say the "Notorious Mike McGee") to join us and lead the basic course workshop. Mike promises not only to use his experience as co-author with Bryant and Wallace on their basic public speaking text, but also his experience as founder of one of the more popular broadly based mass media/rhetorical/analytical introductory courses to provide a very stimulating program for all. Mike is a full professor at the University of Iowa and of course, is widely known as one of the natives of Sparta, Tennessee, coming home again, after having make good in the big corn fields.

After our dinner meeting on Friday evening we will be enlightened and entertained by one of those slick TV tapes from Nashville. Bryan Cottingham is one of Nashville's major independent producers who has worked with a variety of music stars, sports figures and an occasional professor or two. He has also done considerable commercial production and videos for major corporations such as HCA and the Arthritis Foundation. Last year the arthritis telethon raised approximately six and one half million dollars in an eight hour nationwide telecast originating from Operyland. This promises to be a show-and-tell session, with Bryan doing the showing with his video tapes and telling us behind the scenes stories of what really goes down in Nashville.

Saturday will conclude the various interest groups sessions, the awards luncheon for the Tennessee Speaker of the Year, and Tennessee Speech Teacher of the Year. It all promises to be a fun-filled and exciting fall conference. What is most important is that you send your reservations to Ms. Pack as sooon as possible, but certainly no later than August 1, or you may discover what it is like to sleep under the stars, and I do not mean Nashville Country Music Stars.

You will receive more information in the mail as the preliminary program with specific topics becomes available from the particular interest group chairperson. Of course, if anyone has any questions or concerns they can write to me at Memphis State or call me at (901) 454-2350.

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.