RECEIVED
MAY 1[illegible] 1988
M T S U LIBRARY

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

published by the

Tennessee Speech Communication Association

FALL 1987

Volume XIII Number II

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Volume XIII Number II

Table of Contents

Tennessee Speech Communication Association 1

Contributors 2

Editorial Comment 3

An Overview of Nonverbal Gender Differences 5
Faye D. Julian

Must I Justify "Speaking Across The Curriculum?" 9
Kina Mallard

The Persuasion of the Apostle Peter: Pentecost Revisited 11
Stephen J. Pullum

Analysis of the Importance of A Liberal Arts Curriculum for Employment of Tennessee Mass Communication College Graduates 19
Paul Shaffer and Kathryn Lamond

Crying Foul: The Limits on Negative Advertising in the 1986 Tennessee Gubernatorial Race 31
Jim Walker

TSCA Membership 36

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.

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association

John Bakke, President
Memphis State University

Reece Elliott, Executive Secretary
Austin Peay State University

Stanley K. McDaniel, Journal Editor
Johnson Bible College

Mass Communication
David Briody, Chairman
University of Tennessee, Martin

Rhetoric & Public Address
Mike Osborn, Chairman
Memphis State University

Organizational Communication
Steve Johnson
Freed-Hardeman College

Interpersonal Communication
Marcus Ambrester, Chairman
University of Tennessee, Knoxville,

Curriculum
Ralph Hillman, Chairman
Middle Tennessee State University

Forensics
James N. Brooks, Chairman
Middle Tennessee State University

Theatre & Interpretation
Vicky Voltz, Chairman
Belmont College

Religious Communication
Paul Prill, Chairman
David Lipscomb College

Contributors

Faye D. Julian is Professor of Speech Communication at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. She received her Ph.D. in communications at UTK, and her dissertation was an experimental study of the nonverbal determinants of a television newscaster's credibility. Her primary teaching and research interests are nonverbal communication and oral interpretation. She has also written, adapted, and directed numerous Children's Theatre productions.

Kathryn M. Lamond was recently awarded an M.A. degree in communications from Austin Peay State University. Her home is in Australia and her Bachelor of Science degree is from Newcastle College of Advanced Education in that country. Her Master's thesis was titled, "News retention as a Function of Newscast Format Presentation." She plans to work in the television industry in either Autralia or the United States.

Kina S. Mallard is Instructor of Oral Communications at North Greenville College in Tigerville, South Carolina. She earned the B.S. degree from Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, with a major in theatre. The M.A. degree in Speech Communication was awarded in May 1983 by the University of Tennessee. Her thesis was titled "The Evolution and Contemporary Production Techniques of the One-Person Show." Mrs. Mallard is involved in research in the area of synthesized literature for performance. She plans to pursue the Ph.D. in Communications at the University of Tennessee in the Fall of 1988.

Stephen J. Pullum is a doctoral candidate in speech communication at Indiana University, Bloomington. He has major interests in the areas of public address, rhetorical theory and criticism, and religious rhetoric. Presently, Mr. Pullum is engaged in work on a dissertation entitled, "Explicating the Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement Via Three Televangelists: A Rhetorical Analysis of Ernest Angley, Kenneth Copeland, and Jimmy Swaggart." Mr. Pullum received his B.S. degree in Speech Communication in 1979 from Middle Tennessee State University and his M.A. degree in Speech Communication from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1981. He currently serves as the assistant course director for the business and professional communication course and co-directs the communication apprehension project for speech anxious students at Indiana University.

Paul D. Shaffer serves as director of Television Studies at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee. He has a Doctorate in Higher Education from the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. Dr. Shaffer has published articles in both academic and commercial publications. His most recent article, "Face to Face With Mass Media," was published in the September 1987 issue of Nashville's business monthly magazine, **ADVANTAGE**. His research interests are concerned with mass communication internships as well as the area of curriculum development for mass communication programs at colleges and universities. He also serves as a consultant in mass media matters to corporations and government agencies.

Judith Thorpe, Assistant Professor of Speech Communication, is in her first year at the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin. In 1986, Ohio State University awarded her the degree of Ph.D. She studied the persuasive arguments of Lee Iaccoca in the repositioning of Chrysler Corporation in the market place. She focuses her research primarily on the area of media aspects of persuasive organizational communication.

James R. Walker (Ph.D., University of Iowa, 1984) is an assistant professor of communication in the Department of Theatre and Communication Arts at Memphis State University, where he teaches courses in communication research methods, mass media and society, and American broadcasting. His current research interests concern broadcast programming, exposure to mass media, and political communication.

Editorial Comment

The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association reflects the stimulating diversity that characterizes its writers and readers. The variety of interests and perspectives you will find in the five articles and one essay of this issue came from four females and three males, four living in Tennessee, one each in South Carolina, Indiana, and Wisconsin, who direct graduate study, who teach and research full time, or who study as full time graduate students, in both public and private colleges.

The topics these authors selected for their writing demonstrate even more vividly the breadth and diversity of interests within the speech profession. Faye Julian reviews research that has focused on gender differences in communication. Faye wants to raise more questions than she answers, and she achieved her goal. Her article should, therefore, stimulate you to consider serious research into the questions raised. Kina Mallard's essay addresses questions that are both current and ancient—the place of communication education in higher education and how best to deliver that education. Many of you will identify with the struggles Kina shares with us, and I invite your responses to her essay. How did you, how have you resolved in your institution the conflicts she describes in her essay?

Stephen Pullum takes us back to the first century A.D. for a neo-Aristotelian analysis of Christianity's inaugural address. Steve' analysis provides you with suggestions for similar treatment of pulpit speaking in your hometown, or of sermons delivered via television. I suggest an analytical comparison and contrast of the Pentecost sermon Steve examined and a sermon by a contemporary television evangelist would provide provocative and informative reading.

Paul Shaffer and Kathryn Lamond have done us a great service by providing an empirical basis for curriculum decisions and development in mass communication education. Similar documentation about the value of presentational skills, group discussion techniques, and interpersonal communicatin skills in business, industrial and governmental organizations would provide additional data needed for educational planning.

Judie Thorpe has brought us into the electronic age. Reading her article will extend your ethical concerns about communication from the ancient prohibition, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," to the latest prohibition, "Thou shalt not steal from thy neighbor's electronic mailbox." Jim Walker has also focused on the contemporary by documenting what some voters will and will not tolerate in "dirty political communication."

Reading this issue of **The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association** will involve you in communication issues, problems, theories, and practices beginning with the Apostle Peter in 1 A.D. to the latest flap about Gary Hart.

Please let these authors stimulate your professional and intellectual curiosity and growth. Then, let us hear from you. Happy reading!

An Overview of Nonverbal Gender Differences

Faye D. Julian

The idea that one's biological sex plays a part in shaping one's communication patterns is fascinating yet somewhat deceptive, appealing but debatable. The study of sex and language, the proliferation of writings on nonverbal communication, and the growing interest in women's issues and roles account in part for the abundance of gender-linked communication-difference research that has taken place in the past decade.[1] The body of material on nonverbal gender differences is sometimes contradictory and certainly inconclusive. Even the working of the topic under consideration is debatable. Some writers prefer to use the term "sex differences", while others reserve that term for a purely physiological designation.[2] MacRae considers gender as characteristic of the body and sex as an activity.[3] Birdwhistell has divided the characteristics that differentiate between the two sexes as primary (whether a human produces ova or spermatazoa), secondary (anatonomical), and tertiary (psychological). The first two are biological; tertiary sex, or gender, is learned.[4] And others argue that behavior has no gender. Bernice Lott states:

> No teachable human behavior belongs exclusively to any one group of persons, and both women and men manifest individual differences along all behavioral dimensions. It is therefore both empirically and theoretically invalid to continue to genderize behavior categories.[5]

With full acceptance of the principle of androgyny, this writer will present a limited review of observed gender-linked nonverbal behavior differences and report some of the explanations given for the diverse manner in which males and females communciate nonverbally.

Numerous studies have shown that women demonstrate more sensitivity to nonverbal cues than men.[6] Accuracy in nonverbal detection is greater for women as demonstrated by their PONS (Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity) scores. PONS is a 45 minute sound motion picture with 220 two-second nonverbal behavior segments. In tests with over 10,000 females from third grade to middle age, females were reliably better than males at decoding the nonverbal messages.[7] The female advantage is most pronounced for facial cues, less pronounced for body cues, and least pronounced for vocal cues.[8]

Judith Hall* offers several possible explanations for female nonverbal sensitivity. She includes innate and learned behaviors, empathy, attention, accommodation, and oppression. The maternal instinct to decipher children's needs and intentions is said to lead to woman's ability to interpret more quickly nonverbal cues. Whether innate or fostered by societal expectations of woman's nurturant role, this heightened sensitivity (woman's intuition?) definitely exists. Women report sharing others' moods vicariously more than men; they appear to be more empathetic. Women simply may pay more attention to others' behavior. The female is more willing to adapt and conform in order to fit in. And finally, the oppression of women could explain their greater need to observe all aspects of the environment in order to find ways to please.[9]

Interesting findings are reported from research on the different modalities of nonverbal communication. In studies of facial expression, males are found to be internalizers more often than females (i.e., males are more likely to inhibit overt expression of their feelings). Women are more often externalizers.[10] Emotions are more easily judged from women's faces than from men's faces, but female facial expressions do not necessarily represent felt emotions.

Women engage in more positive facial expression—smiling and laughing, but these expressions may have ambiguous meaning unless intention and context are considered.[11] Ekman and Friesen call the smile the most frequent qualifier added as a comment to any negative emotion. The smile is the most common emotional mask.[12] Smiles are used to placate, signal submission, and show nervousness. What Henley refers to as "a woman's badge of appeasement,"[13] the smile may be a habit acquired by observation. Women smile 89% of the time in social encounters while men smile only 67% of the time. And 26% of female-to-male smiles are not returned.[14] Smiling is a way of seeking approval, and when seeking approval, both sexes smile more often.

Children respond differently to male and female smiles, attributing greater friendliness to male smiles than to female smiles. Since females smile more often when giving both positive and negative messages, children interpret male smiles as more sincere.[15] In actuality, females may smile more, but the interpretations of the smiles may be as varied as the reasons for the smiling.[16]

The functions and types of eye behavior are similar for both males and females, but frequency and duration of gaze are often different for the sexes. No sexual difference in eye contact is apparent until about the fourth grade. At about this time, boys begin to learn that it is less masculine for them to engage in mutual eye contact, but girls are encouraged to seek and keep the gaze of others.[17] This eye behavior continues through adulthood. Women establish eye contact more often than men do, hold gazes longer, and look more while speaking and being spoken to.[18] The fact that women look more seems to contradict the idea of the male's higher-status privilege of staring. Henley reasons that women's gazing can be interpreted as subordinate attentiveness.

> ...like all underlings of the animal world, they [women] must watch for cues from the powerful. Second, female looking could be due to the fact that women do more listening than men.[19]

While it is one of the most basic forms of communication, touch is also one of the "least researched and least understood areas of nonverbal communication."[20] American society is relatively nontactual as compared to other groups. Tactile communication studies conclude that females are touched more than males from infancy. Hall reports that adult women initiate more touch, but this is largely due to the fact that women touch other women more. Men touch women more than women touch men.[21] Touch is a status privilege; the higher one's status the greater one's license to touch. Major says that men and women interpret touch from an equal-status stranger in different ways. Men tend to perceive such touch as a "put-down" while women tend to perceive this touch as a friendly gesture.[22]

Our concern about space and its use is culturally dictated. The proximity with which we approach others is determined by cultural norms. In societies in which reading of pupil dilation occurs, the proximity of conversants is much closer than in our culture. But most of the literature on gender differences and the use of space in our culture deals with territoriality and the propensity to occupy space. Generally, studies of gender differences in use of space show that men stand or sit farther apart from each other than do women; oppostite sex pairs tend to stand or sit closer together than do same sex pairs; and men and women both approach closer to a seated or standing female than they approach a male. Women are more cooperative and less aggressive than males in high density situations.[23]

Men are generally allotted more personal space than are women. Henley says that a woman's femininity is gauged by how little space she occupies. Males are more expansive in use of space around them (sitting with one foot on the other knee, using arm rests, gesturing with hands and arms away from body), while women condense themselves by crossing one knee over the other, holding arms to the sides, and using fewer broad and expansive gestures.[24]

Certain gestures are used more often (or at least differently) by men than women. One of these, the 'steepling' gesture, is made by joining the fingertips and forming what resembles a church steeple. Birdwhistell, who coined the term, says steepling shows confidence and pride. The more important one feels, the higher the hands are held while steepling. Women who use this gesture modify it to a "covert, lower-steepling" form (i.e., hands are held nearer the body and far from the face).[25] Although women are using the handshake more than they once did, the "aggressive" handshake (turning another's palm upward while keeping one's own palm downward) is generally reserved for men. A gesture that seemingly is predominantly communicative with females only is the gentle holding of both the hands of another coupled with congruous facial expressions. This is generally an expression of deep sympathy and is often followed by an embrace between women.[26]

Females show more direct shoulder orientation (angle at which people orient themselves toward another) in female pairs than do male pairs. In studies of body orientation of seated subjects, Mehrabian found that women had little orientation with intensely disliked partners, most orientation when interacting with partners about whom they felt neutral, and slight decrease in orientation for best-liked partners. Males had less direct body orientation for best-liked partners.[27]

Women are often shown in the media with tilted heads—a signal of coyness or submissiveness. The tilted or cocked head might be used as compensation for a general height difference between the sexes, but this gesture along with the slightly lowered head with upturned eyes is often regarded as a sign of submission. Scheflen suggests that American women are changing this behavior to a more nonsubmissive one, and that the lowered eyes-tilted head stance is being used less than it once was.[28]

Women and men walk differently in our culture, but the difference may not be entirely anatomical. The American male moves his arms independently of his trunk and uses a slight right and left movement involving a twist of the rib cage. American females, who appear less relaxed when walking than their male counterparts, present the entire body as "a moving whole" from neck to ankle. Females walk with their legs closer together and their arms close to their sides. Similar walking behaviors are found among males in other societies.[29]

In studies concerning paralanguage, women's voices were found to be more variable in pitch, more musical, and more expressive. Contrary to popular belief, studies show that men generally talk faster than women. Women have been shown to have more precise pronunciation and more fluid speech than men. Men's speech produces more disturbances in the forms of errors (repetitions, omissions, intruding sounds) and filled pauses (uh's).[30]

What accounts for the differences in the ways in which men and women communicate nonverbally? There is no simple answer to this question. Although many theorists (such as Birdwhistell) would insist that sex differences are learned within a culture, others would argue that biology explains some of the differences. Dianne McGuinness is one of the latter.

McGuinnes is a research psychologist and one of the few scientists working exclusively in the field of male versus female behavior. In support of her theory of innate biological behaviors, she points to the thousands of observations and tests she has made in the last decade. McGuinness says that some sex differnces appear very early, others after puberty, and the differences seem to be independent of culture. The differences include women's greater senstitivity to touch and better fine-motor coordination. Men and women do not gather information nor

solve problems the same way. She points to female superiority in language skills (e.g., fluency, verbal reasoning, and reading). Girls are more sensitive to sound and are comforted by speech more than boys are.

Male infants, according to McGuinness, respond to lights and objects in their environment while girls respond to people. Boys play with objects and draw objects; girls draw people.[31] These differences occur extremely early and could explain the female's greater sensitivity to nonverbal cues.

The work of McGuinness and her colleagues, Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin, has shown wide statistical differences between human males and females in the brain. Sex differences found in human brains is receiving much attention with conflicting findings. The one mental difference between men and women that experts can agree on is that women are generally superior at verbal tasks and men at spatial tasks.[32]

Females develop faster than males. At birth, girls are four weeks ahead of boys; they talk earlier, walk earlier, and reach puberty and maximum growth earlier. Because they mature faster, females generally have reduced lateralization of the brain. Women tend to rely less strongly on a single hemisphere of the brain than do men.[33] For example, since language seems to be more adaptable in both hemispheres of the female brain, damage to the left hemisphere (language dominant side) causes less aphasia in women than in men.[34] The hemispheres of the female brain have been likened to two generalists while the halves of the male brain work as two specialists.[35] This greater specialization (lateralization) is due to slower maturation of the male nervous system.

Doreen Kimura, psychology professor at the University of Western Ontario in London, Ontario, Canada, challenges the idea that women's brains are more diffusely organized than men's. She concludes from her studies of male/female brains that brain organization patterns are more variable from person to person and more dynamic than once realized. "We strain to look for differences," she says, "and, of course tend to empahsize the few we find."[36]

The research being conducted on the differences in male and females brains may add credence to the theory of nonverbal innateness as well as supplying evidence for gender differences. Some writers will continue to argue that sex differences in nonverbal communication are really power differences, that the nonverbal behavior of women is typically subservient and submissive due to the power and privilege that exists for males. For these theorists, nearly every gender difference can be explained by the 'oppression' theory. And still another group of dedicated nonverbal scholars will contend that gender differences reflect cultural norms.

For each argument suggesting that human beings are programmed with certain nonverbal characteristics, some refutation exists to demonstrate our learned nonverbal traits. How or why we adopt the nonverbal communication patterns we do is open to question. But the fact remains obvious that men and women differ genetically, physiologically, and psychologically, and it is very difficult to explain these gender differences. Hall says:

> Because maleness and femaleness are complex mixtures of biology, tastes, attitudes, personality traits, and social behavior, investigators' inability to experimentally manipulate these many factors means that there is no certain way to ascertain which factor or factors "cause" a given sex difference.[37]

But with the full knowledge that a "cause" for sex differences may not be immediately identifiable, researchers will continue to observe and record the nonverbal phenomena which characterize males and females with the intention of better understanding all human communication.

*Hall's **Nonverbal Sex Differences** (1984) reviews the descriptive research on this topic in what is probably the most exhaustive study to date.

Notes

[1]Judith A. Hall, **Nonverbal Sex Differences** (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), p. 2.

[2]Marianne LaFrance, "Gender Gestures: Sex, Sex-Role, and Nonverbal Communication," **Gender and Nonverbal Behavior**, Eds. Clara Mayo and Nancy M. Henley (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1981), p. 129.

[3]Donald G. MacRae, "The Body and Social Metaphor," **Body As A Medium Of Expression**, Eds. Jonathan Benthall and Ted Polhemus (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1975), p. 66.

[4]Mark L. Hickson and Don Stacks, **Nonverbal Communication** (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1985), p. 151.

[5]Bernice Lott, "A Feminist Critique of Androgyny: Toward the Elimination of Gender Attributions for Learned Behavior," **Gender and Nonverbal Behavior**, p. 179.

[6]Hall, p. 13.

[7]Mark L. Knapp, **Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction**, 2 ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), p. 417.

[8]Loretta A. Malandro and Larry Barker, **Nonverbal Communication**(Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1982), p. 157.

[9]Hall, pp. 31-44.

[10]Malandro and Barker, p. 157.

[11]Marianne LaFrance and Clara Mayo, **Moving Bodies: Nonverbal Communication in Social Relationships** (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 158-159.

[12]Paul Ekman and Wallace Friesen, **Unmasking the Face** (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 102.

[13]Nancy M. Henley, **Body Politics** (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977), p. 175.

[14]John Leo, "Is Smiling Dangerous to Women?" **Time** (January 14, 1985), p. 82.

[15]Malandro and Barker, p. 157.

[16]Hall, p. 71.

[17]Malandro and Barker, p. 168.

[18]Hall, p. 80.

[19]Henley, p. 163.

[20]Brenda Major, "Gender Patterns in Touching Behavior," in **Gender and Nonverbal Behavior**, p. 15.

[21]Hall, p. 117.

[22]Major, pp. 31-33.

[23]Hall, pp. 85-105.

[24]Henley, p. 38.

[25]Gerard I. Nierenberg and Henry H. Calero, **How to Read a Person Like a Book** (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971), pp. 93-95.

[26]Nierenberg and Calero, pp. 39-42.

[27]Albert Mehrabian, **Nonverbal Communication** (Chicago: Aldine/Atherton, 1972) pp. 117-119.

[28]Albert E. Scheflen, **Body Language and Social Order** (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 19.

[29]Ray L. Birdwhistell, **Kinesics and Context** (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), p. 45.

[30]Hall, pp. 129-130.

[31]Jo Durden-Smith and Diane deSimone, **Sex and the Brain** (New York: Arbor House, 1983), pp. 59-61.

[32]Richard A. Harshman, "Sex, Language, and the Brain: Adult Sex Differences in Lateralization," **Conference on Human Brain Function**. Eds. Donald O. Walter, Linda Rogers, Joyce M. Finzi-Friend (Los Angeles: Univeristy of California, 1976), p.27.

[33]Thomas R. Blakeslee, **The Right Brain** (New York: Berkley Books, 1980), p. 48.

[34]Doreen Kimura, "Male Brain, Female Brain: The Hidden Difference," **Psychology Today**, 1985, 19 (1), p. 54.

[35]Blakeslee, pp. 99-102.

[36]Kimura, p.58.

[37]Hall, p.14.

Must I Justify "Speaking Across The Curriculum?"

Kina Mallard

Recently I was invited to attend a faculty forum at a nearby university on the theme, "Oral Communication in the Classroom." This particular university had just completed a two year self-study program for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. One finding of the Association claimed that the institution was deficient in teaching oral communication skills. The forum had been called to determine what action to take for correcting the problem. This university offers a course in Public Address, which the student can elect, but has no oral communication requirement in their core curriculum. The forum included faculty speakers who advocated adding an oral communication component to the requirements for graduation. These professors had been required to take a speech course at some point in their educational preparation, and they expressed how it had benefitted them. Their talks were well organized if unimpressive. The opposing viewpoint was presented from faculty who felt that a "course in talking" was unworthy of their academic objectives. One professor even remarked, "The written word is the **only** form of intelligent discourse." The discussion continued, and faculty members revealed what type of oral assignments their particular discipline (psychology, physics, and education among others) required in their respective courses. They each felt these assignments sufficed in meeting the oral communication educational needs of their students, despite the fact that many shared the opinion expressed by one of their colleagues, "I require oral reports in all my clases, but I never grade them because I don't feel qualified."

Most college professors require written work in the form of a research paper, a report, or answers to an essay question. In those classes, the teacher must 'feel qualified' to grade the work. Professors grade these written discourses on grammar, vocabulary, organization and clarity of thought, research and evidence to support a conclusion, and the ability of the student to persuade the professor that he has mastered the material. I doubt that these professors believe they must have a degree in English to grade the written work they assign. Why, then, would that same professor feel unqualified to grade an oral presentation that must demonstrate many of the same communication competencies? Vocal and physical delivery elements can be added to the professor's evaluation. Have we all not passed judgment on the eye contact, rate, articulation, or energy of a preacher, a political candidate, or, dare I say, a colleague? It is no more necessary to have a Ph.D in Rhetoric and Public Address to grade an oral presentation than it is to have a Ph.D in English to grade a written presentation.

Recently I heard a professor comment that he felt it was unethical not to require writing in small classes. We have been bombarded recently with lectures, seminars, and articles advocating "Writing Across the Curriculum." I agree with this position, but may I offer the premise that it is unethical not to require **oral** work in small classes.

If it is true that the written word is our only intelligent form of discourse then perhaps the educational society should take a closer look at the ineffectiveness of our teaching of oral discourse. We must recognize the need to incorporate oral communication skills into our curriculum. In a society that spends over 40 percent of its communication time listening to the spoken word, we educators have an obligation to teach our students how to compose, organize, and deliver oral discourse intelligibly.

My first teaching position was at a private two-year college as Oral Communications Instructor. I understood that my employment was the result of the long debated issue of requiring oral communication as part of the core curriculum. Those in favor of adding a speech course won the battle, and I am confident that the persuasiveness of their **spoken** views influenced those who originally opposed the idea.

The faculty forum mentioned earlier decided that their university was already teaching "speaking across the curriculum," and that no formal course in oral communication need be added to the general education requirements. I hope their students will learn the importance of effective oral discourse while crossing the curriculum, but I am certain it will only be learned if it is **taught** - if the professor is gutsy enough to provide concrete oral feedback. Students who know that their oral work will not be graded probably will be poorly motivated to do their best.

I take the stand that oral proficiency should be part of the total evaluation of students graduating from institutions of higher learning. I believe we can accomplish oral proficiency best by a general education requirement of at least one course in oral communication. It is inevitable that most of our students will be asked at sometime to address an audience. Whether Sunday School teacher, PTA president, football coach, executive, doctor, or teacher, it is probable that the request to communicate orally will occur more frequently than the request for written reports. Is not a major objective of education to prepare our students for the "real world?" Must the importance of teaching speech communication skills in an oral/aural society be justified?

I regret having to communicate with you in this manner. I could be much more effective if you could **hear** my voice and **see** my face.

The Persuasion of the Apostle Peter: Pentecost Revisited

Stephen J. Pullum

Around nine o'clock on a Sunday morning in the year A.D. 30, thousands of Jews who had come to Jerusalem to celebrate Pentecost gathered to investigate an astonishing noise—the sound of a rushing wind in a house occupied by the apostles of Jesus.[1] Just prior to this time, Peter and ten fellow apostles had convened in an upper room in Jerusalem to decide who would fill the apostolic office vacated by Judas Iscariot, who had betrayed Christ to Roman authorities. They appointed Matthias and when Pentecost arrived, the twelve apostles were "together in one place" waiting to receive the Holy Spirit that Jesus had promised.[2]

According to the writer of "Acts of the Apostles," several weeks earlier Christ had told his apostles to go to Jerusalem and wait there "until ye be clothed with power from on high."[3] It was during this time that "there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind..." and there appeared "tongues...like as of fire" that sat upon them. Moreover, "Acts" records that the apostles "began to speak with other tongues." When the Jews who had come to Jerusalem for Pentecost heard this commotion, it amazed and perplexed them. Not only were they attracted by the noise, but they were also confounded because "every man heard them [the apostles] speaking in his own language." Some Jews asked, "What meaneth this?" Others simply scoffed and accused the apostles of being "filled with new wine."[4] At this point the apostle Peter, who De Satge suggests had "pre-eminence among the apostles" and "was always to the fore," rose in defense of his fellow appostles.[5]

What followed altered the course of history. "Acts" records that "three thousand souls" were converted as a result of Peter's discourse. Ironically, the people who had become "pricked in their hearts" as a result of Peter's preaching were those who had crucified Christ some fifty days earlier.[6] Nevertheless, on this Pentecost day the apostolic church—the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy and the kingdom "not of this world" as spoken of by Christ—came into existence.[7]

This biblical record raises the question: What was it about Peter's sermon that made it so persuasive? Although Kennedy, in his New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism,[8] attempts to account for the success of Peter's sermon, he leaves many questions unanswered or calling for more attention. For example, what was it specifically about the rhetorical situation that contributed to Peter's success? Did Peter's ethos contribute anything to his acceptance by the audience? What were the specific arguments that Peter used? Given the situation in which Peter found himself, why were his arguments compelling? The present analysis attempts to address these issues and to enlarge on what Kennedy has begun; in short, to give a more detailed account of why Peter succeeded on the Day of Pentecost.

Before attempting to answer the above questions, it is important to know why a study of Peter's sermon is significant. Kennedy argues that Peter's address in Acts 2 is the first example of Apostolic preaching in which the speaker uses some situation, occasion, or sign to lead into proclaiming the gospel.[9] In addition to being the first post-resurrection sermon preached, it also provides an example of apostolic preaching in the early church. As the noted biblical scholar John A.T. Robinson writes, "Acts 2 comes to us as the most finished and polished specimen of the apostolic preaching, placed as it were in the shop window of the Jerusalem church and of Luke's narrative."[10] Furthermore, Broadus suggests that one may find in the apostles' preaching a greater number of practical lessons on how to preach than in any other place in the Bible. Like Jesus and the prophets, says Broadus, the apostles left "noble and highly instructive examples" from which one can learn.[11] Similarly, Dargan contends that the preaching of the apostles and their co-workers is an "abiding model."[12]

Another question to address before analyzing the speech asks: To what extent can one be sure that what is recorded in Acts 2 is actually what Peter said? How can one be sure that Peter's sermon, or any other sermon recorded in Acts, is not a mere invention by the writer of Acts? These types of questions have long plagued the historical-rhetorical critic. Bruce concedes that it is well known that classical historians, like the writer of "Acts," did not give verbatim accounts of orations. Although the speeches recorded in Acts, says Bruce, are not verbatim accounts, one can be confident that the speeches recorded are "at least faithful epitomes, giving the gist of the arguments used." By and large, he argues, the speeches in Acts suit the occasion, the audience, and the speaker. The conclusion, therefore, is that these speeches are not mere inventions of Luke, the assumed writer of "Acts,"but are faithfully condensed accounts of speeches actually delivered by the apostles. They are, therefore, valuable sources of the history and theology of the infant church.[13]

Foakes-Jackson argues that Luke gives one an "extraordianarily accurate picture" of the theology of the infant church and an accurate description of the way the gospel was presented in the primitive church. "However produced," contends Foakes-Jackson, "the speeches in Acts are masterpieces, and deserve the most careful attention."[14]

Writing in reference to the integrity of Luke's historiography, the eminent archaeologist Sir William Ramsey claims that Luke is a first-rank historian who deserves to be listed alongside the best. Ramsey argues, "You may press the words of Luke in a degree beyond another historian's, and they stand the keenest scrutiny and the hardest treatment, provided always that the critic knows his subject and does not go beyond the limits of...justice."[15] Confidence that Luke faithfully recorded Peter's sermon encourages us to analyze it, examining first the Jerusalem context and audience on that Pentecost.

The Context and Audience

Contextually, the freedom of speech the Jews enjoyed during this period contributed to Peter's success. At this time, Tiberius Caesar ruled the Roman empire of which Jewish Palestine was a part. Pontius Pilate governed Judea, the province of Jerusalem. Under these men, the Jews freely practiced their religion. The average Roman made little distinction between Jews and Christians during the early first century, and had even less concern for their religious acts. Not until the reigns of Caligula and Claudius did Christians experience hostility from the Roman government. In 30 A.D., therefore, Peter was free to speak as he desired.[16]

Peter's immediate audience was composed of religiously "devout" and probably friendly Jews.[17] Kennedy points out that since this was the case, "there [was] no serious problem provided [Peter] [could] get their attention."[18] In his Word Studies in the New Testament, Vincent suggests that devout carries the idea that a person "takes hold of things carefully." It emphasizes "the element of circumspection, a cautious, careful observance of divine law; and is thus peculiarly expressive of Old Testament piety, with the minute attention to precept and ceremony."[19] Similarly, Vine says that devout means "careful as to the realization of the presence and claims of God...."[20] These definitions describe accurately those Jews who had come "from every nation under heaven" to observe a religious feast according to Old Testament law.

Pentecost, one of three major Jewish feasts, occurred fifty days after the Feast of the Passover. Passover commemorated the salvation of the Jewish firstborn in Egypt when Jehovah passed over them. Always falling on Sunday, Pentecost was a major gathering of the Jews.[21] Tenney says that it brought people of the Jewish Dispersion from foreign countries to offer, at the Temple, bread made from the harvest of spring grain (Ex. 34:22, Lev. 23:15-21, Deut. 16:9-11). The people in Peter's audience, therefore, devoutly worshipped Jehovah. Pentecost, therefore, provided occasion to proclaim the gospel.[22]

Boles argues that in many ways Pentecost was considered the greatest feast of the year. More Jews came to this feast than any of the others. Many of these Jews had stayed over from the Feast of the Passover. Others, however, had come to the feast of Pentecost who had not come to the Feast of the Passover.[23] Specifically from where did these Jews come?

Halley points out that the events in Acts 2 occurred at the zenith of Roman dominion and Roman built roads made the entire empire accessible.[24] These roads made it possible for the large gathering of people in Jerusalem from all over the empire. Luke, for example, records that there were Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and "dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene...." There were Jews and proselytes from Rome. There were also Cretans and Arabians.[25]

Boles says that the Parthians, Medes, and Elamites came from the East beyond the Caspian Sea and the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Judeans were from southern Palestine. Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia were all major provinces in Asia Minor. Large colonies of Jews lived in Egypt. "Sojourners from Rome," says Boles, were Romans who were Jewish proselytes. Proselytes converted to the Jewish religion, having been born of Gentile parents or of half Gentile, half Jewish lineage. Jews from Rome were those who were born of Jewish parents. Cretans were from the western isle of Crete in the Mediterranean Sea, and Arabians were those Jews who had settled in Arabia.[26] The point here is that Peter's audience was composed of sincere and dedicated people who had traveled great distances, often by foot, to keep the Jewish law. Indeed, they had sacrificed to celebrate the Feast of Pentecost. Tenney suggests that while the cultural background of these people was cosmopolitan, they all "agreed on the common faith of Israel." He continues, "Their common bond was the Law; their central interest, the Temple Worship."[27]

Jewish scholar Israel Bettan suggests that Jews were fond of preaching. Basically, they wanted from sermons spiritual applications to their lives. The Jewish sermon, says Bettan, has always derived its interest from the spiritual applications that can be made rather than from its "homiletical framework."[28] Similarly, Foakes-Jackson contends that twentieth-century man's dislike of legalism makes it difficult to understand the Jewish fascination with their religious law. They loved their law, found consolation in it, and "delighted in studying it," says Foakes-Jackson. He also reports that a Jewish synagogue in which Jewish sermons were heard could be found in every Jewish town and village, and the Jews were dedicated to attending these synagogues and learning their religion. In addition, Gentiles often attended these synagogues to hear the Law and the Prophets read in Hebrew.[29] Perhaps this helps explain why the Jews and the Gentile proselytes in Acts 2 wanted to listen to and then to accept the preaching of Peter. Listening to preaching was part of their cultural habits.

In summary, three contextual factors may have contributed to Peter's success. First, Jews were religiously devout people who took advantage of opportunities to hear preaching. They were willing subjects for Peter's discourse. Second, Peter had the freedom to preach and therefore to accommodate the Jewish interest in preaching. Third, and perhaps most important, were the events that occurred prior to Peter's address. The Jews were astonished at the noise that filled the house where the apostles were sitting. They were also amazed because they heard the untutored Galilean apostles speaking in foreign languages. Luke writes, "And they were all amazed and marvelled saying, 'Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own language wherein we were born?'"[30] These three elements, therefore, set the stage for Peter's discourse.

The Speaker

Of all the elements that had a bearing on Peter's accomplishment in Acts 2, perhaps the weakest was the character of the speaker. Peter, sometimes called Simon Bar-Jonah or Cephas,[31] and his brother Andrew were mere fishermen from Bethsaida in northern Galilee, the northern-most province of Jewish Palestine during the first century.[32] Coincidentally, Peter was fishing with Andrew when Christ said to them, "Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men." Matthew says they immediately dropped their nets and followed Christ.[33] For the next three years, Peter spent his life with Christ and learned about the kingdom that Christ said he would establish. In fact, Matthew records an occasion when Christ told Peter that "I will build my church...I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."[34] Just as Christ promised, it was Peter who unlocked the doors of the new kingdom—the church that Christ promised to establish—on the Day of Pentecost.

By and large, Peter lacked a formal education. In Acts 4, after having locked Peter and John in jail for preaching to the people, the Jewish Sanhedrin brought Peter and John before them to be tried. Luke records that the magistrates "perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men..." Nevertheless, these rulers also perceived that Peter and John had spent time with Christ by the way they answered their questions.[35]

Perhaps Peter's lack of education allowed him to earn the reputation of being impetuous. On one occasion, for instance, he rebuked Jesus, his own master.[36] On another occasion, he impatiently jumped from a boat into the lake to meet Jesus, who stood on the beach. He could not wait until the boat was rowed ashore.[37] Furthermore, in the Garden of Gesthsemane, Peter impetuously drew his sword and cut off the right ear of Malchus, the servant of the high priest, much to the dismay of Christ.[38]

Despite these character weaknesses, Scripture recognizes Peter as first in the inner ring of Christ's disciples. For example, when Mark records the miracle of Christ raising the daughter of Jarius in Mark 9, only Peter, James, and John are mentioned, and Peter's name comes first. In Matthew 17, on the Mount of Transfiguration, only Peter, James, and John are recorded, Peter's name again coming first. Finally, in the Garden of Gethsemane, as recorded in Matthew 26:36-44, only Peter, James, and John are mentioned, in that order, as being with Christ. Evidently Christ thought enough of Peter to command him to "feed my sheep."[39] This was exactly what Peter was attempting to do in Acts 2.

Not only was Peter impetuous and lacking in formal education, but he was occasionally a coward. During the trial of Christ, as recorded in John 18, Peter denied having ever known the man with whom he spent three years of his life. Realizing what he had done, Peter went out and "wept bitterly."[40] Ironically, however, after Peter saw the resurrected Christ, he was anything but a coward. Indeed, he was willing to lay down his life for the cause of Christ. "Acts" paints an entirely different picture of Peter's fortitude than that described in the Gospel narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. For example, he preached to the thousands of Jews on the day of Pentecost, telling them that God had raised up Christ "whom ye crucified."[41] Moreover, Peter militantly told the Jewish civil authorities in Acts 4:19-20, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard [referring to Christ's resurrection]." In short, Acts describes Peter differently from the spineless, pusillanimous individual found in the synoptic Gospels. It is hard to say whether anyone in Peter's audience knew of his past. Nevertheless, it did not seem either to help or hinder his persuasive power in Acts 2.

Although Peter lacked the formal education afforded the apostle Paul and other men in the first century, he had a sound knowledge of the Jewish Old Testament. This much is evident from the quotations he cited in Acts 2. More will be said about these quotations in the next section. In addition, Foakes-Jackson points out that the synagogue was an educational center where every Jewish boy learned how to keep the law. By having to learn prayers, these boys developed their memories. Jewish boys also learned disputation skills, in order to reason and to think about the exact meaning of Old Testament scriptures. Consequently, Foakes-Jackson argues that one should not believe that the disciples of Christ were entirely uneducated men.[42] Similarly, Kennedy adds, "Though the Jews of the pre-Christian era seem never to have conceptualized rhetoric to any significant degree, the importance of speech among them is everywhere evident...and undoubtedly they learned its techniques by imitation."[43]

Foakes-Jackson claims that knowledge rather than ordination gave Jews the right to teach. The Jewish pulpit, then, was open to anyone who had a knowledge of the Jewish scriptures. Foakes-Jackson argues that although Peter and John were criticized in Acts 4:13 for being unlearned and ignorant, this was probably a result of their accent, which sounded uncouth to the priests who heard them. Also, Foakes-Jackson says that Galilean Jews

seemed to have been simpler people than their Judean brethren and were held in little honor by those in Jerusalem, who often criticized the Galileans for a dialect that was distinct from that in Judea.[44]

Vincent suggests that Galileans were frequently blamed for neglecting to study their language. They often were charged with "ridiculous mispronunciations" and grammatical errors.[45] If this were the case, Peter's dialect certainly did not affect the way his audience accepted him in Acts 2. This may have been because Peter's audience wanted the commotion that they had heard explained to them, and therefore dialect did not immediately concern them. Peter's success may also have come from his straightforward talk and that he was "quietly earnest" as described by Broadus.[46]

An important question arises at this juncture: If Peter had some training in rhetoric, as informal as it may have been, to what extent was he influenced by the teachings of Roman or Greek rhetoricians of his day? Dargan suggests that with perhaps the exception of the apostle Paul's discourse at Athens, one can detect little, if any, influence of the classical orators on the apostles' preaching. Rather, their preaching was like Christ's. It reached out to all people, taught them to repent, to have faith, showed the way of reconciliation with God, and proclamied Christ as the central theme.[47]

On the other hand, Kennedy contends that the evangelists of the New Testament could have been acquainted with the handbooks on rhetoric in circulation during the first century A.D. The apostolic preachers, according to Kennedy, would have been "hard put to escape an awareness of rhetoric as practiced in the culture around them, for the rhetorical theory of the schools found its immediate application in almost every form of oral and written communication...." Kennedy suggests that the evangelists of the New Testament would have encountered government documents and public and private letters. In addition, these evangelists would have seen documents in law courts and assemblies and would also have heard various epideictic speeches at commemorations and festivals. Finally, these New Testament ministers would probably have seen compositions in both prose and verse. In other words, argues Kennedy, inhabitants of the Greek-speaking world of early Christianity would have developed necessarily "cultural preconceptions about appropriate discourse" even if they lacked formal education in rhetorical theory and methods.[48]

In summary, we do not know if Peter's audience knew of his background—his lack of formal training, his impetuous nature, or his lack of courage during the trial of Christ. But, if they did, such knowledge seemed not to weaken his credibility with them. It is doubtful that Peter had much, if any, prior ethos with his listeners.

His intrinsic credibility, however, is a different matter. Instead of hearing a petty coward, concerned about how he would be received, Peter's audience heard a man poignantly accuse them of crucifying the Son of God. Like Stephen in "Acts" 7, Peter risked death by stoning for this preaching. This threat, however, did not deter him as he proclaimed, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God has made both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."[49]

The Message

While the context in which Peter's sermon occurred and the credibility of the speaker himself are important elements to consider, neither had the impact of the message itself. Shortly after the audience had accused the apostles of being drunk with wine, Peter arose to his feet. He "lifted up his voice," and explained why the apostles were speaking in foreign languages.[50] Peter seemed to be following his own advice that he wrote later. In I Peter 3:15 he admonished Christians to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you...." In his Pentecost discourse, Peter personified his own exhortation.

Bruce suggests that there are four types of speeches recorded in Acts: evangelic, deliberative, apologetic, and oratory. The speech delivered by Peter in Acts 2, says Bruce, is evangelic, the type of speech delivered to Jews or God-fearing Gentiles who had abandoned pagan worship and had embraced the worship of the synagogue.[51] Kennedy points out that Acts 2 is a combination of two species of rhetoric; verses fourteen through thirty-six, divided into two parts, are judicial, while verses thirty-eight and thirty-nine are deliberative.[52] The remainder of this paper will focus on these three major sections of Peter's speech.

Verses fourteen through twenty-one comprise the first division in which Peter disposed of the notion that the apostles were inebriated. In verse fourteen he began with a formal proem, "Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and give ear unto my words." Having gained his listeners' attention, Peter used an enthymeme in verse fifteen to persuade his hearers: "For these [apostles] are not drunken, as ye suppose; seeing it is but the third hour of the day." In Jewish time, the third hour would have been 9:00 a.m. Peter was arguing that it is improbable that anyone would be drunk so early in the morning. Barnes suggests that Jews customarily abstained from food or drink until after the third hour of the day on all festival occasions. Even the intemperate, says Barnes, did not drink before this hour. Peter could, therefore, appeal to this custom with confidence.[53] He then argued that the actions the audience had labeled as drunkenness, the ancient Jewish prophet Joel had predicted would occur. Joel predicted in part, "And it shall be in the last days saith God, I will pour forth my Spirit upon all flesh and your sons and your daughter shall prophecy.... And I will show wonders in the heaven above, And signs on the earth beneath."[54] Not all of Joel's prophecy came true on the Day ofPentecost, but what the audience witnessed could have been explained by a reference to Joel's writings. This audience had studied the

prophet Joel, and this knowledge made it easy for Peter to defend his colleagues with references to this Jewish prophet. This demonstrates the ability of Peter to adapt to his audience.

But, Peter did not end his message by discussing Joel's prediction of how the Spirit would be poured out. Rather, he included Joel's prophecy which said, "And it shall be that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."[55] He accomplished two goals. First, Peter used the ethos of Joel to point out that if a person were going to be saved, he would have to "call on the name of the Lord...." Instead of running the risk of antagonizing his hearers before he was allowed to present his own ideas on the salvation of these Jews, Peter disarmed his audience by saying in essence, "This is what your own prophet says." Second, Peter set the stage for the next major section of his speech, introduced with the transition in verse twenty-two, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words." This section, as mentioned above, is the second part of what Kennedy refers to as judicial rhetoric.

Having defended his fellow apostles and having shown the audience that their own prophet told them how they were to be saved, Peter indicted them for crucifying Christ. The foundation for salvation (i.e. calling on the name of the Lord) had been laid. Peter then, in verses twenty-two through thirty-six, defined who this "Lord" was. In verse twenty-two, for example, Peter introduced "Jesus of Nazareth," and suggested that he was "a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs...." These miracles, said Peter, were done "in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know." Although never mentioned specifically in the speech, Barnes says Peter was probably referring to miracles of healing the sick and raising the dead.[56] Peter knew that his audience would not deny what they saw Christ perform and they would, therefore, probably believe that Christ was deity. Peter did not end here, however, in attempting to prove that Christ was God in the flesh.

He proceeded to tell his listeners that Christ was "delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." In other words, Christ was turned over to his enemies to be slain. Peter then accused his audience of being the murderers of Christ when he said, "Ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay" Jesus.[57] Had the audience been composed of hostile listeners, Peter may have been stoned to death. He was allowed, however, to continue his discourse.

To strengthen his argument that Christ was the son of God, Peter insisted that God raised Christ from the dead. If this assertion had no empirical support, Peter would have been laughed to scorn or stoned in the presence of these Jews for blasphemy. To refute Peter, the Jews could have gone outside Jerusalem to the grave of Jesus and produced the corpse. This would demonstrate his total humanity and lack of deity. Connick argues that one is driven to the conclusion that they failed to produce the body because they could not.[58] These Jews were, therefore, compelled to accept Peter's argument.

In addition to miraculous acts, Peter quoted two prophecies from the ancient Israelite King, David, to help establish his point. In doing so, Peter relied on David's ethos. Peter used prophecies from Psalms, written by David, because the Jews revered David. Under King David's rule, much had been accomplished for the Israelites. The Philistines had been expelled from Palestine and the Moabites had been subdued under David's leadership. David moved the Jewish capital to Jerusalem and gathered the materials for the temple that was later to be built there by his son, Solomon.[59] Jerusalem was often referred to as the "city of David."[60] Peloubet suggests that David was a king "on the scale of the great oriental sovereigns of Egypt and Persia."[61] Perhaps the Jews as a nation thought highly of David because, as Samuel wrote in II Samuel 8:15, "David executed justice and righteousness unto all his people." Connick suggests that whatever David's personal problems (and they were numerous), "he reached the pinnacle of political greatness." Israel enjoyed her Golden Age under the leadership of Saul, David, and Solomon and, thus, "in times of distress and deportation," says Connick, "later generations looked back to the days of David."[62]

The Christian Bible also records how much the Jews thought of their former leader. For instance, Matthew 12 tells of Christ healing a blind and mute man, and the witnesses to the event asking, "Can this be the son of David?" Again, in Mark 11:10, many Jews who thought Christ was the coming Messiah about whom the Old Testament prophesied said, "Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David...."

Knowing how highly the Jews thought of their former king, Peter took advantage of David's own words. After suggesting that God raised Christ and "loosed the pangs of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it," Peter quoted David in reference to Christ: "Thou wilt not leave my [Christ's] soul unto Hades, Neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption." In explaining what David meant by this passage, Peter suggested that David, 'being...a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn...to him that...he would set one upon his throne; he forseeing this spake of the resurrection of Christ...."

Peter continued to argue for the deity of Christ when he suggested, "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses" and it was Jesus who "hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear."[63] Peter attributed the commotion that astonished the Jews to Christ, and he argued that all the apostles had witnessed his resurrection. If there had been no witnesses to Christ's resurrection, the audience could have proven Peter a liar at worst or an uninformed idiot at best. They did neither, however. Connick suggest that although no one saw the actual resurrection of Christ, many saw the resurrected Christ.[64] For example, the apostle Paul, writing in I Corinthians 15:5-6, said that after Christ arose from the grave "he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep." Probably many Jews in Peter's audience had seen the

resurrected Christ and could not deny Peter's assertion. In any event, these Jews realized that David did not refer to himself in his prophesy, because as Peter pointed out, David "both died and was buried and his tomb is with us this day."[65]

By this stage of the speech, suggests Zehnle, Peter was "progressively winning over his audience." This appears evident, Zehnle argues, from the language Peter uses. Earlier in the discourse, verses fourteen and twenty-two, Peter addressed the listeners formally. By verse twenty-nine, however, Peter referred to his audience as "Brethren," suggesting a more intimate relationship than earlier.[66]

At this point in his speech Peter had presented several impressive arguments to establish the divinity of Christ. He added more argumentation by quoting from King David. He pointed out that David "ascended not into the heavens" like Christ did, implying that Christ was greater than the man the Jews held in highest esteem. Then Peter quoted David as saying, "The Lord [God] said unto my Lord [Christ], sit thou on my right hand, Till I make mine enemies the footstool of thy feet.' This passage was the rhetorical coup de grace. Peter concluded that David called Christ his Lord, again implying that Christ was greater than David. The Jews understood that because Christ had risen but not David, that Christ was greater than the greatest. In final pronouncement of the divinity of Christ, Peter boldly affirmed, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."[67]

Luke records that when the Jews heard this, "they were pricked in their heart" and asked Peter and the other apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"[68] Vincent says that the expression "pricked in their heart" means that the audience experienced a "sharp, painful emotion."[69] Peter's sermon had produiced a sting.

Peter's reply to the Jews' question constitutes the third and shortest section of his sermon. This section is what Kennedy refers to as deliberative. Peter had spent the greatest portion of his sermon attempting to show that Christ, the son of God, was crucified by his Jewish audience. Peter succeeded in casing dissonance in the mind of his hearers. In order to lead them out of their incongruity, Peter commanded them to "Repent...and be baptized ...."[70] Zehnle argues that since Peter had just preached that those who would be saved must call on the name of the Lord, the Jews realized they must repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus to be saved.[71]

Peter's epilogue followed: "For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him." Here Peter connected the promise spoken of earlier by the prophet Joel (i.e. salvation) to the Jews and their posterity as well as to all mankind. If there had been any audience hostility toward Peter, this promise would have modified it and helped them to accept Peter's message. Luke says that Peter continued to exhort his audience to "save yourselves from this crooked generation." This implies that more was said of which there is no record. Nevertheless, as a result of Peter's urgency, Luke reveals that "they that received his word were baptized: and there were added unto them [apostles] in that day about three thousand souls."[72] Judged by immediate audience response, Peter succeeded.

In summary, once Peter had convinced his Jewish audience that the apostles were not drunk, he proceeded to use the unusual events of the day to show that those events were a result of the Lord's promise. Kennedy agrees when he says that Peter may have been successful because of his "adroit utilization of the sign."[73] Peter also drew on the ethos of the prophet Joel, one with whom the Jews were familiar, to support his claim.

In addition, Peter succeeded partly because he relied heavily on the Jews' own experiences with Christ. Citing the miracles that Christ performed among them and his resurrection, Peter convinced the Jews that Christ was divine. Peter also relied extensively on quotations from the former Jewish king David. Using David's ethos, it was almost as if David himself were there preaching in place of Peter.

Conclusion

I have attempted to explain why the apostle Peter succeeded in his Pentecost address, delivered before thousands of Jews in the Year A.D. 30. Contextually, I have noted that Peter's listeners were religious, devout Jews who loved preaching and who knew the writing sof Old Testament prophets. Second, although Peter's initial ethos did not seem to affect the way he was received, his intrinsic ethos did. Peter established himself as a knowledgeable, bold speaker of conviction. His sermon was uncompromising and unequivocal. Finally, Peter supported his arguments with quotations from the Old Testament prophets, and with the experiences his Jewish listeners had with Christ during his life time.

In fact, these experiences, coupled with what the prophets Joel and David prophesied would occur, proved to be irrefutable by Peter's audience. Nearly two thousand years later, Peter's consoling reply to his first-century audience is still heard vicariously in thousands of churches across the globe: "Repent and be baptized...for the remission of your sins...."[74]

Notes

[1]Henry H. Halley, **Halley's Bible Handbook** (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1965) 559-61. Halley suggests that there is not enough data to form exact dates in Acts, but there is sufficient data to approximate most of the dates. The formation of the church in Jerusalem occurred ten days after Christ's ascension. See also John Broadus, **The History of Preaching** (New York: Armstrong, and son 1901) 44.

[2]Acts 2:1. All biblical references are taken from the American Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

[3]Luke 24:49. Compare to Acts 1:4.

[4]Acts 2:2-13.

[5]John De Satge, **Peter and the Single Church** (London: SPCK, 1981) 11.

[6]Acts 2:37,41.

[7]John 18:36.

[8]George A. Kennedy, **New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism** (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984) 116-17.

[9]Kennedy 117.

[10]"Christology" 185 in Richard F. Zehnle, **Peter's Pentecost Discourse** (Nashville: Agingdon Press, 1971) 26.

[11] Broadus 38, 43.

[12]Edwin Charles Dargan, **A History of Preaching** (London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1905) 25.

[13]Frederick F. Bruce, **The Acts of the Apostles** (1951; London: Tyndale Press, 1962) 18. See also Bruce's **The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles** (London: Tyndale Press, 1942) 27.

[14]Frederick J. Foakes-Jackson, **The Acts of the Apostles** 16 in Frederick F. Bruce, **The Acts of the Apostles** 21.

[15]Sir William Ramsey, **The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament** (London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1915) 89, 222.

[16]Merrill C. Tenney, **New Testament Times** (1965; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975) 204-05.

[17]Acts 2:5.

[18]Kennedy 117.

[19]Marvin R. Vincent, **Word Studies in the New Testament**, 4 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904) 1:273.

[20]W.E. Vine, **An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words** (Nashville: Royal Publishers, Inc., 1939) 299.

[21]H. Leo Boles, **A Commentary on Acts of the Apostles** (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1973) 32.

[22]Tenney 182.

[23]Boles 32.

[24]Halley 758.

[25]Acts 2:9-11.

[26]Boles 36.

[27]Tenney 183.

[28]**Studies in Jewish Preaching** (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1939) 36-37.

[29]Frederick J. Foakes-Jackson, **Peter: Prince of Apostles** (New York: Doran, 1927) 41, 53-54.

[30]Acts 2:7-8.

[31]Matthew 16:16-19; Mark 3:16; John 1:42.

[32]John 1:44. For a detailed account of the life of Peter, see Ronald Browning, **Who's Who in the New Testament** (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971).

[33]Matthew 4:19-20.

[34]Matthew 16:18-19.

[35]Acts 4:13.

[36]Matthew 16:22-33; Mark 8:32-33.

[37]John 21:7.

[38]John 18:10.

[39]John 16:17.

[40]Matthew 26:75.

[41]Acts 2:36. In his **Book of Martyrs** p.33, Foxe reveals that Peter was eventually crucified upside down for his faith and testimonies of Christ near the end of the reign of Nero. Peter chose this position, says Foxe, because he felt unworthy to be crucified like Christ was.

[42]Foakes-Jackson 54.

[43]Kennedy 11.

[44]Foakes-Jackson 28, 54-55.

[45]Vincent 450.

[46]Broadus 45.

[47]Dargan 25.

[48]Kennedy 5, 10.

[49]Acts 2:36.

[50]Acts 2:14.

[51]Bruce, the Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles 5.

[52]Kennedy 117.

[53]Albert Barnes, Barnes Notes on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1962) 381.

[54]Acts 2:17-19.

[55]Acts 2:21.

[56]Barnes 384.

[57]Acts 2:23.

[58]Milo C. connick, Jesus: The Man, The Mission, and The Message, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974) 409. See pages 408-10 for a detailed discussion of various theories about Christ's resurrection.

[59]II Samuel 8:1-2, I Chron. 28-29.

[60]II Samuel 5:9.

[61]F.N. Peloubet, Peloubet's Bible Dictionary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1972) 142.

[62]Connick 7.

[63]Acts 2:24-33.

[64]Connick 408.

[65]Acts 2:39.

[66]Zehnle 26-27.

[67]Acts 2:34-36.

[68]Acts 2:37.

[69]Vincent 450.

[70]Acts 2:38.

[71]Zehnle 62.

[72]Acts 2:39-41.

[73]Kennedy 118.

[74]Acts 2:38. (King James Version).

Analysis of the Importance of A Liberal Arts Curriculum for Employment of Tennessee Mass Communication College Graduates

Paul Shaffer and Kathryn Lamond

Introduction

This study grew out of the findings reported in an earlier study which examined the college curriculum and skills required of news interns at commercial television stations (Shaffer, 1986). The earlier study reported that the courses and skills which television station news directors believed important for a successful internship were developed through an all-encompassing liberal arts background, not by taking specific mass communication courses. It also revealed that media professionals, college faculty, and television news interns believed liberal arts courses were as important for a successful internship experience as were the more specific mass communication courses.

The conclusions of this earlier study raised the following question which this study seeks to answer: are employment opportunities of mass communication graduates of television, print or radio studies enhanced when the job seeker has a solid undergraduate liberal arts background?

Need for the Study

The Austin Peay State University (APSU) administration and mass communication faculty believed strongly, but without adequate support, that a quality undergraduate liberal arts education enhanced the marketability of a graduate who sought employment in the news areas at Tennessee mass media outlets. Research on this question particularly interested APSU because the Tennessee Board of Regents had designated APSU as the only state supported liberal arts university. Also, APSU offered an extensive professional preparation program in three mass communication areas: print, radio, and television.

A grant to examine the importance of liberal arts study to the employment of Tennessee mass communication college graduates was funded by the Research Committee of the Graduate and Research Council of Austin Peay State University. This study was to determine if mass media news department professionals who hire college graduates for entry-level news positions value the job applicant with an extensive liberal arts undergraduate education.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

In order to discover whether a liberal arts background is desirable for a career in mass media news, supervisory professionals working in Tennessee mass media were contacted and asked to indicate the importance of various liberal arts courses when hiring college graduates.

Specifically, newspaper editors as well as radio and television station news directors were asked to respond to a questionnaire which required them to assume that a newly graduated college senior had applied as a news department employee or reporter with their media outlets. In addition, the editor or news director was requested to assume that the applicant for the job had no significant practical experience. Hiring considerations were to be based only on the academic studies of the job applicant. The editors/news directors were then requested to rate 22 traditional liberal arts areas.

Using a five-point Likert scale, respondents were asked to indicate those liberal arts areas which they believed to be "irrelevant," "not important," "somewhat important," "important," or "very important" to the hiring of graduates for employment in mass media news. The respondents circled the number one if they believed the course area to be "irrelevant" to employment; the number two if "important"; number three if "somewhat important"; number four if "important"; and number five if they believed the course area to be "very important."

After a brief pilot study was conducted in May of 1987, questionnaires were then sent in June to randomly selected Tennessee daily and weekly newspaper editors and radio and television station news directors. Ninty-one questionnaires were sent out with 34 directed to newspapers, 21 to television stations, and 36 to radio stations. Total response rate was 55% (50 of 91) for the entire study. The response rated by groups were: 56% by newspaper editors (19 of 34); 67% by television station news directors (14 of 21); and 47% by radio station news directors.

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 if the populations surveyed significantly differed in responses. This yielded 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. 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. The results of each ANOVA can be found in Table One.

TABLE ONE

Importance of Liberal Arts Core Courses to the hiring Practices of Editors and News Directors at Tennessee Mass Media Outlets

Subject Areas	Newspapers		Television		Radio		F-Ratio	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Communication Courses								
English Composition	5.00	.00	4.64	.50	4.71	.47	4.38	p<.05
Public Speaking	3.32	.95	4.43	.65	4.47	.72	12.00	p<.05
Interpersonal Comm.	4.58	.69	4.58	.65	4.76	.56	.49	p>.05
History/Humanities								
American History	4.11	.74	3.93	.62	3.76	.97	.82	p>.05
Art Appreciation	2.37	.76	2.71	.91	2.24	.83	1.34	p>.05
Foreign Language	2.58	.90	2.36	.84	2.59	1.00	.30	p>.05
Introduction to Theatre	2.32	.58	2.71	.47	2.18	.95	2.35	p>.05
Music Appreciation	2.32	.58	2.29	.47	2.53	1.12	.47	p>.05
Philosophy	3.05	.85	2.57	.65	3.00	1.06	1.37	p>.05
World History	3.95	.78	3.64	.84	3.65	1.00	.70	p>.05
World Literature	3.63	.83	3.07	.83	2.71	.77	5.97	p<.05
Mathematics/Science								
Biology	2.74	.87	2.64	.84	2.29	.77	1.37	p>.05
Geology	2.68	.82	2.50	.76	2.24	.75	1.49	p>.05
Algebra	2.74	.99	2.43	.94	2.00	.87	2.79	p>.05
General Mathematics	3.47	1.07	2.86	.95	2.94	1.20	1.65	p>.05
Social Sciences								
American Government	4.47	1.02	4.43	.51	4.47	.80	.01	p>.05
General Geography	3.89	.99	4.14	.66	3.82	1.07	.47	p>.05
Political Science	4.37	1.01	4.29	.61	4.24	.83	.11	p>.05
Economics	4.00	.94	4.00	.55	3.76	.97	.42	p>.05
Psychology	3.63	.60	3.36	.74	3.35	1.11	.63	p>.05
Sociology	3.63	.90	3.50	.76	3.41	1.00	.27	p>.05
World Civilization	3.63	1.01	3.57	.85	3.24	.90	.90	p>.05

Newspapers: N = 19
Television: N = 14
Radio: N = 17

A second table was constructed to display the rank order of the means for each liberal arts course within the three mass communication professional groups. This allowed a method of comparing how the editors/news directors rated the various liberal arts areas.

Analysis of the Findings

A primary analysis of Table Two indicated similar rankings across the three media disciplines surveyed. All three groups were in relative agreement concerning the five most desired courses in which a potential media news employee should have competence. In fact, the same five courses were selected by both radio and television news directors in only marginally differing order.

TABLE TWO

Importance of Liberal Arts Course Areas to Hiring Practices as Ranked by Mean Responses of Newspaper Editors and Broadcast News Directors

Newspaper Editors	Mean	TV News Directors	Mean	Radio Directors	Mean
1. English Comp.	5.00	1. English Comp	4.64	1. Interper. Comm.	4.76
2. Interp. Comm.	4.58	2. Interp. Comm	5.58	2. English Comp.	4.71
3. American Gov.	4.47	3. Public Speak.	4.43	3. American Gov.	4.47
4. Political Sc.	4.37	3. American Gov.	4.43	4. Public Speak.	4.47
5. American History	4.11	5. Political Sc.	4.29	5. Politial Sc.	4.24
6. Economics	4.00	6. Gen. Geography	4.14	6. Gen. Geography	3.82
7. World History	3.95	7. Economics	4.00	7. American Hist.	3.76
8. Gen. Geography	3.89	8. American Hist.	3.93	7. Economics	3.76
9. Psychology	3.63	9. World History	3.64	9. World History	3.65
9. Sociology	3.63	10. World Civil.	3.57	10. Sociology	3.41
9. World Civil.	3.63	11. Sociology	3.50	11. Psychology	3.35
9. World Lit.	3.63	12. Psychology	3.36	12. World Civil.	3.24
13. General Math.	3.47	13. World Lit.	3.07	13. Philosophy	3.00
14. Public Speak.	3.32	14. General Math.	2.87	14. General Math.	2.94
15. Philosophy	3.05	15. Art Apprec.	2.71	15. World Lit.	2.71
16. Algebra	2.74	15. Intro. Thea.	2.71	16. Foreign Lang.	2.59
17. Biology	2.74	17. Biology	2.64	17. Music Apprec.	2.53
18. Geology	2.68	18. Philosophy	2.57	18. Biology	2.29
19. Foreign Lang.	2.58	19. Geology	2.50	19. Art Apprec.	2.24
20. Art Apprec.	2.37	20. Algebra	2.43	19. Geology	2.24
21. Music Apprec.	2.32	21. Foreign Lang.	2.36	21. Intro. Thea.	2.18
21. Intro. Thea.	2.32	22. Music Apprec.	2.29	22. Algebra	2.00

NOTE: The means correspond to the ratings of the questionnaire in that:
5 = very imporant to the job
4 = important to the job
3 = somewhat important to the job
2 = not important to the job
1 - irrelevant to the job

The five liberal arts courses which radio station news directors rated highest were: interpersonal communication, English composition, American government, public speaking, and political science. Television station news directors who responded to the questionnaire reversed the first and second courses in their order of priority of the courses listed. Newspaper editors' rank order of these top five courses was very similar, differing only with the placement of public speaking at the fourteenth position. Since the newspaper industry concentrates almost totally on written communication rather than oral communication, this exception was understandable.

The ranking of the mean scores reinforced the importance of those course areas to the editors/news directors (see Table Two). The relatively small standard deviation scores observed also supported the importance of these liberal arts course areas to the editor/news directors. As illustrated in Table One, the narrow standard deviation scores generally indicated homogeneous agreement within each of the three groups. The pattern generated by the questionnaire data lends believability to the contention that knowledge based upon liberal arts studies which enables the graduate to communicate verbally and in writing are very important to the job seeker. For example, when calculating statistical significance for the study items, three liberal arts courses were found to have probability scores which rendered them significant. That is, the probability scores of $p < .05$ for English Composition, interpersonal communication, and world literature suggested that competency or at least knowledge gained in these subjects was of untmost importance for employment in news departments within mass media.

Additional studies which supply the graduate with a basic understanding of the society in which he/she functions are also important for success in the mass media job market. These included historical and political courses which the prospective college graduate will need in order to function effectively in mass media news departments.

The category of the social sciences contained subjects which focused on society's political infrastructure. This category included American government, political science and principles of economics. Based upon the mean responses, these subjects were ranked between the third and seventh positions by each of the three groups of media professionals. Such a finding adds substance to the claim by editors/news directors that they want college graduates with a well-rounded liberal arts background.

Another general group of liberal arts courses on the questionnaire included the histories: American history, world history and world civilization. Those areas ranked between five and twelve, with newspaper editors ranking these subjects consistently higher than their broadcasting colleagues.

The social science group of subjects included general geography, psychology, and sociology. These seemed to be relegated to rankings well into the middle of the 22 course areas contained on the questionnarie. The sciences, consisting of biology and geology, also fell into the middle ranges.

The group of subjects the editors/news directors consider of least importance for employment by a college graduate in print or broadcasting were found in the humanities area. These courses included art and music appreciation, foreign language, and introduction to theatre. The one exception was world literature which editors/news directors showed to be "somewhat important" to a news job. Perhaps somewhat surprising, course areas such as art and music appreciation and introduction to theatre, often considered as akin to the media industry and frequently associated with college communication departments, received rankings which relegated them to the "irrelevant" or "not important" areas. Editors/news directors indicated in the survey that they did not believe these three subject areas to be very useful for employment in mass media news department.

One recurring written comment the editors/news directors often attached to a returned questionnaire noted that trade skills (such as equipment operation) could be taught 'on the job.' However, written and verbal expression skills as well as knowledge gained from liberal arts subjects which focus on societal issues could not be taught "on the job." Thus, written remarks by some of the respondents reinforced the belief that liberal arts studies develop competencies which the communication graduate applying for a job should possess and study.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Responses to the questionnaire by media professionals suggested that they consider a well-rounded liberal arts education imperative in order for colleges to prepare adequately their graduates for employment within the news areas of mass media.

Three conclusions based on the data became readily apparent. First, the data from this study point to the need for mass communication graduates to have a mastery of liberal arts courses which lead to proficiency in written and oral expression. Such course areas included English composition, interpersonal communication, and public speaking. These courses were found to be of particular importance to the hiring practices of editors/news directors.

Second, mathematics and science courses were consistently ranked lower than communication skill areas. They still, however, tended toward the "somewhat important" category when editors/news directors considered these course areas in their hiring practices.

Third, survey-type courses such as art appreciation, music appreciation and introduction to theatre were found to be "not important" to a graduate seeking a news job at a newspaper or broadcast station. This does not imply, however, that these courses are unimportant to the personal development of an individual. The editors/news directors only indicated that they did not attach much importance to these three areas when making hiring lecisions in mass media.

The data gathered by the study suggest several important recommendations toward curricular development in a mass communication degree program. The study pointed out dramatically that competencies in many of the traditional liberal arts courses are necessary to finding employment within news departments at mass media outlets.

One specific recommendation for developing a curriculum for the mass communication major is to require liberal arts studies which develop written and verbal expression skills. The study pointed specifically to such courses as English composition, public speaking, and interpersonal communication.

Another recommendation is that higher education mass communication programs include a range of courses which require the student to become knowledgeable concerning the structure of the American society, the social sciences and the world in which we live. Such course areas should include American government, political science, economics, sociology, psychology, and general geography.

A third recommendation is that the mass communication curriculum must develop the ability to perceive events in their historical context for those who wish to pursue a career in news areas at newspapers and broadcast facilities. Editors/news directors indicated, for example, that they considered American history and world history important for this reason.

The results of the study suggest that colleges and universities, which emphasize primarily professional training of the mass communication major should consider implementing a core of liberal arts requirements. This study also suggests that graduating seniors will find an education in a liberal arts core of marketable value to them in the job market of Tennessee mass media outlets.

Similar studies should be conducted on a nationwide basis to determine if industry professionals consistently value a liberal arts education for entry level personnel. In other words, do industry executives in other areas of the United States believe a liberal arts education to be as important for employment in mass communication news departments as do Tennessee editors and news directors?

Finally, we need to study Tennessee media personnel managers to determine how much importance they place on mass communication professional studies curriculum in their hiring practices. In other words, are there important professional development skill requirements which are specific and necessary to the newspaper, television, and radio industries?

References

Shaffer, Paul D. (1986). An analysis of the importance of selected course areas to television news internships in Tennessee. **The Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association**, XII(1), 11-15.

The Responsible Media Communicator: Guidelines for Consulting in the Information Age

Judie Mosier Thorpe

Introduction

It starts quite simply. The professor of television production is asked to bring his or her students to film an annual awards banquet for a local company. An intern is assigned to write a videotape script on training assembly line workers for the company. Members of the media faculty involved in the new technologies are asked by the provost to implement the electronic mail system that will be available university-wide. A professor emeritus is asked by a large company to research, develop and produce what will become a videotaped annual report to employees. A recent graduate of a large midwestern mass communications department is asked to design a computer assisted instructional program for another company. Over and over, the same scenario is played as the entrenched forms of media as well as the new technologies are being utilized by organizations and institutions. The components are much the same despite the varying assignments; a media professional is asked to do external or internal consulting. Some would argue that consulting is consulting and that the rules for consulting in an organization are fairly much in place. This essay argues that media consulting requires adaptation. In sum, responsible media consultants must recognize and honor the ethical concerns of consulting and then adapt these to the special needs of clients and the constraints of technologies used. The information age is upon us and as Wilson P. Dizard, Jr. has argued, 'Success in our generation will depend on the degree to which we shape the new information technologies in accordance with human values. (Dizard, 1985, p. 9). More than just the new technologies, the responsible media communicator/consultants need to follow guidelines that will protect themselves and the organization they serve. To help meet this need, this paper will discuss the following topics: the increase in media use by organizations, particularly of the new technologies; guidelines suggested by organizational consulting that have been adapted to media; suggestions for future research.

Media Use By Modern Organizations

As Stewart L. Burge pointed out, "In the late 1960's and early 1970's many organizations jumped on the video bandwagon....Good video is not cheap, but many organizations have found that the costs of production and distribution are dollars well spent when measured by an 'effectiveness of communication' yardstick." (1985, p. 190) The new technologies are presently being surveyed more extensively. For example, Hellweg, Frieberg and Smith (1984) conducted a survey of Fortune 50 companies in the U.S. and discovered that interactive computers were found in nearly every major corporation and electronic mail is used in half of the companies. Two studies conducted in 1985 give insight into impact of the computer on the organization. In 1985, Purdue University surveyed 387 randomly selected manufacturers. The companies responding indicated that 33% had access to microcomputers, 51% had at least one supervisor who used a microcomputer, 63% had one or more supervisors who used a microcomputer or a mainframe. The trend however, is to move away from mainframes toward the personal computer. **Business Week's 1985 Guide to Careers** estimates that there are currently 5.5 million personal computers in offices in the United States, and within four years, the International Data Corporation expects that number to increase seven fold, to 35 million.

A second study reported in the September 16, 1985, **Wall Street Journal**, cited Dun and Bradstreet statistics showing that personal computers were used in the following manner: 65% for financial analysis; 73 % for accounting; 57% for word processing; 38% for data base management; 32% for inventory control, 14% for credit analysis and 23% for purchasing. These statistics support a survey by Honeywell Techanalysis reported in **Management Review**, May, 1985. (Bryan, 1986, 38).

Harvard Business Review has also commented on the significant impact computers are making as they grow more powerful, versatile, less expensive, and as people in organizations increasingly use them as a general purpose tool to gather and distribute information and to talk with others. In addition to message exchange and information retrieval, businesses are turning more and more to the computer for training applications. Leslie Bryan, Jr., Associate Professor in the Department of Supervision at Purdue University, has predicted that the increasing use of computers in the workplace will require increased training on computers. He argues that trainers must stay tuned to the direction their company is moving with automation. This will require the trainer to determine if training needs are with microcomputers or with remote computer terminals. In addition, they must constantly monitor areas of the organization in order to determine where computers will be productively utilized. (Bryan, 1986, 38-39).

Whether it be videotape, electronic mail, computer-based training, or video-conferencing, the media professional occupies an excellent position for offering expertise as an internal or external consultant. The trend is

moving toward increased job opportunities within organizations that widely use electronic media. With these consulting opportunities comes the responsibility for following ethical procedures, which currently are mostly left up to the individual. It seems timely, therefore, to suggest some guidelines.

Suggested Guidelines For Media Consulting

Before suggesting specific criteria to follow, we should review the research on consulting and identify some of the problems and concerns. Richard Eich conducted a national survey several years ago. He found that over half of the respondents mentioned exaggeration of expertness as a major unethical practice. Many consultants claimed to have expertise in areas, but in reality they lacked sufficient expertise to help the client. Additionally, Eich found that 78% of the more experienced consultants believed that consulting agreements should be put in writing and should include such items as pay and expenses, objectives, responsibilities, obligations, statements pertaining to expected time or duration of the client-consultant relationship. (Eich, 1977) These two concerns suggest several potential guidelines.

1. Responsible media consultants will not oversell their own expertise nor that of an intern they are placing in an organization.
2. Responsible media consultants will spell out the details of their activities for the organization in contract form. Included in this contract will be items such as time, compensation, materials provided by either the consultant or the client, and the specific job to be done. It is possible that a project may need to be done in stages with contracts written for each stage. For example, if the project is a videotaped annual report for employees, the first stage may be auditing to discover what employees wish to know about the company. The second stage may be writing the script. The next stage may be producing the tape, and a final step may be distributing the tapes. If the project is complex, individual contracts may be useful for both the client and the consultant.
3. Media consultants who are educators or media interns, who wish to share their projects with an outside audience for educational purposes should clear this before entering into the consulting relationship. Eich discovered that 91% of the respondents he surveyed believed that consulting aided in teaching, while 81% reported that consulting helped in research. (Eich, 1977) Indeed, consulting activities provide rich, real-world experiences that can be useful in the learning environment.

However, responsible media communicator/consultants also must preserve client confidentiality. For example, the author did some consulting for Procter and Gamble in Cincinnati. While many of the work experiences with this corporation can be shared in the classroom, information about product development or information that is not in the public domain have no rightful place in the classroom. To insure that no questions about integrity arise, perhaps the media consultant should leave all videotaped materials or research in the corporate facility.

This brings us to a discussion of a serious problem inherent in consulting with new computer-oriented technologies. That problem is computer security. These new technologies have created a security problem of potentially sensitive material. As Sherman argued in an article, "Is Your Vital Information Protected?"

> The increase in volume of information also has resulted in a corresponding increase in its importance. Gone are the days when customers were known by name and their records were determined by checking a sheet or two of paper. Now a customer's information is recorded on a multitude of media, including computers....That information, which contains an organization's valuable customer-account relationships and establishes its asset/liability position, has become its most valuable asset. Most organizations realize the need for at least some form of information protection, but they are unsure how to implement a program. (Sherman, June, 1986, p. 50).

Adding a more specific warning about e-mail and voice-mail systems, Wright affirms the reality of the security issue:

> Despite their advantages, both systems have problems to overcome, mainly concerning security. Although most message systems provide some security through identification codes and/or password requirements, users still can access each other's messages if codes or passwords are known. (Wright, June, 1986, p. 76)

Finally, R.E. Johnston, Contributing Editor to **Infosystems**, crystalizes the issue by saying that as technology continues to move at a rapid pace, security risks are left in its wake. Typical of these problems are PBX message systems that have long-distance calls charged to that system from external phones. Recently, the problems of penetration and sabotage of corporate message systems have surfaced. These problems range from the destruction of messages to the introduction of false messages or attempts at extortion. (Johnston, 1986, 35). This leads us to the fourth guideline.

4. Responsible media consultants and interns must abide by the client-consultant confidentiality rule and must not, in any way, jeopardize the organization's information. Although this may seem in tension with the previous

guideline, a basic rule to follow is to obtain prior clearance from the supervisor in charge before discussing consulting activities in the classroom. Some professors skirt this issue by not identifying the company by name in lecture. This is a risky practice because students may know the clients for whom the professor consults.

In addition to the above, guidelines already exist for providing training such as computer-assisted instruction or how to use new technologies such as electronic mail. Charles Redding authored them and Gerald Goldhaber published them in **Organizational Communication**. They are as follows:

5. Respect for the integrity of the individual (trainee)-trainees are treated with dignity.
6. Providing opportunity for self-actualization-training activities helps trainees reach their true potential.
7. Encouraging the exercise of critical faculties-trainers encourages trainees to keep an open mind towards the organization's goals by allowing ample opportunity for dialogue and expression by trainees.
8. Devoting explicit attention to ethical problems and issues—trainers include a discussion of ethics (applied to both the organization and the training experience) by de-emphasizing ends-over-means objectives.
9. Concern for long-term development of trainees—trainers keep trainees' career paths and potential in sight by linking the training to their future career goals instead of just their immediate jobs. (Goldhaber, 1986, p. 389)

If the media consultants are also employed as a faculty or staff member of a university, it is recommended that they check their faculty handbook or with their Dean or personnel department as to the consulting guidelines in place. This brings us to the next guideline.

10. The media consultant, if a university staff or faculty member, should adhere to the consulting guidelines in place. These guidelines or rules may vary from institution to institution with absolutely no rules at one school to very prescribed formulas and procedures at another. Eich, for example, in his survey found that consulting may or may not help advance one's academic career. The respondents were split with 50% thinking it advanced their careers and 50% believed it had no effect. Eleven percent believed it could be detrimental. (Eich. 1977) Responsible media consultants, if employed full-time, must make every effort to see that their consulting does not create problems or jeopardize either their employers or clients.

Directions For Future Research

This essay outlines suggested ethical guidelines for the media professional who either consults externally or supervises interns. We are on new ground, particularly in view of the new technologies that are diffusing rapidly. We need to start considering the ethical considerations before we come into a conflict of interest. As Hays has written of ethics for communications consultants:

> ....those principles and standards which guide the choices of alternative behaviors in the conduct of consulting with clients regarding the process of communication in an organization. Ethics here deals with the conduct that is approved or disapproved. It covers the range of any behavior that can be judged worthy or unworthy. What in the long range is judged good for the client, good for the consultant, and good for the profession, will be the criteria for the code of ethics....(Hays, 1972)

These ten guidelines are a beginning. What needs done now is to survey media professionals to discover the amount and type of consulting they do. In addition, we need to assess their problems and concerns and ascertain how they deal with them. Finally, continued efforts towards developing a list of guidelines are needed. In particular, these guidelines must be comprehensive and, at the same time, flexible so that they do not restrict the rich opportunity of real-world experiences for teachers and students.

Summary

This essay has argued that the responsible media communicator faces an organizational environment that provides rich opportunities for consulting. These opportunities may either be in the traditional media formats or with the new technologies. In order to maintain ethical standards, ten guidelines have been posited as a beginning point for media consultants who work in academic settings.

As Dizard has argued, "Here is a challenge to match the promise of our democratic society as we move towards a new century. In little more than a generation, the technology to match this challenge has moved from the laboratories into everyday use....The United States has expanded its information production to the point that it is now the repository of the largest share of the world's organized knowledge." (1985, p. 17)

As teachers and researchers of media, we are often challenged and privileged to share our knowledge with the American organizations that are commanding this power. Whether we are providing production support or pedagogical services, we need to think about our responsibilities to assure that our future as consultants continues.

Bibliography

Bryan, Leslie A., Jr. (1986, July). Supervisors With Micros: Trends and Training Needs. **Training and Development Journal**, 40, No. 7, 38-39.

Burge, Stewart L. "Audiovisuals". **Inside Organizational Communication** edited by Carol Reuss and Donn Silvis, Second Edition. New York: Longman, 1985.

Chester, Jeffrey A. (1986, May). Technology and Top Management. **Infosystems** 33, No. 5, 34-35.

Dizard, Wilson P., Jr. **The Coming Information Age: An Overview of Technology, Economics and Politics.** Second Edition. New York: Longman, 1985.

Eich, Ritch. "Communications Consulting Practices: State of the Art." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1977.

Feuer, Dale, Jack Gordon, Ralph Pribble and Ron Zemke. (1986, March). Computers: Most Users Need Only Basic Training. **Training**, 23, No. 3, 14-15.

Feuer, Dale, Jack Gordon, Ralph Pribble, and Ron Zemke. (1986, March). A Standard for Videodiscs: Will the Army Do It? **Training**, 23, No. 3, 15-16.

Feuer, Dale, Jack Gordon, Ralph Pribble and Ron Zemke. (1986, January). Computer Literacy: Making "Easy" Learning Easy. **Training**, 23, No. 1, 14-15.

Feuer, Dale, Jack Gordon, Ralph Pribble and Ron Zemke. (1986, February). CBT: Authoring Styles for the New and Nervous. **Training**, 23, No. 2, 70-71.

Ferrarini, Elizabeth. (1986, August). Getting the Most from Online Databases. **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 8, 28-31.

Field, Anne R. and Catherine L. Harris. (1986, August 25). The Information Business: Despite a Slow Start, Many Still See a Bonanza in Selling Electronic Data. **Business Week**, 82-90.

Finlay, Douglas. (1986, November). Facsimile and Electronic Mail: Providing Better Accuracy and Speed for Tighter Communications. **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 11, 17-22.

Galati, Tess. (1986, October). Electronic Communication: Implications for Training. **Training and Development Journal**, 40, No. 10, 42-44.

Goldhaber, Gerald M. **Organizational Communication**. Fourth Edition. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, Publishers, 1986.

Gordon, Jack. (1986, April). Why CBT Isn't Just for Training Anymore. **Training**, 23, No. 4, 43-50.

Gordon, Jack. (1986, October). Where the Training Goes? **Training**, 23, No. 10, 49-81.

Gross, Lynne Schafer. **Telecommunications: An Introduction to Radio, Television, and Other Electronic Media**, Second Edition. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, Publishers, 1986.

Hays, Ellis. "A Behavioral Objectives Approach to the Development of a Code of Ethics for Communication Consultants." Paper presented at a meeting of the International Communication Association, April, 1972.

Hellweg, Susan, Kevin Freiberg, Anthony Smith. "The Pervasiveness and Impact of Electronic Communication Technologies in Organizations: A Survey of Major American Corporations." A paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Meeting, Chicago, 1984.

Johnston, R. E. (1986, December). The Risks of Change: Technology Continues to Move at a Rapid Pace, Often Leaving Vulnerabilities in its Wake. **Infosystems**, 33, No. 12, 35.

Kiesler, Sara. (1986, January-February). The Hidden Messages in Computer Networks. **Harvard Business Review**, 64, No. 1, 46-60.

Kimmerling, George F. (1986, March). Gaining Firm Ground. **Training and Development Journal**, 40, No. 3, 22-25.

Kliem, Ralph L. (1986, May). Overcoming User Resistance to Microcomputers. **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 5, 52-54.

Laird, Dugan. **Approaches to Training and Development Revised Second Edition**. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1985.

Lee, Chris. (1982, April). Adding the New Technology to Your Training Repertoire. **Training**, 19, No. 4, 18-26.

Mamis, Robert A. (1986, April). Managing Technology: Expect More from Those CDs. **INC**, 108.

Mortensen, Erik. (1986, June). One Network. **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 6, 39-46.

Mallach, Efrem G. (1986, November). The Truth about Training for Computer Sales. **Training and Development Journal**, 40, No. 11, 54-59.

Parson, Frederic W. (1986, September). Inexpensive Interactive Training. **Training and Development Journal**, 40, 9, 38-39.

Paznik, M. Jill. (1986, June). The Automated Office: Make Computers and Software Easy, Then See If There's a Slump. **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 6, 8-9.

Redding, W. Charles. "The Ethical Considerations of Consultants and Graduate Students in Organizational Research.' Paper presented at a meeting of the International Communication Association, April 1972.

Rice, Ronald E. & Associates. **The New Media: Communication, Research, and Technology**. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1985.

Ross, Earl R. (1986, November). I'm An Electronic Mail Freak: To Find Out What Features You Do and Don't Need, Heed the Advice of a True Enthusiast. **Infosystems**, 33, No. 11, 56-57.

Schiller, Zachery. (1986, August 25) Mead Makes Information Pay—Most of the Time. **Business Week**, 90.

Settle, Peter L. (1982). Organizational Communication: Curricular Concerns, Practices, and Problems. Paper presented at Central States Speech Convention.

Sherman, Lloyd E. (1986, June). Is Your Vital Information Protected? **Administrative Management**, XLVII, No. 6, 50-51.

Siemasko, Dan. (1986, December). CBT Fantasies: The Ground Beckons. **Training**, 23, No. 10, 79-86.

Siragusa, Gail. (1986, April). Voice Mail Takes Off. **Administrative Management**. XLVII, No. 4, 43-48.

Spitzer, Dean. (1986, June). Five Keys to Successful Training. **Training**, 23, No. 6, 37-39.

Stein, Jess, Editor. **The Random House Dictionary**. New York, Ballantine Books, 1978.

Thorpe, Judith Mosier. (1986, Fall). Electronic Mail, A New Media Technology Making Its Way from a Cubicle in Academe to the Corporate Setting. **Journal of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association**, 12, No. 2.

White Collar Productivity: Putting Office Automation in the Hands of Those Who Can Maximize Its Potential. (1986, January). **Infosystems**, 33, No. 1, 56.

Wright, Jan. (1986, June). E-Mail and Voice-Mail Systems: Conspirators or Competitors? **Infosystems**, 33, No. 6, Part 1, 74-76.

Zemke, Ron. (1986, September). The Rediscovery of Video Teleconferencing. **Training**, 23, No. 9, 28-43.

Crying Foul: The Limits on Negative Advertising in the 1986 Tennessee Gubernatorial Race

Jim Walker

Introduction

—In South Dakota, Republican Senator James Abdnor's television ads wooed the state's beef and pork producers by accusing his rival of accepting advice on farm problems from red meat critic Jane Fonda.[1]

—In New York, Democrat Mark Green's ads questioned his Italian-American opponent's campaign contributions from alleged organized crime figures.[2]

—In Maryland, Republican Linda Chavez branded unmarried foe Barbara Mikulski a "San Francisco-type liberal" with an anti-male Marxist feminist on her staff.[3]

—In Pennsylvania, Democratic gubernatorial candidate Bob Casey accused his opponent, Lt. Governor William Scranton, III, the son of the popular former governor, of absenteeism from the state senate. "They gave him his job because of his father's name," one television ad suggests. "The least he could do would be to show up for work."[4]

As the mud began to mount, the pundits spoke out, labeling "1986 as the year of the negative campaign,"[5] and the "low-water mark" in negative political advertising.[6] Explanations for the rise in negative advertising were almost as plentiful as the examples of it. Leonard Matthews, president of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, suggested that in political advertising, as in all advertising, "it's harder to say something positive about yourself or your product than it is to attack the other guy."[7] Republican consultant Roger Stone admitted that "voters don't like negative ads, but they retain the information so much better than the positive ones."[8] Former Democratic political consultant Charles Guggenheim speculated that "the nature of the 30 and 60-second spot encourages negative advertising because it's much easier to hit and run and to use innuendo."[9] But Barry Goldwater blamed the consultants, who "just sit down and think up dirty things."[10] However, the most widely accepted explanation was simply that "negative commercials work."[11]

Reactions to the blight of negative ads were varied and not always rational. While continuing to run his own negative ads, Colorado Republican gubernatorial nominee Ted Strickland proclaimed that "if elected he would consider signing legislation preventing people who use negative ads from serving in office."[12] Revolted by the negative advertising in the Pennsylvania gubernatorial race, William Scranton, III declared a "unilateral truce" and withdrew his own negative ads.[13] After the November election, several groups—including a ten member bipartisan commission in Wisconsin, members of Congress, and advertisers—discussed ways to control negative advertising in future elections.[14] Finally, one candidate for county sheriff beat his opponents to the punch by launching his campaign with a newspaper ad "that boldly proclaimed he hadn't been inside a church for years, once drank heavily and curses 'like a sailor'."[15]

During the 1986 Tennessee gubernatorial race, negative campaigning was, at first, limited. But in mid-October, Republican gubernatorial candidate Winfield Dunn began airing a "man on the street' television ad that questioned opponent Ned McWherter's interests in "the state-regulated industries of trucking, banking, nursing homes, and beer distribution."[16] McWherter responded by accusing Dunn of "running a negative campaign" and "polluting the airwaves."[17] Later, McWherter's television ads attacked Dunn's record as governor and his avoidance of income tax payments in 1982 and 1983.[18] In the last week of the campaign, McWherter kept airing his negative ads, but Dunn switched to television ads featuring a strong endorsement from Governor Lamar Alexander.[19] After Dunn's defeat, Tennessee Republican Chairman Jim Henry saw McWherter's attacks on Dunn's tax records as especially damaging, lamenting "I can assure you that no one in this state can miss two years paying taxes and win an election."[20]

Previous Research

Studies of negative campaigning have focused on the acceptance of negative advertising by the electorate, the demographic variables related to its acceptability, and the impact of negative advertising on both the target and the sponsor of the attack. In an early study of public perceptions of mud-slinging and mud-slingers, Stewart measured attitudes toward twenty hypothetical campaign statements.[21] He found that "all statements that seemed to attack a political opponent—even ones referring to broken promises and voting records—were cited as mud-slinging by the majority or a large minority of respondents," and mud-slingers were perceived "to be untrustworthy, dishonest, incompetent, unqualified, unlikeable, not self-confident, and immature."[22]

Surlin and Gordon found that different types of eligible voters respond differently to negative political ads.[23] In particular, low socio-economic status (SES) respondents believed that these ads are both more informative and more unethical than middle SES respondents. In addition, Black respondents found negative ads to be both more informative and more "affective" (the ads both entertained and made the respondent more favorable toward the sponsoring candidate) than White respondents.

In a study of the recall of specific television ads, Garramone found that the more frequently a negative ad was perceived to be true, the more effective it was.[24] However, in general, negative advertising delivered a backlash, producing "a strong negative influence on the viewer's feelings toward the sponsor but only a slight net negative influence on feelings toward the target."[25] In a subsequent experimental study, Garramone found that negative advertising was more effective if it was sponsored by a source other than the candidate (e.g., political action committees).[26] In addition, Garramone found that rebuttals by the target candidate increased the backlash against the original attacker, but did not change respondents' perceptions of the target. In summary, although most eligible voters are critical of negative political advertising, it can negatively effect perceptions of the attacked candidate when its claims are widely believed. However, attacking candidates runs a substantial risk of backlash, which may be more detrimental to the attacker's image than the original attack was to their opponents'.

Although previous research has identified and qualified some of the effects of negative advertising, it has not specified the limitations the public places on negative advertising. Specifically, previous research has not identified what characteristics of a candidate are believed by eligible voters to be "fair game" for attack by the candidate's opponent in a political ad and what characteristics should be "off limits." In addition, previous research provides an incomplete picture of how demographic variables (sex, age, race, income, education) and political beliefs (partisanship, ideology) are related to tolerance for negative political advertising.

This study addressed these concerns by exploring the limits on negative political advertising expressed by eligible voters during the 1986 Tennessee gubernatorial race. The study addressed two questions:

1. What candidate characteristics do eligible voters believe can be fairly attacked in an opponent's political advertising, and what characteristics should not be attacked?
2. How do eligible voters with a high tolerance for negative advertising differ from voters with a low tolerance?

Method

Respondents and Procedure

The respondents were 336 eligible voters from Memphis, Tennessee. Respondents' households were randomly selected from residential listings in the most recent Memphis telephone directory using a procedure outlined by Frey.[27] To lower the refusal rate, an introductory letter was mailed to each household, before telephone contact, explaining the nature of the study. Four attempts were made to contact each randomly selected household before that household was dropped from the sample. Once the household was contacted, one eligible voter per household was randomly selected for interview, using procedures described by Backstrom and Hursh.[28] The refusal rate for those households contacted was 28%. The sample was 61% female and 64% White, with an average age of 45 years and an average of 13 years of education. The median household income was between $19,000 and $30,000.

Trained graduate students conducted the interviews. Most interviews were conducted on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday nights between 6:30 and 9:30 PM, during the weeks of October 12 and October 19, 1986.

Negative Advertising Item

The negative advertising attitude measures were developed by using the results of a pilot study of 55 Little Rock, Arkansas residents conducted in August 1986. Respondents answered two open ended questions:

1. What elements in a candidate's record or personal life are fair game for attack in an opponent's political ads?
2. Is there anything in a candidate's record or personal life that should not be attacked in an opponent's political ads?

These open ended questions generated 34 items considered fair to attack in political ads and 26 items considered unfair. These 60 items were reduced to the 10 most frequently mentioned items: four "fair" and six "unfair" items. The fair items were a candidate's political records, stands on the issues, voting records, and criminal activities. The unfair items were a candidate's personal life, current or past marriage, family members, religion, medical history, and sex life.

In the main study, respondents were asked if they believed it was fair or unfair for an opponent to attack each of these ten items in a political ad. For each item, an answer of unfair was scored as zero and an answer of fair was scored as one. Negative Advertising Tolerance (NAT) equalled the sum of the respondent's answers to the ten individual items. Thus, the possible NAT scores ranged from zero to ten.

Demographic and Political Belief Variables

Partisanship was measured on a seven point scale where one represented strong Democrat and seven strong Republican. Ideology was also measured on a seven point scale where one represented strong conservative and seven strong liberal. At the close of the telephone interview, respondents were asked their sex, age, race, education and household income levels.

Results

Table 1 contains the percentages of respondents who found each of the ten negative advertising items either fair or unfair.

Table 1
Fairness or Unfairness of Items Attacked

ITEM	UNFAIR TO ATTACK	FAIR TO ATTACK	NO RESPONSE
Unfair Items			
Sex Life	81.3%	14.9	3.9
Marriage	79.5%	18.8%	1.8%
Religion	75.3%	23.5%	1.2%
Personal Life	74.7%	23.8%	1.5%
Family Members	73.5%	24.1%	2.4%
Medical History	61.3%	36.9%	1.8%
Fair Items			
Voting Record	20.2%	77.7%	2.1%
Political Record	17.9%	79.5%	2.7%
Criminal Activities	14.0%	84.2%	1.8%
Stands on the Issues	8.6%	89.0%	2.4

Five of the six items viewed as unfair to attack in the pilot study were also deemed unfair by respondents in the main study. Less than 25% of the respondents believed that it was fair for candidates to attack their opponents' sex lives, current or previous marriages, personal lives, religious preferences, or family members. There was slightly more tolerance of attacks on an opponent's medical history. The four "fair" items suggested by respondents in the pilot study were also viewed by respondents in the main study as fair areas for attack, especially the candidates' stands on the issues and criminal activities.

The respondents had an average Negative Advertising Tolerance of 4.79 on a ten point scale. Twenty-four percent of the respondents had low NAT's (scores ranging from zero to three), 57% had average NAT's (scores ranging from four to six), and 19% had high NAT's (scores ranging from seven to ten). The relationships between NAT and five demographic variables (sex, race, education, household income, age) and two political belief variables (partisanship and ideology) are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Relationships between Negative Advertising Tolerance (NAT) and Demographic/Political Beliefs Variable

VARIABLES	% WITH LOW NAT	% WITH AVERAGE NAT	% WITH HIGH NAT
SEX*			
Males	16.7	59.6	23.77
Females	28.5	55.4	16.11
RACE*			
Whites	20.8	55.7	23.44
Blacks	29.5	59.0	11.44
EDUCATION*			
No H.S. Degree	40.4	40.4	19.1
H.S. Degree	27.2	53.3	19.66
Some College	23.4	63.6	13.00
College Degree	12.0	63.9	24.1
HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
Under $19,000	32.4	52.9	14.77
$19-30,000	20.3	58.0	21.77
Over $30,000	17.3	60.9	21.8
AGE			
18-30	22.9	65.1	12.0
31-40	17.9	59.7	22.4
41-60	22.0	54.9	23.2
Over 60	31.7	47.6	20.6
PARTISANSHIP*			
Republicans	21.7	46.7	31.7
Independents	21.6	62.1	16.4
Democrats	28.1	57.0	14.9
IDEOLOGY*			
Conservatives	26.4	40.3	33.3
Moderates	22.8	62.9	14.4
Liberals	22.4	63.8	13.8

* Indicates significant chi-square (p .05) with NAT

Chi-square analyses between each of these variables and NAT produced five statistically significant ($p < .05$) relationships: sex (chi-square 6.47, Cramer's V .147,N 300, race (chi-square 7.38, Cramer's V .158, N 297, education (chi-square 16.97, Cramer's V .168, N 299, partisanship (chi-square 9.35, Cramer's V .127, N 290, and ideology (chi-square 15.84, Cramer's V .163, N 297. Household income and age were not significantly related to NAT.

An analysis of cross tabulations and significant chi-squares reported in Table 2 reveals some clear patterns. Females were more likely to have low NAT's than males and males were more likely to have high NAT's. Blacks were more likely to have low NAT's than Whites and Whites were twice as likely to have high NAT's. Respondents without a high school degree were twice as likely to have low NAT's as they were to have high NAT's. For college graduates, the reverse was true. Democrats were somewhat more likely than Republicans to have low NAT's, but Republicans were over twice as likely to have high NAT's. Finally, conservatives were almost two and a half times as likely as liberals to have high NAT's. To summarize, high NAT respondents were more likely to be male, college educated, White, conservative, and Republican. Low NAT respondents were more likely to be female, without a high school degree, Black, and Democratic.

Conclusions

Previous research has identified some of the effects negative political advertising has on both the target and the sponsor of that advertising. This study has attempted to clarify attitudes regarding the boundaries of negative political advertising during a particular political contest. Specifically, respondents evaluated the fairness of ten candidate characteristics that might be attacked in a political ad. Then, the responses to these items were summed to produce the respondents' Negative Advertising Tolerances (NAT). The relationships between NAT and seven demographic and political belief variables were then evaluated to determine which groups have high tolerance for negative political advertising and which groups have low tolerance.

In general, respondents believed that negative political advertising that addresses the target candidate's political record, including his/her voting record and stands on the issues of the campaign, is fair. The possible criminal activities of the target candidate are also fair game. However, attacks related to the candidate's personal life are usually considered unfair. These include attacks on the candidate's sex life, marriage, religion, and family members. A majority of respondents also believed that the candidate's medical history should not be attacked, although the percentage was substantially lower than for other personal matters.

Negative Advertising Tolerance was significantly related to sex, race, education, partisanship, and ideology; but not related to age or household income. Males, Whites, college graduates, Republicans, and conservatives are more likely to be high in NAT; females, Black, high school dropouts, and Democrats are more likely to be low in NAT.

Although potentially useful to politicians considering a negative advertising campaign, the results of this study should be interpreted cautiously. The results represent the opinions of respondents from a particular location during a specific election about the fairness of attacking a candidate in general areas such as personal life, voting record, etc. At best, they represent a baseline of opinion from which eligible voters judge concrete political advertisements within the context of an ongoing political campaign. The complex rhetorical situation that exists in even a simple campaign demands the careful interpretation of these results. In general, males may be more tolerant than females of negative advertising, but convincing evidence of spouse abuse a week before an election might persuade many undecided women voters. In the abstract, voters may believe that it is not fair to attack a candidate's sex life in a political ad, but that does not mean that it will not be a major factor in a campaign. Just ask Gary Hart.[29]

Notes

[1]John J. Fialka, "Intense Mudslinging in South Dakota Senate Race Provokes Many to Favor Restricting Political Ads," **The Wall Street Journal**, November 13, 1986, p. 68.

[2]Steven W. Colford, "Polls Accentuated Negative," **Advertising Age**, November 10, 1986, pp. 104.

[3]Ibid.

[4]David Shribman, "Scranton's Shift to High Road in Governor's Race in Pennsylvania May Test Effect of Negative Ads," **The Wall Street Journal**, November 3, 1986, p. 68.

[5]Haynes Johnson, "Peddling the Negative," **The Washington Post**, October 29, 1986, p. A-2.

[6]Colford, p. 3.

[7]Ibid, p. 104.

[8]"Negative Advertising Pro and Con," **Advertising Age**, November 10, 1986, p. 104.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Johnson, p. A-2.

[11]Colford, p. 104.

[12]"Do as I say, Not as I do," **The Washington Post**, October 31, 1986, p. A-6. Stickland's opponent, Democrat Roy Romer, questioned the credibility of someone who says "I'm going to continue to do this negative advertising, but I'm going to go to the legislature and pass a law to make it illegal for anyone like me to serve."

[13]Shribman, p. 68. Scranton lost his bid for governor.

[14]"Bipartisan Wisconsin Panel's Goal is Halt in Negative Campaigning," **The Washington Post**, November 16, 1986, p. A-4; David Shribman, "Costly, Negative Congressional Campaigns Spur Immediate Backlash, Legislative Calls for Reforms," **The Wall Street Journal**, November 7, 1986, p. 70; Colford, p. 104.

[15]Mike Tapscott, "Forthright Candidate is 'Telling it Like it is,'" **The Commercial Appeal**, July 1, 1987, p. B1.

[16]Philip Ashford, "Dunn Cools Attack, but McWherter Ads Keeping up the Heat," **The Commercial Appeal**, November 1, 1986, p. A1.

[17]Richard Locker and Terry Keeter, "McWherter Says Dunn Turning Negative," **The Commercial Appeal**, October 14, 1986, p. B1.

[18]Ashford, p. A1.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Terry Keeter, "Tax Records Hurt Dunn, GOP Leader Says," **The Commercial Appeal**, January 20, 1987, pp. B1-2.

[21]Charles J. Steward, "Voter Perception of Mud-Slinging in Political Communication," **Central States Speech Journal**, 26 (1975), 279-286.

[22]Ibid., p. 285.

[23]Stuart H. Surlin and Thomas F. Gordon, 'How Values Affect Attitudes Toward Direct Reference Political Advertising," **Journalism Quarterly**, 54 (1977), 89-98.

[24]Gina M Garramone, "Voter Responses to Negative Political Ads," **Journalism Quarterly**, 61 (1984), 250-259.

[25]Ibid., p. 258.

[26]Gina M. Garramone, "Effects of Negative Political Advertising: The Roles of Sponsor and Rebuttal." **Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media**, 29 (1985), 147-159.

[27]James H. Frey, **Survey Research by Telephone**, (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983), p. 65.

[28]C.H. Backstrom and G. Hursh, **Survey Research**, Chicago: Northwestern University, 1963), pp. 50-53.

[29]The survey was taken seven months before Gary Hart's 1988 Presidential campaign was ended by a sex scandal. Whether or not this scandal has changed eligible voters' minds about the acceptability of attacks on a candidate's sex life is an interesting empirical question.

1987 - 88 TSCA Membership List

Robert S. Ambler, Ph.D.
Speech and Theatre
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
Phone: (home) 615/687-8065
(bus.) 615/974-7066

Marcus L. Ambrester, Ph.D.
Speech & Theatre Professor
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37938
Phone: (home) 615/922-1421
(bus.) 615/974-7070

David L. Appleby, M.F.A.
Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/458-7349
(bus.) 901/454-2565

John P. Bakke, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/682-9509
(bus.) 901/454-2565

John E. Buckley
Dept. of Speech & Theatre
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37922
Phone: (home) 615/573-2909
(bus.) 615/974-7064

Wilma Bullock
Dept. of Theater and Communication
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38158
Phone: (home) 901/458-4645
(bus.) 901/458-5859

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

Gary R. Cowan, M.Ed.
Speech & Theatre
Teacher; English, Mass Communication
Antioch High School
5059 Blue Hole Road
Antioch, TN 37013
Phone: (home) 615/297 7368
(bus.) 615/333-5001

Reece Elliott, Ph.D.
Chairman, Dept. of Speech Communication
Austin Peay State University
4446 APSU
Clarksville, TN 37040
Phone: (home) 615/647-8733
(bus.) 615/648-7364

Vickie W. Foltz, M.R.E.
Dept. of Communication Arts
Belmont College
Belmont Boulevard
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: (home) 615/883-1987

Diane House
84 Lester Ave.
Box 1124
Nashville, TN 37210
Phone: (home) 615/255-8147

Faye Julian
Dept. of Speech and Theater
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37938

Joan C. Kennedy, MAT
Vocational Education, VIP English
Hillsboro High School
3812 Hillsboro
Nashville, TN 37215
Phone: (home) 615/292-0602
(bus.) 615/298-8408

Joyce (Joy) R. Marshall, M.Ed.
Media Department
Antioch High School
5050 Blue Hole Road
Antioch, TN 37013
Phone: (home) 615/834-8362
(bus.) 615/333-5001

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

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

Michael M. Osborn, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication Arts/Chairman
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/682-4515
(bus.) 901/454-3182

Suzanne S. Osborn, Ph.D.
Dept. of Theatre & Media Arts
Rhodes College
2000 North Parkway
Memphis, TN 38112
Phone: (home) 901/682-4515
(bus.) 901/454-3182

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

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

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

David E. Walker, Jr., Ph.D.
Dept. of Speech and Theater
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
Phone: (home) 615/896-9592
(bus.) 615/898-2640

James R. Walker, Ph.D.
Theatre & Communication Assistant Professor
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
Phone: (home) 901/272-9245
(bus.) 901/454-2565

Virginia S. Walker
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
Phone: (home) 615/896-9592