

The Pennsylvania Scholars Series

Published by the Pennsylvania Communication Association

Kathleen Hall Jamieson

Introduction Nichola D. Gutgold.....	5
The Interplay of Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s Early Influences Herbert W. Simons.....	8
Building the Field of Political Communication David S. Birdsell.....	14
Rhetoric, H.R.H., and Me: Difference Without Disagreement Roderick P. Hart.....	25
Teaching Rhetoric in the Commonwealth via the <i>Bill Moyers Journal</i> : Kathleen Hall Jamieson Jane S. Sutton.....	33
Kathleen Hall Jamieson on Political Advertising: Unspinning the Spin Doctors Steven R. Brydon.....	44
Strengthening the Field of Communication Through Public Policy Research and Visibility: Kathleen Hall Jamieson and the Annenberg Public Policy Center Kate Kenski.....	58

Standard Bearer of the Discipline

THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
FOUNDED 1939

PCA is dedicated to research in, ethical use of, and education for excellent oral communication in every human activity, especially those in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Specifically, its members seek to: (1) Encourage recognition of speech communication and its partner system, listening, as an inherent part of basic human skill; (2) Advocate education in competent speaking and listening through the adoption of at least one required course in oral communication in all Commonwealth school districts and institutions of higher learning; (3) Encourage competent oral communication and listening across the curriculum in all class activities; (4) Encourage people to participate in co-curricular activities that develop speaking and listening skills; (5) Recognize communication as an integral and on-going process in the business and organizational world; (6) Promote literacy in the performance in and critique of competent mass communication; (7) Further recognition of the artistic merits and human growth potential of various performance settings that utilize oral communication; (8) Train all citizens in critical thinking and effective communication of their ideas; (9) Encourage scholarship in and publication of results that investigate various aspects of human interaction; (10) Communicate emerging or on-going concerns regarding speaking and listening in its various settings to decision-makers in government, organizations, business, and the arts.
 ~Article II, By-Laws of the Pennsylvania Communication Association

OFFICERS

President

Colleen Burke
Westminster College

Vice President

Sheryl Baratz Goodman
Ursinus College

Immediate Past President

Cem Zeytinoglu
East Stroudsburg University

Secretary

Janie Harden Fritz
Duquesne University

Treasurer

Kathy Taylor Brown
The Pennsylvania State University,
Greater Allegheny

Publicity Officer

Jennifer Snyder-Duch
Carlow University

Member at Large

Jack Ciak
Seton Hill University

Member at Large

Joe Downing
The Pennsylvania State University,
York

Editor, Communication Annual

Donna Weimer
Juniata College

Editor, Scholars Series

Ronald C. Arnett
Duquesne University

Executive Director

Ronald C. Arnett
Duquesne University

The Pennsylvania Scholar Series

Kathleen Hall Jamieson

Volume Editor

Nichola D. Gutgold
The Pennsylvania State University, Lehigh Valley

Managing Editor

Ronald C. Arnett
Duquesne University

Editorial Assistant

Susan Carr
Duquesne University

COPY DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION

Copies of issues from the Pennsylvania Scholars Series are distributed to members of the Pennsylvania Communication Association, Inc. The price per copy for non-members is \$35.00. All business correspondence regarding membership, payment of fees, and matters pertaining to the Pennsylvania Communication Association should be addressed to the Treasurer: Kathy Taylor Brown, Penn State—Greater Allegheny, 4000 University Drive, McKeesport, PA 15132, 412-675-9495, ktb2@psu.edu.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

The PA Scholars Series as published is the property of the Pennsylvania Communication Association, Inc. The right of reproduction of its contents is expressly reserved by the Association. The Association waives the requirement of permission in the case of fair use of brief quotations for scholarly purposes and criticism, requesting only that appropriate credit be given for each quotation. Persons and publishers wishing to reproduce articles should contact the Editor for specific permission.

Copyright© 2012 by the Pennsylvania Communication Association, Inc.
All rights reserved

Introduction

The sixth issue of the *Pennsylvania Scholars Series* honors the contributions of nationally renowned political commentator, teacher, and scholar Kathleen Hall Jamieson. The author of 16 books on political communication, campaigns, and political rhetoric and a frequent guest on PBS *NewsHour*, *Moyers and Company*, and many other TV news programs, Jamieson's impressive body of work is one that is at heart searching for the truth. This collection of essays by distinguished rhetorical scholars aims to serve up the truth about Kathleen Hall Jamieson. From the authors assembled here, we gain insight from various vantage points into Dr. Jamieson's scholarship, humanity, and even her sense of humor.

In his engaging contribution to this collection of essays, Temple University Professor Emeritus Herbert W. Simons has a conversation with his longtime friend, Kathleen Hall Jamieson. In lieu of writing an essay about her, Professor Simons offers an edited interview format. In the exchange between Jamieson and Simons, we learn little known facts about our subject's life: that her grandfather sold encyclopedias door-to-door, that at age 11, she won a 4-H public speaking contest, and that she cleaned dorm rooms to earn her keep at an all-girls' boarding high school that offered her lessons in leadership as well as solid academic teachings. She graduated college in three years instead of four from Marquette University and considered being a lawyer before entering an M.A. program at the Communication Arts Department at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. It was there that she discovered that she liked teaching as she embarked on her Ph.D. studies. The affection between author and subject is apparent in this rare and intriguing interview where we gain many insights into the life of Kathleen Hall Jamieson.

Baruch College Dean David Birdsell, in his essay "Building the Field of Political Communication," argues that Jamieson's pursuit of her contributions have created the discipline of speech communication much more rapidly and on a different trajectory than would have been the case without her efforts. Considerable attention is devoted to Professor Jamieson's choice of publishing venue, her creation of inter-disciplinary and cross-professional venues for political communication, her consistent advancement of the field of communication, and her creation of durable platforms for political communication research. Birdsell notes that it is important to recognize Jamieson's ongoing contributions that have given the field of political communication its identity.

"Rhetoric, H.R.H., and Me: Difference Without Disagreement" is an amusing personal and comparative exploration of the work of University of Texas Professor Roderick P. Hart and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Hart's close relationship and personal affection for Jamieson is revealed with a scholarly

lens, informing the reader of their different approaches to rhetorical criticism despite being “similarly aged, similarly trained, [and] similarly socialized people.” Hart points out that rhetoric “is not only a thing produced but also a thing consumed,” and his engaging essay illustrates his bond with Jamieson. He describes Jamieson as “a brilliant scholar, a fine university administrator, and a spellbinding teacher” and recounts many of her book contributions while holding up *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* (Jamieson, 1990) as his most admired. Hart reminds the reader that Jamieson’s scholarship is in a constant state of fact-seeking and that “[i]f we could just get the *facts* right, Kathleen habitually argues, the world would be at peace.” Hart also reflects that Jamieson may be most well-known for her PBS and NPR commentary, where she deconstructs the rhetoric of current events, and in doing so, brings pride to the communication field, which often goes unrepresented in the national press. Hart’s admiration for Jamieson is deep, and he describes her as someone to “learn from constantly” because “true scholars—in relationship—learn to trust one another and to open themselves up to important questions.” Hart’s essay invites the reader to consider important questions of both Jamieson’s work and his own.

Penn State Professor Jane Sutton, in her essay “Teaching Rhetoric in the Commonwealth via the *Bill Moyers Journal*: Kathleen Hall Jamieson,” analyzes Jamieson’s public teaching of rhetoric during her two decades of appearances on the PBS program *Bill Moyers Journal*. Sutton points out that Jamieson rarely uses the word rhetoric, though when she does, it is to make a point. The themes that Professor Sutton uses to frame her essay include debate and women in politics. Sutton points out that Moyers and Jamieson provide their audience with many web-based instances of rhetoric, so her essay also demonstrates how web-based examples can provide instructors of rhetoric with a rich classroom resource. She closes her essay with a list of her favorite web-based examples of rhetoric for use in the classroom. In her essay, Sutton illuminates Jamieson’s observation of the many ways women politicians suffer from their treatment in the press. She notes that “words like *first* must be carefully weighed before turning them into frames for a woman or a president” and that emotion is much more difficultly tied to women politicians than to men. In her essay, Sutton notes that Jamieson stresses the value in presidential rhetoric to her students. She argues: “Presidential words matter. Presidential power is real. And in times of war, a President’s capacity to act is much less constrained than it is in other environments.” Finally, Sutton offers a blog post, pointing toward the newer ways that rhetoric finds entrance into the political conversation.

California State University Professor Emeritus Steven R. Brydon, in his essay “Kathleen Hall Jamieson on Political Advertising: Unspinning the Spin Doctors,” describes in clear and precise detail the contributions of Kathleen Hall Jamieson to the development of journalistic fact checking, including the development of a grammar for “adwatches” and the founding

of FactCheck.org, which provides in-depth fact checking for both news organizations and average citizens. Evidence from the National Annenberg Election Survey documents the importance of campaign messages in determining voter choice as well as the potential for deceptive advertising to influence that choice. Professor Brydon also describes how he applied Jamieson's techniques for fact checking to teach his political communication students how to fact check on the local level, opening the eyes of many students to the deception in political advertising. This essay argues that the contributions of Dr. Jamieson are more important than ever as new campaign finance rules ushered in by the Supreme Court are leading to a message environment with greater potential for deceptive messages to influence voters.

This collection of essays concludes with a tribute by University of Arizona Associate Professor Kate Kenski. Kenski writes that Kathleen Hall Jamieson's award winning scholarship and public policy initiatives conducted at the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania have strengthened the field of communication by showing scholars, political elites, and members of the public how communication affects public policy and American life for better or worse and thus merits recognition and attention as a topic of scholarly import. Kenski denotes three themes of Jamieson's research: communication matters, accuracy of claims matters, and civility matters. Kenski emphasizes that these important themes have resonated with a wide and diverse audience, earned Jamieson praise and recognition, have benefited the communication discipline, and helped to build it into what it is today.

Nichola D. Gutgold

The Pennsylvania State University, Lehigh Valley

September 2012

The Interplay of Kathleen Hall Jamieson's Early Influences

Herbert W. Simons (Emeritus), Temple University

Kathleen Hall Jamieson (KHJ) is a force of nature. Most readers of this volume are aware of her impact on the field of communication and on the larger society. I've known and admired KHJ for 40 years but not until this interview project did I (HWS) get a glimmering of the main factors that have influenced her.

HWS: What was it like growing up in Minnesota and Wisconsin?

KHJ: My paternal grandfather was a lawyer who earned the money for law school selling encyclopedias door to door. He and my grandmother homesteaded land in Montana. He died when my father was a child. My paternal grandmother sent her son (my dad) and daughter to live with her sisters and brother and went to the Mayo Clinic for training as a registered nurse. We have a picture of her with the Mayo brothers who were her teachers. She then gathered up her family and set out to find work. During the depression, they "truck farmed."

My father completed high school as did my mom, but my father did not attend college. My mother had been offered a partial scholarship to St. Catherine's College (now St. Catherine's University), but since her family's savings had been wiped out in the depression, she couldn't afford to attend. While working as a secretary, she met my father who was working as a machinist.

I spent a lot of time with my paternal grandmother. She and Sister Anne Rose are the individuals who shaped my aspirations. From a young age, my grandmother told me that I would grow up to be a lawyer or a doctor. My mother hoped that I would be a teacher, which is what she had aspired to be. I assumed that I would work my way through college. It never occurred to me that there were scholarships to be gotten by kids from lower-lower-middle class families. (We refused to believe we were poor).

HWS: Tell me about your early education.

KHJ: I grew up in a small town in Minnesota and went to a Catholic grade school. When the results of my first test scores came back in second grade, the nun in charge of the school concluded that I had a religious vocation. My mother informed her that although no one could be sure about a vocation at seven years of age, she thought that my tendency to reject most forms of authority probably forecast another life calling.

As did the other girls in my class in grade school, I joined 4-H in fourth grade. 4-H held a speaking competition that culminated in presentations at the State Fair. In the August before seventh grade, I won the contest at the city and county level with a ten minute speech about stocking a fallout shelter. After scoring the highest number of points for the speech at the State Fair, I was declared ineligible for the top prize. The contest was for ages 12 to 18; I was 11. I was thrilled to be given the blue ribbon as a consolation prize (the top prize was a purple ribbon). After the award ceremony, my grandmother, who (along with my parents and siblings) had attended, declared that I was definitely my grandfather's girl and would clearly be the next Clarence Darrow. It seemed odd being seen as the legatee of someone (my grandfather, not Clarence Darrow), who I never knew, who was, to me, a set of yellowing pictures in a scrapbook.

Since I hated needles and felt faint at the sight of blood, I was grateful that my grandmother had narrowed my options to exclude medical school. When I called her to say that I had gotten a college scholarship, she cried. She died my freshman year in college. When we cleared her house, we found that she had kept every letter I had written, every mention of me in the news, and every word I had published in the school paper.

Since my parents were lower-lower-middle class, there was no money to send us to college or to private high schools. The public high school in my hometown was not accredited. The nuns pushed my parents to send me to a Catholic high school. A number of girls from my hometown had gone to St Ben's, a Catholic boarding school in Northern Minnesota. My dad took me there for the entrance test. My test scores were high enough to qualify for a full scholarship. I cleaned the dorms to pay for my meals and lodging. In summers, I worked for a wealthy family as a governess for their four young children.

At St. Ben's, I met Sister Anne Rose, who responded to my eagerness to argue by telling me that I was going to join the debate squad. My sophomore year, we won the State Catholic Championship.

Since it was an all-girls school, we all assumed that women could hold any available leadership position. I edited the school paper and was elected Student Council President. The only reason I won was that the principal (who had been the object of my disposition to fight authority) more or less came out against my candidacy.

Sister Anne Rose secured the debate scholarship for me at Marquette. I took out NDEA (National Defense Education Act) loans to cover the cost of room and board at Marquette and worked at customer service at Sears and as

a copy editor in summers. Sister Anne Rose was confident that I would be a college professor. (She was working on her Ph.D. in theology when I was in high school.) She lived long enough to see that I had made it into an assistant professorship. She was killed in a car accident in the early 1970s.

Since I was taking 20 credits a semester at Marquette (they didn't charge extra for extra credits), I graduated in three years with a major in Rhetoric and Public Address and a Minor in Philosophy. After visiting both Harvard and the University of Chicago in my second year, I concluded that I did not want to be a lawyer after all. My debate coach and Sister Anne Rose said "grad school." I applied to the University of Wisconsin, Madison on a whim.

Bob and I got engaged our senior year. In the summer after I finished Marquette, I worked nights co-authoring a debate manual with one of my teachers and a fellow debater. With the money I was paid, we bought a suit for Bob and a plane ticket for him to get to his new job as an engineer in the Navy Department in DC. The Communication Arts Department at the University of Wisconsin, Madison admitted me. I headed to Madison to complete a one year M.A. en route to a possible Ph.D. Since I was a fellowship student, I didn't get to teach. I covered my friends' classes whenever asked.

HWS: Do you recall your early commitments?

KHJ: I enjoyed teaching. I went back for a full summer of University of Wisconsin classes after Bob and I were married (and while VERY pregnant with our older son, Rob) and took a semester at Catholic University to fill out my minor in Philosophy/Theology. The essay on the Stesichoran Palinode in *Rhetorica* was written for a course I took with patrologist, Johannes Quasten, at Catholic University.¹

In 1969, the University of Maryland offered me a job, which was withdrawn when I told the department chair I was pregnant (with Rob). I reapplied the next year and was hired by a new department chair to teach rhetorical theory and criticism and political communication.

My tenure track job at the University of Maryland was contingent on completing the Ph.D., which I finally did in 1972. *Packaging the Presidency* was

¹ Kathleen Jamieson, "Jerome, Augustine and the Stesichoran Palinode," *Rhetorica* 5 (1987): 353–367.

written from lecture materials I developed to teach an undergraduate political communication course.²

My dissertation won an NCA (National Communication Association) award because Herb voted for it. [This is partly true, but Herb voted for it because he thought it was very, very good.] The first essay I published on genre (in *Philosophy and Rhetoric*) is actually the answer I wrote to an insightful comp question asked by my doctoral advisor, Ed Black.³ Most of my early publications are cut from my dissertation, which was titled, “A Rhetorical-Critical Analysis of the Conflict over *Humanae Vitae*.” *Humanae Vitae* is the papal birth control encyclical promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1968 declaring that birth control violates natural law.

HWS: On to your efforts at political reform (e.g., Committee on Aging).

KHJ: I was a foot soldier in efforts to integrate all-white clubs in Milwaukee and then in Madison in the effort to remove LBJ and elect Gene McCarthy. After we moved to Maryland, I worked in the 1972 McGovern campaign (where I created “Get Out the Vote” radio and TV ads and scripted op-eds for placement in student newspapers). The work for McGovern led to the offer to serve as director of communication for Florida Congressman Claude Pepper’s newly formed House Committee on Aging. I did not take a leave to work for McGovern. I did to work for Pepper. At the Aging Committee, I coordinated Pepper’s effort to extend protection from mandatory retirement to age 70. I also coordinated two hearings on age stereotyping and television.

HWS: And your administrative innovations, such as the University of Maryland internship program?

KHJ: Andy Wolvin and I concluded that to be employable, the students needed applied experience. We lacked the networks that the major private schools had into work in politics. Internships were the solution. The model worked. [HWS: Left unsaid by KHJ is that she largely financed the internship program with the fees she’d earned as a guest lecturer.]

HWS: [I’ve always marveled at Kathleen’s skills as a public speaker. She dismisses them as the normal requisites for college debate, but that’s not been

² Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Packaging the Presidency: A History and Criticism of Presidential Advertising* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984). The revised second edition was published in 1992. The revised third edition with two new chapters was published in 1996.

³ Kathleen M. Hall Jamieson, “Generic Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 6 (1973): 162–170.

my experience. For one thing, KHJ is funny! For another, she manages to adapt to several audience segments at once.]

Please comment on your early scholarship.

KHJ: My dissertation and early articles capitalized on the fact that I could read Latin and had taken coursework in theology.

When I read in *Spectra* that Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (KKC) was coordinating a conference on form and genre, I wrote asking whether she needed help. In an astonishing act of generosity, she responded by asking me to serve as her co-chair. We edited the conference volume for NCA.⁴

My first university press book came out of class notes. What sold Oxford on the book was *Interplay of Influence*, which KKC and I published in 1978. Karlyn is the one who taught me how to write books.⁵

HWS: Is there a politics of book-writing: balancing publicly stated objectives against private motives?

KHJ: I don't know what this question is asking.

My favorite books of mine are *Eloquence in An Electronic Age*⁶ and *Beyond the Double Bind*.⁷ I wrote them because I wanted to make those arguments. The essay I'm proudest of is the one on Stesichoran palinode.⁸

You told me *Eloquence in an Electronic Age*⁹ was too pro-Reagan. Had you not introduced me to Bateson and second order change, I could not have written *Beyond the Double Bind*¹⁰. [HWS: This form of flattery is a Stesichoran palinode.]

HWS: What, if anything, has this retrospective taught you about yourself?

⁴ Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, eds. *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action* Speech Communication Association (1978).

⁵ Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *The Interplay of Influence: Media and Their Publics in News, Advertising and Politics* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1983, 1987, 1991, 1996, 2000). Revised 6th edition, 2006.

⁶ Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988 & 1990).

⁷ Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Beyond The Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁸ Jamieson, "Jerome, Augustine and the Stesichoran Palinode," 353–367.

⁹ Jamieson, *Eloquence in an Electronic Age*.

¹⁰ Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Beyond The Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

KHJ: That I am more “retro” than “spective.”

Editor’s Note by Herb Simons:

Kathleen Hall Jamieson and I are old buddies. Back in 1972 when the Research Board of the Speech Communication Association selected Dissertation-of-the-Year winners, I voted for hers. In more ways than one, it was a weighty tome.

Rather than my writing an essay about her, we agreed to an edited interview format. I was curious about her early influences and was confident that readers of this journal would be as well. Kathleen says that she's not big on retrospecting, but I believe she warmed to this task of ours. I'm grateful to Kathleen and to Nichola Gutgold for this opportunity to share with readers these remembrances of the early KHJ.

Building the Field of Political Communication

David S. Birdsell, Baruch College

As Kathleen Hall Jamieson was preparing the first edition of *Packaging the Presidency* for release in 1984, political communication was a discipline conducted largely at the junction of political science and social psychology. Political scientists such as James David Barber (1980) and Murray Edelman (1964, 1971, 1977) documented the importance of communication in political campaigns, in the daily conduct of governance, and in creating “spectacles” that (in Edelman’s steadily dyslogistic understanding of communication’s role in civic culture, he was not alone) distracted from the real business of public deliberation. Social psychologists such as Herbert Kelman (1958) and his many collaborators wrote extensively on communication, negotiation, public opinion, and attitude change, particularly with respect to international affairs and other loci of negotiation, perspectives that informed the work of political scientists such as Ole Holsti (Holsti, Farley, & Fagen 1967, Holsti, Gerbner, et al, 1969) and Robert Jervis (1970, 1976). Philosophers and political theorists were also writing about political communication, often lamenting the influence of advertising and other monied forms of expression on the quality of and the very frames containing public discourse.

Largely absent from the interdisciplinary conversation about communication and politics was what was then “speech.” Very little work in any corner of speech, much less political communication, was produced at book length¹—textbooks were the routine exceptions—and articles in journals sponsored by the National Communication Association (now NCA, then the Speech Communication Association, or SCA), the several regional speech associations, and the International Communication Association (ICA) were not widely cited outside of the community of scholars associated with speech. This left the one discipline that took as its business the elucidation of popular messages per se on the sidelines of scholarly—and by extension, professional—approaches to political communication.

Understanding this landscape is essential for an appreciation of Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s contributions to political communication and to the visibility of communication studies more generally. While she was not alone—there were many involved in the rapid ascent of political communication as a sub-discipline within communication studies—she

¹ There were of course exceptions—Lloyd Bitzer and Theodore Reuter, *Carter Versus Ford: The Counterfeit Debates of 1976*. Dan D. Nimmo and Keith R. Sanders edited the *Handbook of Political Communication* in 1981 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage) following the release the previous year of Nimmo’s own *Subliminal Politics: Myths and Mythmakers in America* (New York: Prentice Hall). Nimmo was, however, a political scientist collaborating with speech scholars and others. From speech, per se, Robert E. Denton’s *The Symbolic Dimensions of the American Presidency: Description and Analysis* appeared on Waveland Press in 1982.

adopted strategies and achieved a measure of excellence in pursuing those strategies that accelerated the trajectory of political communication far beyond where it would have been without her efforts. Specifically, she:

- 1) Published and continues to publish her most important work in monograph form on university press imprints that were not primarily associated with speech or with political communication but were among the most prestigious venues for political science and social psychology and pursued journal publication in interdisciplinary venues closely attended to by scholars outside of speech communication.
- 2) Developed venues to engage scholars and practitioners (and often journalists) face-to-face, notably around the quadrennial presidential “debriefings.”
- 3) Continued her close association with communication studies, routinely bringing the best students and senior scholars from that discipline into the interdisciplinary dialogs she pioneered.
- 4) Built research platforms that address questions of interest to scholars in communication studies but in forms instantly recognizable to scholars from political science, social psychology, sociology, and other disciplines traditionally associated with studies of elections, civil society, and public opinion.

Though I am fortunate to have been her student and her co-author, the topics I address here are matters of public record and available to anyone interested in her career or the growth of political communication from the 1980s to the present day.

University Press Monographs and Interdisciplinary Journals

With the publication of *Packaging the Presidency*, Jamieson began a long association with Oxford University Press. In addition to *Packaging*, Oxford brought out *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* (Jamieson, 1988), *Presidential Debates* (Jamieson & Birdsall, 1988), *Dirty Politics* (Jamieson, 1992), *Beyond the Double Bind* (Jamieson, 1995), *Spiral of Cynicism* (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997), *The Press Effect* (Jamieson & Waldman, 2003), *Echo Chamber* (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008), and *The Obama Victory* (Kenski, Hardy, & Jamieson, 2010). She and her co-author Karlyn Kohrs Campbell have published with University of Chicago Press (*Deeds Done in Words* in 1990 and the substantial update of that volume as *Presidents Creating the Presidency* in 2008). The University of Pennsylvania published *Capturing Campaign Dynamics 2000 & 2004* (Romer, Kenski, Winneg, et al, 2006) and Cambridge University Press had *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundation of Party Politics* (Johnston, Hagen, & Jamieson, 2004).

Academic monographs on distinguished university presses constitute, in many disciplines, the single best indication of scholarly merit. Of course, no one simply decides to bring out a book with this or that press, particularly early in a career; acceptance is based on the quality of the work and the strength of the reviews. That Oxford had no “speech” list at the time that *Packaging* was published is further testament to the strength of Jamieson’s scholarship and to the cross-over appeal (e.g., to political scientists, to historians, to journalists, and to serious readers among the general public) of the book.

Elsewhere in this volume, Steven Brydon devotes extensive attention to *Packaging* and its role in shaping a field. The points I want to make here are more tactical:

- 1) Penetration. With Oxford, and later with Chicago and Cambridge, Jamieson chose a press with a catalog that would be in every scholar’s mailbox (and in 1984, that meant a physical catalog in a real box in a real mailroom) at every major university. It meant library adoptions in every academic library in the nation and many throughout the world. It meant a publicity budget and a public relations person working in America’s largest media market (or in the case of Chicago, its third) and copies of the book in the hands of producers and anchors across the country. A University of Wisconsin Press book, no matter how good, did and does not launch with these advantages.
- 2) By getting a prominent placement at a press without a “communication” list in the NCA/ICA sense of the term, Jamieson accomplished two things simultaneously. First, she guaranteed, perforce, that the book would be marketed to scholars in the disciplines—again, largely political science and social psychology—that dominated studies of political communication. Second, she made the world’s leading academic press pay attention to an entire discipline, both as a source of scholarship and as a marketing conceit. As I write today, Oxford advertises 147 titles on its communication list.

Much the same can be said of her journal publication strategy. In addition to choosing prominent university presses for her books, Jamieson has pursued journal publication outside of traditional communication venues with the exception of the joint ICA-American Political Science Association political communication publications. Her work is more likely to appear in *Presidential Studies Quarterly* or the *American Behavioral Scientist* than in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Many scholars with doctorates in communication studies have followed her to these venues and at least one preceded her, but as one of the earliest and most prominent voices in the movement from publication

primarily in disciplinary journals to interdisciplinary journals, she helped to shape a new audience that comprised the emerging core of the field of political communication.

Communication titles are now well represented among the most prestigious university presses. That owes in no small part to the success of *Packaging* and the subsequent titles on Oxford. Communication scholars routinely publish in *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, which has appropriately become required reading for anyone interested in political communication at the presidential level.

Engaging Others Directly

As important as monographs undoubtedly are, they are disproportionately influential on a relatively narrow community of scholars. Very early in her career and well before *Packaging's* debut, Jamieson began building bridges to the community of professional campaign consultants and the journalists covering campaigns. At one level, the consultants were informants, providing crucial historical and tactical details that made *Packaging* and other books so valuable. At another, they constituted a new audience, hungry for sources of information on campaign practice and influential in how others perceive campaign planning and practice.

In addition to meeting many of the key players in the course of gathering information for her research, Jamieson also initiated the practice of bringing the senior leadership of the two presidential campaigns together for quadrennial post-mortems called “debriefings.” Launched at the University of Maryland and continued at the University of Texas and Penn State University, these debriefings brought (and continue to bring) students, senior communication scholars, campaign operatives and journalists together for off-the-record conversations about what worked, and the debriefings provided, every four years, an in-depth, insider’s view of decision making throughout the campaign.

Everyone benefitted. Communication scholars got what was—especially during the early 1980 and 1984 post-mortems, before books such as Larry Sabato’s (1983) *The Rise of Political Consultants* and documentaries such as Pennebaker’s and Hegedus’ (1993) *War Room* noted and to some extent created the celebrity consultant—access to what was then genuinely behind-the-scenes thinking. Journalists got to cultivate sources and learn more about the very stories they covered earlier in the season. Campaign operatives got a chance to explain themselves to both scholarly and journalistic audiences and influence the historical understanding of the decisions they made. They also got to tell generations of masters and doctoral students in communication studies how they think, which I can say with certainty was profoundly influential for at least one graduate student in 1984—me—who got to see the very best scholars in communication studies formulating questions for one

group of pollsters, advertisers, and strategists who had returned a president to the White House and another group that had failed to dislodge him.

In these multi-perspectival forums, the insights of communication scholarship are held to standards of utility not necessarily more demanding, but different from those applied in academic journals in the field. How might the findings of communication scholarship reshape political campaigns? Is the scholarly construction of communication a useful framework for assembling a successful campaign? These are questions from which Jamieson has never shied, and to which she has offered well-evidenced, affirmative answers for more than 30 years. More importantly, she has shown how a deep understanding of rhetoric and other dimensions of communication scholarship not only informs practice but provides a crucial extension to the more structural tutelage of political science or the careful cognitive distinctions of social psychology. But those contributions are only evident in bold, immediate contrast with insights from other disciplines and other professional engagements with politics.

As this festschrift goes to press, Jamieson and her co-author, Kate Kenski, are finishing their editorial work on the *Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*, which collects the best thinking on the state of the field from more than 60 scholars, most of them in the three critical fields of political science, social psychology, and communication studies. The contributions could have been assigned via email and collected remotely, but Jamieson and Kenski instead chose to host in December 2010, at the Annenberg Public Policy Center, a two-day working session with as many contributors as could attend. The result was something that I view as emblematic of Jamieson as a scholar and a teacher: bring as many smart people together with something useful to contribute and hash out your differences in open colloquy to best ensure that all relevant perspectives have been laid against one another and made to take account of one another. By abandoning the uncertain comforts of the disciplinary silo—and bringing others along with her—Jamieson has consistently built a stronger platform for political communication research and a broader audience to consume its results.²

Continued Close Association with Communication Studies

In a late-night conference conversation with a colleague some ten years ago we got to talking about Jamieson's contributions to the discipline. He praised Jamieson's early works such as *Form and Genre*, but said, "Of course, she doesn't do communication studies any more, much less rhetoric." I found

² She has shouldered precisely this burden in print as well. See Capella and Jamieson's 1996 "Bridging the Disciplinary Divide."

this stunning and offered the following observations, which I have updated somewhat:

- 1) Her work is intimately and explicitly grounded in the field. In *Deeds Done in Words* and later in *Presidents Creating the Presidency*, she draws on her copious work with form and genre to propel an analysis of the various genres of presidential speech, which in turn constitute, iteratively, the nature of the presidency itself. *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* stems from her abiding concern with the nature of political language and how it changes in response to technology, to the conditions in which audiences encounter messages and message makers, and to the sound of language itself. Even a book as technically brilliant as *The Obama Victory* attends closely to how the manner of expression and reactions to candidates' choice of words move beliefs about candidates' intentions and voter preference. This short article cannot bear a detailed analysis of all of the places in which a concern for the traditional interests of rhetoric, much less the broader field of communication infuses her work, for indeed, that would involve close attention to almost her entire oeuvre.
- 2) She has been an active participant in the relevant conferences and, as dean, brought Pennsylvania's Annenberg School closer to NCA than it had been under any previous dean, a rapprochement that continues to this day.
- 3) She has, per the first and second sections above, done more than any other living communication scholar to build an audience for communication scholarship in other disciplines.
- 4) Through her election to honorary societies such as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (AAAS), the American Philosophical Society (APS), and the American Academy of Political and Social Science (AAPSS), she represents the field in circles not previously inclined to offer admission to communication scholars.³

So how could my colleague have come to such a strange conclusion about Jamieson's drift away from rhetoric and communication? My suspicion is that it has to do with at least two things: (1) her attention to where campaign discourse has gone over the years in which she has been a productive scholar; and (2) her insistence on using the analytical methods most appropriate to new forms of discourse. In the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* in 1999, Jamieson lamented the decline of genuinely deliberative discourse in political campaigns, with spots and the logic of the sound bite substituting for evidence, argument and speeches themselves.

³ Manuel Castells and Geoffrey Cowan are the only Communication scholars to join her in the AAPSS. Unless one was to count Gary Wills, she is alone among current members of the APS; Wills joins her on the AAAS list as well.

The speech is not the only victim of contemporary politics. With it has gone its integral element: argument. The notion that the end of rhetoric is judgment presupposes that rhetoric consists of argument—statement and proof. Morselized ads and news bites consist of statement alone, a move that invites us to judge the merit of the claim on the *ethos* of the speaker or the emotional appeals (*pathos*)—enwrapping the claim. In the process, appeal to reason (*logos*) one of Aristotle’s prime means of persuasion—is lost. With it goes some of the audience’s ability to judge. (p. 336)

The rhetorician has not deserted speech; speech has deserted the rhetorician, and the scholar of contemporary campaign communication uses the best tools at her disposal to understand what has taken its place.

Research Platforms

Elsewhere in this volume are extensive treatments of the National Annenberg Election Survey (Kenski) and Factcheck.org (Brydon). Both are research platforms, albeit quite different from one another and targeted toward different audiences and purposes. Factcheck.org, which calls itself a “consumer advocate for voters” (www.factcheck.org/about), is routinely consulted by journalists and consumers of political news. The National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) is a longitudinal platform for scholarship on “political attitudes about candidates, issues, and the traits Americans want in a president. It also has a particular emphasis on the effects of media exposure through campaign commercials and news from radio, television and newspapers” (www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/ProjectDetails). The data in the NAES are not for lay people but for experts; usage requires a measure of technical skill not widely dispersed in the population. In this regard, the NAES is, though much younger, differently constructed and stewarded and is attentive to different issues, more similar to the General Social Survey (GSS) or the National Election Studies (NES) than to the polling conducted by organizations such as Quinnipiac, Harris, or even Pew. I will not recapitulate Brydon’s or Kenski’s deeper discussions here, but I want to make two points about both platforms and their importance vis-à-vis the development of political communication.

First, each advances political communication scholarship in its own way. Factcheck.org takes assertions seriously and weighs the evidence offered, if any, and the quality of the evidence that might have been brought to bear if not; the website is widely cited in the press and has many imitators (e.g., PolitFact.com and the *Washington Post’s* “Fact Checker,” etc.). The NAES fills in the many gaps in the NES and/or the GSS on the relationships among exposure to political messages, issue knowledge, and electoral preference, enabling scholars making use of NAES data sets to draw much more robust conclusions about the effects of political messaging. In this way,

audiences central to the growth and development of political communication—voters and the journalists who sometimes shape their understanding of political fair play, and scholars looking for hard evidence of communication effects—get platforms tailored very specifically to their expectations and needs.

Second, these are tools that, though founded by Jamieson and her colleagues, produce benefits for their audiences even when Jamieson herself is not involved in the analysis. This is particularly important in the case of the NAES. The NES is administered by political scientists, the GSS by sociologists. Anyone can make use of these complicated data sets for their own research purposes without the direct involvement of those who initially vetted and placed the questions, allowing multiple scholars to use the same data to different ends. The NAES is the first such data set created by political communication scholars, attentive to the kinds of questions that scholars who value communication are inclined to ask. Given the importance of research rooted in large secondary data sets for scholars in political science and social psychology, it is hard to overstate the importance of the NAES in leveling the playing field with respect to the research bases that earn respect from the editors of interdisciplinary and even disciplinary journals in the social sciences.

A key indication of a field's maturity is its capacity to develop and sustain sources of data that are not specific to single research efforts. The NAES is the first such endeavor from political communication. As such, it represents the conviction that the field's insights derive not only from the idiosyncratic insights of its scholars but can be supported for appropriate questions from data gathered generally and analyzed by separate research teams. It is also a challenge to communication scholars to think big and join in the kind of scholarly data projects that animate a great deal of research in the other social sciences.

Conclusion

Political communication would have had to invent someone—or more likely, a sizeable platoon of someones—to do the things that Kathleen Hall Jamieson has done had she not been on hand herself to advance the field. We focus, quite rightly, on the brilliance of her scholarship and her impact as a teacher and mentor, but we should not forget her steady contributions in creating the assumptions, the venues, the professional networks, the media presence, and the data sets that in many respects give political communication its identity. There are many, many scholars whose insights are central to the disciplines they represent, fewer who create tools that resonate beyond their own work and sustain the efforts of others, and a tiny minority who touch both of those bases while bringing the fruits of exacting scholarship to a wider audience of informed readers. Jamieson is in that last

category, and there is no one working in this field today that does not owe her an enormous debt of gratitude for her brilliance, her energy, and the selfless breadth of her vision.

References

- Barber, J. D. (1980). *The pulse of politics: Electing presidents in the media age*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Bitzer, L., & Rueter, T. (1980). *Carter versus Ford: The counterfeit debates of 1976*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cappella, J., & Jamieson, K. (1996). Bridging the disciplinary divide. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29, 13–17.
- Cappella, J., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Denton, R. E. (1982). *The symbolic dimensions of the American presidency: Description and analysis*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Edelman, M. (1964). *The symbolic uses of politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Edelman, M. (1971). *Politics as symbolic action: Mass arousal and quiescence*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Edelman, M. (1977). *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Holsti, O. R., Farley, D. J., & Fagen, R. R. (1967). *Enemies in politics*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Holsti, O. R., et al. (1969). *The analysis of communication content: Development in scientific theories and computer techniques*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1984). *Packaging the presidency*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1988). *Eloquence in an electronic age*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction and democracy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1993). Discourse and the democratic ideal. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 137, 332–338.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (2000). *Everything you think you know about politics...and why you're wrong*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Birdsell, D. S. (1988). *Presidential debates: The challenge of creating an informed electorate*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Cappella, J. (2008). *Echo chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the conservative media establishment*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The press effect: Politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1970). *The logic of images in international relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnston, R., Hagen, M. G., & Jamieson, K. H. (2004). *The 2000 presidential election and the foundation of party politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. In Kelman, H.C., ed., *Studies on attitudes and communication, Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 51–60.

- Kenski, K., Hardy, B. W., & Jamieson, K. H. (2010). *The Obama victory: How media, money, and message shaped the 2008 election*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nimmo, D. D. (1980). *Subliminal politics: Myths and mythmakers in America*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Nimmo, D. D., & Sanders, K. R. (1981). *The handbook of political communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pennebaker, D. A., & Hegedus, C. (Directors.) (1993). *The war room* [motion picture]. US: Pennebaker Associates.
- Romer, D., et al. (2006). *Capturing campaign dynamics 2000 and 2004: The national Annenberg election survey*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sabato, L. (1983). *The rise of political consultants: New ways of winning elections*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rhetoric, H.R.H., And Me: Difference Without Disagreement

Roderick P. Hart, University of Texas at Austin

What a preposterous task: say something sentient about Kathleen Hall Jamieson, make it flattering but not hagiographic, acknowledge your personal relationship but maintain your scholarly distance, make it worthy of intellectual consumption, and do so in 4,000 words. When first reflecting on my charge, I soon realized that the essay requested of me here is what Professors Jamieson and Campbell (1982) would call a “generic hybrid”—part honorific, part expostulation, part gossip. Ah, gossip. I’ll start with that.

I met Her Royal Highness in an elevator. She was wearing black. She introduced herself to me, not the other way around, she being an open-hearted Midwesterner and me being a reserved New Englander. She said she liked my work. My work! There wasn’t much of it at the time, but I had published an essay on genre (Hart, 1971) and had just read her own lovely essay on that same topic (Jamieson, 1973). I mumbled something flattering to her, the elevator door opened, and she whisked herself across the convention floor.

Thus was born a relationship. Kathleen is not my only friend, but I once dedicated a book to her, calling her “my first, best critic.” As anyone with half a brain knows, Kathleen Hall Jamieson is one hell of a critic—omniscient about textual details, precise in her interpretations, scandalously direct when rendering judgment. She was, I am told, a brilliant college debater, and she still gives evidence of that affliction. No stray fact, no unhinged implication, escapes her steely mien. Her synapses fire at full force whether she’s critiquing a lazy argument or a sorry brand of mint tea.

Everyone, it seems, knows Kathleen’s qualities: a brilliant scholar, a fine university administrator, a spellbinding teacher. I admire each of these traits, but I like these things even more: (1) she is one of the funniest people I know; (2) she is instinctively fair-minded; (3) she has mentored scores of young scholars; (4) she possesses every skill taught by Young Homemakers of America; (5) she is generous to family and friends alike; (6) she is vigilantly non-partisan; (7) she understands rhetoric and practices it well; (8) she is a colleague’s colleague; (9) she occasionally practices forbearance; and (10) she is one of the funniest people I know.

It is customary in publications like this to provide an overview of the honoree’s publications, to assess their unique intellectual contributions, and to position them definitively in the field’s evolution. But that sounds too eulogistic to me. Kathleen is still young, at least as judged by me (who is one year her senior). Besides, there are persons better equipped than me to place history’s diadem atop her silken locks.

I’d much rather discuss our differences, for they have fueled our relationship even though we rarely disagree about things. Our differences

seem evident to me although others might see them as nonexistent; after all, we have each authored a bunch of books, taught school and held deanships, prowled about in the political communication arena, pursued both humanistic and social scientific inquiries, and won some awards when the award committees deadlocked.

Kathleen and I have never published together (she contends it's because I'm too ornery, which is to say, I'm too male), but we once taught together, a memorable experience to be sure. The poor darlings who spent the semester with us—doctoral students at the University of Texas—seem not to have forgotten that event and were no doubt scarred for life. In the beginning of the course, they report, it seemed like “Mom and Dad fighting.” That soon faded once we established the ground rules for the seminar—I would be the adult and Kathleen would be the obnoxiously precocious child. Once our students got past their instructors' peculiarities, they witnessed two scholars approaching the same intellectual task and learning from one another. As the semester moved along, Kathleen and I would—conspiratorially—take the same text apart in class, and we never failed to find something different. Such differences of opinion, says Mark Twain, make horse races.

But how could differences exist between two similarly aged, similarly trained, similarly socialized people, people who suffered through 12-to-16 years of Catholic education, who read many of the same books, who each had but one spouse and two kids, and who voted for all of the same presidential candidates since 1968? If there are differences between us, could they be significant? If significant, could they be heuristic? I believe they are all of these things and that they admit to five binaries:

Ontology vs. Phenomenology

An interesting session was held at a recent meeting of the Rhetoric Society of America dealing with critical genealogies, how “schools of thought” are passed down through the ages. So, for example, participants at the conference noted how New Criticism led to post-structuralism and then to New Historicism and later to cultural studies. These progressions affected not only what was deemed worthy of study but inevitably, how one studied it. When discussing such matters over dinner, Kathleen and I noted the differences in our dissertation committees, hers consisting of three rhetorical scholars and two humanists, mine consisting of two rhetoricians and three social scientists. Kathleen minored in philosophy during her graduate work and I in sociology.

So what? So Kathleen is instinctively intrigued by the ground-of-being underlying a rhetor's worldview—in his or her first assumptions, how they search for evidence in the warrants undergirding their assertions. Given these proclivities, nobody tracks an argument better than Kathleen Hall

Jamieson. Nobody better detects an abandoned premise or a faulty bridge between data and claim. And nobody performs such feats quicker than she.

Rhetoric is more than claim-making, however. It is not only a thing produced but also a thing consumed. And it is consumed by eminently odd creatures like you and me. When taking in rhetoric each day, we bring to bear our hopes and fears, our aspirations and preternatural biases. So, while Kathleen tends to feature rhetorical stimuli, I am more interested in the reconstructive work performed by audiences. I am interested in the listening experience, in how people re-make the rhetoric served up to them. I detail such processes in *Seducing America*, a book describing the feeling states created by televised politics (Hart, 1994b). As I remember it, Kathleen liked this book, but it is not one she would have written.

Because she does not focus on audiences, per se, Kathleen would find it banal that Newt Gingrich wept in public in December of 2011 when discussing his bipolar mother. “What did such a performance have to do with the war in Afghanistan or with sub-prime interest rates?” she would thunder. “Why don’t politicians stick to the serious business of governance and avoid the gratuitous-cum-maudlin?” “And how can one possibly assess the quality of someone’s tears via FactCheck.org?”

Good questions. In response, I would note that Newt’s effusions made national headlines and that that means something. But what? Why did newspaper readers attend to Newt’s lamentations? What ancient needs did it fulfill? Why hasn’t modernism driven such antediluvian instincts out of people? In an age of logos, why does pathos still abide?

Of all the fine works Kathleen has produced, I most admire *Eloquence in an Electronic Age*, a volume that tracks the “feminine style” in contemporary (male) rhetoric, a rhetoric superintended by television’s serial intimacies (Jamieson, 1990). While not a thorough-going phenomenology, the book pays ample attention to the oddly irrational aspects of contemporary rhetoric and does so brilliantly. And all of this from She-of-the-Left-Brain. How perfectly wonderful.

Impulse vs. Method

Although we have never discussed the matter directly, I believe that Kathleen is a critic-by-reflex, one who tears apart a text knowingly upon first encountering it but without a pre-established *modus operandus*. Her “method,” such as it is, is guided by memory (she never forgets an assertion once made, never forgets a fact pattern once established), a feeling for rhetorical architecture (she links diverse claims quickly and easily), and boldness (she is preeminently willing to follow the trajectory of a rhetor’s argument to its obvious—sometimes ludicrous—conclusion). When Kathleen Hall Jamieson approaches a text, the text quivers.

As a result, each of Kathleen's essays has its own distinctive take on the world. As a critic-historian, Kathleen moves with the moment, with the twists and turns of contemporary politics. Her books are often "period pieces" which, because of their intelligence, speak to larger moments in time. So, for example, *Dirty Politics* (Jamieson, 1992) was inspired by the 1988 presidential election, *Spiral of Cynicism* (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997) by the 1996 campaign, and *The Obama Victory* (Kenski, Hardy & Jamieson, 2010) by the 2008 election. In addition to being a discerning critic, Kathleen is an historian who looks through popular media coverage to discover the politics behind the politics.

I, in contrast, am more methodologist than commentator, more theorist than critic. One of my long-standing goals has been to find tools meeting the demands of replicability and validity. As such, I have wandered across the temporal landscape and then back again. So, for example, my book, *Modern Rhetorical Criticism* (Hart & Daughton, 2005), lays out a bevy of critical questions that can be asked consistently and probatively across textual domains. In addition, I have constructed a tool, the DICTION program (www.dictionsoftware.com) that tracks language choices to discover rhetorical forces present-but-unnoticed. Some traditional critics regard my use of such a tool as heretical, but Kathleen has treated my profanations with a benign smile.

If Kathleen is a critic-historian, then, I am more a critic-scientist, a frankensteinian version of my doctoral advisor, Carroll Arnold (1974), who was himself a technician-of-the-text, a fact amply on display in *Criticism of Oral Rhetoric*. I push the matter further, however, by assuming that all critics are mathematicians, scholars concerned with textual proportions whether they know it or not. So, for example, when a critic praises a work—"the finest address Churchill ever gave"—he or she is trading on barely suppressed notions of normativity and morphology. While the critic-historian works *in situ*, the critic-scientist works trans-temporally. Although they start with different assumptions, both sets of critics have much to learn from one another.

Pattern vs. Variation

Both Kathleen and I did doctoral dissertations on rhetorical genre, which is how we found one another. The book she wrote with Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Deeds Done in Words*, is an ambitious romp across presidential discourse in search of rhetorical phenomena that go together often enough as to constitute a theme (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). Presidential inaugurals, campaign debates, ceremonial addresses—all come under their microscope and a series of generalizations emerge.

Kathleen's sense for rhetorical form makes her an astute critic, but it is her taste for synecdoche that makes her devastating. Nobody—nobody—

argues from example better than she. She has an ear for the rhetorical gaffe, for the animadversion that sinks a political ship, instinctively contrasting the argument-gone-awry with the way things ought to be. In doing so, she attends to what linguists call the “emic units” of language, features standing out against a given cultural backdrop. In Kathleen’s hands, examples are weapons.

Individual texts do not bore me, but they do make me sleepy. My wont is to focus on patterns, not deviations. As I see it, the critic-scientist is an anthropologist of discourse, a collector of details but one focused on regularities. For such a scholar, the divergent text, the historically situated text, is interesting not because of its peculiarities but because it sheds light on *patterns not present*. The brilliant text is important not for its own sake but because it reveals a regularity defied.

Accordingly, I have spent considerable time with very large datasets, tens of thousands of them, in books such as *Campaign Talk* (Hart, 2000) and, more recently, *Political Tone* (Hart, Childers, & Lind, 2013). By tracing language recurrences, I have been able to ask truly basic questions: How do politicians differ from reporters? Republicans from Democrats? Governors from senators? Campaigners from policy-makers? Today’s texts from yesterday’s? Such large-scale studies do not produce more truth than traditional criticism, just a different kind of truth. After all, once such data are gathered, the critic-scientist must still turn numbers into meanings and honor the fact-territory of the discourse under study.

Answers vs. Questions

Over the years, Kathleen has associated herself with creatures of all kinds, survey researchers included. Perhaps, because she has such an empirical cast of mind, she believes that answers can be found to really knotty problems. One of her more entertaining books, *Everything You Think You Know About Politics...And Why You’re Wrong* (Jamieson, 2000), calls into question much political folklore. *The Press Effect* (Jamieson & Waldman, 2003) details the fabrications underlying political news coverage, and *unSpun: Finding Facts in a World of Disinformation* (Jamieson & Jackson, 2007) lays out the half-truths and outright lies cascading upon us during the campaign season. If we could just get the *facts* right, Kathleen habitually argues, the world would be at peace.

In recent years, Kathleen has masterfully orchestrated the National Annenberg Election Studies (NAES), which use rolling cross-section polls to track political lifecycles. The NAES has been a boon to communication scholars because it contains a number of media-based questions, something that prior NSF-funded polls had largely ignored. Kathleen and her colleagues have been particularly deft in combining survey data with content analytic work to track cause-effect relationships in campaigns.

I greatly admire survey researchers, but I do not trust their data. Personally, I need to see ideas made manifest in language, which is why I became a rhetorical critic. For me, human discourse bodies-forth our attitudes and worldviews. Unless I can observe what Kenneth Burke has called the dancing of an attitude, it does not register for me.

Texts are data-in-the-wild. They emerge in natural settings, are produced by flesh-and-blood people, and often emerge unbidden by others. In contrast, no matter how carefully surveys are constructed, they represent an “intrusion” into people’s lives. That is, respondents will tell a surveyor what they think about gay marriage if asked to do so, but that is not to say: (1) that they had thought about the topic before; (2) that they care about such matters; or (3) that they are telling the researcher the truth. The rhetorical critic’s act-of-faith is quite different: If you want to know what people think, go to a bar and listen to them talk.

For me, texts prompt questions and that is their glory. In contrast to survey items, which remain lodged within a non-reproducible timeframe, texts are ever-fresh. They are reincarnated each time a critic brings a fresh question to them. Critics today inevitably learn something new about Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address when asking questions of that text that nineteenth-or twentieth-century critics had failed to ask. Rhetorical criticism is therefore hermeneutics at its most productive. It does not “contaminate” its data (like surveys and experiments) but proceeds by watching and waiting, looking for questions.

Criticism vs. Meta-Criticism

A great many people who know, or think they know, Kathleen Hall Jamieson do so because of her work as a public intellectual. With great regularity, Kathleen deconstructs the rhetoric of the day on PBS and NPR and sometimes on the national networks. When doing so, she makes the field proud, showing what happens when a razor-sharp intellect confronts political pandering. During such encounters, Kathleen’s thoughts are habitually fresh and devoid of cant.

Work of this sort is not without its detractors, of course, although such comments are often the products of jealousy. Few academics, after all, are as sharp or as witty as Kathleen nor do they bring to such tasks a lifetime of learning. Academic publishing, it is said, lets one conduct one’s education in public. Who has done so better, or more publicly, than Kathleen Hall Jamieson?

Although I have done a bit of public commentary, I don’t have Kathleen’s skill-set and hence find such encounters unsatisfying. Reporters’ questions rarely engage me, and their questions often sound like answers: “Don’t you feel, Professor Hart, that Mitt Romney bloviated during his economic speech in Detroit last evening?” To be sure, media personnel

sometimes ask wonderful questions. When they ask them of Kathleen Hall Jamieson, she makes them sound even better.

Kathleen is not especially introspective and therefore has written very little about her own critical processes. She is a practitioner, a doer, while I am more intrigued by the act of criticism itself. I have written some fairly pointed essays on these matters, taking to task those who make criticism too academic or not academic enough (Hart, 1976; Hart, 1986; Hart, 1994a; Hart, 1994c; Hart, 2010). Sometimes these essays have been solicited by others and sometimes not. Nevertheless, they reflect my preference for the library versus the klieg lights.

Conclusion

Your good editor requested this essay because she wanted to honor Kathleen and not because she wanted to know what I thought about the world. But scholarship is nothing if not dialectical, nothing if not dialogical. For these reasons, I have found it impossible to talk about Kathleen's work without talking about the "us" of our relationship. For 40 years now, Kathleen and I have hovered around one another—querying, sharing, bantering and, yes, teasing and taunting. At times our similarities have seemed so stark as to be boring; at other times, our differences have delightfully confused us. Ultimately though, I have found that to have an intellectual relationship with Kathleen Hall Jamieson is to learn from her constantly. To have a personal relationship with her is to be bathed in her generosity.

So, is it newsworthy that scholars have relationships? Probably not, but it is news not heralded often enough. True scholars—in relationship—learn to trust one another and to open themselves up to important questions. Kathleen Hall Jamieson has done that for me, but I am not alone. One of my current colleagues, Dr. Sharon Jarvis, became a college professor because she encountered Kathleen when Sharon was a college student in California. According to Sharon, she did not know in 1990 that it was possible for a woman to be both brilliant and humane, both an electrifying teacher and a deeply committed citizen. By watching Kathleen lecture for 75 minutes, Sharon became convinced of all that. Twenty-plus years later, Sharon Jarvis passes that legacy along to hundreds of young people each year, and I, delightedly, get to watch. So goes the widening gyre.

References

- Arnold, C. C. (1974). *Criticism of oral rhetoric*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cappella, J., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, R. P. (1971). The rhetoric of the true believer. *Communication Monographs*, 38, 249–261.
- Hart, R. P. (1976). Theory-building and rhetorical criticism. *Communication Studies*, 27, 70–77.
- Hart, R. P. (1986). Contemporary scholarship in public address: A research editorial. *Western Journal of Communication*, 50, 283–295.
- Hart, R. P. (1994a). Doing criticism my way: A reply to Darsey. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58, 308–312.
- Hart, R. P. (1994b). *Seducing America: How television charms the modern voter*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, R. P. (1994c). Wandering with rhetorical criticism. In Nothstine, W., Blair, C., & Copeland, G. (eds.), *Critical questions: Invention, creativity, and the criticism of discourse and the media*. New York, NY: St. Martins, pp. 71–81.
- Hart, R. P. (2000). *Campaign talk: Why elections are good for us*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hart, R. P. (2010). *The wondering imperative: Better criticism through science*. A paper presented at the National Communication Association Summer Conference on Teaching Rhetorical Criticism & Critical Inquiry, University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA.
- Hart, R. P., Childers, J. P., & Lind, C. E. (2013). *Political tone: How leaders talk and why*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hart, R. P., & Daughton, S. M. (2005). *Modern rhetorical criticism* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1973). Generic constraints and the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 6, 162–170.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Eloquence in an electronic age: The transformation of political speechmaking*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (2000). *Everything you think you know about politics...And why you're wrong*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Campbell, K. K. (1982). Rhetorical hybrids: Fusion of generic elements. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68, 146–157.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Jackson, B. (2007). *unSpun: Finding facts in a world of disinformation*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The press effect: Politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kenski, K., Hardy, B. W., & Jamieson, K. H. (2010). *The Obama victory: How media, money, and message shaped the 2008 election*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Teaching Rhetoric in the Commonwealth via the *Bill Moyers Journal*: Kathleen Hall Jamieson

Jane S. Sutton, The Pennsylvania State University, York

Andrew Cline (2012) blogs about teaching rhetoric and makes this comment on *The Rhetorica Network*. Anyone who teaches rhetoric at some point in his or her teaching career enters a conversation that goes something like this:

Q: What do you teach?

A: Rhetoric.

Long silence. Then...

Q: What's that?

Even longer silence.

This run-of-the-mill exchange is as ordinary as it is frustrating for academics encountering “friends” in everyday life. Now with Kathleen Hall Jamieson’s frequent appearances on the *Bill Moyers Journal*, there are useful ways to manage the silences. There is a familiar context—a television show—to go to; there are her responses to Moyers’ questions, which provide an opportunity to talk about rhetoric. Interestingly, she talks about rhetoric without using the word *rhetoric*. Except for one time, she talks around it. So Jamieson’s appearances on PBS coupled with her blogs (Kathleen Hall Jamieson Answers Your Questions, 2008) offer to the public as well as to the student some good insight into the role rhetoric plays in understanding political debates and deciphering political advertisements and campaigns. Through these lessons, Jamieson, in effect, continues to keep rhetoric right in the middle of democracy.

Jamieson has appeared on the *Journal* for almost two decades. I limit my essay to nine of her guest appearances, occurring between December 2007 and October 2008. In this way, I am able to foreground how Jamieson talks *about* rhetoric in her conversations with Moyers. Specifically, I have identified two broad-based themes that comprise Moyers’ talk with Jamieson about political campaigns in general and the 2008 presidential election in particular. The themes are: (1) debate, and (2) women in politics. Connected to and beneath these visible themes are discussions about rhetoric, ancient and contemporary, such as *dissoi logoi*, or opposing views, deception, deliberation, choice/agency, enthymemes, presidential speeches, visual rhetoric, language/figuration, feminisms, and rhetoric. As I mentioned earlier, the word *rhetoric* is rarely used; however, when Jamieson does employ the word, she does so purposefully. Through their conversations, Moyers and Jamieson offer many web-based examples that illustrate rhetoric (most of which are cited in the transcripts). A second aim of this essay is, therefore, to show how many of the web-based examples can be used in the classroom to

talk about rhetoric's principles, concepts, or ideas. I close this essay with a miscellaneous list of my favorites for the classroom.

Let's begin with Bill Moyers: "With me is long-time colleague whom you've seen frequently on my broadcast during political years since 1992. Kathleen Hall Jamieson is a professor at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania...Welcome to the JOURNAL" (December 7, 2007).

On the *Journal*, October 10, 2008, Moyers asked Jamieson, "When you watch politics as a scholar, did anything this week go beyond the boundary of your sense of propriety and offend you personally as a voter, as a citizen, as an American?"

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: "What I respond to more than the attacks and the counterattacks about who knew whom, where, and why are those statements that are fundamentally deceptive about something that matters when you cast your vote."

Referring to an Obama ad about McCain's position on Social Security and then referring to a McCain ad about what Obama says about troops in Afghanistan, Jamieson parses each side. Each side—Republican and Democratic—is viewed in terms of what it means for an ad to be fundamentally deceptive. As she does so, the idea of rhetoric comes into play. Insisting that any problem must be approached from two opposing sides, Jamieson performs the founding idea of rhetoric as a *dissoi logoi*. To say any problem must be approached from two opposing sides may sound trite. However, this idea is precisely where Jamieson digs in. Specifically, she argues that there is a need to have exposure to places "that give you both sides" so the audience can hear when their side is wrong and when the other side is wrong. A website devoted to putting Republican ads about, for example, social security next to a Democratic ad about the same subject would hearken to the crucial relation between rhetoric and democratic deliberation. It would soften (but not solve) the problem of deception, insofar as having both sides is the condition for effective governance.

Bill Moyer: I heard you say the other day that what we need is heroic rhetoric. Now what do you mean by that?

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: I was hoping that in this past week when Senator Obama had purchased the amount of time that made it possible to be on seven different networks...to speak to more than 25 million people, that he would also pay for a half hour for Senator McCain and say to the American people, "He can't afford it. I can. And I'm going to give some of the money that you gave me over...so that he has a chance to tell you how he sees the future of governing and what he will do and how it will differ from what I will do. And then I'm gonna tell you the same thing from my point of view." (October 31, 2008)

Jamieson's heroic rhetoric hearkens to the principle of rhetoric as the distinct art devoted to guaranteeing that both sides are seen and heard

alongside the other. As a form of *dissoi logoi*, heroic rhetoric lets the viewer “try on th[e] presidency...” of each candidate. Heroic rhetoric, therefore, is less about giving money away (although this is almost unimaginable) to an opposing candidate than it is about supporting the “free” exchange of ideas. Supporting the “free” exchange of ideas is not just a central aspect of democracy that is all too often a mindless mantra but rather it distinguishes her vision of a heroic rhetoric. Such rhetoric is meant to draw attention to the extreme need for facts and perspectives on what candidates say. In this manner, Jamieson tells Moyers that political debates should not be thought of in terms of winners and losers; rather debate is “about [hearing] each other’s policy positions [as they] will relate to governance” (October 10, 2008).

The phrase—heroic rhetoric—stands out for two reasons. First, it is the only time during her regular appearances over ten months that she uses the word *rhetoric*. Second, heroic rhetoric is a strategy for Jamieson to move the question of attack and counterattack ads to a larger context of rhetoric conceived in terms of argumentation, choice, and decision making. The fact that the other side’s view can be overshadowed and diminished causes even more trouble; specifically, it causes problems related to deception. The trouble with attack and counterattack ads in each case is how they may lead the viewer to “draw a bad inference.” This in turn takes away or bends the viewers’ capacity to use reason and make an evaluation. She gives several examples such as “The Daisy” ad from the 1964 campaign and shows how its casual inferences work through guilt by association and argument by visual juxtaposition. In other words, if a viewer looks at an “attack” ad and takes “it at face value... [he or she] could be led to believe something that is untrue.” So when people watch debates, as they do and they learn from them, the question is, as Jamieson puts it, “is it accurate learning?” (October 3, 2008). By implication, her question is: How can rhetoric enable citizenry to decipher political arguments during a debate?

To continue the theme of debate, I turn to the way in which Moyers engages Jamieson in a discussion about the debates between vice presidential candidates Senator Joe Biden and Governor Sarah Palin (October 3, 2008).

Bill Moyers: One critic I read this morning said that this debate was not won and lost on what was said, but on how it was said. That on nonverbal communication, Sarah Palin won. You know, she walks in, blows a kiss to the audience, says to Biden, “I’m so pleased to meet you. Can I call you Joe?”... Then he asks, “When do you get credible data that enables you as a scholar to say, ‘This event last night had this impact on this campaign and on the election?’”

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: It takes days. And the problem with last night for me...is there’s no way to win or lose 90 minutes of discourse...You can win a chess game. You can win a football game. You can’t win 90 minutes of discourse.

Once again, Jamieson offers the view that debate should be approached in terms of learning “about the similarities and differences on issue positions.” After 90 minutes of debate, the idea of a winner and loser doesn’t make sense and, in fact, “demeans” the experience of democratic debate. She says:

And you saw [a] network that was asking to call in to vote to see who won and lost. It was FOX, so you’re not surprised to hear that Palin won. You have the most illegitimate form of evidence gathering you can have taking place. Because you now have a poll of the people who are disposed to watch that channel, voting, with the other side presumably trying to run their own numbers as well (October 3, 2008).

In effect, she points out, but again without using the word *rhetoric*, that rhetoric is the mainstay of democratic deliberation, and this critical aspect is lost as soon as choice is taken away from the viewer. How so? “Essentially measurement devices” substitute for the active process of making a decision. The “peoples” choice of a “winning” candidate is displayed on the little screen—TV, PC, Smartphone. The danger of a measurement device is that it can be used to answer a viewer’s question. So the would-be viewer asks, “Hmm, I wonder how well candidate “X” answered the question on social security?” The answer, if you will, is on the screen, but it only displays *who* won the answer to the question. It says nothing about the meaning of the candidate’s answer.

There are other problems with a meter reader because it stages a person, as opposed to character or ethos. Character turns on qualities, such as temperament and disposition. It asks “whether or not [a candidate is] going to be judicious about—the exercise of power in the White House” (February 1, 2008). By inserting the person, not the substantive claims, inside the framework of measuring devices—i.e., meters on the screen—something else makes it possible for a candidate to be crowned a winner or a loser. What is this something else? What is the foundation for the win or the loss? Again, it is the voiceless click of a meter reading a viewer’s personal tastes. Many viewers clicked “winner” when Palin (read person, not character and not argument) blew a kiss because they “like that sort of thing [a woman blowing a kiss], that’s just the sort of thing they like.” Deciphering character (as opposed to featuring a person blowing a kiss) enables viewers to forecast a candidate’s governance. Rational decision-making is obviously compromised when a person and not his or her claims are put in the foreground. According to Jamieson, “words do matter. In general, the words of a candidate [character] do forecast governance” (October 3, 2008).

In terms of rhetoric, Jamieson wants not a meter but:

a discussion of where they [vice president candidates] showed similarities, where they showed differences. And where in the big picture, they deceived the public about what they would do, or what they had said,

or...where they were communicating something that was relevant to governance and where they weren't. (October 3, 2008)

The conversation goes like this:

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: We also have in that...debate [McCain and Obama] a statement by Senator McCain that invited an immediate follow-up by Tom Brokaw, and it didn't occur. Senator McCain in that debate told us that future beneficiaries of Social Security would not get the same benefits as the current beneficiaries."

Bill Moyers: I thought that was the moment that illuminated the possibility of a real debate.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: "And at that moment we should have stopped the debate, and we should have said, "All right, let's look at—" because there is a question on the table about..."

Jamieson advocates that substance and policy debates be placed in a rhetorical framework that not only refuses to announce winners or losers but also seeks a discussion of where they stand, again where they show similarities and where they show differences. In this vein, rhetoric seems to be a force that would resist turning the sight of a debate into something seen only through a measurement device because rhetorical "devices" would replace the devices of meters, and thus, viewers would have to do their own critical and evaluative work.

There is more at stake if debates remain in the frame of winners and losers. Winning a debate enacts nothing less than a hunger game, a fight to the death. As Jamieson tells Moyer on January 11, 2008:

...the death metaphors in this last week have—they've been astonishing...there was a headline...that said "Death Match." And it was Romney versus McCain. And then a person says—on MSNBC, "For her [Hillary Clinton] to beat Barack Obama, she'd have to tear his head off." Well, if you tear someone's head off, you kill them.

Opposed to the idea that a debater has to knock someone out or kill someone to win is something like rhetoric. At the very least, tearing someone's head off or announcing a death match connotes a kind of violence that positions us (the viewers) outside of rhetoric. When debate is situated within rhetoric's purview, the art displaces what is increasingly framed as "more violent means of settling disagreements;" yes, rhetoric is combative, but according to Jamieson, the "contact and combat [move] into the arena in which the combat is of ideas" (October 10, 2008).

So far, I have schematized several conversations around the debate theme. I explained how Jamieson implicitly engages the subject of rhetoric through the problems of deception, attack and counterattack ads, and person/character. Concerned with rational inference, she presses the urgency of presenting both sides of issues, even if it means giving money, heroically

speaking, to an opponent for the sake of presenting opposing arguments. She draws attention to the use of metaphors, especially those related to the kill, including the idea that a debate means bashing character. In each case, Jamison always calls upon the resources of rhetoric to reconfigure debate. The most poignant way that Jamieson points to this reconfiguration of debate is when the concept of rhetoric converges with the young voter. To bring this sense of rhetoric to the foreground, I need to leave the *Journal* for a moment and tell a brief story about the beginning of rhetoric. Because I think this story encapsulates Jamieson's take on the emergent voter as the embodiment of a nascent rhetoric.

A myth attributed to the sophist Protagoras tells a story of rhetoric. It is a gift sent from the gods (Sprague, 1972). Many are familiar with the idea that the gods gave gifts to humanity. For example, fire is a gift from the Greek god, Prometheus. Rhetoric also is a gift of a Greek god—Zeus. The story goes something like this: The people—*demos*—were living like wild beasts. They were scattered, meaning they lacked a common direction or way to create consensus. They couldn't talk to one another without getting into it. They used violence to settle their differences. For Zeus, the people's violence was wrecking his idea of civilization and of people living peacefully. So he asked one of his lackeys—the god Hermes, aka Mercury—to distribute rhetoric among the people. This gift enabled the people—*demos*—to settle their differences by means of talk rather than violence. How should we distribute this art, Hermes asked Zeus? Should we give rhetoric—the power to speak—to a few? Zeus thought for a moment. Give rhetoric to everyone, Zeus said, and distribute its power equally. The distribution of rhetoric to the people is how some say democracy was born.

This sense of rhetoric, I think it is fair to say, informs Jamieson's views on debate. The idea of rhetoric—as gift—really comes alive, on June 6, 2008, when Moyers and Jamieson talked about how the youth are entering politics. She said, "...there are times [war, economic anxiety, etc.]..." when the youth are more likely to vote. "I think the young are waiting for a candidate who could harness their aspirations for a different kind of future." For Jamieson, youth participation is the condition for the "invention" of rhetoric (again) because young voters implicate their agency by taking part in democratic deliberation. She observes this of what is happening, "If you actually create agents of change then their (individuals') obligation is not simply to participate [in] politics every four years, or every two years, but to create a different kind of community." The phrase—"a different kind of community"—hearkens to rhetoric as the force that brings people together to talk and discuss matters that matter to them. Jamieson says, "And if the young start to vote, look what happens...Now you have a group that's at the table thinking in the long term." The notion that rhetoric is waiting in the wings with the young voter willing and able to engage the other at the table,

the quintessential site of decision-making, echoes her vision of giving voice to the other side and of “free” exchange in heroic rhetoric.

With the young voter, the conversation between Jamieson and Moyers (December 7, 2007) shifts to the topic of new media affecting politics. I use the topic of new media to explain how Jamieson sees it as invigorating the prospect of vigorous productive debate. Then I’m going to use new media as a transitional device. While new media can invigorate debate with rhetorical resources, it has a dark side. New media’s dark sides are most evident in the discussion of gender and politics, and this leads to my second theme—women and politics.

Bill Moyers: You’ve been looking this year at how the new media, the Internet, the blogs, the Web—YouTube, MySpace, Facebook—have been affecting politics. What have you found so far?

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: Well, first, there’s more information than there ever has been.

With access to technology, a voter, she goes on to say, can locate “candidates’ issue positions, contrast them to other positions, search news interviews with the candidates where they’re held accountable for discrepancies between past and current positions.”

In terms of debate, new media offer a chance to interrupt the debates, if you will. Although she never says so, Jamieson indicates that new media may be the antidote to meter readers set on television screens during live debates. How can new media interrupt a debate? It does not happen in real time but rather in virtual time. So a viewer listens to a debate and then a viewer can go to new media to find/check the facts on either side. Jamieson features her favorite example which is ‘You Choose within YouTube.’ She tells Moyer that you “find the candidate’s logo, names, and issues that you want to match them on. You get an exposition of issue positions and you can find out where they stand with specifics.” She gives a demonstration and picks three candidates—Mitt Romney, Barack Obama, and Mike Huckabee—and selects an issue position.

There is another side to new media. Exposing its dark side, Jamieson is quick to point out how new media make it possible to publicize misogyny in a way that old media could not or would not. The conversation about new media centers on women in politics. The Internet, the blogs, the Web—yes even YouTube—is where women in politics and Hillary Clinton in particular are demonized.

Bill Moyers: Let me show our audience some of those attacks...Here are some of the entries from Facebook...“Hillary can’t handle one man; how can she handle 150 million of them?” “Send her back to the kitchen to get a sandwich.” “She belongs back with the dishes, not upfront with the leaders.” It goes on and on like that.

To explain this phenomenon, Jamieson moves the discussion of new media from debate to language. Drawing from her book *Beyond the Double Bind: Women in Leadership* (Jamieson, 1995), she says, “Underlying this is a long-lived fear of women in politics. For example, we know that there’s language to condemn female speech that doesn’t exist for male speech. We call women’s speech shrill and strident...” They discuss the question put to McCain, ‘How do we beat the bitch?’ Jamieson asks rhetorically, “How would you ask a comparable question about a male candidate you really wanted to defeat? Where would you find comparable language to use?”

Bill Moyers: And where would you? There is no language of degeneration like this [word *bitch*] that describes men, is there?

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: Well, you could say, “How are we going to beat the bastard?” But it wouldn’t carry all the same resonance of that word in the context of its use now.

Returning to dark side of the media, new media sites that proclaim that Hillary can’t be the first female president because she is really a man (and visualizes her with testicles) is an assumption about women in power appropriated by new media. Again, Jamison returns to her basic stance about debate. Visual vilifications of a woman seeking the presidency must warrant a discussion. She says, “When something like this happens [calling Hillary a bitch or showing her having testicles] and we don’t have the discussion, we move it in to acceptable use.” She suggests that boundaries have to be created so that a different kind of discourse can emerge.

Ultimately, Jamieson approaches visual vilification as a question of language and of frames. In a conversation, she explains that “[l]anguage does our thinking for us...If this [economy] is described as a taxpayer bailout of Wall Street, it’s not popular. If it’s described as a taxpayer investing in the well-being of the economy, it’s far more a positive” (October 3, 2008). She extends the sense that framing matters from gender concerns to economic ones. She describes Warren Buffet’s use of language to depict the American economy. Buffet refers to the problem in terms of an “economic Pearl Harbor;” he also says it is “a great athlete that’s having a cardiac arrest.” Either way, the frame creates exigence for different responses: go to war or revive the economy.

I return to December 7, 2007 to listen to her examples of women in politics vis-à-vis framing.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: Something pernicious happened last night in press commentary. The commentators on each of the networks that were covering live—so the major cable networks—managed to say at, at least one point, that two-thirds of the Democratic voters had rejected Hillary Clinton...Nothing in the polling data tells you that anyone rejected Hillary Clinton. But the press frame is an either-or frame, a zero sum frame game.

To work against zero-sum-frame game, Jamieson argues for making boundaries or frames, and in this way, the dark side of new media would have its day, so to speak. Negative posts on Facebook and elsewhere could be reframed and as such new media would be poised to maintain civility about women in politics.

Jamieson never refers to feminism and rhetoric as she discusses language and frames, but she is certainly pointing to her scholarship (e.g., *Beyond the Double Bind*) as well as numerous rich projects of critique and various attempts to come to terms with women in the history of rhetoric which begun earnestly in the 1990s. Two examples of this feminist critique stand out in her talk with Moyers.

There is the problem of proclaiming Victoria Woodhull or Hillary Clinton as the *first* female running for president. The same goes for race. It is problematic to claim that Obama is the first black man running for president. One of the drawbacks to this announcement is that the person risks not being viewed as “running to be our—the President of all of us” (June 6, 2008). Words like *first* must be carefully weighed before turning them into frames for a woman or a president.

There is the problem of connecting emotion to women. When Hillary Clinton shed a tear in New Hampshire—what has been dubbed ‘the moisty moment’—Jamieson pointed out, on January 11, 2008, a serious discrepancy between the credibility of male and female candidates that show emotion.

When Governor Romney becomes emotional talking about soldiers coming back from the war in Iraq in the context of having sons—when he gets emotional talking about his father, as he did Thursday of this week—when President Bush reports becoming emotional and you seem him being emotional in circumstances, when President Reagan, in one of the finest speeches of his presidency, recalls the boys of Pointe du Hoc and the men who took the cliffs and his voice is quivering...we don't say, “Is that real?” We accept it. Why is it that we raise the question about whether it's feigned with Hillary Clinton?

This view that women are emotional, and thus not fit for leadership, is an old story, and Jamieson's response to it illuminates this tradition and shows ways to reclaim emotion for all speakers. So women in politics, vis-à-vis the new media, must be attentive to frames, especially how they differ from frames surrounding men in similar circumstances, such as the display of tears.

Since I began this essay describing how the conversation between Moyers and Jamieson could be used to explain rhetoric or could be used to illustrate some basic principles of rhetorical discourse, I thought I would close by offering miscellaneous examples illustrating key rhetorical concepts. First, there is enthymeme. On February 29, 2008, she discusses a McCain ad in which the ad speaks for him.

The most powerful thing that can happen with any communication is that something emerges on your radar screen, and the audience draws in the rebuttal on its own. You never want to say, "I am the hero." You never want to say, "I underwent all of this." It sounds self-aggrandizing. You want someone else to say it. And you want the audience to fill it in on its own when the charge is raised. So someone else has to do this.

This timely example illustrates nicely for students how enthymemes function.

Second, there is the analysis of speeches and presidential words (e.g., January 4, 2008 and February 1, 2008). On February 1, 2008, she explores a sentence from one of George W. Bush's speeches. President Bush said, "Tehran is also developing ballistic missiles of increasing range and continues to develop its capacity to enrich uranium which could be used to develop a nuclear weapon." She asks the question that students repeatedly ask, "Why should we pay attention to [words in Bush's speech]." "Because," she says, "presidential words matter. Presidential power is real. And in times of war, a President's capacity to act is much less constrained than it is in other environments." Throughout her conversation with Moyers, she offers various ways to explore vital speeches from G.W. Bush to B. Obama.

Finally, I use a blog post to end this description of Pennsylvania educator and scholar, Kathleen Hall Jamieson:

Thank you Bill Moyers for having such a fine person help us interpret 'political speak' during this election season. Dr. Jamieson does such a superb job focusing on what is/may be behind the vocabulary used by candidates. I appreciate the opportunity to hear someone of her caliber. I so enjoy the program. (Mahalik, February 8, 2008)

References

- Cline, A. (2012, March 28). A defining moment [Web log message; *Media Rhetoric Journal*]. Retrieved from <http://rhetorica.net>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2007, December 7). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/12072008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, January 11). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/01112008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, February 1). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/02012008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, February 29). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/02292008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, June 6). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/06062008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, October 3). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/10032008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, October 10). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/10102008/transcript1.html>
- Bill Moyers Journal*. (2008, October 31). Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/10312008/transcript1.html>
- Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahalik, Susan (2008, February 8). Kathleen Hall Jamieson answers your questions [Web log message]. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/blog/2008/02/kathleen_hall_jamieson_answers.html
- Sprague, R. K. (Ed.). (1972). *The older sophists: A complete translation by several hands of the fragments in Die Fragmente Der Vorsokratiker edited by Diels-Kranz*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson on Political Advertising: Unspinning the Spin Doctors

Steven R. Brydon, California State University, Chico

On October 5, 2004, in a nationally televised vice-presidential debate, incumbent Dick Cheney plugged the Annenberg FactCheck website, co-founded by Kathleen Hall Jamieson, in an effort to undermine an attack on his tenure at Halliburton by his opponent, Senator John Edwards. Unfortunately for Mr. Cheney, he didn't get his facts quite right. Cheney claimed:

Well, the reason they keep mentioning Halliburton is because they're trying to throw up a smokescreen. They know the charges are false.

They know that if you go, for example, to factcheck.com [sic], an independent Web site sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania, you can get the specific details with respect to Halliburton. ("Transcript," 2004)

Of course, the domain is factcheck.org, not [.com](http://factcheck.com), which in the world of the internet makes a huge difference. In fact, "Cheney's mistake sends people (through one redirect) to a website run by George Soros, with the top-level caption 'Why we must not re-elect President Bush'" (Ogbuji, 2004).

Thanks to the vice president, for the first time millions of Americans learned of a groundbreaking effort, spearheaded by Jamieson, to inform the public about the truth of political advertising. Those who found the actual factcheck.org site learned that the domain wasn't all Cheney got wrong: "Cheney wrongly implied that FactCheck had defended his tenure as CEO of Halliburton Co., and the vice president even got our name wrong" (Factcheck.org, 2004).

The purpose of this essay is to describe the contributions of Kathleen Hall Jamieson to the development of journalistic fact checking in a political environment increasingly plagued by deceptive campaign messages. As the Elizabeth Ware Packard Professor of Communication at the Annenberg School for Communication, Jamieson has been widely recognized for her contributions to the field of communication. As the Director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania, her contributions have extended far beyond academe. As someone who has not worked with Dr. Jamieson, I come to this project from the perspective of an educator and citizen, who is appreciative of her work both to extend our understanding of the political communication process and improve the quality of campaign discourse in our democracy. With that perspective in mind, let me begin with what I take to be a turning point in Jamieson's thinking about political advertising—the presidential campaign of 1988.

The 1988 Presidential Campaign: Willie Horton, Tank Rides, and Boston Harbor

To understand the origins of FactCheck and the televised adwatches¹ that preceded it, one must look back to the election of 1988, a campaign in which the saturation level of so-called oppositional advertising reached a new high (Cappella & Jamieson, 1994). Ads attacking the Democratic nominee, Michael Dukakis, for furloughing prisoners (including the notorious Willie Horton), opposing a strong national defense, and allowing Boston Harbor to remain polluted helped then-Vice President George H. W. Bush erase a 17-point deficit in the polls to go on to become the 41st President of the United States (“What George Bush Won,” 1988). Jamieson (1996) termed 1988 “[t]he nastiest campaign in the history of television” (p. 465).

Unfortunately, the press devoted little attention to debunking the most deceptive of these ads. Jamieson (1992a) points out that less than two percent of lines in articles about ads in the major print news sources discussed their accuracy. Television news was hardly any better:

From September through election eve, 1988, NBC, ABC, and CBS evening news aired 155 broadcast ad images from the presidential campaign. During only 4 percent of that air time was the accuracy, fairness, legitimacy, or relevance to governance of the images being evaluated. (p. 144)

Jamieson has a long history of scholarly contributions to the study of political advertising. *Packaging the Presidency: A History and Criticism of Presidential Campaign Advertising* was published in three editions (Jamieson, 1984, 1992b, 1996). In that seminal work, Jamieson did for campaign advertising what scholars such as Marie Hochmuth Nichols had done for public address. Jamieson (1996) states, “This book was premised on the assumption that advertising provides an optic through which presidential campaigns can be productively viewed” (p. 518). Indeed, the book accomplished exactly that purpose.

Packaging the Presidency presented an extensive and comprehensive rhetorical study of presidential advertising in the television age, introduced by a chapter, “Broadside to Broadcasts,” reviewing advertising before the advent of television. From the first televised campaign ads in the 1952 election of Dwight Eisenhower to the three-way campaigns of George H. W. Bush, Ross Perot, and Bill Clinton in 1992, her thoughtful analysis shows the

¹ There is no consistency in how authors spell “adwatch.” Often it is spelled “ad watch” and sometimes “ad-watch.” I’ve chosen to use the spelling “adwatch,” except when quoting, because that is the spelling found on FactCheck.org (<http://www.factcheck.org/about/>) and in much of Jamieson’s own writing.

reader how candidates attempted to use television advertising to gain the highest office in the land—sometimes with great effect and at other times with embarrassing failures.

One of the major advances in this book is the blending of rhetorical and empirical methodologies. Through the use of focus groups and survey research, the analysis of late twentieth-century campaigns helps untangle one of the great questions all rhetorical critics face: Do the methods used by rhetors, be they speakers, debaters, or ad makers, actually make a difference? Determining whether or not the “Eisenhower Answers America” ads of the 1952 campaign contributed to his victory is speculative at best. After all, Eisenhower was a beloved general and was actually sought as the nominee by both political parties. On the other hand, the detailed examination of the election ads of 1988 combined with focus group research and polling data, helped answer the question: What is the relative contribution of structural factors and campaign messages to electoral outcomes? As Jamieson (1996) concludes, “In most elections, both play a role and in their commingled influence it is difficult to clearly identify the discrete effect of either. What 1988 contributed to our understanding of politics was evidence that campaign messages do matter” (p. 484).

Consider, for example, Jamieson’s analysis of the Bush ad called “Revolving Door.” Independent Political Action Committee ads had accused Dukakis of granting a weekend pass to convicted murderer Willie Horton, who brutally kidnapped a Maryland couple and raped the woman. In this context, Bush’s ad implied that this was a common result of Dukakis’s furlough policy. Yet Bush’s “Revolving Door” ad relied on a false inference, as Jamieson (1996) pointed out, “By carefully juxtaposing words and pictures, the ad invited the false inference that 268 first-degree murderers were furloughed by Dukakis to rape and kidnap” (p. 471). And how does she know that this false inference influenced voters? Here she tests her rhetorical analysis with focus group research: “Focus group members interpreted the ad to mean that in the past year 268 first-degree murderers had escaped and committed violent crimes, a false inference forged by allying the announcer’s words with the printed number” (p. 471). This finding is further bolstered by survey data:

An October Harris poll found that 60% of those surveyed remembered the ‘revolving door’ ad. From the time that the ad started to the time of the survey, the percentage reporting that Dukakis was ‘soft on crime’ rose from 52 to 63%. (Jamieson, 1996, p. 471)

This helps explain why, despite leading in the polls by double digits after the Democratic convention, Dukakis was running dead even with Bush by mid-September (Jamieson, 1996, p. 466). Jamieson’s analysis convincingly demonstrates the potential importance of campaign messages to electoral outcomes.

Were campaign ads governed by the same rules as product ads—where deceptive ads are removed and corrective advertising often mandated by the Federal Trade Commission—then deceptive political ads would be little more than a sideshow. Of course, given the First Amendment guarantees of free speech, there can be no requirement that political ads are truthful. Further, if deceptive ads are left unanswered, they often work as intended. As Jamieson (1996) pointed out in the first sentence of her introduction to the third edition of *Packaging the Presidency*: “Never before in a presidential campaign have televised ads sponsored by a major party lied so blatantly as in the campaign of 1988” (p. xix). Clearly the campaign of 1988 caused a shift in Jamieson’s thinking: “I concluded the first edition of this book with the assurance that the public had little to fear from distortions in TV and other ads. I was wrong” (p. xxi).

Although some television and print reporters attempted to criticize misleading ads in 1988, Cappella and Jamieson (1994) report that the result was often just the opposite of what was intended:

Focus group evidence from the 1988 campaign suggested that when a reporter tried to critique a controversial ad that had been aired full-screen in network news, audiences recalled the ad rather than the reporter’s words. (p. 343)

The prime example was Richard Threlkeld’s analysis of a Bush ad showing a list of weapons programs Dukakis supposedly opposed superimposed over the image of Dukakis riding around in a tank. Threlkeld paused the ad at key points and voiced objections to its factual claims, all the while showing the disputed claims frozen full screen for viewers to see. Unfortunately, seeing the claims was more memorable than Threlkeld’s critique:

Those focus group members who saw Threlkeld’s piece were better able than those who had not to recall the *ad’s* claims. They could remember that a reporter said some of the ad was false but could not recall what or why. (Jamieson, 1992a, p. 147)

Developing the Adwatch Grammar

In response to the deceptions of the 1988 campaign and the failure of news coverage to effectively expose them, Jamieson and her colleagues used the resources of the Annenberg School to investigate what could be done.

In fall 1991, Kathleen Hall Jamieson and a research team from the University of Pennsylvania’s Annenberg School worked with CNN to create a visual grammar for adwatches...In preliminary tests, focus groups responded in the expected direction to this visual grammar when it was applied to a controversial ad, the 1988 Bush tank ad directed at Michael Dukakis. (Cappella & Jamieson, 1994, p. 343)

This grammar was presented in an appendix to her 1992 book, *Dirty Politics*, and was distributed by videotape to academics and news professionals throughout the country (Albright, 1991). The tape was accompanied by a short pamphlet visually illustrating how to use grammar to do an effective adwatch (Jamieson, 1991).

The efforts to promote effective adwatches bore fruit in the 1992 campaign coverage. “In 1992, for the first time the advertising of a presidential campaign was ‘policed’ by both print and broadcast reporters. The most systematic and highest quality analysis was done by Brooks Jackson of CNN” (Jamieson, 1996, p. xxiv). Jackson, of course, would later go on to become co-founder with Jamieson of FactCheck.org. CNN was not alone; Cappella and Jamieson (1994) report, “In the 1992 general election campaign, CNN, ABC, NBC, and CBS each employed some version of the recommended adwatch format” (p. 344). The recommended format included “distancing, disclaiming, interruption, and adding print correctors” (p. 345). Particularly important were presenting the ad so that it was not seen full screen, interrupting the ad for the reporter’s corrective statements, and placing a visual cue on the screen over the ad, such as the words “misleading” or “false.”

The impact of the adwatches on the candidates’ campaigns was illustrated in the post-election debriefing held by the Annenberg School. For example, Harold Kaplan from the Bush campaign remarked:

I don’t remember these reality checks in ’88...Believe it or not, it was a terrible feeling when I used to open the *Times* and they’d take my commercial apart...or watch CNN and watch them take it apart. In fact my dad called me and asked me if I’m worried and were they going to come and get me. (Cogswell, 1992)

Kaplan added, “I think these reality checks made our commercials less effective. I think that instead of being an agenda, they became a target” (Cogswell, 1992).

Bush was particularly vulnerable to his ads being exposed as deceptive according to Clinton strategist Mandy Grunwald: “‘George Bush paid a price throughout [the 1992 campaign] because of what he did in 1988,’ notes Grunwald. Voters ‘expected the worst of him...Everytime [sic] he attacked in a questionable way...voters said, it’s Willie Horton all over again’” (Jamieson, 1996, p. 499). This vulnerability made Democrats quick to seize on any perceived inaccuracies in Bush’s ads, as illustrated by the example of the Clinton campaign’s response to the Bush “worker” ad that claimed Clinton would raise middle class taxes:

After unraveling the Republican computations, the Democratic strategists got on the phone to reporters to argue that the “worker” ad was seriously deceptive. Both the *Washington Post* and the *Wall Street Journal* policed the ad. For the Democratic strategists, the *Wall Street Journal*—whose editorial

pages are among the more conservative in the country—was a particularly valued source. Into the Democratic rebuttal ad went the conclusions of the adwatches. (Jamieson, 1996, p. 503)

Use of media statements critical of an opponent's ad in rebuttal advertising reflects an important indirect effect of adwatches. Since few people will see an adwatch compared to those who see the repeated airing of an offending ad, there needs to be a way to propagate the criticism beyond the original adwatch article or news segment. As Jamieson (1996) states:

The difficulty in relying on news to correct distortions in advertising is, of course, that comparatively few people consume news while many are exposed to ads. The impact of adwatches is not lost on consultants, however, who justifiably fear that their content will appear in opponent's ads. (p. 520)

Are Adwatches Counterproductive?

As with any innovation in communication, the adwatches were subjected to empirical tests of their effectiveness. Some researchers found reason to doubt their efficacy, suggesting that they might produce the opposite of their intended effect. Pfau and Loudon (1994) found a boomerang effect with some adwatches during the 1992 North Carolina campaign for governor. Ansolabehere and Iyengar (1995, 1996) conducted experiments using adwatch stories from the 1992 campaign. They concluded, "The ad-watch stories clearly backfired" (Ansolabehere & Iyengar, 1995, p. 139). Could it be that, even following the Annenberg recommendations, adwatches actually helped the candidate whose commercials were criticized? Perhaps, journalists served the public better by leaving political advertising alone—a disappointing finding for those seeking to elevate political discourse to allow citizens to make their judgments based on facts and sound inferences.

Jamieson and Cappella (1997) carefully analyzed the results of these studies and conducted their own experiment demonstrating that adwatches could have the intended effect if done according to the recommended format. With regard to Pfau and Loudon's study, Jamieson and Cappella (1997) first note that the experiment didn't follow the recommended format. Instead, "the visual modality of the ad watch runs from beginning to end in both the full-screen and boxed versions. Stopping the visual sequence is important to interrupt short-term memory processes, attentional inertia, and on-line interpretation by viewers" (p. 14). Second, they argue, "Because two exposures and two judgments are made, order effects must also be counterbalanced. There is no discussion of such effects" (p. 14). Finally, because the study compares ads for two candidates, criticisms of the ads needed to be balanced. If not, "then apparent boomerang effects from the ad watch may be nothing more than relative persuasion for candidate Hunt against candidate Gardner" (p. 15).

Similarly, they find that the Ansolabehere and Iyengar study is deficient because the content of the adwatches was not particularly critical of the ads. They explain the results as follows:

Ansolabehere and Iyengar's counterintuitive finding can be understood by focusing on the content of the particular ad watches employed. In each case, the ad watch *supported* the gist of the claims made in the ad, primarily offering small caveats and reservations. Unlike many ad watches, these did not accuse the ad makers of fundamental deceptions. (Jamieson & Cappella, 1997, p. 16)

In contrast to the preceding results, Cappella and Jamieson (1994) found significant effects from an adwatch critiquing a particularly inflammatory ad from Pat Buchanan in his 1992 primary challenge to George H. W. Bush, which alleged that the Bush administration had funded pornographic art. Although the adwatch did not change attitudes toward the target of the ad (Bush), attitudes toward the sponsor were affected on one of two attitude questions asked. Cappella and Jamieson (1994) also report:

The strongest and most consistent effect is found on people's judgments of the ad. Those exposed to the adwatch have less positive attitudes toward the Buchanan ad, viewing it as less fair and important than do those in the control conditions. (p. 355)

Cappella and Jamieson (1994) conclude:

The adwatches appear to do precisely what they are designed to accomplish, namely put the claims of the ad in context so that the ad is judged less fair and less important than is the case in the absence of the adwatch. (p. 355)

These effects were not only evident in the experimental setting. Jamieson (1996) notes, "When NBC and CNN joined the *Atlanta Constitution* in exposing false inferences invited by an anti-Bush ad aired by Buchanan in the 1992 Georgia primary, a CNN survey showed a public backlash against the criticized ad" (p. 519).

What is one to make of the conflicting results of studies on the effects of adwatches? Jamieson and Cappella (1997) sum it up this way:

The lesson of research on the effects of the ad-watch structure is that the content of the critique matters a great deal to the effects produced. When studies consider very few ad watches—as those we have examined have done—the content of the critique can overwhelm whatever effect the ad-watch structure might produce. (p. 20)

Also, one should keep in mind that these studies are only concerned with direct effects on viewers in a controlled environment. In the actual environment of the election campaign, one should not expect huge effects

from adwatches when compared to massive amounts spent running deceptive ads. Rather, as Cappella and Jamieson (1994) point out, there are two less direct, but nonetheless important, effects: “First, they enable the side that is unfairly attacked to use the corrections in counteradvertising. Second, their presence serves proactively to discourage the campaigns from employing egregiously false claims” (p. 344).

Local Adwatches

I became aware of the importance of Jamieson’s adwatch recommendations when I was asked, along with a colleague from political science, to take part in an adwatch program to be broadcast by our local public television station (KIXE in Redding, California). After agreeing to participate, the station sent us a videotape illustrating how to do an adwatch, prepared by KING-TV in Seattle for Best Practices in Journalism, an organization devoted to improving local television political coverage (Cate, 2000). On the tape, KING-TV reporter Robert Mak talked about the highly positive response they received from their viewers to the extensive adwatch coverage their station had provided in the 2000 general election: “Hundreds of calls, hundreds of emails. Almost all of them thanking us for doing this” (Cate, 2000). The tape shows an adwatch format almost identical to that recommended by Jamieson, right down to putting the ads in a box angled to one side. The reporters also discussed the complexity of making judgments about the veracity of the ads; as reporter Mike Cate (2000) said:

Initially, we thought we’d be declaring all claims in these political commercials true or false. What we found almost immediately is that things are neither true nor false most of the time and we had to figure out variation and gradation of truth or falsehood.

He also notes that not all the adwatch judgments were negative, emphasizing that “we didn’t hesitate to say when something was true” (Cate, 2000). Even though the adwatches were long by local TV standards (four-to-five minutes), Cate (2000) reports, “The response from viewers was tremendous, and if you live by the ratings, the quarter hour in which the adwatch aired was always our highest rated quarter hour in the overnight ratings.”

The opportunity to actually practice what I teach—critically analyzing campaign ads for the benefit of the viewing public in our area—was not only personally satisfying, it also provided an educational opportunity for students enrolled in my classes that semester. They were assigned to fact check the ads for various candidates for state and local office as well as several controversial propositions on the November ballot. As many students indicated in their fact check papers, this exercise opened their eyes to the importance of looking behind slick campaign ads at the factual basis for the claims being made. Thus was born an assignment I’ve used in subsequent

election years—having students learn for themselves how to check the facts behind political advertising. Of course the 2002 election preceded the advent of FactCheck.org, the existence of which has made it far easier for students and average citizens to determine the accuracy of ads and other campaign messages. The take away message is that Jamieson’s grammar for policing political ads has had a reach far beyond the level of presidential campaigns—right down to state and local races and even into the college classroom.

FactCheck.org

As one not directly involved in the FactCheck organization, I will leave it to others writing in this volume, who are more knowledgeable, to provide an insider’s view. As a user and advocate of the website, I would be remiss not to discuss how it improves the process of policing campaign ads and other discourse that often remains below the radar. Jamieson explains how the idea for the website came about:

Brooks [Jackson] and I cooked up the idea of FactCheck.org out of our common concern about the seeming demise of fact in politics and out of respect for the deadlines and day-to-day pressures of journalism that make it difficult for reporters in already overstretched and understaffed media outlets to take on the task. (Jackson & Jamieson, 2007, p. 187)

The success of the site was evident almost immediately. Jackson and Jamieson (n.d.) recall, “To our amazement, the website found a huge audience. By Election Day 2004, FactCheck.org was being visited by hundreds of thousands of persons daily. Ordinary voters told us they were fed up with political spin.” As a measure of the hunger for accurate reporting on the campaign, “FactCheck.org got nine million visits during its first two years of operation from citizens seeking help to sort through the deception and confusion in U.S. politics” (Jackson & Jamieson, 2007, p. xi). And if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, one need only look to other sites such as the *Tampa Bay Times*’ PolitiFact.com, (www.politifact.com) with its “pants on fire” ratings for truly deceptive ads or the *Washington Post*’s Fact Checker blog (www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker) awarding up to four Pinocchios to deceptive ads. As campaigns have moved beyond television to microtargeting of voters through emails, text messages, robocalls, radio and cable ad buys, and the like, it is important that there are sources such as FactCheck where voters can come to find out if the messages they have received are truthful or deceptive. FactCheck now encourages its visitors to upload questionable campaign materials such as viral emails to www.factcheck.org/spindetectors.

The 2008 Election

Others in this volume will discuss the National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) in detail, but I will address its findings as they relate to deceptive political advertising. In their book *The Obama Victory*, Kenski, Hardy, and Jamieson (2010) “combine rhetorical analysis of messages with survey data capturing the effects of key maneuvers and movements” (p. 10). The NAES conducted 57,000 interviews and a post-election panel of 3,700, making it one of the most extensive surveys ever conducted of a presidential election.

Some of their findings are clearly relevant to the issue of adwatches and fact checking. First, there is the underlying question of whether or not we need to be concerned with deceptive political advertising. After all, if election results are basically predetermined by the fundamentals—the state of the economy, presidential approval, and party identification, for example—advertising is merely a sideshow. One of the most important NAES findings, therefore, is that advertising does have a quantifiable effect on election outcomes, even in a year dominated by an overriding issue, namely the financial meltdown of fall 2008. Although fundamental factors accounted for about 75 percent of the variance in vote choice, Kenski, Hardy and Jamieson (2010) found that “campaign messages account for a substantial portion of the explained variance in vote preference by adding 14.2 percent for a total of 94.2 percent of the variance explained in the vote preference model” (p. 299). In an election where a strong tailwind favored the Democrats, it is significant that nearly 15 percent of the vote choice was explainable by campaign messages.

Second, how influential were deceptive messages in 2008? Here the NAES study raises some areas of concern: “An Annenberg Public Policy Center post-election survey found widespread public ignorance about the facts underlying the nominees’ exchanges on taxes” (Jamieson & Gottfried, 2010, p. 19). This lack of knowledge was directly related to ad exposure: “Exposure to ads increased the impact of the deception, but only when it was not rebutted. By counter-advertising, Obama negated the effect of McCain’s attack” (Jamieson & Gottfried, 2010, p. 19). McCain’s inability to do the same, “left audiences vulnerable to the false inference invited by Obama’s ads” (Jamieson & Gottfried, 2010, p. 19). Importantly, believing deceptions affected vote choices:

All of this matters because, even in the presences of a robust list of controls, being misled about these issues affected vote choice. Voters who were convinced that McCain would impose a net tax on health care benefits were 2.8 times more likely to cast their ballot for Obama. Similarly, those who believed that Obama would raise middle-class taxes were 7.8 times more likely to vote for McCain. . . . [E]mbracing deception is almost as strong a predictor of vote as party identification. (Jamieson & Gottfried, 2010, p. 23)

In another example of widely believed deceptions, Kenski, Hardy, and Jamieson (2010) report:

Fifty-seven percent (56.9%) of those who knew of William Ayers said that his relationship with Obama was ‘somewhat’ or ‘very close,’ a conclusion unsupported by evidence. Nearly 19 percent (18.7%) found the statement ‘Barack Obama pals around with terrorists’ to be truthful. (pp. 97–98)

Of particular concern is the effectiveness of “under-the-radar” campaign messages: “Those who received e-mail in the final weeks of the campaign were more likely to report that candidate Obama was a Muslim, for example, and palled around with terrorists...charges debunked by impartial organizations” (p. 307).

Finally, what was the role of the ad police in 2008? Unfortunately, the ad police seem to have taken a furlough. Kenski, Hardy, and Jamieson (2010) write, “To the dismay of the McCain campaign, news accounts of paid campaign messages either disappeared entirely or were relegated to parenthetical mentions in a nation transfixed by the economic meltdown” (p. 308). The lack of media policing of ads is disappointing, and Kenski, Hardy, and Jamieson (2010) renew the plea for more effective ad policing: “The news media, particularly those emerging on the Web, also could contribute to the solution by vigilantly policing microtargeted messages, including viral e-mail, and by aggressively vetting candidate claims” (p. 314).

2012 and Beyond

To some degree, this essay has chronicled the rise and fall of adwatch journalism. Of course, with the proliferation of media, microtargeting of messages, and fragmentation of viewing audiences, it is increasingly difficult to debunk all the misleading messages in the campaign environment. Websites like FactCheck.org provide a much richer source for accurate analysis of campaign messages than any television adwatch package ever could. However, there are still times when major media organizations will need to take the responsibility to point out distortions in significant campaign messages. In 2012, there is some indication that traditional media may be once again taking responsibility to police deceptive advertising, as was the case with the *King of Bain* video purchased by the Winning Our Future Super PAC endorsing Newt Gingrich. The video was widely criticized as deceptive by numerous organizations, including FactCheck.org. *The Washington Post* awarded it four Pinocchios (Kessler, 2012). In fact, the criticisms were so damaging that Gingrich was forced to call on his Super PAC (with which he supposedly was not allowed to coordinate) to edit or withdraw the ad. As the *LA Times* reported:

Saying he does not want false claims made on his behalf, Republican presidential contender Newt Gingrich on Friday morning called on a 'super PAC' that supports him to withdraw commercials it ran in South Carolina criticizing Mitt Romney and his old company Bain Capital. (Powers, 2012)

The ad police have hopefully returned for the 2012 campaign, one that promises to be the most expensive and potentially deceptive in history.

Conclusion

The American political landscape changed dramatically with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* (2010). Unlike political parties and candidates, so-called Super PACs can raise and spend virtually unlimited sums of money. One wealthy donor, Sheldon Adelson, for example, kept Newt Gingrich's primary campaign alive through his multi-million dollar donations to the Winning Our Future Super PAC (Gold & Mason, 2012). Barack Obama's decision to forego federal financing of his general election campaign in 2008 enabled him to significantly outspend his opponent, John McCain, who chose to adhere to the limits of the campaign finance law he helped write. With all limits off in 2012 and beyond, the potential is enormous for advertising, viral emails, robocalls, and all the rest to pollute the campaign environment. Furthermore, the old rule of thumb, a negative ad that is proven to be highly deceptive will likely backfire against the sponsor, becomes irrelevant when the most aggressive negative ads are sponsored by groups technically unaffiliated with the candidate. Thus, a candidate can simply disavow such advertising or even do as Gingrich did and publicly call on the sponsor to cease and desist, all the while claiming that he had nothing to do with the offending messages.

It is likely that the need for accurate fact checking and monitoring of campaign messages will be greater than ever in the coming election cycles. In particular, voters need to have reliable places, such as FactCheck.org, where they can learn whether the messages they receive in their email, on their smart phone, or in their mailbox are true, false, or somewhere in-between. If democracy is to function effectively given the cacophony of campaign messages to which we are all exposed, the role of those who seek to separate truth from falsehood is more important than ever. Thomas Jefferson, perhaps, said it best, as Jamieson and Gottfried (2010) remind us, "In his 1805 inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson expressed confidence that '[t]he public judgment will correct false reasoning and opinions on a full hearing of all parties'" (p. 23). Hopefully, the work of Kathleen Hall Jamieson will resonate for years to come as voters, journalists, and fact checkers use the tools she helped create to better inform the electorate and improve our democracy.

References

- Albright, A. (Producer). (1991). *News coverage of political ads: Helping the electorate make sense of political advertisements* [videotape]. Philadelphia, PA: Annenberg School for Communication.
- Ansolabehere, S., & Iyengar, S. (1995). *Going negative: How political advertisements shrink and polarize the electorate*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Ansolabehere, S., & Iyengar, S. (1996). Can the press monitor campaign advertising? *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 1, 72–86.
- Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1994). Broadcast adwatch effects: A field experiment. *Communication Research*, 21, 342–365.
- Cate, M. (Producer). (2000). *Best practices in journalism: How to do an ad watch* [videotape]. Seattle, WA: KING-TV.
- Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 50 (2010).
- Cogswell, M. (Producer). (1992). *Annenberg School for Communication Election Debriefing* [videotape]. Philadelphia, PA: Annenberg School for Communication.
- Factcheck.org. (2004, Oct. 6, updated Nov. 8). *Cheney & Edwards mangle facts*. Retrieved from http://www.factcheck.org/cheney_edwards_mangle_facts.html
- Gold, M., & Mason, M. (2012, March 20). Adelson donations to pro-Gingrich 'super PAC' total \$16.5 million. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/20/news/la-pn-adelson-donations-to-progingrich-super-pac-total-165-million-20120320>
- Jackson, B., & Jamieson, K. H. (2007). *unSpun: Finding facts in a world of disinformation*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Jackson, B., & Jamieson, K. H. (n.d.). *From the authors*. Retrieved from <http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/unspun/>
- Jamieson, K. H. (1984). *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential campaign advertising*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1991, November 1). *News coverage of political ads: A grammar sheet*. Philadelphia, PA: Annenberg School for Communication (pamphlet).
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992a). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992b). *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential campaign advertising* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1996). *Packaging the presidency: A history and criticism of presidential campaign advertising* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Cappella, J. N. (1997). Setting the record straight: Do ad watches help or hurt? *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 2, 13–22. doi:10.1177/1081180X97002001003
- Jamieson, K. H., & Gottfried, J. A. (2010). Are there lessons for the future of news from the 2008 presidential campaign? *Daedalus*, 139, 18–25. doi:10.1162/daed.2010.139.2.18
- Kenski, K., Hardy, B. W., & Jamieson, K. H. (2010). *The Obama victory: How media, money and message shaped the 2008 election*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kessler, G. (2012, Jan. 1). Four Pinocchios for 'King of Bain.' *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/factchecker/post/four-pinocchios-for-king-of-bain/2012/01/12/gIQADX8WuP_blog.html
- Ogbuji, U. (2004, Oct. 6). Fact check.huh? *O'Reilly onlamp.com*. Retrieved from http://www.oreillynet.com/onlamp/blog/2004/10/fact_check_dot_huh.html
- Pfau, M., & Loudon, A. (1994). Effectiveness of ad watch formats in deflecting political attack ads. *Communication Research*, 21, 325–341.
- Powers, S. (2012, Jan. 13). Newt Gingrich calls on 'super PAC' to pull anti-Romney ads in S.C. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jan/13/news/la-pn-newt-gingrich-pac-bain-ads-20120113>

Transcript: Vice presidential debate. (2004, October 5). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/politics/debatereferee/debate_1005.html

What George Bush won. (1988, November 8). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/11/09/opinion/what-george-bushwon.html>

Strengthening the Field of Communication Through Public Policy Research and Visibility: Kathleen Hall Jamieson and the Annenberg Public Policy Center

Kate Kenski, University of Arizona

Extraordinary scholars are those individuals who conduct insightful research that not only affects their own discipline, but speaks to other disciplines within the academy and transcends the walls of the ivory tower through its importance and utility, garnering the attention of a wide and varied audience. They accomplish this by being effective communication practitioners who are both generalists and specialists—generalists in the sense that they are well-read on different subjects and across multiple disciplines, but specialists in the sense that they have studied an area thoroughly and understand how that area of expertise relates to other important topics and fields. They are communication practitioners, regardless of their affiliation with the communication discipline, in that they are able to explain to others how their research is connected to the world at large and why their findings have utility for scholars and others.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson is one such extraordinary scholar. Through her award winning scholarship on issues of great public significance, diverse research profile, and ability to speak across disciplines and to political elites and average citizens, she has earned the respect and admiration of those who have read her work, heard her on the radio, seen her on television, watched her give a speech, and/or worked with her in person. Jamieson's speech and debate experience, rhetorical training, and pursuit of answers to large societal questions have made her uniquely suited for the task of altering how the public sees the communication discipline generally using her work as the vehicle. She has made her mark upon the field by propelling communication into the public spotlight at a time when the discipline needed recognition in order for its long-standing contributions to be understood and acknowledged by the modern academy.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson is an outstanding scholar, visionary, and teacher. Her early scholarship focused on papal rhetoric but shifted over the years to include “presidential discourse, political argumentation, media framing, gender and sexism, and adolescent mental health” (Kenski, 2008). She served as Dean of the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania from 1989 to 2003 and currently resides as the Elizabeth Ware Packard Professor of Communication and the Walter and Leonore Annenberg Director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center. She is also a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and the International Communication Association (The Annenberg Public Policy Center, 2012). Author and co-author of 16 books and well over 100 articles and chapters, Jamieson's scholarly contributions are numerous. In this

essay, I will discuss Jamieson's creation of The Annenberg Public Policy Center (APPC) of the University of Pennsylvania to disseminate important scholarship that she has conducted as well as the scholarship of other Annenberg faculty members and will highlight three significant and consistent themes in her scholarship.

Jamieson and the Annenberg Public Policy Center

Founded in 1993, the APPC was established by Ambassadors Walter and Leonore Annenberg to increase the recognition and influence that The Annenberg School for Communication's cutting-edge research would have on society. Under Kathleen Hall Jamieson's direction, the APPC's initial focus centered on four research areas: political communication, information and society, children and media, and health communication. The APPC's research agenda is and has been theoretically driven yet addresses concerns of high public relevance. While many scholars focus their research on testing specific theories, often for the sake of theory testing rather than for serving a greater purpose, the APPC has been focused first and foremost on issues of public relevance, letting the research questions drive the theories and methodology employed.

Jamieson has directed, produced, and/or been involved with the development of research in each of the policy center's four general areas. Her primary area has been political communication. The projects and initiatives in this area include but are not limited to: (1) FactCheck.org, which monitors the accuracy of claims made by major political figures, (2) FlackCheck.org, which "uses parody and humor to debunk false political advertising, poke fun at extreme language, and hold the media accountable for their reporting on political campaigns" (FlackCheck.org, 2012), (3) Institutions of American Democracy, which has brought together commissions of scholars to reveal what is known about the nature and function of democracy across disciplines, (4) Issue Advertising, which has tracked the quality and content of political advertising for over a decade, (5) Student Voices, which is a program that has increased civic engagement among high school students, (6) Annenberg Classroom, which provides civics curriculum, lessons, and materials for educators, and (7) the National Annenberg Election Survey, conducted in 2000, 2004, and 2008, which were the largest academic surveys of the American electorate to date.

The information and society area has produced leading research in the study of the internet's role in public policy, including how the internet has shaped health policy as well as information presented on other modes of communication. The media and the developing mind area has examined the effects of media and technology on children, families, and public policies aimed at helping them. The health communication area has directed its efforts toward promoting health policy awareness and health-related

behaviors. In all areas of the APPC, Jamieson has brought together groups of scholars across disciplines to address the state of the research on topics of high public import, to make scholars aware of the research, and to drive the research forward quickly, efficiently, and accurately. The center has held approximately 39 conferences in the last 12 years (D. G. Stinnett, personal communication, August 14, 2012).

Themes in Jamieson's Scholarship

While Dean of the Annenberg School for Communication at The University of Pennsylvania, Kathleen Hall Jamieson began each school year's orientation by highlighting the research being done by the Annenberg faculty and suggesting that anyone who had questions on papal bulls should see her while those with other research questions could be directed to the other Annenberg faculty members. No one of course fell for the ruse. Jamieson's work has been diverse. Her research at the Annenberg School for Communication and Annenberg Public Policy Center has often included three themes. First, communication matters. Second, the accuracy of claims in candidate and news discourse matters. Third, civility in public discourse matters.

Communication Matters

When Walter Annenberg founded the Annenberg School in 1959, he observed, "Every human advancement or reversal can be understood through communication." His contention was not commonly held by the academy at the time. In the area of politics and elections, for example, political communication as an object of study had been all but abandoned by sociologists and political scientists who tended to ignore how political discourse could influence citizens' attitudes and behaviors after the first set of landmark studies suggested that people did not change their opinions easily or often during campaigns.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson's research and initiatives have demonstrated empirically that communication can affect outcomes, which is something that communication scholars have known but not always managed to communicate to those outside the discipline. Part of the reason why political communication was overlooked by the field of political science during the first couple decades of contemporary political research was due to the collection of data that was not geared toward detecting message effects. Most models from political science have assumed that campaign information is not needed to foretell election winners.¹ By contrast:

Historians of presidential campaigns have long speculated about the importance of certain moments that may have turned the outcome in one direction rather than another. Unspoken in their analysis is the

¹ For an overview of these models, see Holbrook (1996).

assumption that the outcome of presidential campaigns is not a foregone conclusion, that some moments are consequential where others are not, and that determining which moments mattered is important in making sense of who and how we elect and what it all means for those who govern and are governed. (Jamieson & Kenski, 2006, p. 3)

Several projects within the APPC have demonstrated the importance of communication. The amount and types of messaging to an audience can affect citizens' perceptions and behaviors. One of Kathleen Hall Jamieson's most important contributions to social science generally, and communication specifically, was the establishment of the National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES), the largest academic presidential election survey conducted. Based on the work of Johnston, Blais, Brady, and Crête (1992), which demonstrated that debate effects could be detected in Canadian elections, the NAES has employed a rolling cross-sectional (RCS) design, which was selected with the purpose of being able to detect the effects of campaign messages and events, if they in fact existed. Jamieson recruited Richard Johnston to write the protocols for the NAES and supervise their implementation in 2000, the year of the first full NAES study. The NAES was conducted in 2000, 2004, and 2008. The presupposition of the NAES is that understanding campaign dynamics is important because communication matters.

Two books based on NAES data, and co-authored by Jamieson, have illustrated how campaigns (and hence communication) matters. Johnston's, Hagen's, and Jamieson's (2004) *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics* is a landmark study. It is important to communication, specifically, and the social sciences, generally, for two primary reasons. First, it provides compelling evidence of communication's role in activating the background factors that have dominated political scientists' and sociologists' understanding of how elections work. When candidates fail to emphasize those factors in their campaign messages (e.g., Gore failing to take partial credit for the administration's role in the economy), they do not reap the benefits, and traditional models consequently fail to predict elections accurately. Second, although the book is focused on the 2000 election, the findings and study design have wide application for scholars interested in understanding how mass communication affects public opinion. At the time of its publication, the empirical evidence behind *Foundations of Party Politics* was unparalleled by any political or mass communication study to date. As evidence, the book used rolling cross-sectional data from the NAES, which included over 37,000 interviews with adults in the United States between July 4 and Election Day in 2000, to examine shocks in public opinion trends. In addition, time-buy data were acquired from the presidential campaigns so that spatiotemporal patterns in ad buys could be matched against the survey interviews. Campaign coverage in newspapers and national networks also were utilized to contextualize the

findings. Although the American National Election Study (NES) has provided data about elections via a panel design for decades, the NES design is simply not suited to capture communication/media effects well. The NAES provided the design needed to demonstrate the reality of campaign effects, which Johnson, Hagen, and Jamieson skillfully utilize to show that campaign messages matter.

Building upon Johnston, Hagen, and Jamieson (2004), in *The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message Shaped the 2008 Election*, Kenski, Hardy, and Jamieson (2010) demonstrate how presidential campaigns affect voter opinion and behavior. Their work contains several important communication findings and makes significant methodological advances to the study of political communication. The book shows that: (1) contrary to standard structural explanations, the electorate did not steadily converge toward an Obama vote, but instead, McCain's message made it possible for Obama to gain ground after the final debate; (2) specific messages mattered and embracing them changed the likelihood of a vote for a candidate; (3) vice presidential candidate, Sarah Palin, negatively affected perceptions of and the likelihood of voting for McCain; (4) spending differences produced a significant impact on vote preferences; (5) the microtargeting through cable and radio by the Obama campaign moved perceptions of moderate women; (6) Obama's use of the internet moved likely votes; and (7) the Democrats locked down votes they might not otherwise have gotten in key battleground states by persuading individuals to ballot early. The work's methodological advances include: (1) in-depth analyses of the NAES; (2) the first time daily cable, radio, and broadcast television spending data geographically and temporally tied to rolling cross-sectional survey respondents; and (3) a comprehensive analysis of messages across media and time which are also married to the NAES. In July 2010, Thomas B. Edsall wrote, in *The New Republic*, "This book [*The Obama Victory*] could transform the way we understand presidential campaigns." *The Obama Victory* has received recognition from the Association of American Publishers by winning the PROSE Award for the 2010 Best Book in Government and Politics and the International Communication Association by winning the 2011 Outstanding Book Award.

Accuracy of Claims Matters

Jamieson had long advocated for the press to check the claims made in candidate and campaign discourse. APPC research has demonstrated that people fall prey to deceptive claims and are most likely to believe the errant claims made by members of their own party (Winneg, Kenski, & Jamieson, 2005). In *The Press Effect: Politicians, Journalists, and the Stories that Shape the Political World*, Jamieson and Waldman (2003) argue:

Citizens need journalists to fill in the blanks when definitions are wanting, test evidence when its legitimacy is in question, and concentrate not on

who will win or lose but on the ways in which the proposals of candidates and officeholders would affect individual lives. (p. 194)

People's misperceptions about candidates can be corrected when the news media take the time to provide factual information to counter errant claims. Because campaigns usually do not want news coverage that purports they have been misleading the public, they may be less likely to offer misleading claims if they know that the news media are taking their watchdog function seriously.

While fact checking via adwatches is what one might have thought was already the responsibility of the news media, a common complaint from reporters has been that they do not have the time or resources to vet candidate claims. As a result, campaign reporting has often consisted of he-said-she-said reporting, without serious attempts to verify the claims made by candidates and their campaigns. To remedy these complaints by reporters and help citizens navigate misleading statements by candidates and their campaigns, Jamieson created FactCheck.org as a response. FactCheck.org vets claims made in political advertising and has been the model for other spinoff organizations, which also vet candidate claims. In *unSpun: Finding Facts in a World of Disinformation*, Jackson and Jamieson (2007) reveal how campaigns try to deceive the citizenry and how people can find solid sources of information.

Jamieson has shown in multiple projects that citizens learn from campaign discourse such as political debates (Jamieson & Adasiewicz, 2000; Kenski & Jamieson, 2006). Yet, if the candidates' claims are deceptive, then citizens may be misled over what the candidates are likely to do when in office. Jamieson's commitment to voters learning accurate information so that they can make thoughtful decisions has resulted in the development of FlackCheck.org, which seeks to engage people in political content via humor.

Civility Matters

Over the last three decades, the media environment has changed significantly, resulting in a current media environment that is highly fragmented. Polarization has become a problem among citizens as well as elites. Civility has therefore become a topic of interest to the public. Showing her uncanny knack for pinpointing major problems in public discourse well before the areas have become popular objects of study by scholars, Jamieson started working with the topic of civility in the 1990s. In her first APPC report on civility, Jamieson (1997) wrote:

In Congress, comity is based on the norm of reciprocal courtesy and presupposes that the differences between Members and parties are philosophical not personal, that parties to a debate are entitled to the presumption that their views are legitimate even if not correct, and that those on all sides are persons of good will and integrity motivated by conviction.

Her initial analysis of the congressional take down process and of words ruled out of order during congressional sessions held between 1935 and 1996 revealed that incivility peaked in 1946 and 1995. Her 2011 report on civility in Congress revealed that congressional incivility peaked again in 2007. The increases in incivility coincide with changes in party leadership in Congress.

Jamieson continues to work on the issue of civility in public discourse, which unites with her other work in the mission of making our society and citizenry stronger by keeping citizens engaged in the political process and exposed to the best information from candidates and politicians when it comes to topics important to the public. Her most recent work on civility has tracked MSNBC, CNN, and FOX coverage of uncivil remarks made by political leaders, groups, and activists and documented how those incidents gained coverage on the cable news networks within the week following the transgressions (Jamieson, 2012). The data have shown that MSNBC was more likely to feature incivility by conservatives, whereas FOX was more likely to feature incivility by liberals. Her approaches to studying civility are being used by other researchers, such as those affiliated with the National Institute for Civil Discourse at the University of Arizona, who are tracking incivility in online news discussion boards.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson: Putting Communication Research in the Spotlight

Kathleen Hall Jamieson's unique background, career choices, unparalleled rhetorical skills, and intellect make her a tour de force as an emissary for the field of communication. She has used these qualities to make the APPC a successful scholarly enterprise that has strengthened the field of communication by shining the light on communication research for other academic disciplines, news organizations, political elites, and the public. Each year national and international news media quote APPC programs, research, and staff several thousand times (K. L. Riley, personal communication, August 14, 2012).

Jamieson's interest in communication and public policy, it should be noted, was established well before becoming Dean of the Annenberg School for Communication and the Director of the APPC. She was the Director of Communication for the U.S. House Committee on Aging in the late 1970s. That practical experience and her high school and college speech and debate background created a synergy with her scholarly pedigree that has allowed her to put into motion the lessons of communication research unlike any other.

In the modern academy, the formal field of communication is relatively new. It has struggled internally to create a disciplinary coherence across related but unique interests because the field stems from many disciplines, including but not limited to rhetoric, journalism, history,

philosophy, sociology, political science, and psychology. As a result, it has fought for recognition from other fields, which have often overlooked or misunderstood how communication scholarship contributes to the social sciences. Through the APPC's initiatives, commissions, and conferences, under the direction of Kathleen Hall Jamieson, scholars from within the field have come together to establish a common set of interests that unify the field. They have also provided opportunities for communication scholars to reach out to scholars in other disciplines who also have an interest in communication but may not have been aware of already established communication research. Through APPC's research, the public has come to understand why communication matters and how communication discourse and its effects contribute to or potentially detract from the public good. Kathleen Hall Jamieson's scholarly work and her leadership have steered the communication discipline into the spotlight and consequently have increased other communication scholars' potential for using their research to advance individual, communication, and societal well-being.

References

- The Annenberg Public Policy Center. (2012). Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Ph.D. The Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved August 11, 2012, from <http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/Bio.aspx?myUsername=kjamieson>
- Edsall, T. (2010, July 14). The way it really works. *The New Republic*. Retrieved August 13, 2012, from <http://www.tnr.com/book/review/the-way-it-ireallyi-works>
- FlackCheck.org. (2012). About us. The Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved August 11, 2012, from <http://www.flackcheck.org/about>
- Holbrook, T. M. (1996). *Do campaigns matter?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackson, B., & Jamieson, K. H. (2007). *unSpun: Finding facts in a world of disinformation*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1997, March 1). Civility in the House of Representatives. APPC Report #10. The Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved August 12, 2012, from <http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/NewsDetails.aspx?myId=195>
- Jamieson, K. H. (2011, September 27). Civility in Congress (1935–2011) as reflected in the taking down process. APPC Report No. 2011–1. The Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved August 12 2012, from http://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/Downloads/Civility/Civility_9-27-2011_Final.pdf
- Jamieson, K. H. (2012, March 27). Cable news networks increase amount and public accessibility of incivility, Annenberg Public Policy Center Study finds. The Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Press Release. Retrieved August 12, 2012, from <http://www.flackcheck.org/wp-content/uploads/civility-cable-news-press-release-03-27-2012.pdf>
- Jamieson, K. H., & Adasiewicz, C. (2000). What can voters learn from election debates? In S. Coleman (Ed.), *Televised election debates: International perspectives* (pp. 25–42). New York, NY: St. Martin's.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Kenski, K. (2006). Why the National Annenberg Election Survey? In D. Romer, K. Kenski, K. Winneg, C. Adasiewicz, and K. H. Jamieson, *Capturing campaign dynamics 2000 & 2004: The National Annenberg Election Survey* (pp. 1–13). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The Press Effect: Politicians, Journalists, and the Stories that Shape the Political World*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, R., et al. (1992). *Letting the people decide: Dynamics of a Canadian election*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Johnston, R., Hagen, M., & Jamieson, K. H. (2004). *The 2000 presidential election and the foundations of party politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenski, K. (2008). Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. In L. L. Kaid, & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of political communication*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage. Retrieved March 26, 2009 from, http://www.sage-ereference.com/politicalcommunication/Article_n314.html
- Kenski, K., Hardy, B. W., & Jamieson, K. H. (2010). *The Obama victory: How media, money, and message shaped the 2008 election*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kenski, K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2006). Issue knowledge and perceptions of agreement in the 2004 presidential general election. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36, 243–259.
- Winneg, K., Kenski, K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2005). Detecting the effects of deceptive presidential advertisements in the spring of 2004. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 114–129.

Contributors

David S. Birdsell is Dean of the Baruch College School of Public Affairs, where he is also Professor and Special Assistant to the President for Institutional Effectiveness. He is a member of the Executive Council of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration and serves on several fiduciary and advisory boards in the government and nonprofit sectors. A regular contributor to the scholarly literature on political and policy communication, visual argument, and civic engagement, he is privileged to have been Kathleen Hall Jamieson's co-author on *Presidential Debates: The Challenge of Creating an Informed Electorate* and to have been her student at the University of Maryland, where he received his Ph.D. in Public Communication in 1986.

Steven R. Brydon is Professor Emeritus of Communication Arts and Sciences at California State University, Chico. He has taught in the area of political communication, argumentation, and fundamentals of communication for nearly four decades. He also served three terms as department chair. In addition to a number of articles, he has published several books, including *Televised Presidential Debates: Advocacy in Contemporary America* (with Susan A. Hellweg and Michael Pfau) and *Between One and Many: The Art and Science of Public Speaking* (with Michael D. Scott).

Nichola D. Gutgold is Associate Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences at The Pennsylvania State University, Lehigh Valley where she teaches public speaking, organizational communication, and an honors course in women and the American presidency. In addition to a number of articles, she has published several books, including: *The Rhetoric of Supreme Court Women: From Obstacles to Options* (2012), *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton 'Won' in 2008* (2009), *Seen and Heard: The Women of Television News* (2008), and *Paving the Way for Madam President* (2006). With Molly Wertheimer, she co-authored *Elizabeth Hanford Dole: Speaking from the Heart* in 2004. With Ted Sheckels and Diana Carlin, she co-authored *Gender and the American Presidency: Nine Presidential Women and the Barriers They Faced* in 2012.

Roderick P. Hart is Dean of the College of Communication at the University of Texas at Austin and holds the Shivers Chair in Communication and Government. He is the author or editor of 12 books including *Political Tone: What Leaders Say and Why*, forthcoming from the University of Chicago Press. He also serves as executive director of the Annette Strauss Institute for Civic Participation.

Kate Kenski is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication and School of Government & Public Policy at the University of Arizona where she teaches political communication, public opinion, and research methods. Prior to teaching at the University of Arizona, she was a senior analyst at the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania. She was a member of the National Annenberg Election Survey (NAES) team in 2000, 2004, and 2008. She is co-author of *The Obama Victory: How Media, Money, and Message Shaped the 2008 Election* (2010, Oxford University Press) with Bruce W. Hardy and Kathleen Hall Jamieson

and *Capturing Campaign Dynamics: The National Annenberg Election Survey* (2004, Oxford University Press) with Daniel Romer, Paul Waldman, Christopher Adasiewicz, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. She has published articles and research notes in the *American Behavioral Scientist*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *Communication Research*, *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *Psychology, Health, & Medicine*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *Social Science Computer Review*, and *Women & Politics*.

Herbert W. Simons, Professor Emeritus, taught persuasion and related subject matter (e.g., political communication, rhetoric of science) at Temple University from 1960 until his retirement in December 2007. Recipient of the National Communication Association's Distinguished Scholar Award, he has authored or edited eight books, including *Persuasion in Society* (2nd ed.), co-authored with Jean Jones (2011, Routledge). He has also received four "Best Article" awards. A frequent media commentator, visiting professor, and guest lecturer, he did teaching stints recently in London, Tokyo, and Boulder, directed Temple's London Study Abroad Program, lectured at Peking University and elsewhere in China, and served as a Fulbright Senior Specialist in Hong Kong and Jakarta. Dr. Simons is currently at work on *Dilemma-Centered Political Communication* (forthcoming, Wiley-Blackwell).

Jane S. Sutton, Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences, teaches at The Pennsylvania State University, York. She is a member of the graduate faculty at the university and serves as the program coordinator for the communication arts and sciences baccalaureate degree at Penn State, York. Sutton started a chapter of the National Communication Association Student Group (NCASG) and the Pi Rho Chapter of Lambda Pi Eta, a national honor society, at the Penn State, York campus. She involves students in her research projects and has taken them to conferences where they have presented papers and won awards. She is the author of *The House of My Sojourn: Rhetoric, Women, and the Question of Authority* (2010, University of Alabama Press), which received the Bonnie Ritter Book Award in Feminist/Women Studies in Communication from the National Communication Association in 2011. She has more than 30 publications, among them journal articles in international and national journals such as *Rhetorica*, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *Windsor Access to Justice*, and *Journal of International Women's Studies* as well as chapters in books, including references such as the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. She has earned a number of awards and grants for her research, including a "Best Article Award" for her publication in *Southern Communication Journal* on women and rhetoric. Sutton is past president for the American Society of the History of Rhetoric and is an internationally known expert on rhetoric.