January 2013

Examining the Ontoepistemological Underpinnings of Diversity Education Found in Interpersonal Communication Textbooks

Tammy L. Jeffries
University of South Florida, tjeffrie@mail.usf.edu

Examining the Ontoepistemological Underpinnings of Diversity Education

Found in Interpersonal Communication Textbooks

by

Tammy Jeffries

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Communication
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Jane Jorgenson, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Bell, Ph.D.
Deirdre Cobb-Roberts, Ph.D.
Navita C. James, Ph.D.
Frederick Steier, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
June 24, 2013

Keywords: social construction, difference, the social construction of differentness (SCD),
diversity education, thematic analysis

Dedication

I dedicate this paper to my devoted and loving Mother, family and to everyone who loved me through this process. With me it truly took a village to get me to this point. Thank you to the friends who first planted the seed: To the Pacific Oaks college advisor, although you are nameless when we spoke during intermission at the Marcel Marceau performance in Pasadena your words of encouragement never left my mind, Thank you. To Charlie Phiffer from Ford Motor Credit Company, although we only had a working relationship you never missed an opportunity to tell me how proud you were of me. Thank you for your perfectly timed fatherly advice, "just go for it and follow your dreams, kiddo!" I went for it Charlie, thank you. And to my life-long friends who went on this journey with me: David Rosselli, Sarah Toring-Moore, Kathleen Rusch, Jeniffer Zemla, Brigitte Christman, Chitra Akkoor, Mary Crawford, Kris Bryd, Angie and Renee Day, and Shirlan Williams, WE DID IT.

Acknowledgments

I want to acknowledge the love and support of The Kalamazoo Quakers, Religious Society of Friends, with a specific thank you to: Drs. Richard and Raelyn Joyce, Flo Frienders, Joe and Linda Mills and Cordelia Greer. My Committee Members Dr. Elizabeth Bell, Dr. Deirdre Cobb-Roberts, Dr. Navita C. James, Dr. Frederick Steier And Dr. Jane Jorgenson the person who saw this happening for me before I could see it for myself and never allowed me to give up hope.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

This project examines the ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education in the field of communication by focusing on the points where diversity, pedagogy and communication intersect. In this study I seek to understand how we come to know what we know about diversity, or the social construction of differentness, and how we share this information with others. I analyzed three popular interpersonal communication textbooks, examining the patterns revealed in the text, in order to address these questions.

This study uses three complimentary methods to reveal the number of occurrences that center on diversity in the text (content analysis), to interpret themes reflected by the patterns discovered in the text (thematic analysis) and a creative twist on the coding process that opens the analysis process to the coders and includes their input as participants to this study (reflexive content analysis). The results of this study revealed three-hundred ten occurrences of the social construction of difference across all three textbooks but only a portion of those, seventy-six, suggested social constructionist underpinnings of these constructs. This study shows how we have missed an opportunity at the introductory level to expand our student's knowledge of issues in diversity.

Chapter One

Question: *Where do we in the field of communication get our knowledge of diversity?*

"Epistemology is the study of knowledge, ways of knowing, how we learn, what

constitutes knowledge" (Hacking, 1999, p23).

I've been shaping my future as a diversity educator since my first day on a college campus. Later inspired by a performance of otherness by Guillermo Gómez Peña (2000), I was awakened to the power of the voice of "the Other". Soon after I decided my education would focus on knowing and researching various aspects of identity and diversity. Having explored my own identity negotiation process (Jeffries, 2002), I am now most interested in understanding and teaching others the awareness needed to understand the negotiation of diversity or socially constructed differentness (abbreviated as SCD in this paper), a concept I will discuss in more detail throughout this dissertation. In the field of communication, this awareness often begins at the introductory level in the undergraduate Interpersonal Communication course. In this class, teachers have the option to introduce students to concepts of differentness by introducing them to various aspects of relationship and identity negotiation. As an instructor of interpersonal communication, I sought every opportunity to share with students ideas I feel are basic to understanding the social construction of differentness, such as the importance of empathy and the true meaning of interpersonal dialogue. I also use my classroom space to begin explaining the basic elements of our sociocultural traditions of communication theory (Craig, 1999), which included exercises in examining language, socially constructed

labels and rules, and critical thinking and reflexive activities that question social structures. In this project I take a reflexive turn and critically examine my source(s) of knowledge on diversity. As a result I examine what is shared with my students in order to increase their understanding of diversity issues. With this goal in mind, this project prioritizes the epistemology of diversity and the ontology of the pedagogy of diversity education.

As instructors, we create ontological and epistemological frames in the classroom through a set of social rules that sustain our understanding of the student/teacher relationship, for example rules concerning classroom conduct and acceptable styles of teaching and communicating. Additionally, teachers are the ones who organize and synthesize current information and decide what is important and what will be of value to our students. Students respond by reflecting and perpetuating this knowledge back to us and to others as part of the learning process. Teachers also create ontological and epistemological frames through the materials we use and the choices we make in the classroom, and even while grading our students' work. As instructors our epistemological and ontological choices not only serve us in that moment or for that semester, but are passed on to our students and perpetuated as our students grow in the field and become our colleagues.

Philosopher Alfred North Whitehead (1925) explained "ontoepistemological" as a word that encapsulates both ontology, the idea of searching for the nature of being or how one's way of being is shaped by their perception of their experiences, and epistemology, the branch of philosophy that examines how we come to know what we know. I use this word to indicate my focus on frames of understanding in the communication classroom,

and to open a dialogue about what we know and how we come to know it. For this study I plan to investigate the social construction of differentness in the content of interpersonal communication textbooks and in the context of these books via reflexive discussion among a selected audience of readers. To do this I conducted a content analysis of a small sample of the data that represents our pedagogical tools (popular interpersonal communication textbooks). This examination of three popular interpersonal communication textbooks used in the field will not reveal the entire ontoepistemological frame of interpersonal communication pedagogy, but I hope it will open a dialogue about the frequency and context of diversity issues and how diversity is introduced to our undergraduates via interpersonal communication textbooks and courses. My goal is to open a line of inquiry into how and what we come to know about negotiating diverse relationships, how we choose to share that knowledge with others, and how that knowledge in turn shapes our realities as members of this interdisciplinary field.

Specifically, by analyzing *what* we as communication scholars take as truth with regard to issues of difference, I hope to identify important assumptions as well as gaps in the knowledge base of our field. I believe calling attention to these gaps is an important step in the advancement of the important issues that affect the education of our students. Although this project is situated to begin an academic conversation, it also has relevancy in our communities, as diversity education and the ability to engage in effective communication with diverse groups of people is becoming a national and global mandate, not just for those holding a degree, but for all. As it attempts to advance our understanding of communication in practical settings, this is an applied project, that is, "intended [at least in part] for someone other than a community of scholars and

3

include[ing] in its conversation people who are not within the scholarly community" (Cissna, 2000, p.170).

To better explain the significance of this proposed research project, I have organized this dissertation into several chapters. Chapter One offers a justification for the study by situating the significance of an education in diversity in the field of communication and explaining our field's approach to diversity and diversity education. Chapter Two contains the review of literature where I first examine the complexity of the conversations involved in discussing this issue, including theories of sociocultural construction as they relate to diversity, and a description of pedagogical tools and pedagogy. I also explain categories of differentness known as diversity. Then I discuss the significance of pedagogical tools by closely examining previous studies that both call attention to and analyze the texts we use to teach. And finally I examine the conversation around pedagogy by offering a closer examination of various pedagogical approaches to issues of diversity, including critical cultural and feminist perspectives.

In Chapter Three I explain the methodology and research design of this study. I chose to do an examination of the content of three popular interpersonal communication textbooks followed by a reflexive examination of the patterns revealed in the content. In the content analysis I examined the frequency of occurrences of diversity found within the sample of textbooks. I then used the findings of this descriptive content analysis as a point of departure to introduce thematic analysis or finding the meaning in patterns found in the textbooks. Beginning with this chapter, I incorporate my own reflexive process by adding indented commentary called, *Reflective moments*. I do this as a way to invite the reader into my own growth as a scholar and as I develop my pedagogic approach through

the creation of this project. I also explain the process of the coders meetings and how those meetings influenced the remaining chapters of this study. In Chapter Four I frame a discussion that reveals the results of the content analysis and examines the thematic patterns in the textbook content, including authors' writing styles. I also examine how these patterns might influence the way we teach the social construction of differentness in our field of communication. In Chapter Five, a conversation with the coders, I incorporate the coders' voices into the paper and show how their voice served to improve the analysis of this project. This chapter examines some of the implications for the future of diversity education in the field of communication. Chapter Six offers some concluding remarks about diversity education and how this project might impact our greater communities. I also use this chapter to inspire dialogue in and around the social construction of differentness, the tools and language we use to share our knowledge with future scholars, and the way we approach and inspire further research in these areas by offering a brief overview of activities and pedagogical frames that explore a new direction of SCD education.

Chapter Two

Rationale

"All living systems—including human systems—benefit from diversity"

(Brown & Isaacs, 2001, p. 3).

As educators, we work within a symbiotic system in the sense that we make assumptions of students' core knowledge and skill sets based on what we know of their previous curriculum and cognitive capabilities (Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill & Krathwohl, 1956). Students, in return, are expected to perform to these core knowledge and cognitive expectations. Traditionally we see college and university level work as a last step in this educational chain, the place where students are prepared to enter *the real world* of their chosen careers. In the field of communication, degreed students can proudly boast an advanced and in-depth understanding of the complexities of both verbal and nonverbal communication in a variety of social contexts. I believe we in academia have achieved high levels of success in preparing our students for careers that prioritize communication skills and application of the theories we teach.

*The Chronicle of Higher Education, (*2012) reports that to satisfy national and global employment trends, colleges and universities are now mandating the teaching of diverse cultural perspectives among all students who seek degrees. With prospective employers asking for students with knowledge in cultural diversity and global issues, it is important to train students to notice and value differences. As Allen (2011) argued*,* "to be

6

competitive and to prevent charges of discrimination, many companies are implementing formal programs to hire, retain, mentor and promote non-dominant group members" (p. 5). In fact "many companies are making diversity central to their missions and strategic goals and they are factoring accountability into their efforts" (p. 89). Allen (2011) has noted that as a response to organizational calls for a more diverse work force, "many colleges and universities now require each student to take at least one course that concentrates on some aspect of 'diversity' (pp. 5-6).

In their writings on the subject of race, Graves (2001) a natural scientist and Smedley (1999), a social scientist, have said that diversity as one of the most complex social topics we face as a nation. I both agree and would argue that diversity education is *the* key component to a communication major's humanistic and social scientific undergraduate education. An education in diversity that encompasses such topics as identity negotiation and cultural competence can assist students in the negotiation of all identity and interpersonal relationships. This project examines the construction of diversity rooted in the epistemological frame of the humanist paradigm (Dewey & Bentley, 1949, Rogers, 1969). This paradigm sees communication educators as facilitators and helps students get closer to the ideas of diversity by requiring a closer examination of the *construction* of diversity. This epistemological frame calls attention to language and its role in shaping identities. The close linkage between language and identity, and the notion of identity as communicatively constructed suggests that the effective teaching of diversity issues should be of central concern to our field. With this as a starting point, the question for this project is what practices do we in communication

consistently implement to ensure our undergraduates an education in the complexities of diversity?

A first step in addressing this question was our field's response to a call to action first introduced in 1999 by then president, James Applegate of the National Communication Association (NCA) (Morreal, 2001), when NCA and the Southern Poverty Law Center, Campus Compact, and the American Association for Higher Education sought university and community partners to participate in the "communicating common grounds" program (CCG). This was a program created to advance the communication discipline's role in reducing prejudice and hateful acts by implementing P-12 schools and community group programs that promote respect for diversity. Currently the CCG program has over 70 higher education institutional partners and a strong foothold in the P-12 schools. With this program, the NCA and its partners have taken the necessary first step in increasing the cultural competency of school age children.

The logical next step we, as communication scholars, need to take is to prepare our undergraduates to negotiate the complex conversations that lay emphasis on issues of diversity. This is done by teaching them the complexity of social construction, advanced communication skills for negotiating conversation around diversity, and by critically examining how we teach these complexities in our liberal arts courses at the college level. This goal is made more complicated when we as a nation move away from using the trivium, the underpinnings of liberal arts that focus on critically understanding through logic, grammar and rhetoric. Nationally we have turned away from this element of learning and have prioritized math and science. Now because we as a nation have

required less of an emphasis on teaching the liberal arts and critical thinking skills we have inadvertently changed the way we teach and understand the role of language and social construction to our overall human experiences. As Jackson, et. al. (2007) stated, "the nation is getting more diverse but the curricula are not" (p. 84).

A way of addressing the next step in diversity education is to understand our students' cognitive development and base of knowledge. The level of reflexivity needed to understand the complexities of diversity content can be taught to students using content suited for a student at the advanced cognitive domain level of understanding according to Bloom's taxonomy of learning as a frame for understanding, Bloom et. al. (1956) explain the final elements of the cognitive domain from the most simple to the most complex with the ability to critically analyze, evaluate information and create new meaning from the patterns they observe occurring near the end of their development. In other words the cognitive domain level emphasizes critical questioning skills; if students are not at this level of understanding they may become frustrated with the material, the paradigm used to present the information, or our expectations (see Bloom et. al., 1956). Another common situation that can complicate or even stagnate a diversity class is that classes often require no prerequisites, which means students are not expected to understand the fundamentals of social construction, communication theory, or even relationships, before they are allowed to enroll in any type of diversity course. Students who have not taken a course that asks them to critically examine the uniqueness of socially constructed relationships may find it frustrating and difficult to fully understand the philosophical underpinnings of diversity. Walkerdine's (1992) research offers some keen observations of the potential impact of student's dissatisfaction with a diversity

course. She argues that even when cognitively capable of understanding the material, some students who have little knowledge of the greater conversation around diversity, may either stall at their level of understanding or may attempt to work a personal agenda that hinders the educational process for others in the class. Walkerdine (1992) reports that many of these students react to the frustration they feel in the classroom by becoming rebellious, or feeling silenced. Also it is important to examine the language we use to describe these courses. The ambiguous "undertones" embedded in the word diversity as a course title may lead students to believe enrollment in this course will primarily help them "manage others" by formulaically addressing their own stereotypical, either/or assumptions of dichotomy or experiential assumptions of the 'Others' they encounter. These are incomplete assumptions for today's students. Some teachers of a diversity course may choose not to teach students formulaic communication strategies when communicating with "Others," instead opting for a more self-reflexive, humanist educational format, asking the student to examine their own communication choices and judgments, while students may be expecting a more traditional approach to the topic.

Another primary source of student frustration with the course content may be the wide variety of titles used to describe diversity specific course offerings. Currently we have course offerings with titles such as "intercultural," "interracial," "diversity," and "gendered perspectives on culture" for undergraduates. Although interesting as these titles may sound, they offer no hint to the actual theoretical basis or level of cognitive development the students should have prior to the course or will gain from these offerings.

Perhaps the sources of this frustration stem from our multidisciplinary background and our undefined terms and expectations regarding appropriate cognitive development in the area of diversity education. Not offering prerequisites that establish a strong base for our students' knowledge of diversity can actually be seen as stifling our student's intellectual growth. When students take a diversity-related course they are asked to begin anew with each course. Each culture-focused class spends valuable semester weeks re-introducing simple terms in an effort to bring each student to a consistent and measurable level of competence. This time is typically used introducing those students who have no knowledge to the basis of this complex content. Diversity-related issues contain complex ideas and call for in-depth critical thinking and communication skills. Carrell (1997) offers empirical support for the need to teach diversity to undergraduates, explaining how a focus on diversity can assist in students' socialization skills by deepening understanding of the significance of empathy in our everyday interactions with others who are not like us. By not requiring some mastery of these ideas at the time of graduation, we are putting ourselves at a disadvantage. Furthermore not establishing a unified set of terms and understandings prior to entering these upper level undergraduate courses as Walkerdine (1992) puts it, "can lead to frustration to some [advanced students] who want to begin examining what they feel [but when] the course content and others… [in the class] who are not fully versed in the content [the advanced student] may feel silenced" (p 16). Furthermore this lack of a consistency in course content for our students may affect their ability to express full knowledge on issues related to diversity outside of the academy. By not mandating a series of courses that develop the critical thinking and language skills needed to

11

understand how our and other's identities are shaped and sustained, we in communication are in essence limiting our student's knowledge in this area.

Part of the issue with not offering a series of courses centering on diversity may lie in the lack of a commonly referred-to definition for diversity. At the moment, communication scholars have no common axiom that defines the term, "diversity". What is usually offered is the writer's interpretation of, or standpoint in addressing issues of diversity. For example Orbe and Harris's (2008) textbook, *Interracial communication: theory into practice,* currently the only undergraduate textbook in the field of communication written by communication scholars that takes on the topic of interracial communication, does not define the term diversity. Instead, they begin the book by offering their unique standpoints, thereby offering a hint into the complexity of the idea of diversity and race. In *Difference Matters*, Allen (2011) prefers to use the word 'difference' when speaking to issues of diversity as this term is more consistent with her perspective. Whether addressing topics ranging from gender studies, queer theory, feminist theory to age, ability or race, some communication scholars are now choosing to explore difference not from a traditional binary perspective or from the either/or lens of cross-cultural dichotomies, but by emphasizing the process of construction and the co-creation of identities. In this way, the idea of difference or the social construction of differentness (SCD), becomes more fluid, interpretive and inclusive. Through this interpretive lens, the term difference is interchangeable with the term "diversity" and more importantly becomes a term linked to the idea of social construction and the socio-cultural theoretical tradition (Allen, 2011).

The beauty of understanding difference from a more interpretive lens means communication scholars can begin to see how difference, diversity, or SCD negotiation fits into their own areas of interests. But that utility also serves to divide the body of work on issues of difference as well. This happens when scholars fail to emphasize difference as the key topic of their studies but, rather, incorporate difference into the body of their research, for example as a subheading in studies examining other phenomenon. This practice serves to educate others in the field but makes it more difficult to locate studies that emphasize the complexity of difference, thereby making it more difficult to nourish the conversation on the importance of difference education in the field of communication (Henderix et. al., 2003).

Henderix, et. al., (2003), wrote a telling article on the notion of stagnation in diversity education when they conducted a content analysis that examined articles focusing on issues of diversity in *Communication Education.* What they found were only a few articles that answered the call to our field to act on this very important topic. Additionally, Allen (2007) questions the cultural bias of mainstream communication theories and asks scholars to be mindful of this fact when researching and educating. These revelations of patterns lacking in diversity and unanswered calls to action for a wider theoretical lens have lead to stagnation on the subject of diversity education in the field of communication; if we are not mindful of these calls to action the result may be a regression of our students' growth of knowledge in this critical area and a lost opportunity to lead the conversation on this very important and pervasive topic. One way to begin the educational process on the topic of diversity is to stand in our students' shoes

and examine the academic courses and tools offered to students interested in understanding more about difference negotiation.

In the sub-field of interpersonal communication, courses and textbooks play a key role in the educational process as they often serve as the gateway to difference and diversity education. Interpersonal communication courses focus the students' attention on originating, sustaining and dissolving relationships. Also interpersonal communication is typically a required course if one wants an undergraduate degree in Communication. For some institutions, interpersonal communication serves as a recommended prerequisite course for other elective courses such as intercultural, cross-cultural, gender, and diversity courses. Unlike the core courses of Public Speaking or Rhetoric, Interpersonal communication focuses on increasing the student's understanding of the effects of communication on our everyday encounters and relationships by teaching students about social interactions without an explicitly rhetorical purpose in which the goal is to inform, persuade or motivate. Interpersonal communication aims to prioritize the significance of human-to-human communication for the purpose of understanding the relationship. Interpersonal communication, typically a core course that is not connected to teaching rhetorical strategy, often focuses on teaching negotiation skills. The purpose is less on the manipulation or shaping of these skills to provoke a specific action from the other, and more on defining, sustaining or dissolving relationships. Interpersonal communication teaching often embodies multiple levels of meta-communication that include "content" and "relationship" by simultaneously modeling the collaborative communicative practices we are teaching while teaching the theories behind them, thus allowing the student the freedom to practice the relational negotiation skills they are studying.

Interpersonal communication textbooks explain the complexity of communicating within relationships, with an emphasis on understanding the role of communication within these relationships. What makes, interpersonal communication an appropriate focus for my research is that these courses and textbooks are often the entry points for discussion of topics related to diversity and negotiating diverse relationships; they often serve as the introduction to diversity for communication undergraduates.

<p style="text-align:center">Chapter Three</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Review of the Literature</p>

Understanding Diversity

Different fields conceptualize diversity in different ways. For example in the medical field, diversity might be defined chemically or metabolically at the molecular level. In the field of communication we attach distinctive meanings to the idea of cultural diversity compared to those of other fields in that we tend to equate it with the non-normative. The phrase, "culturally diverse," implies the idea of different from the norm. However if I were to define what I believe should be the definition of diversity in our undergraduate textbooks, it would be the social construction of differentness. I believe the significant element in our field's definition should be the idea that differentness (diversity) is a social construction that is negotiated and in flux, that diversity is what we create.

Diversity as social construct

Social construction is situated in the sociocultural tradition of communication theory. "Communication in these traditions is typically theorized as a symbolic process that produces and reproduces shared sociocultural patterns" (Craig, 1999, p. 144). Understanding the nuances of the socialization process helps to lay a strong foundation for understanding how we construct and communicatively connect to ideas of identity negotiation, diversity and differentness. Social construction is so commonly referred to that one would get the impression that the term was always a known concept. Indeed

<p style="text-align:center">16</p>

many scholars have addressed the issue of social norms in their work and how these norms work to shape our known reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1968; Parsons, 1951). But, "hybrids of sociocultural and other traditions of communication theory are quite common, so common indeed that relatively "pure" exemplars of sociocultural communication theory may be hard to come by" (Craig, 1999, p.145).

According to Hacking (1999), the first book to use social construction in the title was written by Berger and Luckmann in 1968: *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* Here, the authors advance a frame for understanding the phenomenon of social construction by explaining it as a linear process beginning at childhood and carried throughout our life, becoming salient only when we begin to challenge the norms. Berger & Luckmann (1968) present social construction as a set of rules we are both born into and which eventually become invisible to us as we work to sustain them. A key idea underlying their ideas is that the social order, or what human beings take as "real," is the product of human activity and communication. They devote much attention to describing the socialization process as a series of stages beginning with primary socialization. "Primary socialization is the first level of socialization an individual undergoes in childhood." It is at this level the child learns to become a member of a social group (p. 130). At the primary stage of development the child is introduced to language and labels and begins to give social meaning to the labels learned. During this stage children are also exposed to basic social rules for child/ parent, nuclear family and subordinate/superior relationships. It is this beginning process that helps to condition the child to understand a more nuanced secondary stage of socialization.

Secondary socialization consists of the conversations we have in adolescence or adulthood that serve to remake the primary socialization. At this phase or level we learn our place in a system of social roles and develop a more nuanced understandings of relationships. "Secondary socialization is any subsequent process that inducts an already socialized individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society" (p. 130). This new sector can be seen as multi-tasking, developing new multidimensional relationships, or understanding more levels of complexity in existing relationships and exploring the boundaries of a variety of complex social norms. "Secondary socialization is the internalization of institutional or institution-based "subworlds" (p. 138). While experiencing these new relational challenges and testing the social boundaries, reality is maintained by the reaffirmation of the "individual's interactions with others. Here others provide a source for perception checking and offer relational balance for the individual. Just as reality is originally internalized by a social process, it is maintained in consciousness by social processes" (p. 149). Although primary and secondary socialization are the beginning stages of what is explained as a linear process, they can also be shaped and altered by society or the individual's questioning of social rules, roles and norms, adding a curve or shift to the ideal line of progression. As we question what was once invisible, the invisible becomes visible as the individual examines their role in the social systems of rules they work to sustain.

Individuals continue to acquire and internalize the social order as they are exposed to morals, values and taken-for-granted beliefs. However when the socialized individual begins to question their reality they may begin to enter into a new phase of beginning to notice the outliers of "normal," in other words, that which is different. This

involves processes of reflexivity, which works together with the related idea of "alternation" (p. 157) or awareness to offer a new reality for an individual. What is important to understand here is that while Berger & Luckmann's original formulation doesn't specifically address the acquisition of ideas about difference, it has implications for understanding its development.

To conceptualize the development of understanding of difference, we can turn toward the notion of reflexivity. Reflexivity may begin the process of challenging the conversations and repetitive messages of primary and secondary reality maintenance. The awareness of difference as something socially constructed may then become possible. The idea of differentness or diversity implies an examination of that which falls outside the boundaries of normalcy. Plausibility structures, or what is taken-for-granted, are significant to this study because they are both a naturally occurring part of an individual's socialization process, and they also offer a structure for understanding the system we function within. Situating this process within the institution of academia, we see that the student learns about the rules and norms in P-12 and begins to critically question plausibility structures as their experiences become more nuanced, typically near the end or after graduating from high school. What many students do at this point in their lives is move out of the house for the first time and attend college. They often choose to live in the dormitory with others and experience a disruption in the socialization process. At this level, norms are tested and the student enters into a new way of seeing the world. At this level we can see how the student's socialization, cognitive development, or maturation process have implications for their understanding of the notion of difference as many are negotiating new social systems and exploring new identities at this stage of life. Here

understanding what creates the idea of differentness or diversity can be seen as part of the ongoing socialization process. Following the logic of Berger and Luckmann, in order to become socialized an individual must first understand what is constructed as normal in order to possess the ability to identify and understand plausible alternation or social differentness. For this study, Berger and Luckmann's research serves as an interesting framework for understanding the socialization process and positions an interesting argument concerning the complexities of teaching issues related to diversity. That is, they offer the language and conceptual structure. Although the social process is clearly defined by Berger and Luckmann, they do little to label that which falls outside the realm of socially constructed normalcy. Whereas Berger and Luckmann's work does a thorough job of explaining the socialization process, Hacking (1999) explains how this process is implemented to create socially constructed concepts. Hacking offers a contemporary turn on the ideas put forth by Berger and Luckmann by offering a formula for interpreting what can be understood as the social construction of ideas. What Hacking's work does is allow us as educators the freedom to choose key constructs and then show how these constructs are created and often times complicated by society's treatment of them.

Although critical (some might even say cynical) in his approach and in his claims of the overuse of the word social construction in the field of philosophy, Hacking (1999) offers a comprehensive method of identifying the constructs that may fall in and outside of the rules of socially constructed normalcy. He does this by offering a simple formula. To first determine what a social construction is he asks, "What are you claiming? This claim is assigned an X. X represents a construct or idea such as, race, homosexuality, gender etc…" (p. 6). He then presents this simple formula for review, emphasizing that

the reader be sure to state "in your opinion" (a phrase which seems to serve as evidence of his cynicism and hints to the complexity of understanding the idea of social construction):

> Formula for determining if an idea is indeed (in your opinion) a social construction. First, in the present state of affairs X (remember that's your idea) is taken for granted. Second, X need not have existed or need not be at all as it is, in other words, X as it is at present is not determined by the nature of things. And third this formula states, in most social construction analysis, the social constructionist feels X is bad as it is. Furthermore X has come to seem natural, and we would be much better off if X were done away with (Hacking, 1999, p. 6-7).

Hacking then suggests once the idea is determined to be a social construct, the construct must then be examined by tracing the history of the idea, showing its origins of use or misuse. He asks, "How has the idea of X evolved in our society? Once the origin has been laid out then we must move onto the job of rhetorically building a case that persuades the reader to agree that not only is this idea a social construction but that we as a society would be better off without it in existence" (p.8). Using this premise, Tregaskis (2004), suggests juxtaposing a socially constructed characteristic (such as physical disability) against what is seen as "normal" to understand the complexity of differentness in what the author terms "deficit discourse." In this work she examines the language of disability to show first, the power of language by making the intangible tangible and second, how through language we shape disability as a deviant construction, not normal,

an outlier of normalcy. This vein of research as put forward by Hacking and Tregaskis makes it easier to determine what is and what isn't a social construction. Recognizing the languaging of various aspects of our world as social constructions (X) is key to understanding the constructs in question and can be seen as the first step in unpacking the complexity of these constructs. This process shows just how (X) fits into our culture. To more precisely communicate the constructs I am unpacking in this project, and to remind us that diversity as we understand it is a social construction, I choose to re-term the idea of diversity as socially constructed differentness (SCD).

In this section I have laid the groundwork for seeing how social construction shapes what we understand as differentness or diversity. But I see the skill of relationship negotiation as a key component of this process as well. It's the interpersonal communicative process of negotiation that connects communicating and relating to others to understanding our and others' differences. I understand negotiation as the verbal and nonverbal messages we exchange with others in order to make sense of the world around us, and as integral to relationship development. As undergraduates we are taught the basic skills associated with the idea of compromise and negotiation in our interpersonal communication courses by showing empathy, communicating our feelings and listening to others whom we are in relationships with (Stewart, Zediker, & Witteborn, 2005) and theoretically by understanding the dynamics of relationships through relational dialectics (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996) to name just a few of the ideas and theories.

Additionally, when you look at negotiation from a social construction lens you will find that the process of negotiating identity and differentness exemplifies Berger and Luckmann's (1966) idea of "institutionalization" occurring in the first and second stages

22

of the social construction process. The notion that, "secondary socialization is the internalization of institutional or institution-based "subworlds." Its extent and character are therefore determined by the complexity of the division of labor and the social distribution of knowledge" (p. 138). The way we develop this skill academically is to first make students aware of the process of social construction by socializing them at very early ages (P-12) and second, by asking them to grow and develop more cognitively sophisticated abilities such as critical thinking in the latter stages of their life and education process (undergraduate and post graduate) (see Blooms taxonomy in Anderson & Krathwohl 2001).

Teaching the negotiation processes of identity and SCD can be done by using many different pedagogical approaches. Instructors can allow this process to occur naturally as the student develops, or instructors can adopt a more overt pedagogical approach that seeks to emphasize and critically examine the idea of identity and difference as constructed phenomenon by challenging students to critically examine the construction of these ideas. For example while preparing for this study I reviewed many syllabi for diversity courses in the communication field and found many instructors' syllabi advocated taking a critical cultural or critical feminist pedagogical approach to teaching diversity related topics.

Diversity as socially constructed differentness

Authors have written countless papers and books in an effort to examine and explain the complexities of issues in diversity. The truth is diversity as a subject is vast and can be examined from several points of entry. One could for example study power dynamics through notions of hegemony, ideology and oppression by examining the social

policies, and position of those who have the power and those who do not (Foucault, 1977; Friere, 2003). Or a researcher could choose to look at the constructs that make up diversity and examine the social construction, language and the history of the labels used to create and sustain that issue of diversity such as race, gender, class, etc (Graves, 2001; Smedley, 1999). I have chosen language as my point of entry into issues in diversity.

In our culture we associate issues of diversity with notions of race, gender, sexuality, class and physical or mental ability—but many more can be included in this list. Allen (2011) identifies the major areas of diversity in our culture as race, gender, sexuality, social class, ability, and age. She then explains how these social constructions are rooted in ideological structures. She does this by examining the way language is crafted to create what is known as normal and different. History has taught us that it is acceptable to use the words, "normal" and "natural" interchangeably. To us, normal is also considered natural; "both terms are ways of establishing social hierarchies that justify the denial of legitimacy and certain rights to individuals or groups" (Baynton, 2004, p.94). But if you examine the language used to create these categories you will notice the terms, "natural" and "normal," position a system of social hierarchy. What is "natural/normal" is value-laden; what is not "natural/normal" is defined in relation to what is "normal," creating a framework within which judgments of "un" natural/normal can be judged. It is these labels and categories that help us to frame our understanding of what is different.

Race is probably the most common term one thinks of when discussing the issue of diversity or SCD. And along with gender, scholarship on race negotiation makes up a significant amount of the research on identity negotiation done in our field. Race is a

24

modern concept with a well-documented history in the U.S., a concept born from both social-historical and socio-political constructions, that is, the images, stories told and rules created about racial differences. One aspect of the idea of race is the way we connect racial difference to skin tone, and for many years culturally understood it as the result of a biological difference in humans' DNA. This notion of different "races" representing different categories of human beings was supported as fact by scientists for hundreds of years (Graves, 2001). Social-political construction includes the rules and regulations put into place such as segregation in our school systems, and housing laws or voting rights and social policies that work to sustain the story that the races are different; working together these powerful social constructions sustain the false narrative of racial difference in the United States. These social constructions (political and historical) were used to create and sustain the racist assumption of self-appointed racially "superior" groups and framed a culturally accepted social hierarchy based on skin tone and heritage (Allen, 2011). Anthropologist Audrey Smedley (1999) insists that both social constructions (socio-political and social-historical) must be understood if one is wants to fully understand the complexity of race (pp. 325-338).

Another common aspect of SCD discussed under the umbrella of diversity is the idea of gender. This topic is often the subject of courses that discuss the power dynamics of oppression and hegemony through a focus on gender and sexuality. Gender can be examined by looking at the way we construct and perform gendered behaviors or by the way we historically treat females. But again all issues of diversity are interconnected so to examine one, is to gain knowledge in other areas of diversity. For example, Baynton (2004) suggests that "by the mid-nineteenth century, nonwhite races were routinely

connected to people with disabilities, both of whom were depicted as evolutionary laggards or throwbacks. As a consequence, the concept of disability, intertwined with the concept of race and was also caught up in the ideas of the evolutionary progress of women" (Baynton, 2004, p.95).

Disability is interestingly complex, as many modern issues of diversity often began as labels associated with a socially constructed abnormality. But again what is normal is culturally defined, for example the crippling results of foot binding was considered normal in China from the late tenth century to the early twentieth century. We would now see the labored movement of these slow moving ladies as a disability.

What is natural and normal are both constituted in large part by being

set in opposition to culturally variable notions of disability—just as the

natural was meaningful in relation to the monstrous and the deformed,

so are the cultural meaning of the normal produced in tandem with

disability (Baynton, 2004, p. 94-95).

Age, which is currently being socially redefined due to the baby-boomer cohort is another good example of the interconnections between diversities. In some western cultures, age was once associated with negative attitudes. It was believed that the older one became the more medical attention one would need. Older people were believed to be fragile both mentally and physically. "Toward the end of the nineteenth century, physicians believed… in a deficit model of aging" which characterized old age as a pathological condition" (Allen, 2011, p. 166). Now through the tool of television the media and the baby-boomer generation are offering a new cultural perspective on age. Culturally we now see aging as a vibrant part of the life cycle. Mediated images of

graying seniors biking, running, and enjoying all that life has to offer has helped to redefine our idea of age as a disability.

Understanding our Field as Multiple Theoretical Traditions

When I think of the topic of this study, the ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education in interpersonal communication, I look to the gatekeepers of the knowledge, the instructors, and their pedagogical practices. The art of teaching or pedagogy is exactly that, an art form, a skill or craft. Craig's (1999) work offers a theoretical frame for appreciating different approaches to this craft, since instructors are usually guided by a theoretical frame in designing their courses. Here I offer a review of Craig's seven traditions of communication theory to situate a discussion of the pedagogical choices we as instructors make as we guide and inform our students. In his essay, Craig asserts that, "all communication theories are relevant to a common practical life world in which communication is already a richly meaningful term" (Craig, 1999, p. 120). Craig's article nicely explains our field's interdisciplinary underpinnings as a source for our theoretical traditions and indeed this cross-pollination of ideas is what makes our field unique and increases our value to academia as a whole. "The communication discipline initially tried to set itself up as a kind of interdisciplinary clearinghouse for all of these disciplinary approaches. This spirit of interdisciplinarity is still with us and deserves to be cultivated as one of our more meritorious qualities" (p. 121). He articulates a strong argument that frames the connections among these traditions to the best quality of our field. "It is in the dialogue among these traditions that communication theory can fully engage with the ongoing practical discourse (or metadiscourse) about communication in society" (p. 120).

27

Craig (1999) also shows how our interdisciplinary roots can at times be problematic. "The incoherence of communication theory as a field can be explained by communication theory's multidisciplinary origins and by the particular ways in which communication scholars have used and too often misused the intellectual fruits that continue to pour from this multidisciplinary horn of plenty"(p. 121). In his essay Craig makes a valiant effort to bring consensus to the discourse and the research we generate by suggesting seven communication theories. These theoretical foundations can be seen as canonical theoretical frames from which we produce and critique the research the research we produce. These theoretical frames include: rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, sociopsychological, sociocultural and critical.

Rhetorical; as passed down from the ancient Greeks, rhetoric was traditionally understood as the artful use of discourse to persuade audiences. Current approaches to rhetoric are more multi-faceted with the basic underlining goal of rhetoric showing both sides of a story. Most rhetoricians work to examine a phenomenon without judgment in order to help us understand *how* arguments are shaped. Rhetoricians use the principles of rhetorical theory to "provide a useful vocabulary with which to conceptualize and discuss this common experience" (p. 136). Semiotic; semiotics is unique in that it centers on the communicative elements of signs and symbols as they shape our language. Scholars who situate their research in the semiotic tradition want to show how symbols are used to convey meaning. "In the semiotic tradition, communication is typically theorized as *intersubjective mediation by signs*" (Craig, 1999, p.136). Phenomenological; "phenomenology is theorized through dialogue or experience of otherness" (Craig, 1999, p. 138). Phenomenology unpacks the way we communicate with others in our everyday

interactions. Cybernetic; what is most unique about the theoretical tradition of cybernetics is that this tradition makes a deliberate space for collaboration and emphasizes co-creation of thought, imbedded in this tradition are the assumptions that "…the whole is greater than the sum of the parts, …that individuals can transcend their perspectives, and look at communication processes from a broader, systemic viewpoint, and does not hold individuals responsible for systemic outcomes that no one individual can control" (p. 142). And sociopsychological; scholars who seek to explain the cause of behavior or the effect of behavior choices tend to situate their work in this theoretical tradition. "Sociopsychological communication theory implies a strong moral imperative that we as individual communicators should make responsible choices based on scientific evidence concerning the likely consequences of our messages" (p. 144). In addition to the aforementioned theories Craig discusses sociocultural and critical two theories that I rely on to help situate a theoretical argument for this study.

Sociocultural

"Sociocultural communication theory represents the 'discovery' of communication . . . partly under the influence of semiotic thought, within the intellectual traditions of sociology and anthropology" (Craig, 1999, p.144). It supports the idea that "…our everyday interactions largely "reproduce" the existing sociocultural order" (p. 144). Sociocultural theories support the idea that, "social order (a macrolevel phenomenon) is created, realized, sustained, and transformed in microlevel interaction processes" (p. 144). For this study an alluring idea associated with sociocultural theory is that it "…appeals to the beliefs that individuals are products of their social environments, groups develop particular norms, rituals, and worldviews; and that social change can be

29

difficult and disruptive…" (p. 146). In line with the social constructionist ideas presented earlier in this chapter, "sociocultural theory cultivates communicative practices that acknowledge cultural diversity and relativity, value tolerance and understanding, and emphasize collective more than individual responsibility" (p.146).

Critical

One of the key perspectives informing this study is critical communication theory. "For critical communication theory, the basic "problem of communication" in society arises from material and ideological forces that prevent or distort discursive reflection" (Craig, 1999, p. 147). Craig's description of critical theory aligns with Connell's point that "theory [often] emerges from the social experience of the periphery, [and is revealed in research covering] in many genres and styles" (Connell, 2007, p. ix). Here I have taken assumptions from critical theory about the need to explore the communicative basis of inequalities to help justify my examination of textbooks, a prominent, but often overlooked, tool in education. Another way I have incorporated the theoretical underpinnings of critical communication is in the examination of SCD negotiation in the field of communication. Although often interpreted as a common communicative dilemma mandating attention in our communities and universities, diversity is often marginalized as subject matter and is almost never required as a course in communication curricula. The critical-theoretic model of communication supports an agenda of social change because it "embraces a dialectical frame of questioning presuppositions that unmasks those conditions and thereby points the way to social changes that would render genuine dialogue possible" (Craig, 1999, p. 148). Craig's categorization of our field's theoretical traditions invites an examination of our pedagogical approaches and treats the

30

entire field as "a resource for reflecting on practical problems that moves not away from practical concerns but looks more deeply into them" (p.149).

Some Perspective on Pedagogy

How do we in the field of communication approach the task of teaching the skill of negotiating SCD? Although there is no set approach to teaching SCD negotiation, most instructors in this area of our field choose a student centered pedagogical approach. By this I mean instructors often engage with students on a personal level through the use of stories, experiential activities, and personal narratives to craft the course work in a way that most closely fits with their understanding of what is most important in that topic area.

While researching for this project I examined the course descriptions and available syllabi of nearly a hundred SCD-related courses nationwide. While reviewing the course objectives, one pattern that stood out as the most common pedagogical approach applied when teaching SCD courses. I would characterize this approach as open and dialogic in nature as gleaned from the syllabi and the reoccurring use of phrases that imply open class discussions, and activities that are designed to build respect and classroom community. Those who choose to teach from a non-traditional or student-centered frame see the student/teacher relationship as a collaborative process where both have equal power and responsibility. My preliminary review of course syllabi suggested that the pedagogical approaches most compatible with social constructionist approaches to diversity are those approaches informed by critical cultural and critical feminist pedagogy, but diversity can be taught from any tradition of communication theory the teacher chooses (rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenonlogical, cybernetic,

31

sociopsychological, sociocultural or critical) (Craig, 1999 pp. 135-149). Many instructors chose to articulate their pedagogical approaches by identifying their theoretical frames as critical cultural inquiry or as feminist pedagogy, which also examines power structures and relationships, Such approaches ask students to consider their actions within the system, and challenge them to change the system by reshape the power dynamic (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Dolan, 2001).

Critical cultural pedagogy emphasizes the process of questioning. This reflexive approach opens a space for understanding any social constructions. The act of questioning is paramount in academia, yet students often mistrust its purpose, looking to the instructor for the "right response" (Walkerdine, 1992). However critical cultural pedagogy assists in advancing students' negotiation skills by setting a course toward helping students recognize the importance of critical questioning. Another approach to teaching SCD negotiation skills is feminist pedagogy. Similar to critical cultural pedagogy in that it stems from critical questioning, feminist pedagogy teaches not only critical thinking and the communicative process of negotiating but it also advocates action. Feminist pedagogy emphasizes SCD, the body, and activism while seeking to explore the ways in which the oppressed and the oppressor negotiate the socially constructed worlds around us.

Earlier in this study I positioned the idea of ontology. Ontology is an important philosophical concept to this study because it offers a base for the analysis of the ways we reveal or teach our 'truths' as instructors. Do the critical questions and inquiries we asked and tried to make sense of as "students" transfer to the way we challenge and teach SCD constructs to our students now as instructors, and if so *how*? Perhaps those

32

questions we asked as students were reflections of the pedagogical frames from which we were taught. Those instructors who operate from the rhetorical tradition of communication theory might approach diversity by examining the phrasing of questions in order to help students understand the persuasive nature of our SCD. For example in a diversity class taught from a rhetorical tradition the student might ask for the best phrasing of a message as to not offend those that may be seen as different. In the critical classroom students may be guided to examine the power dynamics of SCD. But whatever the theoretical tradition the instructor chooses, they must still decide on the culture of the classroom. Overall, instructors seemed to turn to pedagogical approaches that facilitate examining the current status quo, incorporating activities that engage in activist actions, and sometimes shift the power from one (the instructor) to many (the class) with choice words and creative assignments.

Critical cultural and feminist pedagogy approaches

The idea of co-creating the educational reality we experience or that all are implicated in the art of pedagogy is central to critical cultural communication pedagogy. The idea of co-creation is also central to the premise of social construction. Although many classical critical theorists including, Antonio Gramsci, and Michel Foucult, influenced the development of critical pedagogy it was Henry Giroux (1983) who first penned the term, "critical pedagogy". By joining his ideas with other philosophers, scholars and the Frankfurt school (for example, Paulo Friere, Myles Horton, Herbert Kohl, bell hooks, Maxine Greene) Giroux made critical pedagogy one of the most compelling educational approaches to come out of the 1980s and 1990s (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003). Many would credit the Frankfurt school for first publishing

the basic ideas of critical cultural inquiry. A brief summary of the history of Frankfurt school details the progression of this school of thought (for a historical perspective on the Frankfurt School see Darder, et. al. 2003).

Examining the formation of teaching practices from the frame of socially constructed differentness (SCD) is perhaps a daunting task to those who take a non-critical stance or those who believe knowledge in this area is that which can be measured and quantified (McLaren, 2003). I am not saying that instructors cannot be effective teaching the ideas of SCD from a traditional pedagogical frame. However, many adopt a critical cultural perspective when teaching the skills of recognizing, understanding, tolerating and accepting our and others' differentness (Darder et al., 2003, p. 499). An important tenet in critical cultural pedagogy involves understanding that, any educational or institutional change must first begin with the people who make up that system.

Critical cultural theorists turn the lens away from the dominant group toward those who are considered the marginalized or oppressed in a culture. Critical cultural theorists ask, how can those who are on the perimeter gain voice or power within the culture? Critical cultural pedagogy is important to an analysis of SCD because this frame allows us to challenge the status quo. Furthermore critical cultural pedagogy allows for the reflexive understanding of how we are all implicated in these complex social systems and how our relationships to the constructions within these systems are created. The critical cultural frame provides a starting point for exploring social norms and socially constructed rules that respect and support knowledge, development and growth of what is considered "normal." This frame invites inquiry into ideas of normalcy and how it is used in the construction of social inequalities. This in-group and out-group line of thinking can

be damaging to some as social norms can and often do support an unbalanced social power by silencing those who are constructed as different. It was Freire (2003) who wrote:

> Every prescription represents the imposition of one individual's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed to into one that conforms with the Prescriber's consciousness. Thus, the behavior of the oppressed is a prescribed behavior, following as it does the guidelines of the oppressor…Freedom would require them to reject this image and replace it with autonomy and responsibility (p 47).

To fully understand critical cultural communication, we must examine the components that went into its creation. A key element of critical cultural communication is the idea of agency. One tenet of critical pedagogy states, "in order for education or institutional change to be effective, it has to begin with the people themselves" (Freire, 2003). The notion is that we are all agents with the freedom to choose the way we interact in this world. While in our communities, we must abide by the rules the community already has in place. But when the rules we construct silence or oppress a section of its members (which most communities do) we are able to implement the idea of critical cultural communication to make sense of this silencing. Another important tenet for the critical cultural communication pedagogy is for instructors to understand and share the idea that we are all agents and capable of understanding and changing the social rules we seemingly adhere to. Friere identifies the roles of the agents as the oppressor and the oppressed. From this perspective, we might consider the oppressor as the academic institution, the instructor, the course objectives and/or the tools used to aid in education.

We can also examine the idea of oppression through pedagogical choices. There are also those who feel this work can begin only when and if we work around the ways we understand agency and perhaps move into the realm of discomfort in order to find new avenues for agency: "It is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors" (Friere, 2003, p. 56). In other words, we need to work to find new "truths" in our work and the ways we instruct our students. Along that line Craig (1999) offers, "the field of communication theory marks out a common discursive space—a space for theoretical metadiscourse—in which more specialized theoretical discourses can engage with each other and with practical metadiscourse on questions of communication as a social practice" (p. 154).

Teaching agency and identifying how we are all implicated in the idea of differentness as a changeable construction calls for a new way of thinking about training and teaching, one which embraces a non-dichotomous approach. Instead of juxtaposing normal to abnormal, it involves learning to see them both as variations on ideas of normalcy. This formula for teaching my idea of a non-binary approach to identity and SCD is best articulated in Friere's work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In working with the oppressed, Freire (2003) suggests using a frame defined by tolerance and awareness of oppressor vulnerability as a way to begin teaching from a place of love. He argues that "the oppressed must see examples of the vulnerability of the oppressor so that a contrary conviction can begin to grow within them" (Friere, 2003, p. 64). When the oppressed begin to see the system as oppressive they can then work to change the system. But they must always be careful to not repeat the rules that once held them. They must work to see the system from an entirely new frame where they are independent thinkers working from

36

the outskirts of the system, not from within. "Only in the interdependence is an authentic praxis possible, without which it is impossible to resolve the oppressor/oppressed contradiction" (Friere, 2003, pp. 51-52).

Alongside critical cultural pedagogy stands another significant pedagogical approach and that is feminist pedagogy. Feminist pedagogy has its roots in non-traditional critical pedagogy and ultimately seeks to motivate others to action. Activism is a key element of this pedagogical approach. It is this action step that moves us from critical cultural toward feminist pedagogy. This pedagogical shift also takes us from the theoretical ideas put forth in critical questioning to the idea of a more applied or embodied pedagogical approach. Freire (2003) speaks to the idea of feminist pedagogy when he presents the idea of liberatory pedagogy as a method that focuses on education and classroom practices and incorporates the notion of critically understanding the placement of power. Feminist pedagogy focuses on various sources of power, be they language, or physical oppression. This pedagogy, "is based on assumptions about power and consciousness-raising, acknowledges the existence of oppression as well as the possibility of ending it, and foregrounds the desire for the primary goal of social transformation" (Crabtree, Sapp & Licona, 2009, p. 3). Textbooks are culturally mediated pedagogical tools and a significant part of the socialization process of undergraduates. As such, critical and feminist frameworks invite us to examine and interrogate the content of these texts.

A Critique of Our Tools

Textbooks are the tools of our trade. "Textbook authors' role as gatekeepers is to reflect the best of the research, theory, and application reported in our journals and

discussed at our conventions, as well as that which is relevant from other related fields"
(Devito [1986] as quoted in Webb and Thompson-Hayes (2002). Other academic fields
have asked the same questions I ask here: what information are we giving our students
and how consistent is it across the field?

For several decades, scholars in different disciplines have been using content
analysis to identify trends in textbooks. For example Burns and Rupiper, (1977) and
Knapp (1985) carried out content analysis of psychology textbooks. Knapp's (1985) is
particularly interesting as its findings are implicitly critical of these texts as knowledge
sources. He surveyed the indexes of introductory level texts to determine the authors
cited most frequently and found that Skinner appeared most frequently, Freud second,
and Piaget third, suggesting that "American introductory psychology is European in its
authorities, observational in its method, and still cognitive in its outlook" (p.17).

Following along this line of inquiry two communication scholars decided to
conduct a content analysis of textbooks in the field of communication. Recognizing the
need for a clear connection between field cohesion and undergraduates' common
knowledge base, Webb and Thompson-Hayes (2002) conducted a study that questioned
whether our field operates from a common theoretical base, by identifying the most
commonly taught communication theories in our field. The study is significant to our
field because it calls attention to our field's epistemological assumptions and also raises
questions about how those assumptions help or hinder our field's common theoretical
narrative from moving forward. After analyzing undergraduate textbooks in interpersonal
communication, Webb and Thompson-Hayes (2002) concluded that we have very few
foundational theories that we all know and that we consistently teach to others. The study

questioned our common theoretical and epistemological understanding and offered information about how we as a field coordinate the knowledge we use to shape our future communication scholars. This study further questioned if the depth of the interpretation in these textbooks appropriately informed future communication scholars. As one of the few studies to examine undergraduate communication textbooks in order to determine a common theoretical base for our field, this article offers a sound foundation for this proposed project. Similar to Webb and Thompson-Hayes (2002), the motivation for my study arises from the need to understand the source for our collective knowledge and how we use that knowledge to shape future communication scholars. This study helps to position a need for more inquiry into the greater common narratives we share as part of the ways we communicate and teach others.

Working from the same desire for unity through coordinated knowledge, Hendrix et al. (2003) conducted a similar content analysis. They reviewed the treatment of diversity education in our field. This study was significant because the authors conducted a review of the articles centered on diversity education issues published in *Communication Education* a highly regarded journal in the field of communication. Looking at *Communication Education* journals from its inception to 2002 this study served as a call to action among communication educators. Hendrix, et al. (2002) expressed a concern for our lack of treatment of the issue of diversity information specific to the field of communication.

Craig (1999) offers a critique of our field's need to unify the language by suggesting we localize our scholarship in seven traditions of communication theory offering a basis for centralizing the conversations about our theory and our field. Just as

39

Webb & Thompson-Hayes (2002), offer a similar critique by calling our attention to a lack of a common theoretical base in our field. In their study they look at the common communication theories in our field and hint to a consensus of the teaching of these theories to our undergraduates. Similarly, Hendrix et al. (2002) ask us to consider the wavering interest in teaching and generating knowledge on issues related to diversity education. I connect these articles to a pattern of inquiry that Craig (1999) suggests as the sociocultural tradition of communication theory. The idea that "communication is a production and reproduction of our social order" (p. 133). In the area of interpersonal communication we have no common theoretical frames to situate our knowledge, meaning we as instructors of interpersonal communication may or may not choose to lay emphasis on the idea of social construction. "Sociocultural theory cultivates communicative practices that acknowledge cultural diversity and relativity, value tolerance and understanding, and emphasize collective more than individual responsibility" (Craig, 1999, p.146). In agreement with Craig and Webb & Thompson-Hayes, embracing a sociocultural perspective in introductory communication courses may help to lay emphasis on the importance of understanding socialization and social construction at the beginning of our undergraduates' educational experiences. Given its axiomatic status in our field, social construction could serve as a strong theoretical base capable of situating many issues connected to the understanding and teaching of issues related to diversity. This in turn would help the students understand the interconnectivity between interpersonal relationships and issues of diversity and help to generate more scholarship that examines these constructs as Hendrix, et. al., call for in their article. By

40

demanding more textual and pedagogical consistency, we help our students enter into the community of academic conversations with more knowledge and confidence.

I aim to examine undergraduate interpersonal communication textbooks using content analysis. As a method, content analysis will help me to develop descriptive claims about the frequency of diversity issues found in interpersonal communication textbooks. Understanding the frequency of diversity topics and issues presented in interpersonal communication textbooks can help to begin a conversation about our ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity.

By offering a study that investigates the intersection between our textbooks and the SCD, this study is positioned to open a dialogue on the art of teaching diversity, a critical examination of topic of SCD, and to inspire a closer examination of the pedagogical tools we use to introduce diversity to our students. Engaging in discourse that examines communication's role in teaching the next generation of scholars is an important conversation we need to have if we intend on leading academia in this area of knowledge. I offer the following research questions to guide my observations of the data.

Research Questions

RQ 1: To what extent are issues of diversity covered in a representative sample of interpersonal communication textbooks?

And

RQ 2: What are some pedagogical implications of these treatments of diversity as revealed in reflective conversations about the analysis of textbook content?

These questions focus attention not only on the patterns and trends in content but also the way those trends shape the opportunities we as instructors have to present, and in

some cases, challenge them as we seek to teach this important topic to our

undergraduates.

Chapter Four

Methodological Procedures

Research Design

As stated in the introduction, my goal is to examine the ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education in the field of communication. When I think of academic underpinnings, I think of textbooks. As instructors we often rely on textbooks to introduce students to the canon, tenets and axioms of our field. Textbooks are seen as the best representative data for this study because they are understood by both students and instructors as presenting the foundations of knowledge specific to our field. And they offer entry insight into multiple areas of ontological and epistemological understanding. Textbook content offers different forms and levels of insight. The writing styles of the textbook authors are significant because they hint at differences in ways of knowing, as for example when students' voices are incorporated in the text, when reflective textboxes are used, and so on. The textbooks we use mirror our field in that they offer a variety of styles that aid in teaching from varied pedagogical approaches.

My research inquiry is guided by the idea that there are multiple truths in the data, rather than "a fixed text with fixed meanings" (Denzin, 1997 in Ellingson, 2009). In keeping with the goals of qualitative inquiry, I employ multiple methods for interpreting the content of the textbooks. Opening the methodological frame to capture multiple truths offers more insight into our field's ontoepistemological underpinnings. Ellingson (2009)

describes the multi-methods mixed genre approach as "crystallization." Ellingson writes, "Crystallization projects span multiple points on the qualitative continuum in order to maximize the benefits of contrasting approaches to analysis and representation" (p. 10). This project incorporates the fluidity of emergent design consisting of content analysis, thematic analysis, and reflexivity as the methodological tools for this project. The initial methodological frame for this study focused on content analysis in order to understand the ontoepistemological underpinnings of SCD in our field. The results of the content analysis are presented in charts which show the frequency of occurrences. These charts are not only intended to assert an empirical truth, but also to aid in interpreting and gauging the significance of the interpretive claims made in this study. But the methodological frame shifted to a more in-depth thematic analysis as I realized the content required a more in-depth examination. As Boyatzis (1998) and others have suggested, "Thematic analysis is a process to be used with qualitative information." Boyatzis holds that thematic analysis is a way of seeing. Observation precedes understanding. Recognizing an important moment (seeing) precedes encoding it (seeing it as something), which in turn precedes interpretation (1998, p. 4). I employ thematic analysis as a way to glean more than just numbers of occurrences from the data and offer an alternate method of analysis for future scholars who seek to advance the conversation on SCD and/or replicate a study of this nature. Broadening the methodological frame allowed for a more reflexive analysis of the content, a stance that seems almost required when examining issues related to diversity or SCD negotiation. Overall I conceptualize the study as following an "emergent design" (Cavallo, 2000). This emergent, or evolving, frame enabled me to incorporate content analysis, thematic analysis and reflexivity in a

way which effectively captures the complexity of SCD negotiation education in the field of communication. Cavallo (2000) first coined the term emergent design when he explained his observations of our traditional educational systems and suggested reexamining some of our traditional processes of teaching technology to others. Cavallo does not limit this reshaping of the design only to the art of teaching but he opens it up as an invitation to re-think all of our traditional tools of inquiry. For this study I adapted his process of emergent design to show how I, together with the coders of this study, allowed each other the freedom to create a way of being more inclusive during the process of coding the content, which in turn reflexively revealed another way of understanding SCD negotiation and how we teach this negotiation process to others. As Cavallo suggests, "when the freedom of expression exists, then the learner has the space in which to express himself or herself in a manner faithful to the learner's thoughts"(Cavallo, 2000, p. 771).

Reflexive content analysis defined

The next point of interest centers on my role, the role of the coders, and the act of reflexivity. I positioned a section of this project as a reflexive examination of the coders meetings which are explored to further examine the content. Bateson (1972) offers a unique understanding of the usefulness of reflexivity in qualitative research by asking researchers to ask questions to examine the "negative restraints" (p. 406) of patterns; I interpret this as a reminder to look for alternate reasons that might explain our choices in diversity education and to ask what else is possible in my data collection and analysis process? I honored Bateson's ideas by establishing a reflexive frame for gathering and interpreting the data. Reflexive content analysis is the phrase I use to explain another way

of generating and understanding the data. Content analysis is a powerful empirical tool

for understanding the frequency of a specific topic or issue. Yet, its empirical nature

limits the type of interpretations one can make about the topic in question. As Connell

reminds us, "The moment we ask questions about the truth in 'indigenous knowledge',

we are obligated to think in a different ways. This opens questions about the growth of

knowledge and the transformations of social thought in dialogue and collective learning"

(Connell, 2007, p. 224). Understanding the frequency of occurrences is good when you

want to argue the significance of the data found, but my interest goes beyond this to the

conversations that the data generates. What happens in the gray space that occurs when

the coders and researcher meet? Do these "off the record" conversations generate

insightful observations about the data and the topic? Will a meta-conversation on

diversity education occur? Having been a coder myself, I believe these conversations

contain some of the richest and most stimulating reflexive information. Therefore I am

adding a second phase to my method. This phase lays emphasis on the coders of the study

by giving them a voice in the production of thought for this study. In traditional content

analysis coders simply serve as tools of reliability, in some cases being replaced by

computer software (SPSS) altogether. Expanding the role of the coder to enlightened

participant helps to develop a continued dialogue on SCD negotiation. Examining the

ontoepistemological underpinnings of SCD negotiation and discussing the patterns with

others will generate more critical questioning of our methods and tools used to teach

socially constructed phenomena. Connell (2007) states, "I think it is helpful to think of

social science not as a settled system of concepts, methods and findings, but as an

interconnected set of intellectual projects that proceed from varied social starting points

into an unpredictable future. (If we can predict the outcome of research, we do not need to do that research. The riskiness of science is fundamental)" (p 228). At best, what we as researchers ask of the data and ourselves, is to gain a better understanding of the complexity of the relationships we are examining. What this reflexive content analysis does is allow an examination of the data from a reflexive frame in order to contribute to the conversations around SCD negotiation. This in turn that helps to show how we in academia can become more comfortable with the ambiguity of SCD negotiation produces. "It is, then, possible to conceive of networks of cooperation in the social sciences that run around and across the periphery" (Connell, 2007, p. 228).

Research Procedures

I first drew on principles of content analysis, in particular, the idea of frequency counts, to establish the methodological parameters of the project. In other words this helped me gauge the landscape of the texts. Content analysis generated an understandable frame and in its most traditional form is scientifically replicable. Once the data was sorted, organized, and quantified, thematic analysis offered a broader analytic frame for interpretation. At this point in the project, thematic analysis offered a more qualitatively-oriented interpretation of the data by seeking to explain how we "*see*" the data. Reflexivity opened the analytic possibilities even wider by allowing me the space to reflect and report on my own choices in the project. This opens the conversation on the data and on the process by discussing *why* I had both the successes and failures that I had in this project. My project benefits from incorporating a "crystallization" framework as put forth by Richardson (1994) and developed by Ellingson (2009) insofar as it enables me to capture the conversation on SCD as a fluid and every changing construct.

Crystallization is best understood as a way of understanding how qualitative methods fit together and are related to each other when more than one qualitative method is used. It shows the fluidity of the various qualitative methods in a way that gives them equal value by positioning the epistemological underpinnings of various methodological stances along a continuum ranging from more quantitative and empiricist to qualitative and interpretive. In the context of my project, crystallization allows me to go beyond one single-method, quantitative claims about the representative, data by inviting alternate perspectives and valuing other interpretations. Crystallization shows how by incorporating these various qualitative perspectives, I am able to generate a stronger critical project that serves to generate serious questions about our field's ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education. In the remainder of this chapter I explain the specific procedures involved in the three parts of my study: content analysis, thematic analysis, and the incorporation of reflexivity.

Content Analysis

Put simply, "content analysis sets out—to condense and elucidate the content, to bring out the essential or point out certain typical characteristics. It is a matter of describing the content not by itemizing all the words and clauses, but by revealing features that are not immediately apparent to readers…" (Findahl, & Höijer, 1981, p. 111). Krippendorf (1980) brings a slightly different emphasis by incorporating ideas of context. He writes, "from 'data to their context'—content analysis is now a modern tool for studying the cultural patterns of meaning" (p. 13). What I find interesting in this sentence is the idea of understanding and examining cultural patterns of meaning. As a trusted method for understanding cultural context, particularly when used in combination

with more thematic analysis, content analysis holds potential for producing insight about the materials we use to introduce and communicate issues of diversity to our field. This knowledge will serve to begin a conversation about the treatment of diversity education in our field.

This study of interpersonal communication textbooks could include an analysis of the academic and visual *space* devoted to issues of diversity in our undergraduate textbooks. I italicized the word, "space," because the selection and prominence of words, and the choice of photos and fonts in textbooks often serve to meta-communicate about the importance of content. I did not analyze these visual aspects of content, but rather chose to focus on the textual aspects. For this study I chose to narrow the lens of the content and focused on common canon, tenants, and axioms of diversity or SCD found in these select interpersonal communication textbooks in order to understand how we teach diversity to our young scholars.

Scholars have used content analysis to understand and/or interpret textual data since the 18th century. The first recorded account of content analysis occurred in Scandinavia when Swedish authorities and religious leaders used content analysis to gain a better understanding of religious hymns, the *Songs of Zion* (Krippendorf, 1980). The leaders at the time were concerned with the misrepresentation of the Bible via hymns and sermons. So in order to determine the intent of the various religious sects they evaluated the hymns and sermons for evidence of heresy (Rosengren, 1981). Today content analysis is a popular methodology for interpreting mediated images and text by coding the raw data in order to identify and describe patterns and/or trends in the text. Content analysis is

most commonly used to investigate mass mediated communication because of the popularity and widespread availability of images and texts (Krippendorf, 1980).

Interpersonal communication textbooks as texts for analysis

A professor once said, textbooks help to introduce students to what is known as the greater scholarly conversation, by coordinating knowledge of the theories, language and symbols used in our field and this comment has stuck with me. In academia textbooks help to coordinate knowledge and help instructors frame complex ideas into manageable parcels of information that we then share with our students. Because of their widespread use and purpose, I feel textbooks are the best place to begin understanding the foundation of our knowledge as a field. That is why I decided to start my examination of issues of diversity where most if not all communication undergraduate students begin, with an analysis of contemporary interpersonal communication textbooks.

Investigating the frequency of occurrences related to diversity in our cherished interpersonal communication textbooks can help us engage in more critical and reflexive conversations about our treatment of the importance of diversity education in our field. As a way to organize this study I paid close attention to the *ways* our popular interpersonal communication textbooks introduce issues of diversity to our students. I identified and documented the frequency of any occurrence associated with the idea of SCD found in the body of the textbooks.

On April 28, 2012 I ran an advanced search for the best selling interpersonal communication textbooks on the Amazom.com website. While the list of books did not reveal the total numbers sold, it gave information about the relative popularity of textbooks from bestselling to least. Therefore I selected the first three books authored by

50

communication scholars and decided to base this study on the information gleaned from these books. These books, in order of popularity were Joseph DeVito's (2013) *The interpersonal communication book; thirteenth edition;* Julia T. Wood's (2010) *Interpersonal communication everyday encounters; sixth edition*; and Kory Floyd's (2011) *Interpersonal Communication; second edition.* Although using Amazon.com to locate popular texts is not a definitive way to go about finding the *most* popular, it helps to narrow the list of popular textbooks and increases the chances that the texts chosen for this study have influenced many communication students and communication instructors.

Identifying occurrences and thematic categories

To begin, I started with an examination of the frequency of issues presented in interpersonal communication textbooks. Frequencies are an appropriate place to start the conversation about diversity because they offer a frame that exposes the occurrences of issues of diversity at the introductory level of a student's education. I first identified the significant elements of diversity and then I worked on determining the best way of identifying the elements within the text. I made the decision to initially use the most fluid and open-ended parameters for the data collection process. This was done to leave a space for all occurrences found in the body of the text to be counted, discussed and analyzed.

The categories used for this study are partially derived from existing literature. Allen (2011) offers a frame for identifying six dimensions of difference commonly considered as topics in diversity. I initally chose to focus the efforts of this study on five of them (sexual orientation, race, age, ability and socio-economic status and religion). I am not using this study to identify the frequency with which issues of gender are

broached in the texts (she/he, his/her, female/male), as gender is a significant part of many interpersonal relationships and is often the focus of chapters in interpersonal communication textbooks. What is most important to me as I organize the content of the texts for this study is the idea of normativity as it is positioned against ideas of difference, in the process, asking how do the authors convey the notion of diversity to the readers? Early in the research, a basic question arose about whether the categories and boundaries I put into place were effective in opening a conversation about the treatment of diversity in our field. As Boyatzis wrote, "…you first make the observation that something important or notable is occurring, and then you classify or describe it. . . It all begins with capturing the codable moment" (p. 4).

Thematic Analysis

In this study thematic analysis serves as a bridge connecting content analysis to a more interpretive analysis. Although content analysis is typically associated with quantifiable results, it is not the primary goal of this project. According to Boyatzis, "thematic analysis is a process for encoding qualitative information" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. vi). A key reason for using thematic analysis in this project is to inform a broader interpretive analysis than by simply using content analysis alone; thematic analysis allows the identification and description of patterns in the material that may not be revealed by content analysis alone. Situating the findings of the representative texts as qualitative as well as quantitative results is important as it stimulates a greater conversation on SCD negotiation.

According to Boyatzis, "a theme is a pattern found in the information that at minimum describes and organizes the possible observations and at maximum interprets

aspects of the phenomenon. A theme may be identified at the manifest level (directly

observable in the information) or at the latent level (underlying the phenomenon)"

(Boyatzis, 1998, p. 4).

Boyatizis suggests that thematic analysis has four stages that make it a unique

choice for qualitative analysis. First thematic analysis rests in the hands of the primary

researcher of the study. During this stage, the researcher reviews the representative texts

to get a sense of the themes and capture codable moments or occurrences found in the

text (Boyatzis, 1998). The second stage involves removing the impulse to read critically

or "read into" the context of the text and "…discipline[ing] themselves to use themes, or

to rely on the established codes. During this second stage the researcher is determining

patterns in the data that fit the themes, taking the opportunity to *see* and to *see as* (to

recognize the codable moment and encode it) consistently" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 10). The

third stage involves "developing a code to process and analyze or capture the essence of

the observations." During this stage criteria are put into place as parameters for

identifying themes found in the text (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 11). "In the fourth stage, the

researcher interprets the information and themes in a way that contributes to the

development of knowledge" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 11). During this stage the thematic

analysis takes shape as an interpretive study by opening up a greater space for discussing

the findings than simply reporting the results as static findings. The idea of interpreting

what is seen in the text mandates a more reflexive analysis.

Themes are important to me in this project as many issues of SCD are like the topic

itself, complex and varied. Its important to understand when examining SCD phenomena

that not all occurrences found in the text will easily fit into predetermined textual

parameters and are not always limited to a word, a sentence or even a series of sentences. Occurrences of SCD found in interpersonal communication textbooks are complex because they both directly communicate information to our students and through "gaps" or what is left unsaid, they may meta-communicate to those students who may be sensitive to socially constructed differentness. Those reading the textbooks who are sensitive to the SCD may notice what is present and what is missing in the text. In this project it is important to discuss both depth and breath of each construct in order to move this conversation forward.

Descriptions of thematic categories as codes

Thematic analysis begins with developing a code. The codes presented, "may be a list of themes; a complex model with themes, indicators, and qualifications that are causally related; or something in between these two forms" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 4). The codes for this project allow for an examination of issues of diversity found in the representative text. One particular pattern I noticed in the texts was the use of comparisons between American or western cultural norms and those of other global cultural groups. However, at other times the information on diversity is presented without juxtaposition against other beliefs, phenomena or cultural norms. Using themes helps to tease out these complexities and variations in the text. Developing a theme that fits the topic but is not too exacting is important to the project at hand and any future projects that are generated. "If your code is too difficult to learn, other researchers will avoid it, and the field will lose the benefit of building on your work directly" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 10). Following are the definitions of the categories used in coding.

Race, ethnicity, nationality

Working definitions of this category included any content found in the text that identified a person or group of people by region, nation, country, nationality. Initially, in this area I included religion but later took religion out and gave it its own category.

Sexual orientation

Because gender and gendered speech codes are a significant part of many interpersonal relationships and the focus of large sections of interpersonal communication textbooks, gendered language was not coded as a part of this study, but issues and language referring to sexual orientation were included.

Ability

Ability was coded by counting the frequency of occurrences including both physical and mental expectations and/or limitations. As with sexual orientation and age, anything that authors identify as unique enough to mention was coded and counted as an occurrence of ability.

Socio-economic status or class

Any mention of socio-economic status (SES) was coded and counted as an issue of diversity. For example when labels such as third-world, high or low SES, at-risk individuals, or housing choices common to high or low income and locations such as Beverly Hills, YMCA, or homeless shelters were used, the context surrounding the label was counted as an occurrence.

Religion

Religion as an issue in diversity was made into its own section after I realized that there were instances in which the negotiation of inter-religious communication and understanding elements of various religious groups were mentioned.

Age

Another important dimension of diversity education is age. A working definition of age includes any categorizing or labeling of people or groups of people by age, cohort, or date specific labels such as Baby-boomer or Generation X. Identifying an age cohort is in essence setting that age cohort out as an outlier from the norm by calling attention to age and was therefore counted as an occurrence of diversity. An example of this category may appear in the text as toddler, grandparent and any other mention that makes age a salient feature in a way that is not consistent with the dominant cultural norms (young adult to middle age).

In addition to identifying and explaining issues of diversity listed above, I added a section for language as well.

Language

Language as an occurrence was unique and surprising to me, as I did not initially intend for this category to emerge and did not have clear parameters in place to situate the occurrences of this issue. Special interest was taken if terms or language or labels appeared in the text and they were carefully categorized and coded in the relevant category. As we read the content of the texts, the coders and I worked to remain mindful of all the possible categories that arose as relevant to diversity and through careful consideration decided to code unique overt references to language when language

referred to communicating with or about an issue of diversity. An example of the unique situation where language was made salient in the text might include occurrences when the author chose to comment on terms that are unique to specific diverse groups or ideas such as Spanglish or Ebonics or when speaking about racial label choices such as cablacasian (a term Tiger Woods used to refer to his racial makeup) to replace terms of diversity.

Identifying and characterizing suggested pedagogical approaches

Finding and categorizing pedagogical approaches and tools within the texts was difficult. SCD lessons often rely on instructors taking advantage of teaching moments. The textbooks' authors' writing styles and authorial choices also contribute to and shape the teaching style of the instructor in the way the books present theories, ideas, and suggested activities. However regardless of the textbooks' approach, the information presented in the texts is often treated differently in the classroom. For example, a simple ice-breaker of stating your name and an interest can become a community-building activity depending on the instructor's treatment of the students and their response to the information. In this project I only minimally explore suggested pedagogical approaches that appear in the text, but I go into some detail about my own interpretations of suggested pedagogical approaches as revealed in the textbooks. This is done by plotting the authors' epistemological stance on a continuum ranging from what could be called social scientific/ realist approaches to approaches blending qualitative/interpretive and social scientific assumptions (see Ellingson, 2009 for a related discussion). Social scientific approaches emphasize truth claims based on measurements and statistics; Whereas qualitative/interpretive approaches place more emphasis on the meanings

participants assign to their experiences. As I will explain in the next chapter, I have made an attempt to situate each textbook in terms of its place on a continuum ranging from social scientific/ realist to qualitative/interpretive.

The Challenge of Reliability

Analyzing content is a common method used in communication but issues of reliability are complicated to navigate when examining something as fluid as human communication. The more complex the phenomenon, the more complicated issues of inter-rater reliability become. Inter-rater reliability in coding is usually felt to be a necessity in content analysis in order to reduce the possibility of researcher bias in the analysis. To address this concern, some researchers will narrow the unit of analysis down to its smallest element in an effort to report high percentages of inter-rater reliability, whereas other scholars opt to sample the data using larger units of analysis, which results in a lower score of inter-rater reliability. Regardless of methodological direction chosen (more social scientific/realist or more qualitative/interpretive), whenever a researcher attempts to identify and categorize data, questions about reliability arise: that is, to what extent do different analysts perceive categories and occurrences in a similar way. In this case, I tried to retain a commitment to the integrity of the idea of reliability without necessarily using the formalism of traditional reliability measurements.

Andrén (1981) connects the importance of reliability with the responsibility to find qualified coders. This task became even more salient as I took the opportunity to explore a new role for my coders. In an effort to stay true to my humanist roots I decided to add the voice of the coders to the results section. With Andrén's words as a guide I met

58

this requirement by asking four individuals at varying levels of education to assist in the coding process. The coders for this project included individuals with a range of educational levels: Mike, a retired professor with a Ph.D. in communication with a strong social scientific background, in his seventies, who racially identifies as White and is married to a woman who is a practicing Quaker: Religious society of friends. Fran a retired married housewife in her seventies with a B.S. degree in psychology and a love of learning all things related to diversity, who racially identifies as White and is also a practicing Quaker: Religious society of friends. Christine a non-traditional undergraduate student in her fifties working toward a degree in international business, who identifies as Black, and she too was raised by a Quaker although she does not claim Quakerism as her religion. Similarly all the coders involved in this study had a close affiliation to the Quaker religion. I and another coder recognize Quakerism as our preferred religious practice, and the other two coders have several family members who identify and practice Quakerism as well, it would be a false statement to say that this group is religiously diverse. But what made this group of coders work so well for this study was the variety our various epistemological stances brought to the discussion. Although there was little diversity in coders age, socio-economic status, and religious beliefs we had a fruitful discussion of the categories, content and occurrences.

I worked most extensively with Christine, the non-traditional undergraduate student, particularly in the early stages of the analysis. In the next section I describe the coding procedures used in the first phase of the analysis, including some of the challenges I encountered. Then I turn to a description of the second phase. What I am

calling the reflexive content analysis involved conversations among all three coders in an effort to give them a more explicit voice in the interpretation of findings.

The Content Analysis Process

As a method, content analysis is expansive and has many procedural incarnations. In this study content analysis was originally positioned as the best method to use for examining the phenomenon of the social construction of differentness (SCD) in interpersonal communication textbooks.

To begin the analysis I reviewed three popular interpersonal communication textbooks. The popularity of these textbooks was determined by an advanced search for the top selling interpersonal communication textbooks on Amazon.com. Once I acquired the three textbooks and gained access to the supplemental instructor information that often accompanies the texts, I began reviewing the content with the intent to identify any occurrence in the text that deals with the six areas of SCD chosen for this study.

During the first reading of the content I had to reconcile several conflicting issues, which may have affected the number of occurrences found in this study. First, I had to address each author's writing style. This became an issue in isolating the occurrences as the three authors used different ways to support the information they were offering. For example, Floyd, (2011) incorporated several examples of various cultural perspectives as example using terms such as "Western," "Eastern," "Sub-Saharan" and "Caribbean" to discuss one issue of diversity, presenting these terms in a straightforward way and the supporting the claims with citations to several articles. In such cases this language was interpreted as an attempt to show the vastness of the cultures he was using as exemplars. Using a variety of terms to explain different cultures helps to open the student's

perspective of these cultures and shows that the interpersonal construct being discussed is not unique to one culture. But, because each author used different terms and different studies to support their claims it became difficult to compare their content side-by-side.

Another stylistic issue was that the authors also articulated several different ways of addressing interpersonal phenomena using varying "voices" to explain interpersonal communication. DeVito (2013) and Floyd (2011), explained the constructs using a more expository phrasing while Wood (2010) used students' narratives. This variation was made more salient because of the way issues of diversity were organized in the texts. For example, Wood was the only author to devote a chapter to race and in that incorporated issues related to diversity or SCD negotiation while DeVito and Floyd peppered each chapter of the text with examples of our socially constructed differences. And third, although all the texts presented the information at an undergraduate level, there seemed to be differences in the audience they were writing to. Some author's writing styles incorporated more critical reflection while others presented information as clear and seldom disputed fact. Across all the books, it was typical that, after a point was made either with measurable evidentiary support or using descriptive narratives, the textbook authors challenged the reader to critically consider what was being said. I make a point to mention these differences here because the author's style choices affected the number of occurrences generated and therefore may affect the way the data is interpreted, as you will read in chapter five.

Once I thought a passage represented an occurrence of SCD I highlighted it directly in the text. I gave the three books to my first coder who also read the books cover to cover and independently highlighted any passages representative of the phenomenon in

question, doing this helped me reconcile the fact that I could not give a book to each of my coders. I determined that having one coder review the representative text was sufficient as my first coder was willing to devote the time to reading the three books. This process helped with inter-rater or inter-coder reliability because it was later determined that I had a tendency to, "*read into*" the passage what I knew they were "*getting at*" while my first coder having not worked with interpersonal communication textbooks saw the information as it was written and did not infer meaning where there may have been none intended. This fits with Boyatzis' point that "when researchers have too much familiarity, it is often difficult for them to resist their own typical response to the situation" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 13).

After the second reading I made a copy of all the marked passages and made a second copy of the data. I now had two copies of the data with the representative passages or raw data underlined. Understanding that time commitments and schedule conflicts may prevent all coders meeting every time for multiple meetings I then sat down with the first coder and had our first coders meeting to discuss the representative data. This initial coders meeting spanned over thee days and took eight hours each day to complete, allowing for one lunch break and two breaks per day.

Prior to this first meeting we each identified any passage in the text we thought fit the parameters of a SCD resulting in over 580 passages in need of review. I then asked the first coder to sit with me and examine our combined selected passages against the parameters we set for each occurrence. This, the first of four coder's meetings resulted in the identification of 540 original occurrences. This first meeting, offered a couple of clarifying moments. First it helped me to see that there was some vagueness in the

parameters of the categories, (a topic I will discuss later in chapter five). Second, it helped to organize the content in order to maximize time efficiency in the other coders meetings. Third it provided me with the first opportunity to examine the occurrences independent of the textbooks. The unexpected lessons of this pretest were eye opening and allowed for: a full review of the textbooks in order to ensure that all the representative data had been identified, to review the underlined passages to determine if we indeed had captured the passages in their entirety, and to see if we had consensus on the occurrences we identified. At this point in the process we thought it was important to discuss and assign each passage to a labeled thematic category as we methodically moved thorough the textbooks.

This led us to the first change to the initial design of the content analysis. During this meeting we went into great detail (maybe we took ourselves a bit too seriously) and saw that some information fit the parameters of two categories, or was important to the topic *but* did not fit the parameters of the categories as laid out in the description of the method. To address the first dilemma we decided to organize the representative data into categories or stacks of similar data (themed categories). If a passage fit two categories we simply made two photocopies of the passage in its entirety and assigned one copy to category A and the other copy to category B. The second dilemma took a little longer to resolve. Ultimately we decided to add a miscellaneous category (M) and agreed to review that stack of passages later, taking the time to notice any patterns that may emerge form the data. In the end we settled on seven thematic categories for the representative data; 1. Race, ethnicity, nationality, 2. Sexual orientation, 3. Physical ability, 4. Socio economic status, 5. Language, 6. Religion, and 7. Age. The final occurrence count after eliminating

those we could not agree on was 375 occurrences that we felt fit the parameters of this study. Part of the reason for such a wide range of this initial inter-rater agreement may be a result of my initial impulse to identify every passage addressing anything related to culture. After further discussion during the first coders meeting this large section was examined and it was determined that much of what I was identifying did not fit the parameters of this study and would be better served in a future study.

Thematic categories

"Data driven codes …appear with the words and syntax of the raw information. It is the task of the researcher to interpret the meaning after obtaining the findings and to construct a theory after the discovery of results" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 30). In my study, this task of interpretation was accomplished through thematic analysis. In keeping with the general framework of content analysis, diversity was initially categorized into seven distinct categories containing content related to common topics of diversity taught in many U.S. communication programs today. At this point a theme is similar to code but the theme is situated to inform an interpretive analysis where as the code informs a more realist analysis of the data. Once I made the shift to include thematic analysis (pattern recognition), I redefined the categories to meet the requirements established by Boyatizis (1998) of identifying a good theme. Boyatizis characterized the five elements for a good thematic code.

(1.) a label (name), (2.) a definition of what the theme concerns (the characteristic or issue constituting the theme), (3.) a description of how to know when the theme occurs (indicators on how to "flag" the theme), (4.) a description of any qualifications or exclusions to the

64

identification of the theme, and (5.) examples, both positive and negative,

to eliminate possible confusion when looking for the theme (Boyatzis,

1998, p. 31).

The first category I re-defined to fit the guidelines of a theme was the most popular

category, race, ethnicity and nationality. Transitioning from content analysis to thematic

analysis was relatively easy because of the broad parameters I used when establishing the

parameters for the content analysis.

Race, ethnicity, nationality (REN)

Occurrences of race, ethnicity and/or nationality found in the text were given an

REN label. The working definition of race, ethnicity and/or nationality included any

content found in the text that identified a person or group of people by region, nation,

country, nationality, in this area. The initial definition of this theme included religion but

during the first coder meeting the idea surfaced that there was specific content related to

religion which could be better captured in a category of its own. To identify occurrences

of race, ethnicity, nationality in the textbooks, words such as "African American," "in the

west," "Asian or eastern culture," were used as flags, indicating an occurrence was

nearby.

Sexual orientation (SO)

Issues and language common to sexual orientation is becoming a large part of the

body of research produced by communication scholars. The occurrences of sexual

orientation were given the abbreviation of SO. Characteristics of this theme included a

discussion of sexual orientation as identity relationship negotiation. To identify these

occurrences I looked for words and combinations of words relating to one's own or

relational sexual orientation. Words such as "gay," "homo- and hetero-relationships," and "same sex partner" served as good flags for this category of occurrences.

Ability (Ab)

Ability as both physical and mental expectations and/or limitations was assigned the label of Ab and was identified as an occurrence when the authors made reference to physical shape or ability and/or mental gifts or limitations. Flags for this category could be overt such as "deaf community" or subtle as in occurrences referring to a person's weight or physical shape.

Socio-economic status or class (SES)

Occurrences of socio-economic status were labeled SES and defined as references that helped students understand the complexity of managing identities or relationships where economics takes a central role. Some words used to flag these occurrences were income, terms such as "rich," and locations such as Beverly Hills, YMCA, or Homeless shelters were counted as an occurrence. The theme also revealed relationships between those with financial power and less powerful others in terms such as "wealthy" or "upper-class."

Language (M)

Language, abbreviated as (M) was unique both as an emergent idea as the study progressed and because I did not have clear symbolic parameters for identifying these occurrences as issues of diversity. This theme was often identified using contextual cues and not necessarily focusing on words to flag the occurrences. On occasion we happened upon unique situations that made identifying occurrences in this category very simple.

For example in one text the term "Cablacasian" was used to represent the unique label choice Tiger Woods used when defining his racial make-up. Interestingly we were conscious of the often marginalized experiences of non-English speakers and those experiencing English as a second language.

Religion (R)

Religion abbreviated as (R) was made into its own section after realizing there were instances in which the textbooks mentioned elements of various religious groups and inter-religions communication.. Flags of this occurrence were any mention of a religion or religious group, including Muslim culture or explanations of religious practices such as religious holidays and traditions.

Age (A)

Age, another important theme, was abbreviated as (A) in this study, and defined as any mention of people or groups of people by age, cohort, or date specific labels such as Baby-boomer or Generation X. Identifying an age cohort is in essence setting that age cohort out as an outlier from the norm (in this case young adults attending college) and was therefore counted as an occurrence of this theme in the text.

Now with the final seven thematic categories fixed with edited parameters in place and the occurrences identified to meet these guidelines, we felt ready to continue the coding process with the others. We scheduled a meeting with all volunteer coders where no money was paid to the coders for their time but snacks and water were provided. Since the extraction of occurrences had already taken place, this meeting of all four coders was designed to discuss, validate and interpret the occurrences that had been identified earlier.

Coders Meetings Two, Three and Four

The second, third and fourth coders meetings took place at The Kalamazoo

Quakers Meeting house on January 5th 10th and January 16th of 2013 with all four of us

reviewing the occurrences to both check for inter-rater agreement and discuss the

implications of the content. As a result of these meetings we were able conduct a further

narrowing of agreed-upon occurrences from 375 to 310. Another interesting

methodological choice I made in this project was to include the "voices" of the often-

silenced coders for the reflective portion of this project. To do this I chose to capture the

coders' discussions in order to prioritize the coders' voice in this study. The first step in

this process was to record and transcribe each of the coders meetings. These three, two-

hour long meetings were then transcribed resulting in total of 80 typed pages of

transcribed discussion notes (see appendix B). The meeting procedures were kept

consistent each time we met. First we came together for a moment of silence to show

respect for the religious traditions of the space we were given to use for these meetings,

and then I started the recorder to document the conversation. We decided to start the

process reviewing the identified occurrences with race, ethnicity and/or nationality

because it seemed to have the most occurrences.

> [*Reflective Moment*—I left that first meeting with all the coders
> confused and questioning, the method (content analysis). Upon
> reflection I came to realize the first coder meeting was sufficient. I later
> gave myself permission to accept the process and took this as proof that
> the process was working. I began to see how allowing others to review
> and consider the original occurrences tightened the parameters of the
> category. Additionally, I came to realize the complexity of pinning

down socially constructed phenomenon in a study. After this first meeting I began to understand what it means to give up the control and give into the process of discovering multiple truths.]

I encouraged side conversations as we moved through each stack of occurrences, which in turn aided in the analysis by offering alternate perspectives of the data and bonded us together interpersonally. For example, if and when we went "off topic" it stemmed from an issue we had with an occurrence and served to reinforce the text in a more personal way. This was what I had hoped for when I expressed a desire to incorporate the coders voice in this study. The richness of the coder's experiences added context to our understanding of the textual content enabling us to bring even more clarity to the interpretations of the data. "Through the construction, and mediated by discussion, underlying thoughts become more evident. This enables the teacher or facilitator to better design and implement learning interactions. This leads to the necessity of a more emergent approach"(Cavallo, 2000, p.771).

In many traditional content analyses the role of the coder is interchangeable with the data analysis performed by a software program. Indeed many content analysis studies strive for a high level of predictability but this study is situated in the sociocultural tradition of human communication and strives to examine the underpinnings of SCD negotiation via interpersonal communication textbooks. This study was improved by the coders' curiosity and knowledge of the content of these textbooks. Exposing the backstage act by "*giving voice*" to the coders worked to both add more content for analysis and improve the interpretive quality of this study. However by doing this I could see that opening up the role of the coder had also tampered with the nature of the content

analysis method shifting from its original social scientific purpose to a more flexible approach, seeking to critically examine the data through a more interpretive lens.

In traditional content analysis the relationship between the coders, the primary researcher and data is not declared or documented, in an attempt to maintain the pretense of objectivism. This study attempted to peel back the veil of objectivism in the way we understand traditional content analysis and celebrate the relationship shared by the primary investigator and coders, and then to add the coders' voices. Even in traditional content analysis the primary researcher and coders all share a relationship with each other. In some cases the relationship is a friendship with each other, or it could be a superior/subordinate relationship that fulfills a course requirement but all of these relationships stem from a curiosity to understand more about the topic. Incorporating these "back stage *conversations"* into this study is important because it reveals another level of analysis capturing the multi-functional and multi-valued contribution of the coders in this emerging *re-designed* content analysis. Connell puts it best when she wrote, "A multi-centered social science has a great capacity to circulate knowledge of social experiences other than those of the global elites, and thus enable mutual learning" (2007, p. 231). It is my nature to see most science as a subjective process. Identifying those who participate in the data collection and analysis process will contribute to the re-designing or emergent design of more of our unique social scientific and humanist endeavors in the future, or at least allow us to be a little more honest about the science we are producing and declaring as objective. This new collaborative approach of reviewing the raw data, discussing it in the coders meeting and allowing an analysis to begin during

70

the meeting, then later analyzing both the data and transcripts was an adaption I made to the original method.

Chapter Five

Results of Content and Thematic Analyses

Seeing **as: Recognizing Patterns in the Texts**

In this project I relied on thematic analysis for its organizational components. One

of the benefits of thematic analysis is that it offers a structure for exploring the treatment

of diversity, Additionally thematic analysis moves through three phases of inquiry

beginning with seeing or recognizing patterns. The ability to see the patterns stems from

the researchers' openness to sensing themes in the text. Another key phase of inquiry is

seeing as or "making the observation that something important or notable is occurring"

(Boyatzis, 1998, p. 4). And the final phase is interpretation or "explaining the themes in a

way that contributes to the development of knowledge" (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 11). Although

it is explained as a series of phases by Boyatzis, this process is not linear.

> [*Reflexive Moment*—Initially I had a difficult time with my themes and
> the parameters I set for them. I was dealing with the idea of social
> construction and wanted to include thematic codes in this project that
> could be easily repeated by other researchers but I also wanted to leave
> enough space for inclusion of as many occurrences gleaned from the
> text as possible. This tension created quite an epistemological quandary
> for me. I resolved this tension by remembering that my goal in using
> qualitative research is to generate description and understanding of a
> phenomenon, and to question what is often taken for granted]

After reviewing all the occurrences with the coders and transcribing the tape-

recorded coders meetings discussions, I was left with what felt like mounds of text and

only a few connections to the original questions of inquiry as presented in the rationale.

Stepping back and trusting the method gave me some perspective. I used thematic analysis to move from a more quantitative and social scientific lens to a more qualitative and interpretive orientation. For this reason thematic analysis served this study well in that it laid the foundation for a more in-depth analysis of this complex phenomenon. Because of the inductive nature of this method I felt freer to interpret the data and go where ever it led.

For me "seeing" was not the problem. I saw the social construction of differentness everywhere I looked and experienced it in every conversation I had. At issue was determining how to fit what I saw in the data into codeable themes recognizable by others and ready for analysis. What began as a desire to illuminate the way we understand and teach diversity to our undergraduates morphed into an emergent design set up to examine themes in the text. These themes help to better articulate what I consider to be conceptual gaps in the way we define diversity and teach to our students in the field of communication.

A descriptive overview of the texts

To contextualize the results of the content analysis, I begin by offering a descriptive overview of the texts. In this section I attempt to characterize each author's approach to the subject matter, including features of the writing style and tone. Trying to quantify and then compare the authors' treatments of the social construction of differentness is challenging. It is much like trying to compare romance novels, in the sense that each book has the same main elements but each has a different approach, stylistic voice and treatment of the information. They all teach the basic elements of interpersonal communication but each book has unique tone and each author inspires a

different level of engagement with the reader; this is another complication specific to interpersonal communication in general. The authors of interpersonal communication textbooks often use the text to establish "relationships" with the reader in an attempt to meta-communicate with the reader/students thus reinforcing the relational material presented in the text (Stewart, Zediker & Witteborn, 2005).

Of the three authors of the representative texts used for this project I would plot Joseph DeVito's (2013) *The interpersonal communication book; thirteenth edition*, as the most social scientific/realist in approach. I say this for a couple of reasons. First the author makes no attempt to locate himself or to establish an interpersonal relationship with the reader by offering statements about himself, his life, and so on in the textbook. Second, the majority of the ideas and theories presented in the text are supported using quantitative studies as evidence and very little by way of narratives or elaborate description. What is unique about this author's writing style is that although he is what I see as the most empiricist of the three authors, his work still has an engaging tone. I think this is primarily due to his decision to present interpersonal communication as a series of choices.

DeVito (2013) presents interpersonal communication concepts by deliberately situating the interpersonal communication phenomenon as choices. DeVito's 222 page book builds on a philosophical foundation of the notion of choice, with 48 of those pages dedicated to occurrences addressing issues of diversity. As DeVito argues in the book's foreward, "Choice is central to interpersonal communication; as speaker, listener, and communication analyst, you are constantly confronted with choice points at every stage of the communication process—and these choices will influence the effectiveness of your

74

messages and relationships" (p. xvii). DeVito works hard to acknowledge the growing need for more culturally savvy students by dedicating an early chapter to culture and stressing various dimensions of culture in the other chapters. One special feature of this textbook is the attention to people with physical and mental disabilities as when he articulates "that members of our society who identify as disabled make up a unique culture worthy of attention"(p. xxi). As I will elaborate in a later section, we identified 93 occurrences of SCD in this text. In the majority of these cases, the claims were referenced with a social scientific study and the information presented was often supported by quantified measurements. In the following example, a reference to sexual orientation, the author wrote "Heterosexist language includes derogatory terms used for lesbians and gay men. For example surveys in the military showed that 80 percent of those surveyed heard 'offensive speech, derogatory names, jokes or remarks about gays' and that 85 percent believed that such derogatory speech was tolerated [New York Times, March 25, 2000, p. A12]" (DeVito, 2013, p.124).

Julia T. Wood's, *Interpersonal communication: everyday encounters; sixth edition* (2010) could be placed more in the middle of the realist/intepretivist continuum. One of the reasons I plot her interpersonal communication textbook closer to the middle of the continuum compared to DeVito's is that she offers a short summary of her personal relationships and more details about her relation to the field of communication. Offering her standpoint in this section situates Wood in the text, which seems to have the effect of relativizing her arguments. We identified 150 occurrences of diversity in Wood's textbook. Although I situate this toward the center of the continuum, I recognize that she still relies on studies that employ surveys and measurements to support the claims she

makes, while only occasionally using student commentaries and rarely using personal

story. Of the 267 pages of text, issues of diversity are mentioned on 104 pages. A key

focus of this textbook as articulated by the author is that it "gives strong attention to

significant trends that affect interpersonal communication in the 21st century" (p. xi). The

format of this textbook is distinguished by features such as the use of student

commentaries. The student commentaries offer the author an opportunity to incorporate a

variety of perspectives on various topics central to interpersonal communication and

provide a unique pedagogical opportunity for active learning in the classroom by offering

fodder for discussion. These student commentaries also serve as a primary means to

communicate information related to SCD by comprising a significant number of the

occurrences presented in this textbook. These commentaries serve to present popular and

unpopular opinions along with atypical and stereotypical thoughts on related

interpersonal communication phenomenon introduced in the chosen chapter.

Another feature of Wood's textbook is the inclusion of sections called

"Communication in Everyday Life". These sections are set outside of the paragraph in 66

color-coordinated circles atop a textbox. These boxes identified as: Communication in

Everyday Life, WORK; Communication in Everyday Life, INSIGHT; Communication in

Everyday Life, DIVERSITY; and Communication in Everyday Life, TECHNOLOGY,

serve to narrow the focus into one specific aspect of interpersonal communication. For

example in the chapter titled, "Perception and Communication," under the section headed

The Process of Human Perception, the student will see one of the fifteen orange circles

labeled Communication in Everyday Life, DIVERSITY and a textbox titled *I'm

Cablinasian.* The content of this textbox offers detailed information of the term

Cablinasian, a self-label used by famous golfer/athlete Tiger Woods to symbolize his

multi-ethnic heritage. We noted that 25 of the 66 Communication in Everyday Life text

boxes were counted as occurrences of diversity. Additionally Wood's (2010) text is

separate from the others by being the only one to mention "whiteness" and to promise a

discussion of "whiteness" in the text (p. xi). I found this to be a promising inclusion for

any young scholar or instructor interested in learning more about issues in diversity

regarding race.

> [*Reflective Moment*—Upon further inquiry what was presented in the
> body of the text was a small section explaining the idea of whiteness
> and a larger more prominently placed text box explaining the history of
> white as a racial label. I saw this as a missed opportunity to address a
> critical element of the shifting of a trend in the social construction of
> race. The casual reader or text book skimmer could overlook these
> significant SCD distinctions between whiteness (racial neutrality,
> invisibility, also often referred to as white privilege) and white as a
> racial label and never have another occasion to approach this idea again
> in their undergraduate education.]

I would plot Kory Floyd's (2011), *Interpersonal Communication; second edition*,

closest to the qualitative/interpretive side of the continuum. Floyd's presentation of

diversity occurrences takes on a more conversational tone throughout the text and one

could even argue that this author is meta-communicating by presenting a short bio and

expression of his goals for this textbook in a one page signed note to the reader. What this

does is bring the reader into a shared space with Floyd through the use of first-person

voice to position the text as a conversation with the reader. The introduction presents the

text as emphasizing critical thinking opportunities and promises a reflection of the rapidly

changing world. This text also included unique chapter features such as: "Communication

Light Side/Dark Side" situating a more holistic view of the interpersonal communication

spectrum, which is often mis-interpreted by students as only all positive communication practices (p. xvii). "Fact or Fiction" questions throughout the text are designed to challenge students' assumptions about seemingly self-evident communication questions (p. xv). And a "Got Skills?" activities section in every chapter is offered to serve as a bridge between theory and practice (p. xviii). I believe Floyd has sculpted a text that weaves an artistic presentation of interpersonal communication research into an engaging text that draws the reader in. Interestingly of the 342 pages, only 43 pages of the text were found to include occurrences of diversity.

Results of content analysis

One goal of this study is to examine our field and open a space for conversations about diversity, including what is needed in our curricula to engage in these conversations. Using Allen's (2011) discussion of dimensions of difference as a framework, my content analysis identified the following frequencies for each text and across all three texts combined (see Table 1):

Of the six categories race, ethnicity, and nationality (REN) had the most occurrences in each textbook although no textbook author overtly stated that race, ethnicity, and nationality was the most important socially constructed difference in our culture. In other words, no author directly articulated race, ethnicity, and nationality as the prevailing issue of diversity facing our society. I see this as some measure of success as textbook authors now recognize a variety of socially constructed differences that can influence our interpersonal relationships and identity negotiation choices.

Table 1. Occurrences

Representative Texts	Wood (2010)	DeVito (2013)	Floyd (2011)	Total combined Occurrences
Percentage of pages addressing issues of diversity	38.9%	21.6%	12.5%	
REN Number of occurrence	74	50	35	159
SO Number of occurrence	23	15	10	48
Ab Number of occurrence	19	9	9	37
SES Number of occurrence	17	4	1	22
M Number of occurrence	11	5	4	20
R Number of occurrence	5	4	5	14
A Number of occurrence	1	6	3	10
Total	150	93	67	310

Counting the number of times information concerning these occurrences appear in the representative text is one way of understanding the text but the numbers only tell us part of the story. To get a more nuanced feel for how issues of racial and ethnic differences are presented in the representative texts consider this occurrence found in Wood (2010).

Racial and ethnic stereotypes can lead us to not see differences among people we place in a particular category. The label Asian doesn't distinguish among people from varied cultures, including Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, and China. Native American is a very broad category that includes diverse indigenous North American tribes

[Vickers, 1999]. A student of mine, Winowa, thinks that the term Native American leads people not to notice differences among tribes (Wood, 2010, p.72).

On the other hand DeVito (2013) does not explicitly identify race or ethnic issues in a single section. Rather choosing to introduce these issues as more global constructs speaking of culture and cultural differences throughout the text. One exception was a passage where he addresses the concept of cultural sensitivity:

Cultural sensitivity is an attitude and way of behaving in which you're aware of and acknowledge cultural differences; it's crucial for such global goals as world peace and economic growth as well as for effective interpersonal communication [Franklin & Mizell, 1995]. Without cultural sensitivity there can be no effective interpersonal communication between people who are different in gender or race or nationality or affectional orientation. So be mindful of the cultural differences between yourself and the other person (DeVito, 2013, p. 42).

Like DeVito, Floyd (2011) also chooses not to treat race, ethnicity or nationality as a separate stand-alone issue in his textbook, instead choosing to pepper the text with examples of cultural differences and tips for negotiating differences in interpersonal communication and culture. An example of the way he approached this topic can be seen in this passage about nationality and culture:

Communicating appropriately can be especially challenging when you're interacting with people from other cultures. Because many communication rules are culture-specific, what might be perfectly appropriate in one culture could be seen as inappropriate or even offensive in another. For example, if you're visiting a Canadian household and your hosts offer you food, it's appropriate to accept the food if you're hungry. In many Japanese households, however, it is inappropriate to accept the food even if you're hungry, until you decline it twice and your hosts offer it a third time. Even within a specific culture, exceptions for appropriate communication can vary according to the social situation (Floyd, 2011, pp. 26-27).

Based on such examples and the frequencies of occurrences, we now see that explicit mention of race, ethnicity, and nationality is becoming more of a social norm when compared to the 1960's and 1970's. Particular emphasis is given to explaining what comprises culture and showing students how to understand the broader culture.

As mentioned earlier, the side-by-side comparison of the textbooks offered some unique challenges such as coding each occurrence of diversity while adapting to each author's unique writing style. To overcome this obstacle I looked for patterns in the text such as key words. In order to compensate for each author's unique writing style and to have some common ground for impartial comparison, I purposefully sought out themes that spanned all the textbooks.

While examining the textbooks I realized I had to find one interpersonal communication concept that each text covered. This was made more difficult because of

the varied writing styles and variations in the presentation of diversity topics found in the texts. I was lucky to find one common interpersonal communication construct present in all three textbooks. (This is not to imply that these textbooks did not cover similar content, only that few topics covered in the textbooks had occurrences across all the texts, allowing this type of side-by-side comparison of the texts. The concept I found is monochronic and polychronic time, referring to socially constructed nature of time and its meanings). Here I use extended quotes to show each author's treatment of the constructs and how the occurrences of diversity are situated in that context.

Wood's (2011) explanation of the cultural treatment of monochronic and polychronic time was found in chapter five titled, "The World Beyond Words," under the section heading, "Nonverbal Communication Reflects and Expresses Cultural Values," and very close to the end of the section. This section is written in paragraph form and first addresses the nonverbal act of touch and patterns of eye contact before addressing the issue of monochronic and polychronic orientation toward time.

Cultures also differ in their orientations toward time. Some cultures have a monochronic (from the root term, mono, which means one) orientation toward time whereas others have polychronic (from the root term, poly, which means many) orientations. Most western cultures are relatively monochromic whereas many South American cultures are more polychronic. Monochronic cultures view time as a valuable commodity to be saved, scheduled, and carefully guarded. Within monochronic cultures, people do one thing at a time, and they value punctuality and efficiency. Thus, people are expected to be on

time for appointments, work, and classes, and they are expected to complete work quickly.

In contrast, polychronic cultures take a more holistic, organic view of time. Members of these cultures assume that many things are happening simultaneously. Thus, punctuality is seldom stressed. Meetings may start late, with people joining in after discussions begin. Tangential discussions and social conversations are part of normal meetings in polychronic cultures. People may even cancel meetings without the dramatic reasons expected for canceling in monochronic cultures (Wood, 2010, p. 128).

Immediately following this explanation, the idea of monochronic and polychronic time is punctuated by a Student Speaks text box set out from the paragraph and in a different font and titled "Josh":

Last year, my wife and I had our house painted. The company we hired had a lot of Hispanic workers. They were never on the job at 8 A.M. when the other workers were. They'd usually arrive around 8:30 or even 9:00, and they would take breaks and talk during the workday. But I'll have to say that they also stayed past 5 when they were working on a part of the house. They weren't in any hurry to leave—just weren't going by the clock to do their work. The white workers were out of there at 5 on the dot (Wood, 2010, p. 128).

[*Reflective Moment*—The placement of Josh's commentary immediately after the explanation of monochromic and polychromic constructs was an interesting editing choice that seemed to only reinforce a negative common stereotype which may work to silence some students who identify as members of that culture.]

DeVito (2013) presented monochronic and polychronic in his chapter six titled, "Nonverbal Messages," in the section headed, "Channels of Nonverbal Communication." He uses the idea of monochonic and polychronic construction of time to round out the section, offering a small explanation of the concepts:

Another important distinction is that between monochronic and polychronic time orientation. Monochronic people or cultures—such as those of the United States, Germany, Scandinavia, and Switzerland—schedule one thing at a time. In these cultures time is compartmentalized and there is a time for everything. On the other hand, polychronic people or cultures—such as those of Latin Americans, Mediterranean peoples, and Arabs—schedule multiple things at the same time. Eating, conducting business with several different people, and taking care of family matters all may occur at the same time…No culture is entirely monochromic or polychronic; rather, these are general tendencies that are found across a large part of the culture. Some cultures combine both time orientations; for example, both orientations are found in Japan and in parts of American culture.

Understanding these culturally different perspectives on time should make intercultural communication a bit easier, especially if these time differences are discussed in a culturally sensitive

atmosphere. After all, one view of time is not any more correct than any other. However, like all cultural differences, these different time orientations have consequences. For example, the train crash in Japan might not have happened had it not been for the national obsession with time. And members of future-orientation cultures are more likely to succeed in competitive markets like the United States, but may be viewed negatively by members of cultures that stress living in and enjoying the present (DeVito, 2013, pp 166-167).

Here DeVito attempts to show the fluidity of time by offering a list of countries showing that this is not a stark Western versus Eastern idea but rather many countries interpret time from these two frames. He further explains that "no culture is entirely monochromic or polychromic" which helps to open a discussion of the social construction of the concept of time and how each culture shapes this idea.

Floyd's (2011) text sets a different tone with his approach to explaining the concept of monochronic and polychronic time. In chapter two, titled "Culture and Gender," Floyd offers four numbered sections on perspectives in cultures. The second section headed, "How Culture Affects Communication," offers a list of short two to three paragraph long sections. In the middle of that section is a sub heading focusing on time titled monochronic and polychronic cultures.

Cultures also vary with respect to their norms and expectations concerning the use of time. Societies that have a monochromic concept of time, such as Swiss, Germans, and most Americans, view time as a

commodity. We save time, spend time, fill time, invest time, and waste time as though time were tangible. We treat time as valuable, believe that "time is money, " and talk about making time and losing time.

A monochromic orientation toward time influences several social behaviors. Because people in monochromic cultures think of time as valuable, they hate to waste it. Therefore, they expect meetings and classes to start on time (within a minute or so), and when that doesn't happen, they are willing to wait only so long before leaving. They also expect others to show up when they say they will.

In comparison, societies with a polychronic orientation—which include Latin America, the Arab part of the Middle East, and much of sub-Saharan Africa—conceive of time as more holistic and fluid and less structured. Instead of treating time as a finite commodity that must be managed properly to avoid being wasted, people in polychronic cultures perceive it more like a never-ending river, Flowing infinitely into the future.

Schedules are more fluid and flexible in polychronic than in monochromic cultures. In the polychronic culture of Pakistan, for instance, if you're invited to a wedding that begins at 4:30 P.M. and you arrive at that hour, you will most likely be the first one there. A bank may not open at a specific time—as would be expected in a monochronic society—but whenever the manager decides. People in a polychronic culture do not prioritize efficiency and punctuality.

Instead, they attach greater value to the quality of their lives and their relationships with others (Floyd, 2011, p. 47).

From the onset of his explanation Floyd shows the multiple way we and other cultures situate a relationship with the concept of time by creating a story or narrative about the concept of time. in his quote he offers the old adage of, time is money, to show this relationship. Using common phrases to help explain the relationship we have with time is something the other authors did not do. In addition to offering a different way to understand the concept of time this shows how the authors writing styles affect the way the content of the representative texts, although similar in many ways, is uniquely presented.

The authors have all addressed the idea of polychronic and monochronic in a way that is consistent to their writing styles. All three authors take this opportunity to include global examples of polychromic and monochromic concepts of time and speak about the implications for the behaviors. Additionally when using their own words the authors make an effort to frame these distinctions as neither good nor bad. But Wood's explanation tends to move away from this neutrality and implies a value-judgment with the addition of the Student Speaks box "Josh". As educators "Josh" could be seen as a wonderful teaching opportunity to discuss our willingness to recognize differences, understand various points of view and be willing to discuss these subtleties with others who may have a different perspective, opinion, value or beliefs. Josh's comments serve as a good jumping off point to discuss the complexity of the social construction of our differentness and begin to see others and to reveal ourselves as complex beings. For example I would have liked to know if Josh said anything to the workers who arrived late

or left on time while the others stayed to finish the job? Sadly we will never know how Josh negotiated the social construction of time and what it means to put in a good day's work from his perspective.

Then perhaps this could generate a conversation around our cultural understanding and construction of what it means to finish the job or put in a full day's work, helping to show how even the idea of working hard has it underpinnings in social construction and touches many aspects of diversity from various age cohorts to religious traditions. All of this can affect the way we interpret the idea of working hard.

Coverage of social construction in the texts

One central aspect of the textbook content I investigated dealt with the emphasis placed on diversity as socially constructed. As I described in Chapter 1, a key starting point for this project was the idea that diversity categories are continually created and recreated through language and communication. Effective teaching of interpersonal communication implies cultivating awareness of identities as socially constructed. Therefore, I wanted to attempt to gauge the extent to which social constructionist perspectives are presented in the texts.

Borrowing from McEwan's (2003) approach to the analysis of spirituality content in nursing textbooks, I developed a coding scheme to help illuminate the content of each author's incorporation of the fundamental ideas of social construction (see appendix A). Following McEwan's approach, I developed a holistic process for assessing the relative attention given to social construction within each passage. In contrast to the process I used earlier to identify occurrences of diversity, which involved consultation with another coder, this process was subjective as I was the only person interpreting the content and

ranking the level of social construction of the passage. To begin I reviewed each occurrence and assigned one of three ordinal rankings to each occurrence, ranging from a "plus" to "triple plus" where a single plus indicated least emphasis on diversity as socially constructed and a triple plus indicated most emphasis. Cases marked with a single plus were those which presented straightforward statements of fact and/or judgments and often leaned toward the language and phrasing of certainty. They were characterized by declarative statements about individuals and cultural groups' norms. For an example, Wood writes:

> Socioeconomic class affects friendships because it shapes our interests and tastes in everything from music to lifestyle. In addition, our economic status affects where we live and work, and how much money we have for socializing with friends (O'Connor, 1992)(+) (Wood, 2010, p. 267).

Passages marked with a double plus didn't specifically point to cultural norms or individual choice as explanations but implied that there can be options outside of what is explained in the occurrence, thus relativizing the behavior by showing that other choices are possible. The following passage from Floyd exemplifies this approach:

> Studies have shown that for individuals who speak more than one language, the choice of language can affect their perceptions. While completing a values test, for instance, students in Hong Kong expressed more traditional Chinese values while speaking Cantonese than while speaking English. Jewish and Arab students in Israel both describe themselves as more distinct from outsiders when speaking

their native language than when speaking English. Just as each
language is distinctive, the language we use leads us to see the world in
a particular way (++)(Floyd, 2011, p. 150).

Passages designated by a "triple plus" emphasized the fluidity of the interpersonal
phenomenon, for example by juxtaposing one culture's accepted norms to another
culture's accepted norms, also showing how these cultural norms are in flux and subject
to change. Some trigger words occurring in these passages were terms such as "in-
group/out-group," or offering examples of individual or cultural *choice* side-by-side.
These occurrences were often longer than a sentence as they were more descriptive.

For example the Student Speaks box titled Winowa is a good example of a
passage I rated as emphasizing the idea of culture as socially constructed.

People have a stereotype of Native Americans. People who are
not Native American think we are all alike—how we look, how we act,
what we believe, what our traditions are. But that isn't true. The Crow
and Apache are as different as people from Kenya and New York.
Some tribes have a history of aggression and violence; others have
traditions of peace and harmony. We worship different spirits and have
different tribal rituals and customs. All of these differences are lost
when people stereotype us all into one group (+++)(Wood, 2010, p.
72).

In this passage Winowa discusses a common stereotype of Native Americans and
then shows how this is a misunderstanding. Any student reading this passage now has a

90

greater understanding of the rich histories of our Native American tribes and is alerted to the idea of stereotyping, which can be seen as a feature of social construction.

Again my goal with this three-part scheme was to create a more differentiated picture of how each author's text treats issues in diversity and to what extent they attempt to orient students to a greater understanding of the basic, yet sometimes difficult to articulate, elements of social construction. Organizing the occurrences this way I am able to identify more patterns in the representative text. Using this new frame to identify patterns of social construction revealed eighty-seven of the one hundred and fifty-nine, race, ethnicity and nationality occurrences falling into the single plus category, only forty-three occurrences fit into what I would consider as a triple plus representation of social construction, and only twenty-nine I categorized as double plus. Sexual orientation showed a similar pattern in that the majority of the occurrences only minimally incorporated the language I would associate with social construction. Of the categories of diversity I used in this study ability was probably the best category for the showing the relationship between issues of diversity and social construction. The thirty-seven occurrences in the ability category revealed a surprising eleven were identified as triple plus occurrences. What this indicates to me is that the authors tried to show how ability was a fluid construct capable of multiple interpretations, since there were eleven occasions in which the authors questioned our idea of ability and challenge our assumptions of what it means to be able-bodied. Of the final four categories socio-economic-status and language both seemed to contain the least occurrences with elements of social construction in them implying that the information presented in these occurrences is shown as culturally fixed or certain.

Although these ordinal scale rankings are based only on my own judgment, the patterns are suggestive of an interesting trend in the textbooks. For example, if one looks solely at the number of occurrences one might infer that race, ethnicity, and nationality is the most emphasized diversity dimension, and therefore, the category with the most detail and explanation. But upon further examination little over half of the occurrences speak to the idea of social construction, a key element in the concept of race and issues of diversity overall.

What stands out as interesting is that the idea of social construction is not emphasized more in these occurrences. Of the three hundred and ten occurrences in the representative textbooks that represent issues of diversity only seventy-six (less than a quarter) explicitly reflect the idea of social construction. This means we have two hundred and thirty-four missed opportunities to introduce the basic idea of social construction to our undergraduate students. Another interesting pattern I noticed was the number of double and triple plus occurrences in the sexual orientation, ability and religion categories. I have to wonder why the authors find it easier to discuss the social construction of these categories. Perhaps this is a reflection of a more advanced cultural understanding of these socially constructed differences. But until all or most of the occurrences are in the triple plus column we still have room for improvement.

> [*Reflective Moment*— I understand that there is utility in simply mentioning dimensions of diversity but I also see that each time we fail to challenge our student's assumptions of reality and stereotypes of issues diversity we miss an opportunity to show our students the complexity of the issues we deal with in the field of communication.]

Further themes: Presenting distinctions as dichotomies

As I continued to look at the text from a student's point of view, I considered other aspects of the writing style and approach of each author in order to get a sense of what was being conveyed to our students. One pattern involved the use of dichotomies and binaries. Dichotomy and binary are often used as interchangeable constructs so teasing them apart takes a bit of finessing but is necessary for understanding the underpinnings of diversity education in the field of communication. In this study I have used *Webster's New World College Dictionary, fourth edition,* (Agnes, (Ed.), 1999) to define dichotomy, understood as, "division into two parts, groups or classes, esp. when these are sharply distinguished or opposed" (p. 400). And binary defined as, "a dividing into or branching into two equal parts, esp. when repeated. Something made up of two parts or things, two-fold, double" (p. 145).

Dichotomy—sharply distinguished or opposed

This occurrence in Wood was near the end of a chapter titled "Communication and personal identity" under the heading, Guidelines for Improving Self-concept, in a "Student Speaks" box, titled "Tina":

> Tina: One social value I do not accept is that it's good to be as thin as a
> rail if you're female. A lot of my girlfriends are always dieting. Even
> when they get weak from not eating enough, they won't eat, because
> they'll gain weight. I know several girls who are bulimic, which is
> really dangerous, but they are more scared of gaining a pound than of
> dying. I refuse to buy into this social value. I'm not fat, but I'm not
> skinny either. I'm not as thin as models, and I'm not aiming to be. It's

just stupid to go around hungry all the time because society has sick

views of beauty for women (Wood, 2010, p. 57).

This is an example of dichotomy because it positions a clear struggle between two

opposing groups, what this student sees as society's views on thinness, and her personal

choice to not accept that "social value." As it is written this student has positioned a

struggle between fat and skinny. Here society is the enemy in a fight against her struggle

for body image acceptance.

Another example of dichotomy in the text is found in the middle of Wood's

(2010) Chapter Six titled, "Mindful Listening", under the heading titled, "Obstacles to

Mindful Listening", in a section called, "Failure to Adapt Listening Styles." This passage

reads:

Most whites follow the communication rule that one person shouldn't

speak while another is talking, especially in formal speaking situations.

In some African American communities, however, talking while others

are talking is a form of showing interest and active participation

(Wood, 2010, p. 155).

The word choice, "most whites," juxtaposed against African American sets up an

either/or dichotomy between listening styles. One is likely to read the passage as

asserting the existence of these two cultures as opposing styles. Each one is defined in

opposition to the other, which leads to essentializing of each group. To be fair, in this

example the author is reporting the findings of a study, and this is true of most empirical

studies. However with this phrasing students may feel that because of their racial make-

up they should be expected to display one listening style most of the time. Consider the following passage related to cultural differences in self-disclosure:

> What Westerners consider openness and healthy self-disclosure may feel offensively intrusive to people from some Asian societies. The dramatic, assertive speaking style of many African Americans can be misinterpreted as abrasive or confrontational from a Western, Caucasian perspective (Wood, 2010, p. 214).

Here Wood (2010) presents Western culture against Asian in the first sentence and African American culture to Western, Caucasian in the second implying two sets of dichotomous relationships. Again a student might interpret theses comparisons as fixed behavioral norm for these cultures.

> [*Reflective Moment*—I don't think racializing listening is the most effective way to explain listening or even the barriers to listening as listening styles are influenced by so many internal and external factors.]

Binary—two equal parts

Binary is defined as dividing into or branching into two equal parts, especially when repeated. Something made up of two parts or things, two-fold, double. By this definition binary can be explained as something symmetrical such as the branches of a tree. Branches are binary, they are relational; they are equal parts of the same thing, the tree. On a tree some branches may appear different depending on the tree's position to the sun or other intruding forces.

As a culture we have moved away from binary being used to define equal repeating parts of something to binary as the idea of parts in opposition to each other. A good example is when we misuse binary phrasing to help explain issues of diversity (one

95

is either Black or White, Straight or Gay, healthy or disabled). If we fail to scrutinize our use of binary phrasing, we run the risk of perpetuating a false understanding of both the word and the ideas we put forth, leading to a greater acceptance of erroneous beliefs such as, "talking black" or "acting white." If we continue to overlook the true meaning of binary we run the risk of presenting equal but different parts of our identity as either/or ways of behaving, giving socially constructed phenomenon an air of certainty. Dichotomies and oppositional binaries become more entrenched in our field's lexicon if they appear unquestioned in our students' first formal introduction to the underpinnings of diversity. Using binary and dichotomy to situate issues of diversity takes us away from the idea that these phenomena are the result of language and communication and encourages a view of them as real and natural.

A close examination of the text revealed very few examples of what I would interpret as presenting dimensions of diversity in more complex ways. For example:

> Cultures high in indulgence are those that emphasize the gratification of desires; they focus on having fun and enjoying life. Venezuela, Mexico, Puerto Rico, El Salvador, Nigeria, Colombia, Trinidad, Sweden, New Zealand, and Ghana are the top 10 in indulgence; the United States ranks 15th out of 93 countries, making it considerably more indulgent than most countries (DeVito, 2013, p. 41).

Although the concept of indulgence is presented as a unitary and measurable characteristic, the passage avoids dichotomizing cultures by presenting a ranking. Here, the information is not shown in opposition, rather you get a sense of the fluidity between high and low indulgence cultures.

Positioning information as a dichotomy, binary, or using a writing style that is more positivist or more interpretive are neither good nor bad; they are simply choices the authors make as a way to explain and deliver information to our students. The problem that may arise is that students might assume the textbook they are using is *the* canonical source for information dealing with interpersonal relationships. If they leave an interpersonal communication course with the impression that one approach is the best and only way to understand interpersonal relationships, they may have difficulty understanding that the particular approach presented was one possibility among several, and therefore miss an opportunity to appreciate the value in the other theoretical traditions. "It is in the dialogue among these traditions that communication theory can fully engage with the ongoing practical discourse (or metadiscourse) about communication in society" (Craig, 1999, p. 120). I believe that an undergraduate degree from our discipline should include an understanding of the tensions between our theoretical traditions and in understanding that tension students will begin to see the value of having a degree with multi-disciplinary roots.

Chapter Six

A Conversation With the Coders

Coding was a new experience for all but one of my coders. Even I had only coded once before for a friend's Masters thesis. For this project the coders and I made the commitment to engage in conversation in order to test the effectiveness of the content analysis and also to extend it. I describe this phase of the study as reflexive content analysis and it was a key element of this project. I felt strongly about integrating a method that gives voice to the coders of this study. And I was excited to test this idea with this group of coders. Each coder came to this project with an understanding and eagerness to share their unique experiences in order to enhance this part of the project. Adding the coder's voice to the project was a new concept for all of us. After having presented each coder with a package of the 310 occurrences I began with a short explanation of what I envisioned happening during these meetings. I explained how coders are traditionally meant to stay behind the scenes and told them this study was going to attempt to reveal any assumptions that might come up in these meetings by including the coders voice. Tentative at first, we began these reflexive conversations with lots of silence. Among the moments of awkward cross talk as we tried to manage the act of what we thought was traditional coding with the desire to produce meaningful conversations about the content. As a result we defaulted to the task of silently reading and nodding our approval of the occurrence most of the time during the first meeting.

Only rarely were we not in agreement of a passage but if we were not in agreement, it typically revolved around the context and length of the occurrence and not the content. Perhaps it was a result of our all being Quakers (or closely related to Quakers) and therefore being accustomed to cordially discussing our disagreements, but I felt as though we came to a quick agreement for most of the occurrences in our package.

Another noteworthy observation I have of this process is that each of us had a different comfort level with the idea of going off topic (we were very task oriented), something I had not anticipated in my initial design. As a group we tended to stay on task for the majority of the scheduled meeting time, veering off task only after we felt the task was completed. Near the end of the meetings we opened up about what we had done for that day, sort of a post-meeting discussion of our thoughts and findings. This was the most exciting time of the process for me as most of the conversation included laughter and relationship building and personal reflections about regional and global travels and the people we had met in life that dispelled or supported the information we read in the textbooks. In my opinion these brief ten to fifteen minute closing conversations were ripe with information and contributed to this reflexive content analysis. I believe my coders and I enjoyed the time we shared together discussing issues that centered on the content regarding issues of diversity found in the textbooks. During these conversations we did our best to bring our own experiences and unique points of view into the discussion.

Our reflexive discussion of the representative interpersonal communication textbooks highlights the interdisciplinary underpinnings of our field and calls attention to the value of the varying perspectives of our field. These successful textbooks represent various points on the qualitative/quantitative continuum, offering an interpersonal

communication instructor a wide range of choices when selecting a textbook for their interpersonal communication course. The coder discussion resulted in the generation of a closer examination of our tools (textbooks) and opened a discussion about the way we introduce and teach the underpinnings of diversity to our students.

Connell (2007) states,

> I think it is helpful to think of social science not as a settled system of concepts, methods and findings, but as an interconnected set of intellectual projects that proceed from varied social starting points into an unpredictable future. (If we can predict the outcome of research, we do not need to do that research. The riskiness of science is fundamental) (p 228).

When the coders and I met we began to discuss not only the content of the text but what was *not* written as well, by asking what else is possible? Posing questions this way is described by Bateson (1972) as examining the "negative restraints" within a system (p. 406). I believe examining these patterns in the text or alternate reasons for our pedagogical choices might help to explain our choices in the area of diversity education.

Emerging Conversational Themes: Using Global Examples to Represent Issues of Diversity

When we looked at the patterns in the occurrences, the coders and I noticed a majority of the race, ethnicity and nationality category were actually global references, with 82 of the 159 occurrences using a cross-cultural reference rather than a local perspective. The representative texts seemed to cover the thoughts, feelings and experiences more from a global perspective rather than a local perspective. Such

references to global cultural norms, as the examples presented below suggest, may implicitly tend to communicate lesser regard for our racial issues and instead prioritize cross-cultural differences.

In our discussion, we (the coders and I) challenged what we read in the texts, for example by asking, "why did that passage use global references?" as in this occurrence found in DeVito, (2013).

Members of low ambiguity-tolerant cultures do much to avoid uncertainty and have a great deal of anxiety about not knowing what will happen next; they see uncertainty as threatening and as something that must be counteracted. The 10 countries with the lowest tolerance for ambiguity are Greece, Portugal, Guatemala, Uruguay, Belgium, Malta, Russia, El Salvador, Poland, and Japan (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010, p. 40).

Or this example in Wood (2011) regarding what she calls "feeling rules" places a global example of this rule directly after the explanation writing, "the Semai of Malaysia think that being angry brings bad luck and they try to avoid anger" (p.177). These passages give us useful information about how these cultures differ in their construction of their level of comfort around issues of ambiguity and anger, but it offers little on the nature of cultural differences closer to home. We also discussed the heavy reliance on global examples, particularly those situated in the race, ethnicity, and nationality category. There is no way to know why the authors rely on global rather than local examples in their textbooks but perhaps it is the abundance of available studies seeking to understand cross-cultural relations.

As we read the occurrences, the use of global examples began to pull our attention, at times leading us to question the phenomenon it was used to explain. We wondered aloud what benefit came from such an abundance of global examples. Additionally we noticed that the textbook author often times selected what we thought was the most extreme example to explain a phenomenon. We felt these examples further problematize the student's understanding of social construction. One coder commented on this by suggesting, it seemed very easy for students to ignore cultural differences with the excuse that they will never travel to that country so they will never have to deal with it. One way to interpret the author's choice of using global examples is that there is a level of comfort in distance. Comparing and contrasting western cultural norms to cultures overseas may prove harder to question especially for students with little global exposure. We also discussed how our undergraduate students might interpret these examples in the textbooks, and if using global examples like these might somehow undermine how we teach the social construction of differentness. We thought that juxtaposing other cultures to western culture in a way presented our culture as homogeneous. Mike found this to be a very interesting pattern and commented on the authors' choices by saying:

> It seems to me that this author spends a lot of time informing us of what cultures overseas do and not much time giving information about how to manage the differences in our races in America.

We questioned why an author would not make an effort to offer local references along side the global references. For example, we considered how referencing various religious practices might contribute to our students' education given that many large

cities have a diverse mix of religions. The following passage offers an example of using global examples to explain the category of race, ethnicity and nationality:

>Many Americans would feel disgust at the thought of eating dogs, cats, snails, snakes, camels, guinea pigs, or rats, even though those animals are routinely eaten in societies around the world. People raised as Hindus would feel similar disgust at the thought of eating hamburger—a staple of the U.S. American diet—because cows are considered sacred in the Hindu religion (Floyd, 2011, p. 256).

The coders and I didn't have an initial reaction to this comment but then I returned home and reflected on our previous conversation and looked at this occurrence from a different perspective. In this example using global examples seemed to be an efficient choice for the author as most examples provide clear contrasts and can be supported with empirical evidence. However this can also be seen as a missed opportunity. In Floyd's choice to highlight our cultural tastes in consuming beef and juxtaposing that to the Hindu religion in which cows are seen as sacred, the author could have taken this moment to discuss the Islamic practice of Halal (given that there are 6.2 million Muslims in the U.S. as of 2010) and/or relations those who are Jewish have to Kosher food and food preparation, or even introducing the co-cultural identity of vegetarianism or veganism (*USA Today,* 2011). Choosing to discuss local rather than global examples could open a discussion that touches closer to home as there are many devout Muslims, Jews, and vegetarians who go through great efforts to follow these personal and religious practices here in the U.S. Furthermore, if a student gets hired as a manager or a human resource representative they may find this example more relevant. Many employers are searching for managers and

employees with the skill and ability to manage the complexity of our culture. The authors of these interpersonal communication textbooks are in a unique position to lay a strong foundation that can help our students negotiate the complexities of these conversations. By overlooking local examples we are missing an important opportunity to educate and engage in teaching moments that develop the skills needed for SCD negotiation. Offering more relevant local examples and scenarios will help our students prepare to step into the role of manager and help them when they are called upon to negotiate these complex and socially taboo conversations on their own.

In a similar vein I reflected on this occurrence by DeVito, (2013) wondering if there was a different way to present issues that we consider taboo. DeVito approached the idea of taboo topics by including the following references to Mexicans and Middle-Easterners:

> Not surprisingly, however, each culture has certain conversational taboos—topics or language that should be avoided, especially by 'outsiders." For example, discussing bullfighting or illegal aliens can easily get you into difficulty in conversations with Mexicans, and politics and religion may pose problems in conversation with those from the Middle East (Axtell, 1997, 2007) (DeVito, 2013, p. 202).

Here the examples used could have been just as easily replaced by topics more historically relevant in the U.S., such as the controversy around Thomas Jefferson and his slave and mistress Sally Hemings, or the symbolism of the rebel or Confederate flag as it represents, to some, "southern pride" and a romanticized antebellum south while to others

it symbolizes slavery, racism and oppression. These examples are a part of our U.S. socio-political and social historical past and as such are often understood to be taboo topics. Using these as examples of taboo topics could have the potential of generating some much needed practice in the skill of interpersonal communication relationship negotiation by our students while enabling exploration of different points of views.

Interestingly the coders and I noticed occurrences that touched on issues of race in a way we felt were important and brave choices and yet we questioned if they were almost too provocative given the minimal level of attention devoted to the context supporting them. For example we asked each other to consider an instructor's comfort level if asked by a student to discuss sensitive or taboo topics such as language choices like using the word Negro when referring to an African American person. Wood (2010) bravely takes on this topic by discussing the idea of loaded language and offering a "Student Speaks" box that overtly addresses the issue. She then follows this student speaks box by a section titled, "Language can degrade others" where she discusses the affects of hate speech.

Maynard:

I'm as sensitive as the next guy, but I just can't keep up with what language offends what people anymore. When I was younger, Negro was an accepted term, then it was black, and now it's African American. Sometimes I forget and say black or even Negro, and I get accused of being racist. It used to be polite to call females girls, but now that offends a lot of the women I work with. Just this year, I heard that we aren't supposed to say blind or disabled anymore; we're

supposed to say visually impaired and differently abled. I just can't

keep up. (Wood, 2010, p. 105)

The level of comfort in discussing issues such as language and labels varies from person

to person and I would argue from semester to semester (as each classroom is unique). The

coders and I appreciated the author's attempt to introduce relevant conversation topics

into the text. But we also expressed some concern for how many instructors would

engage in these types of conversations. We considered some of the choices an instructor

might make with regard to this controversial topic. One (more realistic option) is that this

chapter would not be assigned to the students to read if the instructor were uncomfortable

with discussing issues regarding race. To those instructors who are uncomfortable with

discussing issues of race this option is made even more appealing if the department does

not offer courses in diversity or the social construction of differentness. Another option

that the instructor could choose is to minimally discuss the topic in an effort to maintain

as much distance as possible from the controversial undertones of the passage, spending

as little time as possible discussing why this passage was added to the textbook, perhaps

referring to the following statistics offered in the text, but not addressing the social

construction underpinnings of the passage:

> The U.S. Department of Labor surveyed 60,000 households to
> learn what identity labels different ethnic groups prefer. Not
> surprisingly, the survey revealed that members of various racial groups
> do not have uniform preferences. Among blacks 44% wanted to be
> called black, 28% wanted to be called African American, 12% wanted
> to be called Afro-American, and 16% preferred other labels or had no

preference. Nearly half of American Indians preferred to be called

American Indian. Yet 37% wanted to be called Native American. A

majority of Hispanics wanted to be called Hispanic, not Latino or

Latina. Whites overwhelmingly preferred to be called white; only 3%

wanted to be called European-American. (Wood, 2010, pp. 87-88)

[*Reflective Moment*—I always take a moment to pause when I read the results like the one found in Wood's textbook. I believe there are no quick fixes to understanding the labels we choose and use for ourselves and those we assign to others. Perhaps instead of offering statistics that attempt to help students recognize when and how to use the "appropriate racial or ethnic label," why don't we simply teach them the art of asking honest questions and listening without judgment.

Often students will come to a diversity class interested in learning the correct label to use when referring to the other (typically a person of color). The only formula I ever give to my students to help them with this dilemma does not involve hand-outs or notes. I simple tell them, with regard to labeling others it is important to master the art of asking about their race in a nonjudgmental tone. The formula is: to never ask: What are you? (In other words, asking a person to identify as a what is asking them to make themselves recognizable to you. In essence you are saying, of the boxes I have marked racial labels, tell me which one of my boxes you want me to place you in. Rather than asking them to identify as a what ask them how they identify. This simple phrase changes the question from a limited response to an endless number of responses. How they identify means they have the right to choose any label they are comfortable with. The final step in this simple formula is, once you get their response **believe them**, trust that they have given their identity some thought and are comfortable responding to your question the way they did.

In addition to teaching students this question I have them practice this question/ negotiation skill until they are comfortable with the phrase and the responses this phrasing might generate. Asking someone to identify their self suggests that you are familiar with the label choices surrounding a persons racial make-up and that you are eager to learn more about what makes them unique. Is there risk involved in asking about someone's race? Sure there is. But that is also part of the art of negotiation.]

The issue with offering statistics is that we often find comfort in numbers when we want an easy answer. What I mean is the numbers only tell part of the truth. Using numbers to explain this very fluid social construction, we miss another opportunity to talk about and teach the fluidity of racial labels, specifically in the United States.

Consider how statistics might be used in a class where the instructors had the desire to discuss these issues but not the cultural sensitivity, knowledge, or experience to address the socially sensitive undertones of these topics. For example Jackson, et. al. (2007) discusses the discomfort and strategies used by White graduate teaching assistants (GTA's) when the topic of diversity is brought up in their speech class. According to Jackson, et. al., the level of discomfort is great enough that they will develop strategies to minimally discuss or not discuss diversity at all in the classroom. "Avoidance is played out by instructors who do not integrate diversity in the classroom because they feel they are too uninformed and/or do not have the resources to discuss the subject" (2007, p. 79). Other GTA's stated a discomfort with the topic and took this as an opportunity to minimize the tension that can arise. They saw this tension as a type of power negotiation and expressed a desire "to not force their students into a conversation that will make them feel uncomfortable in their class" (p. 78). But these GTA's also recognized a need to at least discuss the topic of diversity so they opted to engage in the topic by preparing a lecture and discussing the topic of diversity for only one day. The danger of engaging in these conversations for one day of a sixteen-week course only serves to further push issues of labels and diversity into the margins (Jackson et. al. 2007).

In this situation, instead of avoidance the well-intentioned instructor might turn to the available resources for assistance, such as the activity found in the instructor's manual

that accompanied Wood's (2010) textbook I found the suggestions in the manual somewhat limited. Only six activities were directly related to issues of diversity (race, ethnicity, and nationality): two activities, one suggestion for a multi-raced panel, two nominal survey style handouts that offered evidence of stereotypical assumptions, and one reflexive journal prompt that centered on the idea of racial identity. One example of a suggested activity is titled, "African American Teach-In" and reads:

> This activity should enhance non-African American students' appreciation of the richness of communication styles used by African Americans.
>
> Ask four or five African Americans to lead a 20-minute workshop in your class. The African Americans may be students in your class or in the campus, or non-students. Explain to the guests that your goal is to make non-African American students aware of the drama, wit, and style of African American communication.
>
> When the guests meet with your class, they should first demonstrate African American communication practices using themselves as examples. They may demonstrate practices such as signifyin', rappin', woofin', crackin' (also called snappin'), and callin' out. Then the workshop leaders should get students in the class to participate in the communication practices (Punyanunt-Carter, 2010, p. 87).

As the coders and I discussed the activities found in the instructor's manual, we were shocked by some of the activity suggestions and under-whelmed by others. One

coder jokingly mocked the activities and we all were miffed by what we had discovered in the manual. We then looked for justifications or reasons for including such a culturally insensitive activity in an interpersonal communication instructor's manual. One coder suggested that the instructor's manuals are rarely used so the chances of this activity being used were slim to none. Another coder grabbed the book and flipped to the first page to see when it was published. The reality is that this activity is part of the most current version of the manual that accompanied the textbook published in 2010. I am left asking if this is really how far we have come in the way we teach issues of language, labels and racial identity? Does this activity help or hinder the students understanding of our differences? Who will be made to feel comfortable and who will feel uncomfortable as a result of this activity being enacted in the interpersonal communication classroom? Jackson et. al. (2007) helps us see that we have failed to prepare our graduate students (GTA's) to address issues of diversity in their speech communication classrooms. And the instructor manuals that accompanied this popular interpersonal communication textbook gave very little guidance as well. I believe the well intentioned instructor could easily overlook the covert relational damage an activity like this one would produce in a classroom that is already limited in time and only briefly touches on the topic of our socially constructed differentness.

Perhaps part of the issue is that activities like these are falling victim to the demands of attempting to give quick answers to complex social constructs. These one-dimensional activities are doing very little to engage our students in conversations that challenge our ways of being. The potential damage with these activities is that they offer a more surface-level conversation, reinforce stereotypes, with little guidance about how

110

to open a discussion of depth or create a meta-discourse, and possibly even silencing those who want to have a more critical conversation.

Another example found in the instructors manual is titled, "Multi-Racial Panel" and reads:

> Create a panel of individuals who are of various races that are substantially represented on your campus (for example, persons who are Native American, African American, European American, and Asian American). In this case it would be ideal to have panelists who are students so that they can talk peer-to-peer with members of your class. Set the tone for open, candid discussion by reminding the class that there are many communication challenges and difficulties among the different races in our society. Explain that this panel is an opportunity for people to talk openly about communication barriers between races. After introducing the panelists to you class, invite each of them to make an opening statement of three to five minutes about communication problems they experience on the campus. After all panelists have made general statements, invite questions from the class. Facilitate discussion to make sure that it remains constructive and focused (Punyanunt-Carter, 2010, p. 52).

Reflecting back to the conversation I had with my coder when he suggested that we as instructors tend to teach what we have learned, I thought back to moments in my education where I sat in classes where panelists discussed experiences of racism, sexism, and classism on campus. I thought back to how unfulfilling these conversations were

because they were either too controlled or too much like a huge gripe session with no real resolution. Perhaps these activities are the clearest evidence of the findings of this study reinforcing a key point of this study, the idea that the textbooks only touch the surface because our field only allows the surface to be touched. If given the opportunity, fostering a practical metadiscourse always has the potential to develop into a truly reflective discourse that engages communication theory with practice to bring about social change.

> [*Reflective Moment*—The question now becomes, what kind of SCD negotiation skills do we want our students to practice once they graduate from our programs? Do we want a system that advocates for advance level negotiation skills and goes beyond a simple awareness of difference or are we comfortable with the status quo? Also how do we recognize innovative classroom leaders who successfully incorporate issues of diversity into the interpersonal communication classroom? Do we have reliable evaluation systems that critically examine not just the teacher/ student relationships, but the tools and research methods used in the classroom as well?]

Sadly, at the moment diversity education is avoided by some in the communication classroom (Jackson, et. al, 2007). It is no wonder with instructor's manuals suggesting antiquated activities and simplistic discussion prompts. I realize the role of the teacher is not rely on tools alone but I also believe academia needs to place a higher value on those instructors with the willingness to think in different ways and who have a desire to bring diversity education out from the margins. Our institutions need to encourage those instructors (and students) who question our sources of knowledge in an attempt to transform social thought through dialogue and collective learning (Connell, 2007).

112

Chapter Seven

Concluding Thoughts on the Challenges, Limitations and Future of SCD Education

The goal of this project was to examine the ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education in the field of communication by focusing on the points where diversity, pedagogy and communication intersect. Placing three popular interpersonal communication textbooks under a magnifying glass and examining the patterns revealed in the text started the process of achieving this goal. My hope is that using interpersonal communication textbooks to examine the underpinnings of the social construction of differentness negotiation in the field of communication revealed a better understanding of the ways we approach and teach the topic of diversity to our undergraduate students. To accomplish the goal of this project I faced several challenges. One was establishing a working definition of the central theme of this project, the social construction of differentness. With the variety of ways to refer to issues of diversity, much of the research was hidden in studies that centered on Nursing and Organizations, very few diversity key word searches resulted in Communication studies focusing on the social construction of differences. Second, in analyzing the texts, I found I had to adapt to and manage the varied stylistic approaches of the authors of the representative textbooks. And third, I felt the need to design a somewhat nontraditional method that would produce a qualitative study that could answer the inquiries I posted as research questions.

Throughout this study I used these challenges as jumping off points in order to develop a powerful project that critically challenged the ontoepistemological underpinnings of diversity education in the field of communication. I hope that reflexively incorporating an examination of the changes this project went through added to the strength of this analysis. In other words, as the study changed, I saw it as an opportunity to make the positive changes necessary in order to learn new lessons and examine new revelations about the social construction of differentness, whether this involved (re)defining the topic, reassessing the data to analyze patterns found in the texts and/or identifying a new method that allowed others' experiences to be incorporated into the findings. All of these changes became an important part of the key findings of this study.

Renaming diversity as the social construction of differentness created a communicative frame for teaching the elements of social construction by one coordinated term. I hope that changing the word, "diversity" to the phrase, "the social construction of differentness" (SCD), I have created a path to a more in-depth examination of the underpinnings of diversity found in interpersonal communication textbooks. Changing from diversity to the social construction of differentness may serve to challenge the taken-for-granted stigma attached to the word diversity and by coordinating the idea of diversity around a phrase that prioritizes social construction, I have created a theoretical frame for reaching a deeper understanding of the idea of diversity. Identifying occurrences and questioning the implications of patterns of diversity found in interpersonal communication textbooks opened a space for dialogue, emergent thematic design, and a critical examination of the present and future of SCD education in the field

of communication. The findings of this study revealed a significant representation of the race, ethnicity, and nationality issues in the texts. But it also exposed a reliance on global cultures as examples of interpersonal communication phenomenon, thus missing an opportunity to engage the student in conversations that might represent more local issues. Additionally the themes revealed in this study allowed for a closer examination of the use of dichotomy and binary in diversity education. Additionally the textbooks only minimally addressed other categories of diversity and when issues such as Sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic-status, age, or religion were mentioned they too were treated as one-dimensional constructs.

The field of communication does not obligate interpersonal communication textbook authors to touch on or explain the social construction of our differences within their pages. On one hand, there are many missed opportunities to offer a strong foundation for understanding the skills needed to address issues of our social construction of differentness in these textbooks. On the other hand, the field of communication does not obligate interpersonal communication textbook authors to touch on or explain the social construction of our differences within their pages. Therefore that these textbooks attempt to even minimally address these complex issues can be seen as both a success in that each author incorporates references to various dimensions of diversity and also a failure in that the examples are often, themselves, overly simplistic.

Changing from "diversity" to "the social construction of differentness" also offers a frame for examining our pedagogical choices by examining the content and the context of the patterns found in our course material. This process has revealed some gaps in the tools we use to teach the social construction of differentness. If we seek to produce

115

students who are well versed in recognizing the social construction of our differences and comfortable negotiating relationships with others who have very different perspectives from their own, then we need to release diversity from taboo topic status and retrain ourselves and our students to understand it as a social creation.

The representative textbooks used in this study effectively explained culture and cultural differences but some bravely discussed race as a key part of our culture's understanding of diversity (Wood, 2010), while others only briefly spoke to the issues of race by defining racism as an "ism" that should be avoided and opting to use more global references to highlight our cultural differences (DeVito, 2013). Each of these textbooks effectively spoke to issues of interpersonal relationships but my research thus far leads me to think that these books have not yet successfully laid a strong foundation for teaching and understanding the complexities of our socially constructed differences. I can say that although the content of these textbooks touched on issues of diversity, they all approached the topic of "difference" and diversity in interpersonal relationships with an eye toward acceptance and advocated for understanding the other's perspective whenever possible. I believe the authors did their best to include the notion of choice in relationships and tolerant and accepting phrases in the text. I consider these word and phrase choices as a positive step toward teaching our students about the complexity of social construction and various points of view.

Another significant challenge in this kind of study was examining only our pedagogical tools without questioning those teaching the courses. I focused on textbooks for one specific reason, to reveal the underpinnings. It seemed important to go back to the foundational textual sources. Jackson, et. al. (2007) conducted semi-structured interviews

that questioned GTA's on their treatment of the topic of diversity in the speech communication classroom. Although this study was provocative and honest, I felt this piece was not speaking to the heart of the problem, and that in a sense what it had done was create a straw-man fallacy. If we truly wanted to effect change in how we teach issues of diversity, we need to investigate our teaching tools and practices, not those instructors new to the field who most likely were not required by their programs' curricula to learn about the complexities of SCD or who may never have had to negotiate these complex conversations as part of their identity. That is not to say that we should not hold our GTA's and graduate students accountable. I believe it is important to question our future instructors on their preparedness before asking them to teach the issues related to the social construction of differentness as they will be at the forefront of this challenge. I would like to suggest we examine our GTA's and graduate students preparedness by developing a self-assessment of some kind that simply questions their comfort level with teaching SCD to undergraduates, where they get this knowledge, what we in the field have done or can do to improve their comfort levels with this topic, as well as if they have a desire to teach this topic to others. I believe the answers to these questions will help us map the landscape of the SCD and could reveal some unarticulated values and beliefs about the idea of diversity and the field of communication. I would also like to conduct a replication of Jackson et. al's. (2007) semi-structured interview study to gauge our progress in the area of diversity six years later. Maybe the next logical step is to coordinate key elements by determining the ultimate purpose of our interpersonal communication courses and considering together the advantages of coordinating a curriculum that includes diversity education. If interpersonal communication is meant to

117

educate students on the complexities of negotiating relationships then it can be framed as a skills course with an emphasis on the skills needed to understand, empathize and affectively communicate with the other, through experiential exercises and conversation-based activities designed to foster an understanding of the Other. But if on the other hand, we see interpersonal communication as a theoretical course then we should perhaps situate it within a clearer theoretical tradition and coordinate the information in the textbooks accordingly. Perhaps a good starting point for this type of curricular change would be facilitated by a study examining students' understanding of interpersonal communication issues and the impact of textbooks' content on their understanding using a "before" and "after" study design. Such a study could help us better gauge our undergraduate students' understanding of the basic elements of social construction, whether our courses are helping to enhance their comfort level with negotiating issues of diversity in everyday encounters, and thus could help us determine our pedagogical and curricular strengths and weakness.

In this project, I have positioned interpersonal communication primarily as a theory course and have tried to develop an argument for situating interpersonal communication textbooks and course content within the socio-cultural tradition of communication. That is not to say there is no place for skills development in a theoretical course, but I am suggesting we first find agreement on where the conceptual emphasis of interpersonal communication textbooks should be and then move from that point in a unified direction. Once a theoretical foundation is laid we could then look to the strengths of various methods such as ethnography, performance, and others to develop the skills

our students will need to manage the relationships that celebrate an understanding of our socially constructed differences.

I believe the field of communication may soon have to make some decisions and changes to our core curriculum with regard to teaching the elements of social construction and move toward making a course in diversity or the social construction of differentness a required part of the undergraduate curriculum. I have tried to position this project at the forefront of that transition by examining the underpinnings of the social construction of differentness education.

One interesting finding this study revealed was as a result of the reflective content analysis conducted through coders meetings. These insights centered on the supplemental material sent to instructors as companion material to the textbooks they receive. For this study I had access to two websites and one instructors manual. The websites were generic and nonspecific to the textbooks and the manual offered six activities related to SCD education. We need to decide if we as a field want to coordinate an effort to develop skills more fully through the creation of new experiential activities. I have used an activity in my interracial communication classroom that I feel meets this challenge by focusing on the idea of social scripts and challenging my students to critically examine the idea of agency. To do this I use Patricia Hill-Collins' (2004) book as a starting point. According to Hill-Collins, "Sexual politics can be defined as a set of ideas and social practices shaped by gender, race, and sexuality that frame all men and women's treatment of one another, as well as how individual men and women are perceived and treated by others" (p. 6). This activity separates the class into three groups that represent three socially constructed groups in our country: the disenfranchised (those who are

119

systemically silenced and whose protests are muted), the marginalized (those with limited access to the system) and the privileged (those with full agency in the system). The key to the activity is to get those with full agency to realize they are not bound to any one social script's they are free agents with the ability to look around and notice who does not have access to the system and then work to help the others gain access. Helping them to see that privilege means action not silence. This activity challenges students to see beyond the socially constructed (gender, race and sexuality) rules and reconstruct new social practices.

Additionally I believe I have shown a need to re-examine how we frame the idea of differentness. In our interpersonal communication classrooms when we juxtapose what is normal to what is different, we miss a teaching moment that could help to unlock the complexity of social construction. This is a pedagogical challenge when you consider most of us have been taught to understand diversity as part of an either/or scenario. Therefore to overcome this obstacle I would suggest no longer using binaries or dichotomies to position an understanding of the "other" but, rather, invite students to consider how treatment of the "other" can be understood in a more complex way, with reference to the socio-politics and social histories that shape those treatments.

Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs is one possible frame for this type of critical examination of the social construction of differentness. For example, Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a model typically explained in detail in Western colleges' and universities' introductory courses, in psychology, sociology, and interpersonal communication. This model offers a scheme for assessing levels of human development, starting at the bottom with the idea of physical needs, and moving through a series of levels to needs for self-

actualization. The model presumes that at this top level, individuals reach a level of social and emotional fulfillment, and the human spirit Franurishes.

I propose using Maslow's model as a way to frame the phenomenon of diversity and socially constructed differentness (SCD), for example by asking students to consider who is socially able to ascend up the pyramid? Why or why not? And what can be done to alter this trajectory, or should we? Asking students to consider this frame, and plot sub-groups and social groups in this frame situates a new and unique way for understanding the complexities of our socially constructed differences.

This project has explored only a small corner of what may be possible for the future of our field. Communication is uniquely positioned to be academic leaders in the area of SCD negotiation and education. Our methods embrace both realist and interpretive results and we have created an academic space that examines and values a variety of academic expressions as important communicative practices. We place a high value on voice in our field and we celebrate those things that make us different and elevate the human experience.

References

Agar, M. (2004). We have met the other and we're all nonlinear: Ethnography as a nonlinear dynamic system. *Complexity 10(2)*. pp 16-24.

Agnes, (Ed.), (1999). *Webster's New World College Dictionary, 4th ed.,* New York: NY, Macmillian.

Andrén, G. (1981). Reliability and content analysis. In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.). *Advances in content analysis, Sage annual reviews of Communication research v. 9*. pp. 43-67. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Allen, B. (2007). Theorizing communication and race. *Communication Monographs, 74*, p. 259-264.

Allen, B. J. (2011). *Difference matters: Communicating social identity 2nd ed*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press Inc.

Anderson, L. & Krathwohl, D. A. (2001) *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* New York: Longman

Bambrough, R. (1963). Aristotle Ethics. Book I. In R. Bambrough (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Aristotle*. pp 286-302. New York, NY: The New American Library.

Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an ecology of mind. Chicago IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Baynton, D. C. (2004). Disability and the justification of inequality in American history. In P. S. Rothenberg Ed. *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study 6th ed.* New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics*. The Guilford Press: New York, NY.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: the classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York, NY: Longmans Green.

Bohm, D. (1996). *On Dialogue.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bojer, M. M., Roehl, H., Knuth, M., & Magner, C. (2008). Mapping dialogue: Essential tools for social change. A Taos Institute publication. Chagrin Falls, OH.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development.* Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Brown, J., & Isaacs, D. (June/July, 2001). The World Café: Living knowledge through conversations that matter. *The Systems Thinker.* vol.12 no.5.

Brown, J., Isaacs, D., Margulies, N. (1999). Asking big questions: A catalyst for strategy evolution. www.theworldcafe.com.

Burns, R. G., & Rupiper, O. J. (1977). Trends in school psychology as demonstrated by content analysis of school psychology textbooks. Psychology in the Schools, 14, 332-340.

Calloway-Thomas, C. (2010). *Empathy in the global world: An intercultural perspective.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Calpotura, F. (1998). Recipe for organizing. *In Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study. 6th ed.* Ed. P. S. Rothenbreg. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Carrell, L. J. (1997). Diversity in the communication curriculum: Impact on student empathy. *Diversity infusion impact.* pp. 234-244

Cissna, K (2000). Applied Communication research in the 21st century. *Journal of Applied Communication research, v28(2),* 169-173.

Crabtree, R. D., Sapp, D. A., & Licona, A. C. (2009). Feminist pedagogy: Looking back to move forward. R. D. Crabtree, D. A. Sapp & A. C. Licona (Eds.). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication theory, 9*(2) pp. 119-161

Connell, R. (2007) Southern Theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R.D. Eds.(2003) *The critical pedagogy reader.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Darder, A. (2003). Teaching as an act of love: Reflections on Paulo Freire and his contributions to our lives and work. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres Eds. *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

DeSantis, N. (Febuary, 1, 2012) New Media Consortium Names 10 Top 'Metatrends' Shaping Educational Technology. *The Chronical of Higher Eduation, Wired Campus Blog*. http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. (1949). *Knowing and the Known*. Beacon Press: Boston, MA.

DeVito, J. A. (2013). *The interpersonal communication book, 13th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Dolan, J. (2001). Geographies of learning: Theory and practice, activism and performance. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Ellingson, L. L. (2009). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research: An introduction.* Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

Fassett, D. & Warren, J. T. (2007). *Critical communication pedagogy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Findahl, O. & Höijer, B. (1981). Media content and Human comprehension. In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.). *Advances in content analysis, Sage annual reviews of Communication research v. 9*. pp. 111-132. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Floyd, K (2011). *Interpersonal communication, 2nd ed.* Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Friere, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition*. New York, NY: The Continuum International publishing Group Inc.

Graves, J. L. Jr. (2001). *The emperor's new clothes: Biological theories of race at the millennium*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *Presenting of self in everyday life*. Garden city, NY: Doubleday.

Gómez Peña, G. (2000). Dangerous Border Crossers: The artist talks back. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grossman, C. L (1/27/2011). Number of U.S. Muslims to double. *USA Today*. Updated 1/27/2011 2:29:00 PM retrieved 5/29/13. http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/religion/2011-01-27-1Amuslim27_ST_N

Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harari, H., & Jacobson, A (1984). Teaching psychology in the 1980's: A content analysis of leading introductory psychology textbooks. Teaching of Psychology, 1,1 236-237.

Hendrix, G.H., Jackson, R. L.II, and Warren, J. R. (2003). Shifting academic landscapes: Exploring co-identities, and critical progressive pedagogy. *Communication Education* 52(3/4). pp 177-190.

Hill-Collins, P. (2004), *Black sexual politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism.* New York: NY. Routledge.

Howe, K. R (2011). Mixed methods mixed causes? *Qualitative Inquiry 17(2),* 166-171.

Hurley, T. J., & Brown, J. (November, 2009). Conversational leadership: Thinking together for a change. *The Systems Thinker,* vol. 20 n9.

Jackson, R.L. III, Warren, J.R., Pitts, M. J., & Wilson, K. B. (2007). " it is not my responsibility to teach culture!" White graduate teaching assistants negotiating identity and pedagogy. In L. M. Cooks & J. S. Simpson, Eds. *Whiteness, pedagogy, performance: Dis/placing race*. New York, NY: Lexington books.

Jeffries, T. (2002). An autoethnographic exploration of racial (i)dentity. *The journal of intergroup relations. 29*(2), pp. 39-57.

Keeney, B. P. (1983). Aesthetics of change. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Knapp, T. (1985). Who's Who in America introductory psychology textbooks: A citation study. Teaching of Psychology, 12, 15-17.

Kreps, G. L. (1994). Gender differences in the critical incidents reported by elderly health care residents: A narrative analysis. In H. Sterk and L. Turner (Eds.), *Differences that make a difference: Examining the assumptions of research in communication, language, and gender* (pp. 27-34). Westport CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology, v. 5 the sage CommText series*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindkvist, K. (1981). Approaches to textual analysis. In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.). *Advances in content analysis, Sage annual reviews of Communication research v. 9*. pp. 23-41. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

McLaren, P. (2003). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres Eds. *The critical pedagogy reader.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Merrigan, G. & Huston, C. L. (2004). *Communication research methods.* Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Morreal, S. (2001, January). CMC, social change, trends & resources. *Spectra*, 37(1), 12

Orbe M. P. & Harris, T. M. (2008). *Interracial Communication: theory into practice 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Parsons, T, (1951) *The social system*, Free Press: Glencoe, IL.

Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2010). Instructor's resource manual: interpersonal communication Everyday encounters, 6th ed. Julia T Wood author prepared by Narissra M. Punyanunt-Carter. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Reinharz, S. & Kulick, R. (2007) Reading between the lines: Feminist content analysis into the second millennium. In Handbook of Feminist research theory and praxis. Ed. S. N. Hesse-Biber. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Rogers, C. (1969). *The freedom to learn.* Columbus OH: Merrill.

Rosengren, K. E. (Ed.). (1981). Advances in Scandinavian content analysis; An introduction. In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.). Advances in content analysis, Sage annual reviews of Communication research v. 9. pp. 9-19. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sepstrup, P. (1981). Methodological developments in content analysis? In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.). Advances in content analysis, Sage annual reviews of Communication research v. 9. pp. 133-158. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smedley, A. (1999). *Race in North America: Origins and evolution of a worldview, 2nd ed..* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stewart, J., Zediker, S. & Witteborn, K. (2005). *Together communicating interpersonally: A social construction Approach 6th ed.,* Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Tregaskis, C. (2004). Constructions of disability: Researching the interface between disabled and non-disabled people. London: Routledge.

Walkerdine, V. (1992) Progressive pedagogy and political struggle. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.) Feminisms and critical pedagogy. New York, NY: Routledge.

Webb, Thompson-Hayes, (2002). Do popular collegiate textbooks in Interpersonal communication reflect a common theory? A telling content analysis. *Communication Education, 51(2),* 210-224.

Whitehead, A. N. (1925). *Scince and the Modern World.*New York, NY: The Free press.

Wood, J. T. (2007). *Interpersonal Communication everyday encounters 5th ed.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Wood, J. T. (2010). *Interpersonal Communication everyday encounters 6th ed.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Appendices

Appendix A: Relative Emphasis Given to Social Construction for Each Dimension

	Wood (2010)			DeVito (2013)			Floyd (2011)			Total		
	+	++	+++	+	++	+++	+	++	+++	+	++	+++
REN	58	7	9	22	8	20	7	14	14	(87)	(29)	(43)
SO	10	7	6	10	4	1	0	3	7	(20)	(14)	(14)
Ab	12	4	3	5	2	2	2	1	6	(19)	(7)	(11)
SES	15	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	(16)	(4)	(2)
M	10	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	(16)	(1)	(3)
R	3	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	0	(7)	(6)	(1)
A	1	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	1	(5)	(3)	(2)
Total										(170)	(64)	(76)

Appendix B: Coders Meeting Transcripts

Tape One sides A and B: Meeting One, January 5, 2013

…organizing discussion of process and explaining the organization of content not tapped

Mike—…one, one thing you might do if you are willing to risk subjectivity is instead of

saying this particular pedagogy say "is the authors tone neutral or critical or supportive of

what's being described?"

Tammy—Oh that's a good idea

Mike—Whether that having to worry abut what activity is being asked of the students

Tammy—That's probably a better way to describe

Mike—Yah assume all reading is active …but like this first one about japan it's clearly

neutral this is not for or against they just throwing it in to show they know something

about Japan but ah the, the second one I don't quite know how you would code it…would

you say …ah

Tammy—It would be an occurrence

Mike —it's… it's definitely an occurrence but would you say gee in a sense this is

accepting of making a difference or ah…maybe not…but anyway.

Tammy—But that's a good point.

Mike —When it's obviously critical…something should be done about that…when that

kind of comes through you know their's some subjectivity their…or obviously

supportive…isn't it nice that the Japanese do this or that.

Tammy—right, right, right. I see what you're saying. Try to some how show the authors

perspective…well judgment

Mike —you know or something I, I, I, you might take that tone and kind of do it that way.

Tammy—That's a good way to get around that too because that's what I was fighting with our struggling with so maybe I'll have to include that in the language of like…maybe we can included in our language when we talk about the occurrences too…like what type of tone does this

(long silence/reading)

Fran—do we agree on this one?

(long silence/reading)

Tammy—do we agree?

(long silence/reading)

Tammy—would we all agree that's an occurrence?

(long silence/reading)

Christine—where's is that?

Mike —That's the first paragraph

Tammy—the next occurrence is this whole page on 305

Fran and Christine—um hum

Fran—the whole page

Christine—yep

(long silence/reading)

Christine- um hum

(long silence/reading)

Fran—Logistic question. Should we take this occurrence out and make four bigger. In REN comparing and contrasting because an issue is the juxtaposing cultures or cultural behaviors as a bench mark of an occurrence. They don't have to be only between US and other cultures right? It can be any two cultures.

Christine—um hum but the two in one occurrence is not required, just if they

Mike —wait we should re-read the parameters

(reading)

Christine—oh ok, so we are right.

Fran—oh actually any mention of a culture.

Christine—yep

Fran—ok ok

(long silence/reading)

Mike —hum… another country oversees

Tammy—it's interesting how much of the occurrences is between Americans and how much is global

Mike —it seems to me that this author spends a lot of time informing us of what cultures overseas do and not much time giving information about how to manage the differences in our races in America.

Christine—bottom

Fran—I'm not sure this fits

Christine—hum

Tammy—oh you're right let's take it out

Mike —yep

Fran—the next paragraph fits though so make that one.

Christine- Um hum, um hum

Tammy—ok

(long silence/reading)

Christine—um..,no, no forget it

(laughter)

Fran—I think someone's getting tired

(laughter)

Mike —this is a descriptive example the author is taking a stance, should, is taking a

pedagogical stance.

Tammy—I see, hum

(long silence/reading)

Christine—gosh my eyes are getting tired

Mike —well we are almost done,

Tammy—should we take a break?

Mike —we only have ten more minutes

(laughter)

Fran—that's wasn't too bad

Tammy—the next ones will go faster because they are shorter. This was the worse one.

And then having the different authors writing styles made it harder to transition from one

to the other.

Mike —you know this is interesting I I can remember traveling overseas and seeing the

way people responded to police offices when they were being pulled over and thought

wow this is strange they would stop the car where ever they were and just deal with it in that moment.

Tammy—Yah when I was in California I noticed a lot of people getting out of their car when they were pulled over. I thought that was strange.

Christine—oh really hum

(laughter)

Mike —or the different signs you see, like when we were in the philipines we saw a sign that said no urinating on the church wall… as if that was such a problem that needed signage.

(laughter)

Tammy—right

Mike —but than again maybe that was something they needed to address.

Christine—hum maybe buildings in general were ok just not churches

(laughter)

Tammy- I guess that gets to the idea of social construction.

(laughter)

Christine—inaudible

Mike—Well…

Tape end

Tape Two sides A and B: Meeting Two, January 10, 2013

Tammy—So here's the…

Mike —Purple package …oh they're grouped by categories here

Fran—ok SO…

Tammy- Sexual orientation should be on top

Mike —S.O. ….

Tammy—This si probably the largest of our final packages

(reading parameters out loud)

Fran—this would be homo-sexual people

Tammy—yep homosexual and any thing transgendered, mentions of same sex partners anything

Fran—although it use to be that could be included under race.

Tammy—oh really?

Fran—oh yes there use to be laws preventing people from…

Mike —That their use to be similar laws

Fran—yah, yah

Tammy—um I think that this would count as an occurrence because it says three fourths cohabitate is same sex male and five million… it's really comparing and contrasting, what do you think?

Christine—yah I agree. Lesbian and gay cohabitation that's pretty much their

Tammy I know right?

(laughter)

Tammy—This is interesting though because she's trying to show similarity between same sex and gay men.

Mike —yah but you have to decide if you want to include it in as one occurrence or two I don't know how you're scoring it.

Christine—logistics

Tammy—I think that's why we're doing this though

(laughter)

Mike —I think the most important this to do is to be consistent so that you can explain why you decided weather jay is separate from the thing as long as you're consistent you can say hey I treat examples as separate instances than the general statements or I treated examples as just part of the general statements

Christine—so let's go back to REN we treated them separate there so…

Tammy—this is unique but I think we should stick to the way we've done he others

Fran—yah yep this is separate

(long silence/reading)

Tammy—if we want to talk about that you know if something interesting if there's wording in the passage or something that's interesting to you we can talk about that cause…I'd I'd much rather have the discussion on tape as we're getting through the packet. I'd much rather have then conversation about why it's interesting to you.

Mike —I would like to point out that paragraph before jay then is an international contrast ah. I don't know if it's important…so now every ones it makes it look like the rest of the world is way ahead of us.

Fran—well we know they are

(laughter)

Mike —exactly

(laughter)

Fran—yah opposed to the ones that kill you

Christine—yah right

Tammy—yah huh

Christine—so what about jay?

Tammy—Ah I think is an occurrence, but nothing too exciting that's what I think

Fran—it sounds very much like heterosexual couples.

Mike —yah I think they're leaning in the direction of saying oh gay people are just like
other people

Tammy—right, see their not abnormal they walk and talk and breeth and bleed just like
everybody else

Mike —it's not a chapter on bath houses or something like that

(laugther)

Chrisitne-uh huh

Tammy—that's funny

Fran—so we're on to the next

Tammy—yah that's funny, and that's the one that continued on the next page so what…

Mike —No so long ago (inaudible) they wouldn't have been identified in one of these
books

Christine—or talked about in public

Mike —they would have just been an aberration they hoped would go away

Christine—uhm

Mike—right now jumping ahead

Tammy—yah, oh where does it begin oh that little part

(inaudible)

Fran—well they sort…

Christine—they sort of threaten it as deviant

Fran—well will you apply to the whole because that changes

Tammy—I'd ay that's a good one

(silence)

Tammy—What what does equal-li-tarian

Fran—egalitarian

Tammy—egalitarian, oh that sounds right now I know once I said it right.

Mike —egalitarian, but for some reason the Q is

Tammy—reading passage out loud

Fran—yah because women aren't into power…egalitarian…egos…equal

Tammy—no ego's involved, maybe that's where it comes from?

(laughter)

Mike —no, no, no… come on…

(laughter)

Tammy—women rule men drool

(laughter)

Christine—no, no, no

Fran and Tammy—yah right laughter

Christine—hum

Tammy-it's interesting though I would wonder if that really true though.

Mike —what the universal..statictical patterns of…

Fran—it's something that I've noticed in the people I know. Their bassing it on research

yah yah yah and the guys I know they don't know how to divide up their chores

Mike —they're basing it on one study too…but ah anyway…that's not our problem.

(laughter)

Tammy—I think that it's an episode what ever our ….

Christine—I yah, I think it's an episode. SO

Fran—Ok…um hum

Christine—we don't know how true it is …ok so episode.

(silence)

Fran—I think you mark is not in the right place.

Tammy—oh so move it down?

Christine—I agree…(inaudible) honesty and …

Mike —did they mention money?

Christine—did they?

Tammy—I don't think so

Mike —so money is not an important part of the choice?

Tammy—for some people

Fran—maybe not to highest in that study

Tammy—cause I know a lot of people who would…you know…prioritize tehat above

most…

Fran—oh I asked my sister with her husband who and I think is a jerk and she said " I

like my lifestyle"

Tammy—ok well there you go…and that that would you know

Mike —a lot of people who are wealthy manage to attract all kinds of things

(silence)

Fran—so this is not different?

Tammy—You know what. I'm gonna question that one cause I don't' think it gives us enough of a…i..it almost seems like it was thrown in as an afterthought

Christine—yah but it's saying that that's about sameness

Tammy—true

Mike—it does mention different groups and it mentions different groups to say they're the same but still they way you've been coding before

Fran— it says any mention of SO as deviant will be mentioned

Mike—put a comma after deviant to make that clear.

Fran—it's a mention where it's inclusive

Mike—any mention of it will be coded and a distinction will be made between when it treated as deviant behavior and when it's not.

Christine—you're taking SO and breaking it into two sections?

Tammy—no not right now but that can be done in the analysis though

Mike—but it's up to you weather you want to do it statistically or weather you wan tto discuss it that's up to you. The more things you'll have to count but the nore ammunition you then have for the discussion you're gonna have to make that deciaion over and over again and just to complicate things if I may?

Fran—sure

Tammy—go for it

Fran—better now than later

Mike—the word deviant can go in two directions one of which can be implied inferiority ad one of which can be simply different

Tammy—right, right

Mike—if I say ah…a homosexual man ah had more temporary relationships be establishing a permanent one than heterosexual men ah have I simply said they are different or have I somehow implied that there's something deviant going on?

Tammy—right right terminology and point of view good point…well I was considering it against the norm is so wiggly any way you know? Like what is normal?

Mike—yah yah…so that's tricky to say compare against the norm. comare against the norm unless the norm is really obvious ah but it's also tricky to us the word deviant because are you looking for something that's putting people down? Or just something saying different?

Tammy—Just different

Mike—they a minority group that ah..inaudible… then the the majority group

Christine—um hum um hum

Mike—ah

Fran—what would be clearer, what would be clearer to say

Christine—what would be clearer about that deviant?

Mike—well you might just do is stress difference verses stressing similarity

Tammy—yah that's a good suggestion

Christine—um hum right right

Mike—cause that's fairly objective getting into weather it was intended to be negative which is harder to code cause it's more objective.

Fran—although sometimes it's very very clear

Mike—yes right that's true…that can come out in the discussion

Christine—I like that…

Mike—sometimes, sometimes difference, difference is discussed used as an an dother times difference is discussed in a way that might be interpreted by many readers as negative.

Christine—I like that…

Mike—sure …

(inaudible)

Tammy—thanks for that mentioning that…cause that's true. That's a good call are we here yet?

Mike—if you say we are we are…it's your discussion

(laughter)

Christine—where does it start at?

Tammy—I guess it's the whole little part down to sasha…it's our discussion (laughter)…I guess it's the whole little part down to sasha

Fran—I would say this and half of the other…or not because this is an inclusion thing it's saying hey…

Tammy—so is (inaudible)

Fran—this is saying hey this happens on both sides of the fence

Mike—well at the top under sexual attraction it is saying here's a similarity between heterosexuals and homosexuals namely htat relationships can be messy or something like that.

Christine—um hum

Mike—hey interesting connection because western cultures well strongly empathize with gender and sex ah wait a minute other cultres don't?

Tammy—right!?

(laughter)

Mike—where's that coming from?

Tammy—right what a word

Mike—Edith can we think about sex? That's news to me…ah (laughter)…that's news to me….I find that a very strange sentence ah…but one thing I've read is that in western culture and quiet possible in others but I don't know um there are often when a situation is ambiguous men are more likely to think its about sex than women.

Tammy—Oh that's interesting

Christine—hum

Mike—they read sex into situations when it's not there women don't read into situations that it is or some thing like that

Fran—wow

Mike—I think that's a very common pattern

Tammy—that's interesting

Fran—I think that's true…the Arab countries where seeing a women's or anything beyond her finger nail as sexual and women are …are

Tammy—well then in Africa women go pretty much nude and it's not considered sexual

Mike—but that's not to say Africans aren't going to be having sex

Tammy—right

Mike—they

Tammy—its what the culture has designed it as

Mike—but you know what I'm thinking about is like oh when we gave our son Andrew a gift certificate for a massage as a christmass present and the question became would he want a man or a woman masuse?

Christine—um hum

Mike—and my wife who gets massages considers massages not sexual thing…ah…ah and that's, that's you know isnt' an issue.

Fran—for her

Mike—as a man, as a man I immediately thought was wel boy it would be an issue for me ah ah I would I would know was massaging me and I'd be you know.

Tammy—like

Mike—it would make a difference because the physical contact

Tammy—right their a meaning to it

Fran—I think it makes a difference…it may or may not make a diffenrece to the person getting the massage I've had them with both men and women and I personally (inaudible) but I was comfortable after

Mike—but a man might not be as comfortable

Fran—right right

Mike—because they are more likely to kind of read the sexual tenson in the room

Fran—or might get an errection and not be able to hide it where as a woman can hide her's

Mike—I really think that's saying about western culture is more, more obsessed with sex

Tammy—yah lie its nonsense right and its like this is random

Mike—I don't know any culture that's not obsessed with sex. We may talk about it differently we go public about some things and less about others and so fourth and we can equally develop cultures (inaudible) having said that well I don't know if that's what you're coding.

Tammy—but that's the discussion I like though it's an interesting perspective of what the book is bringing to our students and what we find interesting to talk about in this meeting

Christine—oh

Tammy—to have that as a sentence is saying something to the students like to have that as a researched part of research…you know.

Fran—but I'm not sure that's because western culture belongs in this they between hetero sexual and lesbian

Mike—right

Fran—right but it's the first sentence you would want to include

Mike—no but this is not discussing gay and lesbian between

Tammy—right like I can have a gay friend

Christine—right

Mike—which is which is more of an issue it's a different kind of realationship…

Fran—what if a straight women gets a crush on a gay man htat can be frustration…

Mike—or in some cases it's safe ah…

Tammy—right it safer…

Christine—I had a friend who ah went to italy and she and she lived wth a um three I thnk gay men and its like you know she was just sripping in fornt of them you know putting her clothes on just like it were girls you know.

144

Fran—huh they weren't interested

Christine—and she wasn't interested in them…they were more like girl friends then men even though they were men.

Mike—any way the topic (inaubdible)

Tammy—yah

Fran—so…so s this portion below sasha included in this first…

Tammy—this the portion below sasha was not included but I thnk we should consider it as an episode if we're…I …I haven't read it all…I'll …

Fran—well I would guess it's part

Tammy—yah

Fran—I'd say it's a separate one…I mean it continues what we're talking aobut

Christine—up here but it's… it's… different.

Fran—same but different

Tammy—let's go for it

Mike—same but different

Christine—oh I hate that term

Fran—yah?

Christine—oh I absolutely hate that same but different idea

Tammy—no…

Christine—no…I know but 've always hated that… oh it's the same but different. That's different

Tammy—what?... I…I like it…it some how makes it easier to see the…

Fran—(inaudible)..

(long silence/reading)

Tammy—yah I thnk that's an episode

Fran—ok aht't the difference between an episode and an occurrence?

Tammy—I don't know. I'm just suign different words

Fran—oh so it's an example…

Tammy—yah (laughter)

Mike—it's a case… a case

Tammy –I need to be careful. I'm sure in real content analysis there's a meaning for each word but I'm just using them interchangeably

Mike—right

Fran—ok

Mike—that's good

Tammy—I think that martin is a separate case

Fran—example cases do you want to write that down

(laughter)

Tammy—I should write them all down because it's dealing with…I'm looking I'm maybe not it is dealing with ah ok it is dealing with the parents

Mike—oh you're treating this as three episodes here that's why all the markings and ah…this…this is three different episodes

Tammy—yah age, race, and sexual orientation

Fran—well martin is …is um specific example of how it affects other people and I think that puts it in a different category but it's um it's it's how being homosexual affects as

oppose to being heterosexual so I thnk it fits the criteria and this would come under um the difference.

Christine—um hum

Fran—oh you're right…now the section below martin is that?

Tammy—I thought another occurrence

Fran—I think it is I thinkit is because the first one talks about parents and the second one talks about how it affects everybody

Christine—what about friendships

Fran—and then the third one is depenceny on friendships

Tammy—ok cool so I wasn't too far off base with that one

Fran—but you don't have that one underlined

Mike—its' here at the bottom of the page

Fran—ok okey-dokey

Christine—it's hard to…

Fran—Oh ok ok

Tammy—this one is continued on page 229 at the very top there

(long silence/reading)

Fran—um…

(long silenc/reading)

Fran—I think you missed one their after the end of theis quote on 229 you've got…reading…

Tammy—oh yah and I would think that's a um…

Mike---yah but that's not just about conflicts (inaudible)

Fran—and that could be just gender but it talks about how gay and …

Tammy—uh huh

Mike—so that's another similarity

Tammy---yah and I think its' another occurrence too separate from the one we just had.

Fran—I think so too.

Mike—(inaudible) next to the go on to the next paragraph

Tammy-no I'm not going to (laughter)

Fran—well my nephew who is gay was playing with dolls when he was little and well

that gave me a clue…(laughter)

Mike—gave him a little slack for doing it

Fran—not me but his mother

Mike—that's it

Tammy—that's the next one… now I'm looking at Wayne

Fran—wow… wow

(reading)

Fran—this is an excellent example of how consider…he was considered as being defined

as less than.

Mike—it's not a part of the textbook. Its…

Tammy—that's true

Mike—it's not the textbook implying

Tammy—it's the conversation that the parents had with eh child

Fran—what is disconfirmation (reading)

Tammy—I'm glad you that distinction for me.

Mike—yah

Fran—ok

 (long silence/reading)

Mike—(inaudible)…

(silence/reading)

Mike—the term domestic partnerships (laughter)

Tammy—my domestic partner (laughter)

Christine—I don't even think I've heard….I've heard domestic partner

Mike—oh yah partner I hear

Fran- not domestic partner

Tammy—right

(silence/reading)

Tammy—Vanessa let's, oh… she's behind… I miss marked that

Christine—ummmm

Tammy—oh and it even goes backwards um further….

Fran—is she make to make or make going to female

Tammy—um so you're on Vanessa?

Fran—no no no no no I got messed up…where does it stop

Christine—it needs to stop.. the break is down here even further

Mike—you need to stop it here…they are expanding into language here

(silence/reading)

Tammy—that kind of calls their attention to language

(inaudible)

Mike—let's go on …discussion of Qe first

Fran—hermaphidite

Christine—any mention of sexual orientation

Fran—and then that one is going back ward

Christine—no problem just flip the page …the copies were our of order

Fran---is a mention of sexual orientation

Tammy—good point

Fran—um here here

Mike—sure

Tammy—that's a different one but that's interesting the textbook doesn't say…where's my head going with this? Do you think that even mentioning things like this is kind of the textbook saying even though she's referencing them or the the negative experiences do you think that that's in some way um including that into the language of the process like like you know what I'm saying can you figure it out?

Christine—nope

Tammy—well the although the author of the textbook isn't declaring this as deviant she's saying something by leaving it out

Mike—actually I think the author of the textbook is doing the opposite because the previous sentence praises this by saying ah it is our responsibility to speak out if your against perspectives we perceive as wrong which is what that guys doing and so the author of that textbook is saying the parents are wrong and he's right

Tammy—so that's a judgment that the author is making

Mike—it's an indication of where the author is making a bias position against treating it as a desire

Tammy—so I think I think so this is probably…I'm going to use this in my discussion but I'm probably not going to count it as an occurrence

Mike—it's a clear case of the author taking a stand against prejudice in a sense but it is not an issue of diversity because it does not fit the parameters of any category

Fran—pedagogy

Mike—but but against a pattern where that doesn't happen too often in the book I don't think so …. It happens but a time most of the time the author tries to be kind of neutral in their stance

Tammy—neutral…but then that's in some way teaching our students about our culture in a way

Mike—well that's teaching that some people in our culture do and osme don't and there are some and our culture is transforming (inaudible)

Fran—ok Jennifer

Chirstine-Jennifer

Tammy—I think Jennifer is a yes

Mike—it be interesting if you go back through and to that and code it as an age issue

Tammy—oh right right

Mike—old people are prejudice and young people… (laughter)…I don't know if you made a note of that earlier but ah

Tammy—well probably not because um it's not mentioning age in the passage..oh maybe I did here. No I don't…

Mike—(Inaudible) I don't know if this is really talking about age or if this just happens to me ok… sexual orientation

(long silence/reading)

Christine—interesting… interspect (inaudible)… inter-sex…maybe hermaphadite

Tammy—where did you read that Chris?

Christine-um …

Tammy—oh maybe hermaphadite I wish I had a dictionary with me.

Christine—I don't …(inaudible)…not this is (inaudible)

Tammy—is…

Fran—I like it, I like it

(silence)

Fran—the cartoon oh I like that ok so we're at being the whole section here

Tammy—and I'm gona look at that one again for religion later on whern we get to that category

Fran—OK yah because that's also a religion

Tammy—yah I think it has some sentences that really lan that way

Fran—um hum, um hum and this is del

Tammy oh I just oh shoot wait there he is

Mike—del (inaudible) how about the third paragraph to the right of del did you code that too?

Tammy—ah ype that's coded

Mike—oh that's the next one so we'll get to that

(silence)

Mike—ok let's get to that so del's ok

Fran—del's fine

Mike—ok now this is still del…oh david and Brenda ok

Fran—ok ok ok

Mike—david and Brenda

Christine—and intersex is any one individual displaying sexual characteristics of both being male and female

Fran—so hermaphidite

Tammy—sexual characteristics could be just about anything really from hermaphadite to a boy have pink painted fingernails like on a continuum to just cross dressing.

Fran—or a man who has breasts

Tammy or a girl who cuts her hair really short where it looks like a boy or something anybody anything counts as characteristics really, characterisitics don't necessarily have to be like major physical body parts it could be clothing …artifacts

Mike—yah well let's see how it's used in the passage and stop just speculating

Fran—yep well I'm not sure how that fits in but it certainly…it's not sexual orientation well it is though…he was born one and raised another and…

Tammy—here's my question…but here's my question…decided that David could never be a normal male he was born a normal male till the doctors decided that david could never be a normal male so they did the surgery…you know so it's a choice forced on him

Mike—that's part of his sexual orientation

Fran—that's it

Mike—I'm just stuck on the word normal…I guess…am I reading too much into that?

153

Fran—well without a penis he will never be able to have sex like a man so they decided he can't

Tammy—but is that the only thing that made him a man?

Mike—their judgment implied by the word normal….um it seems to be so…it's not…

Tammy—um I'm going too far?

Mike—I think so their's a difference in saying normal and abnormal

Tammy—abnormal

Mike—their a diffence in saying African American is not normal or a gay person is not normal because there are millions of them but when something is statistically you know I don't have an absolute then it just seems to me like …what if this person was born with one arm that's not normal…ah not having to appy a value to that…judgment that there is something worng with them or something bad…

Tammy—ok ok I was just reading too far into the use of the word normal in that example

Mike—that's just my reaction because I'm male

(laughter)

Mike—next one

Tammy—maybe that was too much analysis on my part

Mike—again we're crawling through this pile so I think we should go…

Fran—oh oh really everybody has a penis only girls wear barretts

Tammy—oh that's cute

(laughter)

Fran—sexual orientation

Tammy—yes it's a cultural thing

Christine—aaaaa (stretching sound)…oh yah and I don't think because it's not

Tammy—I think it's more of a gender

Mike—it's not speaking of gender per se either it's a gray area

Fran—but is it relevant to this study?

Mike—I think it fits but I on't think it's anyone of those things on your list

Tammy—I'm going to include it in my discussion…but it really isn't part of a specific category, it's gender not sexual orientation

Christine—but if we do where do we draw the line which gender is included

Fran---um hum…do have the persons in western culture to define normal under under um…

Tammy—oh in anything?

Fran—or should that just be included in that one

Tammy—oh it probably should be included in this one

Fran—ok cause it's…it's

Tammy—it's not identified as from my notes here it's not identified as being captured in any other area either

Fran—and it's kind of sets the stage for the next sentence

Christine—um hum

Fran—that what's that called define normality

Tammy—oh it's culture oh you know what my sister and I went through this and we coded that but then I think it should be absorbed ito this next one.

Fran—I think so too

Christine—so western, western?

Mike—yah htat their this one

Tammy—do you guys feel like moving on to the next package that next part of this section so that we can get a…

Mike—to make sure you touch different bases. Do you want to do the ext book or do you want to do the next category

Tammy—ha let's do the next book lets see we've got wood oh and their he is the next one is the next occurrence anyway

Fran—oh so Floyd

Christine—oh

Mike—so we were already on the next anyway

Fran—so we're at the end of the last book..well that's good timing

(laughter)

(silence/reading)

Mike—ok ok

Fran—yep that works

Tammy—pretty much cut and dry I think

Mike—where's 25?

(reading)…(end of tape)

side B Tape 2

Tammy—ok lets' see let me clear my head of the fog of things now

Fran—(inaudible)

Tammy—but so he is saying he is actually giving us there are gender, sex then is biological sex then is alos this thing called sexual orientation I thing that counts as an occurrence he mentions the category point blank

Fran—so it is an occurrence

Tammy—shy do I think it is an occurrence? Because he is making students aware that there is something called sexual orientation

Fran—for whom

Tammy—do or do not

Fran—it may not be on their radar

Tammy—so is that does that? Do you think that's good enough…do I sell it to you?

(laughter)

Fran I don't know I think Mike would have a …a

Tammy—problem with it?

Fran—yah…I'm not sure it involves two or

Tammy—occurrences

Fran—ok yes so ask Mike

Tammy –ok so let's were deciding weather to include this as an occurrence or not.

Mike—ok 28?

Christine—29

Mike—oh 30

Tammy—so we're actually thinking of combining yah basically their the same thing

Mike—ok sure include it then go on

(laughter)

Mike—and I say that realizing that other categories we might want to sample and that we've used up three fourths of our time

Christine—right

Tammy—oh well so do we just want to move forward

Mike—I just altered you to the time I…I don't know…how we use our time is up to you not me.

Tammy—ah well I guess now would probably be a good time to hae the conversation if we want to even have another meeting or not then we could decide how to use our last half hour.

Fran—I'm willing to meet again

Christine—I'm ok

Mike—And I'm not…maybe one more two hour session will be about the end of it for me.

Tammy—ok well then I'll squeeze one more out of you guys

Mike—ahhh

Tammy—I'll wring that, I'll wring it

(laughter)

Christine—then let's move on to another category or another book or something so that we can

Mike—you can get a little sampling of …you can know what you want to come back to

Christine—right

Tammy—ok

Mike—cause we've got class, ability, and age

Christine—and that would also be nice to sort of touch on

Fran—where are they?

Tammy—ability is the one that has Ab it starts after the cardboard I mean the construction paper there's one…so do we want to do…let's see

Christine—I'd like to talk about age

Tammy—age? Ok

Christine—or I'd lie to hear about age

Tammy—ok let's take a request from the audience. I'll be like the DJ spinning

(laughter)

Tammy—lets see flip and it's got an A

Christine—it's small cause I don't see it

Fran—oh, ah huh

Tammy—oh yep only a couple of occurrences

Christine-I've go issues with age

Mike—we all do!

(laughter)

Fran—don't we all.

Mike—I don't know why you do? But

Fran—how old are you Christine?

Christine—fifty-one

Fran—fifty-one?

Mike—you're older than you look

Christine—we all…

Fran—how old are you Tammy?

Tammy—forty-six

Fran—ahh, I wouldn't have guessed it

Tammy—no?

Fran—you don't look it of course I'm seventy-one do I look like it?

Christine—oh my gosh no not at all

Fran—how old are you mike?

Mike—seventy-four

Christine—oh my gosh I thought you were a younger guy

Tammy—we al look very young

Christine—were all very young people

Tammy—cool

Fran—ok

Tammy—age…age is another

Christine—oh let me read the…

Fran—yah what does it say about age

Tammy—ok so many…any mention

(silence)

Christine—what does cohort mean?

Tammy—peers, like when you're in college at the same time like "class of 92" yah…

Fran—the norm being young adults middle age what even middle age is…you guys are the norm

(laughter)

Tammy—depending on you perspective

Mike—we're old geezers to some

Christine—um

(laughter)

Mike—what are these here

Tammy—those are yummy I think I'll have one too

Fran—ok

Christine—all right…age got it (clearing throat)kind of includes a lot

Tammy—but it's kind of like a boring category

Fran—ugh ugh I don't think so

Tammy—no? you don't think so?

Fran—ugh ugh

Tammy—the way I laid it out it looks like any mention of age is going to be…a fit

Christine—well it's a small one anyway so…if it gets boring it'll be over with soon

Fran—that one obviously fits

Tammy—yah definitely

Mike—when are mention of age relevant at all…all mentions of age.

Christine—it looks like it

Tammy—the way I laid it out it seems like that how I laid it out but…

Mike—the way you laid it out it doesn't quiet seem that way it seems like when they're

talking about age as implys like they are like groups…ah the other…ah…

Tammy—when it's compared to something else

Mike—ah as opposed to when you say groups somebody's older than some body else.

Christine—um um hum

Mike—and I don't know weather you want to do it the broader way at any kind of mention of age ah…will be coded or weather you want to look for cases where

Tammy—it's different? Hum

Mike—it is any kind of a group label or something like that…which is harder to decide.

Tammy—yah I was looking…my first intent was to lay out a code that would be able to capture when…when like when the parents had the discussion with the girl Jennifer. That kind of episode that kind of an idea like when age was called to the forefront but the way I read my definition now is reading like anytime it mentions age in the book I've underlined it.

(laughter)

Tammy—you know?

Mike—right

Tammy—that's what I read in this

Mike—so you've moved away a little bit what you were thinking…

      Tammy—this one did…

Mike—…of it originally

Tammy—yes

Mike—because it's easier just not to have to make those decisions

Tammy—judgment calls

Mike—oh ok (laughter)

Tammy—right…but my intention was not to have it every time age was mentioned I wanted it to be salient a conversation

Mike—yah yah

Fran—where it's comparing differnence?

Mike—well where some how you have age groups interacting

Tammy—right, where it's…

Mike—for age groups interacting or one age group is saying something about another age group

Tammy—right that's what I was trying to capture

Mike—that's hard, uh

Tammy—I think when I've gone through this now I'm I'm afraid that what we'll find is even less occurrences than what I really want to capture because I think I've underlined things what age

Mike—yep yep well

Fran—well let's let's find our, but the first one is definitely where age makes a difference

Christine—uh huh

Fran—so number one is right on

(silence)

Christine—ok uh hum…in os this one sounds like it does what it what it um is suppose to…

Fran—also

Christine—um did (reading) did you get this middle class in socio-economic?

Tammy—let's see… page …yah yah we got a whole bunch of representation from that chapter I'm sure we caught it

Christine—ok ok so next

(laughter.reading)

Tammy—what are you guys giggling about?

Mike—this is another controversy liberals and conservatives

(laughter)

Tammy—right he's he's funny in this book he does a lot of political comparison

Christine—oh we're back to this girl

Fran—so what was you're question Christine?

Christine—oh I just wanted to know if she got this middle class in her uh next …um…

Tammy—and I told her that there were lots of them I have a lot of them so I'm sure we got it

Fran—oh ok but number two for age is excellent

Christine—oh yah definitely

Tammy-which one are you on Chris?

Christine—number three

Tammy—what are you experiencing now, let's see (reading passage)

(silence)

Fran—aw that's an example that doesn't compare it although it…

Mike—its also an ability example too

Fran—yes, but it's understood

(silence)

Fran—ok?

Mike—down below that (inaudible)

Fran—yah

Christine—four is in wait, wait four is down on the bottom

Mike—this is the first one that is defiantly fits what your little acronym

Tammy—socially constructed differentness?

Christine—um um hum

Tammy—oh this is ability

Christine—no no go down to the bottom

Mike—well it's to point out differences within a larger culture without implying that one is a sub-culture

Fran—right yah so are we ok with this one?

Christine—I am, that's a nice comparison

Tammy—yep

Christine—now we're up here at eth top?

Fran—hum middle age men have more friends than middle age women. But women have more intimate friends, oh I see

Christine—so their saying that women have closer relationships but men have like more people around them.

Fran—but that's not true in my house

(laughter)

Mike—there aren't any middle aged people at your house

(laughter)

Fran—that's true that's true not any more one of the scary things about being middle aged is that you know you're gonna grow out of it

(laguther)

Tammy—you would pray to grow out of it though right?

Fran—yes yes

Mike—assuming the alternative

Tammy—their's only one way out of this game

Fran—that's ok older persons refer to elderly

Mike—what broke me up in England was seeing these little triangular signs which showed a person bent over with a cane…saying elderly crossing.

Christine and Tammy—aww

Tammy—and then you see the guy show eighty years old jogging next to the sign

(laughter)

Christine—that's what I need

Fran—well I remember seeing a video about a senior who was walking very slowly across the intersection and this young guy in a sports car pulled up and was…beep beep and she wallops him with her purse and the air bag goes off

(laughter)

Tammy—now who's holding up traffic?

Fran—don't mess with old folks

Christine—right

Tammy—that's funny

Fran—(reading) ok most of the time age is irrelevant

Tammy—I like that he's added that sentence

Fran—yah yah

Christine—yah I do too I like that too

Tammy—that's a definite bias statement

(inaudible)

Mike-well the paragraph that follows (inaudible) yah forget it (inaudible)

Fran—um this would be a gray area

Christine—where does a girl become a lady where does a lady become a what? Um…

Fran—I'm not a lady. Lady's cross their legs at the ankle

Tammy—I'd love to be a lady I like to do like teas and stuff

(laughter)

Fran—age-ism yes

(inaudible)

Tammy—but it's funny I only stopped it at…let's see why did I stop it at…we've

changed authors by the way.

Fran—ah huh

(inaudible)

(reading)

Mike—they seem to be leaving out the fact that sometimes expecting difference is a

useful thing…they see ageism which emphasizes difference as bad but they don't seem to

discuss ways in which it could be….

Tammy—right positive

(inaudible)

(casual conversation about and elderly mothers marriage and the Quakers and the Shakers

barns and marriage traditions)

Mike—but it's interesting the book is writing to younger people telling them what not to do when talking to older people

(laugther)

Christine and Fran—right

Mike—with some accuracy and some mistreatment but um you can also imagine that there's some advice

(inaudible)

Mike—a section on how to speak to younger people would not be such a bad thing

(laughter)

Tammy—yah not problematize going one way

Mike—un hum

Fran—so where does this end?

Christine—page 48

Fran—so it's a good example it's just too long (inaudible) we should cut it here…

Christine—um hum but we should include the last part here

Mike—intercultrual? …yah part of that ahs to do with…it ah here

Tammy—ok it says culture and if you assume it is you may be in for interculture different cultures (reading)

Christine—I see you have a hash mark here then here

Tammy—I captured it as an REN but I think it need to be included in this page

Fran—ok I see

Christine—you got it tam?

Tammy—yep

Christine—and that's age

Mike—this was good

Discussing the passage (end tape)

Tape Three sides A and B: Meeting Three, January 16, 2013

Mike—starting with the plastic folder…are their any books you want me to keep an eye out for?

Christine—ok book come through that you might be looking for

Tammy—anything Detroit related or race related

Mike—ok

Fran—I also have an ending racism tool kit that I'm renting for forty dollars I'm suppose to copy and use it and pass it on in order to get my money back

(inaudible)

Mike—I also brought you Asante's book on eliminating racism but then I thought no your presentation is not a eliminating racism thing and I'm not gonna through water on the topic…ah …water down you topic.

Tammy—he's got a cool theory…Afrocentricity…cool now I can go book shopping at your house

(laughter)

Mike—yah where the prices are even lower

(laughter)

Tammy—right free is a great price

Fran—so what are we starting with today?

Tammy—we're starting with socio-economic status which is SES in our packets

Mike—which page are we going to?

Tammy—ah it's page…it's W-SES-1 page 283 it might be down so…

Mike-oh

Fran—Way down at the bottom, way down

Tammy—oh yah that

Mike—ok SES…this one is kind of hard to see the copy is faded…I've copied it kind of light some of these…I've seen it as inter-coder reliability and inter-rater reliability some of these in this section I think we're going to be pretty close to the target because of the topic.

Christine—what's that mean?

Tammy—you guys agreeing with what I've got?

Christine—oh

Tammy—I think we're pretty good I mean socio-economic status is pretty obvious but…

Mike—(discussing the passage) that's kind of a tough call it's proving that we don't have classes by a study that assumed we have classes, you can't decide what class people belong to…unless you ah…

(laughter)

Fran—well but you recognize it when you see it

      Mike—you haven't decided what class we belong to I might as well..

(laughter)

Mike—any way yes it fits no problem

(laughter)

Fran—oh hah ok next

Christine—yah

Tammy—yep

Mike—Tammy because you aspire to the professional occupation someone once said college professors are people with middle class income and upper class tastes

(laughter)

Tammy—what about having a low class income and middle class tastes?

(laguther)

Fran—well what about this "college professors" that's interesting, what about this under here

Christine—that's coming up in the next page

Mike—one more interruption this book called "class" by paul Russell

Tammy—I think I have it…

Mike—you should read it, it's really funny. He writes about class in America. With a great…a great sense of humor you learn a lot of thing like you can decide some bodies social class by the size of ball they like to play with.

(laughter)

Mike—the smaller the ball the…like golf ball means upper class, the bigger the ball basket ball that's lower class. you can judge their class by the size of the writing on the shirt…ah

(laughter)

Tammy—right

Mike—the bolder the print the lower

Tammy—that whispers the name of the brand (laughter)

Mike—he's you know…the length of the drive way…

Tammy—right

(laughter)

Mike—all these things…very entertaining

Tammy—Russell

Mike—Russell…R-U-S-S-E-L-L very entertaining book about class

Tammy—that would be, that would be a fun book to ah read. And show to students you know?

Mike—just for fun yah

Fran—right

Christine—oh yes

Mike—you can judge people's social class by what flavor ice cream they like.

Tammy—let's see, let me see vanilla is…hum

Mike—well again like if you go to triple carmel smash and rocky road your lower class if you go for…you know boysen berry sherbert you're probably (inaudible)

(laugther)

Tammy—oh that's funny…I can see a lot of smiles um hum

(silence)

Christine—yep

(silence)

Mike—were on four now?

Christine—yep

Tammy—I didn't star that one where's that at? Oh here at the bottom my next page

Mike—this is not economic difference with in a family

Tammy—oh I see

Christine—ok

Tammy—good call, good save…now let's see, yah that's husband that's moved to gender really

Mike—that's not in our definition of social class…

(silence)

Tammy—no not gender it's too big in interpersonal

Mike—oh yes I see yep right half the book if not more

(silence)

Fran—so is that class, is it?

Tammy—I think this is

Mike—I agree but it's being used as an example of something else

(silence)

Mike—but it does have a little element of class in it I think

Tammy—I think it's a god example of how we construct class…how we construct class

Fran—so is this pedagogy

Tammy—no not really, but it's it's I think kind of a neat little fuzzy example what do you guys think?

Fran—definitely

Mike—(inaudible) even though the main point of it's not class, class is mentioned

Tammy—middle class…it in the box under the diversity box

Mike—racism, race so it's under race

173

Tammy—um hum

(silence)

Christine—what are our parameters for …for this

(laughter)

Christine—I need to keep referring back to…any mention of it?

Fran—socio-economic status or class

(reading)

Tammy—I tried to weed this out

Mike—you might want to check to see what you've coded that

Tammy—nope no it's not coded as a race good call…case that's more race than it is class

Mike—humm

Mike—well we all got her at the same time that means were' all equal class

(laughter)

Fran—well no Tammy and Christine go here before me

Mike—uh oh

Christine—laugher well not really

Tammy—well according to this study I'm always going to be low class because I like to pop into things early

Christine—I'll have to wait for my appointment and not get their too early…oh umm… (laughter) it all depends on…

Fran—are you gonna tape this?

Tammy—yah I'm taping it….i hope I am

Christine—yah (laughter)

Tammy—it's spinning around still so hopefully we got something

Fran—it also depends on how you were raised if your parents raised you to be punctual than…

Tammy –see I' right in the german culture I'm sure if you were to pop in late to something it would be a little offensive

Fran—when I (inaudible) little I was late every time my mother …fran you need to leave with enough time to get to the door on the other side of the building.

Mike—when I was little I'd always doddle along the way and got their quite late and when my report card came back it said that I'd been late sixty-four times or something like this (laughter) and my parents talked to me about it…ah nobody ever told me I was suppose to be on time…doddling around sometimes…. Just getting lost in thought or played on the playground a little

All—awww

Mike—I thought the most normal thing in the world was to walk into a classroom where everybody was already working…aaah…you know…I …I didn't know any better…

Tammy—in your mind

Fran—when you went home and you walked in

Tammy—and that's funny because kids learn about school from images of kids at their desks learning…they don't learn about school as getting to your desk.

Mike—in kindergarten I always went early cause we got to play with the toys before things got started in first grade I came in and everybody was doing arithmetic and I thought this was a normal thing,

Fran—I don't know if that's a matter of class….ah

175

Mike—is this one?

Fran—yah this one is but our sample ah…

Tammy—right but in real life example it's really a matter of socialization than anything else it's just how we…

Fran—right oh yes

Mike—there are lots of factors that control weather you're punctual or not but (inaudible)

Tammy—well and that you were called out on it it is definetly a cultural thing the teacher saying you were late sixty-four times it might be different if you were in an island area you know? (laughter) where they would have thought you were feeding your soul or something and just let it go

Fran—where being late wouldn't even have been a space on the report card

Mike—right

(laughter)

Christine—right right

Fran—he was a cooperative student, he really got along well with everyone…when he showed up…

(laughter)

Tammy—we really value his input, when he arrives to class

(laughter)

Mike—this could be a race kind of thing too

Christine—um uh huh it….

Mike—it's not all class. its along of things aaa……

Christine—oh I'm on eight right now

(reading)

Christine—hum

Mike—(inaudible)...I mean in a wasy one class is called college kids who haven't had their kids and one class is other people

Tammy—yah...I see what your saying...that's kinda sad

(inaudible)

Mike—but..it's also interesting age again (inaudible) some are these "class lablels" and others are "implied"

Chrisitne—yah

Tammy—I'm looking at this form an empathy point of view

Christine—I'm not very artistic. Oh here

Mike—in use to advise students to personalize theier writing or write something they know about ...a person writing about having a summer job in place where most people work, hasn't goen to college and....and feeling mocked you know beign accused of being...feeling superior we use that as an example

Christine—oh really?

Fran—um hum...it's something they've experience

Mike—probably

Tammy—I wonder if we should teach students how to navegate that terrain...like how do you ...how do you get na education but then down play your education...you know go along to get along or something

Mike—just realize...just realize if you want to communicate with others you can ask yourself what the world looks like to them

Tammy—again empathy yah yah

Mike—realize it's not the same way it lools to you and what you're proud of might seem to them to be an insult

Fran—and you don't use all your big words, but you don't dumb down either

Christine—yah right

Tammy—um but that's hard when that's what you're surrounded by

Fran—you ;pay attention and yo give them some books to read

Mike—and if your from a more advantaged background to anticipate some defensiveness…and ah…(inaudible)…realize some people deep down inside are defensive

Tammy—empathy that's the third time I thought of that word

Mike—good word

(silence)

Mike—were moved to the seacond part right?

Christine—it's the little piece on the bottom

Mike—oh oh I see I'm sorry

Fran—true life experiences (inaudible)

Tammy—I have a lot of students who tell me that's a problem for like their math classes

Mike—where they get a forign GA?

Tammy—uh hum…the GA's teaching the class…I just don't understand sometimes I feel bad for them and sometimes I'm like well you just need to listen harder I'm sure their speaking English (laughter) you know?

Mike—I feel both ways because some of the TA's really do have very difficult accents

bit also students may be looking for an excuse their looking for something to blame their

difficulties on.

Tammy—right right

Mike—eveybody complains about the difficulty say it's both ways

Christine—and the move you hear the different accents and languages the better you can

understand. Like I worked with a bunch of doctors that all of them had different accents

so I was like you know a year or two was like ok…I understand wht you're saying…or

even now I work with people that don't speak and their like …grunts… it took me a

while to figure out what they were saying but now I can understand them

Mike—it reminds me of a study once where they uh…people gave blood and then they

asked who their sample was, why do you think they gave blood? And for relatively upper

class people…the white people…what ever they were was oh because they're very

generous and noble and the lower class people oh they needed the money.

(laughter)

Tammy—they wanted the free cookie

Christine—right, um hum…right

Tammy—that's interesting, wow

Mike—we're treated very different according to social class for the lower class they gave

a more cynical version of why they were doing things…racism or something…but it was

interesting that they're were kind of the benefit of the doubt thing for richer people oh

these must be good people and for poorer people , oh these must be (inaudible) salvation

charity things like that …attribution theory why you did something people know what

you did but theirs a great deal of subjectivity judgment into deciding why you did it and

ah…

Fran—nine is about the doctor

Tammy—yah nine is the little blurb about the doctor andup here ten was the racial

stereotype one

Fran—why is that social economic

Mike—yah why is it SES

Fran—do you have it under race?

Tammy No hum…put friend in race

Christine—what is that an example of?

Tammy—ok let's see black (inaudible) I don't know that's it's anything it just talks about

the idea of stereotype

Mike—it could be that we have these

Fran—stereotypes which are the ones involved anyone with Spanish last names I mean

ones with Spanish last names my youngest daughter is married to a man from Mexico

and when she has her baby in California, even though they wrote on it patient speaks

English they kept talking to her in Spanish

(laughter)

Fran—and she just kept saying no I speak English

Mike—I met a Malaysian guy who was raised up here who last name was Gomez

(laughter)

Fran—how could that be (laughter)

Tammy—love is love

Mike—it's a Portuguese name the Portuguese countries ago invaded India and because of

Portuguese colonization his ancestors were Indians from their brought work in

plantations in Malaysia ah…(laughter) people more around

Tammy—that's funny

Mike—Kids growing up in America and their name is Gomez and everybody expects

them to speak Spanish

(laugher)

Mike—nobody's spoken Spanish in that family ever

(laugher)

Fran—number?...oh I didn't see that

Christine—why? Because hse can afford to not work outside the home…but not really

Fran—but it's not very overt

Christine—and I don't think it

Tammy—no I don't know how that got in there…

Mike—it may be a class situation but you cant' read into it

Tammy—and the context just isn't there you need more information…Tomatao?...i'm

sure he got teased a lot as a child

Fran—(singing) tomatoe…tomatoe ha ha ha…yes that is one definetly

Christine—uh huh yes

Tammy—that's got two stars next to it

(laughter)

Christine—is that an example

Mike—yah but you have to decide if you're going to treat it as one example or two

Tammy—yah I'm going to have to go back and check for consistency onall of these

Christine—um and that's what we're doing to

Tammy—yah I think so thanks

Christine—yep..um

Fran—oh yah the world differently, sure do

Mike—yep…do you know the author Richard Rodriguez?

Tammy—Um Um (no)

Mike—hispanic American who wrote a lot about that experience—some of his writings (inaudible) and so he's was sort of plucked out of a lower class Hispanic and sent onto Harvard and things like that where he did very well and then he writes about..well first of all osme of the asstrangement from some of his classmates there and some on feeling a little bit out of water but even more eloquently he writes about going back home to his family and feeling like he was no longer part of a family because his values are different his opportunities are different…ah even his language…he's you know more use to speaking in English and everything he really eloquently speaks to what…what outsiders would say is an unmitigated blessing that he got all of these educational opportunities he's now making all this money and everything else

Tammy—but now… at what cost

Mike—but…but he has a sense also of what he lost at the same time

Fran—I be he would

Tammy—right

Fran—I see one htat you've missed. Let's mark that the same as we were doing with the other one

Tammy—it actually fits into a lot of them really

Fran—it does that whole paragraph should show up in everything that you're doing

Tammy—pretty much (laughter)

Fran—the sentence right before that talks about…

Tammy—yah we don't have it anywhere REN, yep nothing in the book well good thing you caught that fran thank you

Mike—Zandi…ya that one fits

Christine—um hum

(silence)

Tammy—a lot of this I think a lot of these examples seem to be um just laying out the facts and not really getting into the um it seems…to ah it just seems like its just…facts

Mike—yah theirs not…well go ahead

Tammy I'm loosing my words but it seems like its just kind of giving information but not really

Mike—telling you what to do about it?

Tammy—yah not really…it's almost missing an opportunity to…to really get into the reason why..i keep coming back to the idea of empathy and this section and I' wondeing of a …

Christine—maybe a different author might address it more

Tammy—use it differently? Yah right

Christine—Because were getting into floyd in a minute. Here and maybe he um or she?

Tammy—yah maybe he has a different way of approaching it? I think he does a good job …it's a man they have a picture or at least he looks like a man

Christine—ok yah we talked about that already

(silence)

Fran—their's a sentence after that

Tammy—again good call…I think I stopped short

Christine—the generalized other, what does other mean what is that

Tammy—ok let's read the definition (reading) the shared values and expression shared

by people in the…people in that society

Christine—I still don't understand

Mike—I think the sociological idea is a lot our of our thinking of things is the assumption

of how people in general see them

Christine—ok ok oh

Mike—rather than how so and so thinks and that it here's what people think sort of

shaped by our social background

Tammy—whenever I get…I think of stereotypes

Mike—It also gets to your discussion the social construction idea what is normal. And

this comes out of way back in sociology and the idea that a lot of people their behavior is

shaped by this picture they have of what everybody else is like, what people think things

Christine—um hum..so it's going to change depending on where you're from?

Mike—oh sure yah

Tammy—and it's going to change according to your life experiences…a child would

think every adult is a parent you know? And every parent acts the same way wherever

they grow up.

Mike—it's kind of an unexamined thing. I probably never thought that's why I'm doing

it once I examined it I say now oh what am I worried about am I worried about what

Tammy thinks or am I just worried about…you know? What others think or something

like that had I gotten to that stage but then most people don't think you should take your

clothes off in public (laughter) but you

Fran---I want to grow a garden in the front yard but Doug doesn't think…what will the

neighbors think…who cares!

Tammy—I know I'm still struggling with the who cares part

(laughter)

Mike—we all have our limits…oh well

Tammy—what is that guys name with the yard

Fran—oh tom small

Mike—his yard

Tammy—yah I want to be like him

Fran—to have a jungle in your front yard

Tammy—yah who cares what the neighbors think just go for it and all

Fran—we he did have to go to the city counsel

Tammy—yah he took a stance…I mean he took more of a stance than I ever would but…

Fran—still he's older and he has more money and he has social status…

Tammy—and he has his own house…I mean I'm….I live in the basement of my

mother's house…(laughter)…it's like going to your neighbors house and planting a

garden in the neighbors house and then taking a stance…(laughter)

Mike—who cares what the neighbors think I'm going to plant a garden here (laughter)

185

Tammy—here's where I think context would probably be…

Mike—I have no problem with this I'm sure Bill O'Riley would say it's encouraging class warfare but…ah …(laughter)

Tammy—I'm sure he would

Fran—it fits according to your parameters

Christine—that's the only Floyd one you had?

Tammy—that might be why I like it

Christine—now were in another author

Tammy—oh that was the only sample from Floyd

Mike—oh that was the only one? That's interesting

Tammy—there's just one yah

Fran—oh that's too bad

Mike—it says something about the book too he doesn't deal much with class issues

Tammy—right right

Mike—whre one book has lots of them and one just has a few…ok

Fran—what about power than about financial (inaudible)

Tammy—well that's kind of a weak example

Christine—I think its' more about power than financial wealth

Tammy—what do you think?...do you think this is a good example?

Mike—I think it's a good example it certainly fits the category

Christine—I think it's a good example I can't think of another one...but...(laughter)

(silence)

Tammy—he's kind of like the stealth information dropper you know he drops...he drops

things into the conversation but that's kind of nice that he does that though

Christine—oh I see how you…he's doing it again than

Mike—he tends to treat it…aaaa…social economics…. As just one example of difference

or something like that rather than an important category

Tammy—calling out the difference

Mike—rather than an important category of difference or something like that but it is

there

Tammy—yep, I think that's fair

Fran—um hum

Christine—I would check the book on this one it should be gender no not gender

Tammy—sexual orientation?

Christine—I thin it should be both of them but…

Tammy—they gave me…a…a book it stops on uh page 211 and picks back up later. I'm

missing pages 213 to 264 so I'm missing pages…so I guess that's what I get for asking

for a free copy though…they probably reached into the junk pile and said here you go

(laughter)

Christine—oh it went to sexual orientation and socio economic

Tammy—so clearly my data is going to be a b little off.

Mike—no one will ever know

Fran—yah …well that's a lot for the next one

Christine—both 21 and 22 are rich

Tammy—I mean yo can't get any more overt than that right?

Christine— I mean the first sentence…and that will be the section!

Tammy—that's the section (singing)

Tammy—now….

Christine—what's the name of this book

Tammy—they're all interpersonal communication books and they are the three most popular books

Christine—and that's as much about SES that they had in them…hum

Tammy—yah but the reason I choose interpersonal communication was because it was the core course so their not focused on diversity they are mostly about relationships

Christine—right no but I'm talking about interpersonal communication and that's all they had on SES and the different communication between these two…I'm just saying

Tammy—yah

Christine—I'm just agreeing its interesting that's all

Tammy—yah that 's an interesting point

Fran—it just fell under the radar

Christine—uh huh I mean?

Tammy—it's like the choice to prioritize gender a lot you know?...i think…I wonder if it's just because it's easier

Fran—was it written by a woman

Mike—we're in society where there's a lot of pressure not to think about class

Fran—um hum

Tammy—and

Mike—think about bill o'riely, everything you know there too much class… and oh here we go causing class warfare…you're all together in this.

Christine—clearly not

Mike—where as there's big strong groups that wan to talk about gender

Tammy—well it's easier to because your either you know (cell phone rings)

Tammy—clearly divided man or woman

Mike—most of the examples we had like nationality but a lot of these SES were about high class people and middle class people in the study it says the richer person oh…

Tammy—right

Mike—people like to be middle class out their aren't clear cut definition of what congress just passed…(inaudible)…450,000 means your upper middle class

Tammy—450 thousand I would love to be that middle class I…I aim to be half that middle class one day

(laughter)

Fran—they 're now using two categories of poverty regular poverty or extreme poverty

Tammy—I mean to me poor is poor if you don't have enough money to buy bread than you're pretty much poor

Fran—but if you have a house…are they earning enough to…I don't know…their was a girl on NPR one time and I wrote it down but I don't remember

Tammy—didn't you teach a class on semantics…I wasn't able to take it but….

Mike—I did but I…(inaudible)

(laughter)

Christine—it's all such a game you know

Tammy—it's very disappointing

Mike—it's the way politics works

Tammy—yah it's all politics

Mike—the idea is that the climate in the country is such that people are supportive of the idea that 400,000 is a good cut off point on who needs to be taxed a little more well that's a bad idea

Fran—well I've been getting into this…

Tammy—this is off topic but I've been getting into this channel called um…um current tv…have you ever seen that channel…it's it's really interesting they have a lot of interesting documentaries like on the Koch Brothers and stuff like that it really reveals a lot into how crazy this whole system is now becoming

Christing—that's off topic, let's continue on to the next

Tammy—uh let's do

Mike—you're paying for the two hours so you can be off topic whenever you want (laughter)

Tammy—yah right (laughter)

Fran—what is this ?

Tammy—that was the language that we something we that was something that came up when we um when we were looking through the book but we couldn't really place it so we thought maybe if we had a category that just fits language it would be more clear

Christine—oh right miscellaneous…I think

Tammy—miscellaneous is how we categorized it at first then we made it language beacsue they were about language…it eventually became language but this mostly deals

with language.i mean we can let's let's do a couple of these theirs not that many of them um…bit it's kind of interesting category because it's its making something its addressing a label or language

Christine—we might be able to fit it into some other category that we didn't think of or call it a different name

Fran—this one about tiger woods is interesting to me

Christine—um

Tammy—yah it's it's interesting because I don't think it's I think that it's more about

Christine—um

Mike—I don't think it…remember if it's

Tammy—the label he chooses it does fit into race but it's a really good example of how labels shape the race you know

Fran—it also fits into age. The last paragraph the last generation is breaking down stereotypes…about race the very last sentence

Tammy—I'm gonna section that off and quickly mark it…which is kinda cool kids now days aren't really you now they're deciding to to assert a new reality that doesn't abide that doesn't go along with the I'm black I'm white story you know?

Christine—I…I thik it's more like maybe decreasing in race but increasing in SES because it's like are you wearing the right kind of shoes? Are you wearing the right clothes? Do you look the part? Did you go to blah blah blah for you know?

Fran—un hum

Christine—It doesn't matter if you're white or black but if you…you know

Tammy—right if you had a lap top or what ever

Christine—I can 't think of a lable example but what ever

Tammy—no right what ever…but I know what you mean though that's that's kind of a cool observation

Christine—it's just sort of like switching teeter tottering from race to SES

Tammy—um hum…where you can be friends with the black kid who lives up the road…but if the

Christine—as long as the black kid up the road is …is in your neighborhood…

Tammy—wearing certain clothes.. .has parents that are lawyers…

Christine—yah it's cool we know a black kid

Fran—yah

(laughter)

Fran—is everyone on 2?

Tammy—um let's see I think that we're probably going to get confused because just because I don't have any…any

Christine—because there's no parameters for the category

Tammy—yah

Mike—maybe maybe rather than introducing it as a statistical count some of these may be already showing up in other categories and you can introduce it as that

Tammy—I know I don't think they are that's why we did that because they were like to vague or unique for any other category but the common thing was the focus on language…too fuzzy for any one category

Christine—well I don't..this one is clearly label

Mike—well I well I was gonna say maybe rather than presenting staticstis where you're introducing your category you may talk a little bit about the category issues raised in each book and the authors

Christine—um hum um hum

Mike—that the book discussed what it means to be a different race aaah so what did they say did they discuss what it means to be different cultures and if so what…I don't know but…

Tammy—I know what you're saying I I totally will do that because my numbers are going to be off anyway...for most of these I didn't set up the code clear enough to be able to say we've reached interrater reliability anyway. I…I don't have… already it's a very qualitative study and so to pretend it's gonna be quantitative its just not gonna happen I'm not going to try to speak to that I can't prove any of this really.

Christine—yah

Mike—so instead of getting oh like things that simply says here's a survey of what American would to be called is not really talking about interpersonal communication issues as much as here's an deeper interpretation of this stuff.

Christine—right

Mike—on the other hand one that says you know it's right to be very careful when calling an African American man or boy. It's rally talking about the communication aspect of the impact of that word not just the word

Tammy—um hum the relationship aspect of it

Fran—yah and did you know that Canadians refer to native Americans as first nations. I think that because that points out who was here first.

Christine—it's giving credit where credits due…as for first settlers

Tammy—we know right it's giving credit but there even may be a culture that came before them we just don't know about

Mike—true

Tammy—but yah it's a lot better than saying Indian

Mike—or red skins

Tammy—yah that's offensive

Mike—that's not saying candians never say offensive things

All—right right uh huh

(laughter)

Tammy—they never say anything offensive we love Canadians

Mike—a whole different species entirely

Tammy—right right there's no gun violence, no hate crime…

(laughter)

Christine—the biggest issue is to speak French or English

(laughter)

Fran—so what are we doing?

Tammy—well let's lets plug along with the misc. category and identify and see what kind of conversation that stirs up because I'd much rather deal with the the message that's underlying in these then just the overt stuff that we'll find in the REN section already

Fran—so we're on 2?

Tammy—yah and I think it starts "we should also monitor our labels"…reading …and I chose this because it had the language aspect you know there's this than gays and lesbians stuff in their but I like that it even goes further

Christine—uh huh it would not fir the sexual orientation section but I think it's fine here with the language stuff…this is exactly what you were saying about calling their calling out how you should be conscious of how you should talk to people um um instead of just saying this is what they should be called hum

Tammy—um hum

Fran—is this really what they want to be called?

Mike—you could just preface that by just saying whenever there's a tradition of inequality or a history of inequality be mindful

Tammy—yah be mindful

Mike—be careful be conscious of how other people would like to be identified or else you may irritate them.

Tammy—I have…

Mike—or something

Tammy—well that what I tell my students not to ask what are you but to ask how do you identify if they really need to know

Mike—that's good

Tammy—what If I want to call myself homo-caucasion-indian or something like that

Mike—or you can just say I'm me

Fran—or I'm Tammy

Tammy—right right and all that's acceptable…you're being curtious to them in a certain way by just reshaping the words you use to frame the question

Christine—wow that's interesting tam

Tammy—yah so here you go that's your lesson for today

(laughter)

Tammy—ask them in a way that doesn't make them hav eto fit themselves into your boxes give them the space to create their own boxes and labels for identifying themselves

Chrisitne—I had a dime for everytime I had someone ask me what I was…

Tammy—right what are you…

(laughter)

Tammy—I'm a bleeding carbon based being

Mike—what's worse is when you answer the question and say yes but what are you really

Tammy—um hum

(laughter)

Christine—oh I know I've had that

Tammy—but really what are you

Mike—that happens a lot to Asian Americans where they say where are you from…New York…no where are you really from…

(laughter)

Tammy---(laughter) ok Queens

Fran—there's the guy that works the front desk at (inaudible, some store) and I started saying hola to him because he looks Mexican and then I realized what I was doing…and

he would answer me back hola come esta…you know I was making an

assumption…wehre were you born? California…and how did you learn Spanish well my

parents were born in mexico…

Tammy—hum…

Mike—did you ask him if it irritated him when you said hola?

Tammy—how did he feel…what… sorry if I bothered you what ever

Mike—of course the complaint you get form a lot of people is "they keep changing the

word "they" wan tot be called why don't "they" make up their minds…which is a

perfectly good answer it's prejudice and the new word you pick up will eventually have

the same connotations as the old one so eventually you'll have to move on to a new word

Tammy—just cycle them out

Mike—I was homosexual and now I'm gay and now gay is bad and I'm something else

Fran—queer…

Mike—sure sure just when ah…negros started calling themselves blacks and ah if it was

saying rather than looking like I'm trying to avoid something by saying it is Spanish I'm

going to show I'm proud of it by saying I'm balck and I'm proud and …and…for that

generation that worked really well but they were an awful lot who said I'm not happy to

be black so within the group there's not…especially Mexican Americans there's not…

Tammy—chicana..hispanic…latina/o

Fran—and Latina is a made up name by white gringos

Mike—right… ah

Fran—so

Tammy—so it's how ever they want to identify if you want to take on the name of you know what ever so be it

Mike—if we keep trying to solve problems that aren't language problems with language. As a result we will end up with a very complicated system of language does and don'ts and still nobodies happy.

(laughter)

Fran—ok so where are we?

Christine—definitely that's the problem

Tammy—I'm on page 100

Mike—right Mrs. Howell?

(laguther)

Mike—right Mrs. Howell?

Fran—don't you go there

Tammy—what?...oh is there a story behind it?

Fran—oh yes doug's last name is howell and I get addressed as doug and mrs. Howell I got a Christmas card from his sister addressed to mr and mrs howell last year

Tammy—and you never accepted his last name?

Fran—no I did'nt…he did want me to

Tammy—what

(laughter)

Fran—he said you've been fran for 25 years why change now

Tammy—your brand

Fran—so why mess with your identity but then his birthday card came addressed to mr

fran (last name) it came in the mail the other day

(laughter)

Mike—somebody wrote a letter…a parent…of a student at school wrote a letter to the

president ah …that said you wrote a letter to my daughter at our home address and

addressed her as ms. Instead of miss…

Tammy—ms instead of miss?

Mike—miss…you know she is miss so and so and I don't want any of this feminist

nonsense coming to my home

Tammy—oh my goodness

Mike—and I'm going to take her out of this college

Tammy—wow

Mike—and president (name's president) then wrote back a letter and said I'm very happy

to apologize. But please recognize that as we do mass mailings to thousands of people to

find out who wants to be called miss and who doesn't and who is Mrs. and ms and who

isn't is not practical (laughter) and please have a little patience with us.

Tammy—wow talk about diplomacy

Mike—it would be nice to call everybody what they want to be called but…ah…

Tammy—right.. (laughter) honey-boo-boo (laughter)

Mike—in modern day and age weather it's a thousand letters to parents or weather it's

Christmas cards to fran there's always going to be some slips

Tammy—right

(laughter)

Fran—but form people who know you?

Tammy—I just think..

Christine—yah

Tammy—it's such an interesting to take such a stance over a miss on a letter

Mike—well to people that's a very big deal

Christine—well he wanted that stuff to stop coming into his house you know

Fran—if you're going to be teaching it to my daughter whos gonna turn into a feminist then…

Mike—this could be a symptom too you know if I use a particular word for women or for African amerinca or something else uh…it may or may not be the owrd that some people around me want to use an if you use my choice of words to indeicate…you know it may indicate I'm much more liberal than they are or less liberal then they are you have to worry about your friends when you use that thing

Fran—or…or your spouse…for me I call God a she

Tammy—yah

Fran—and cause it just makes it…it pulls people chains

Mike—oh so you're doing it on pupose

(laughter)

Fran—well i..to me God is…is it? He or she or it you know?...and Doug will come back to me sayig yah HE…does (laughter) we have this little fight

Tammy—and then you say well clearly she's a she you know

Mike—some guy will say that we have 100's of years of history using one of the names

for he or she and a feminist will come back and say we have hundreds of years of beign

screwed up because of male domination…(laugher) and so…

Tammy—so no ones gonna know right?

Fran—and bill cosby said inhis thing this weekend that now women I know that Genisus

was written and re-written and re-written by men so ah…all they talk about is the men

but we all know there were women involved clearly…you know…he said a the beginning

o fthis talk this is kalamazoo I only see two people of color in the audience why is

that?...are we on 12 now…I think so right

Christine—um hum …naming and labeling that might be a fit

Fran—oh yah

Tammy—another thing I was thinking there's really very little middle eastern type of

things too reference…I don't know

Christine—you mean as an example? (inaudible)

Tammy—uh huh

Fran—when were these books written?

Christine—hum…

Tammy—that's the thing some editions in 2010 and some in 2012 I think I can't

remember the exact dates right now…I think that really matters one when these …I don't

think that maybe you can help me understand cause this is like the 13th edition if you're

editing a book do you go out and just add more to it I mean how do you like decide what

is included

Mike—well parts get re-written in tings and you know

Tammy—so you should

Mike—you should treat it as if it's all recent information..the new edition should be

Fran—but you don't want to bother adding ethnicity into every chapter. You don't

Mike—she's reporting on the current state of the art

Tammy—this is like a second edition

Mike—ok that doesn't really matter

Tammy—it should all be current

Mike—it should all be current yes

Tammy—but then

Mike—you're saying theirs reflections of what's currently being published and used on the students

Tammy—popular book yah…these are very popular text books

Fran—you might want to put it in

Mike—the history of how they evolve to be what they are is something you do't have much data on

Christine—or how much was changed

Tammy—well I can figure it out but that's a different study

Mike—it could be part of your analysis

Fran—yes as one of the things you noted was…

Christine—that the older the the…more editions of a book the less current it seems to be…

(laughter)

Tammy—I don't' know

Christine-no

Fran—or that they just didn't have much information about it

Christine—I mean you don't know how much has bee changed it could be something small

Mike—yah right I would go far in the at direction beasue you just don't have the data if you want to look at…I mean if you want to look at the last ten editions of DeVito to see what's been changed but I mean (laughter)

Tammy—yah it's be interesting

Mike—but ah (laughter) it…it I thnk it's worth stating that…that these books do go through readers and that society changes and authors catch on books change things change (inaudible) hopefully some of these problems you identify will disappear ove the coming years

Christine—maybe you will create some moer change tam

Tammy—yah I..i um it's just interesting I wonder if these people have contracts to write or include certain things

Mike—well I'm sure they do

Tammy—I think that…I think that if popularity is making the editor mandate a new edition

Mike—yes because then students can't sell back their old books

Tammy—ok but it seems like it seems like it's mor of an economics thing than it is an information thing

Mike—I meand on one level of course a lot of it is economic the publishers are saying that we want textbooks that will get adopted in a lot of places…that means in most cases

avoiding things that will be controversial avoiding things that will be too different from

what the teachers learned in graduate school because they wont want to use those books

if they are unfamiliar with the information… otherwise they well you know…touching on

all of the major basis

Tammy—just enough but not too much

Mike—right an leaving a few things…room for discussion

Christine—um (laughter)

Mike—having some nice little bullet lists the teacher can make the students memorize

(laughter)

Mike—they market it pretty well and ah there are smaller markets out their that I'm sure

with some books that are geared much more to some of these topics and as a result will

never be part of the top three textbooks…

Tammy—that's why I have a problem I guess

Mike—they may be adopted….you know at Harvard university or something or

someplace like that …but mostly to make money they do want turn over a new edition

every couple of years they do love to keep using an authors name whose well known

there's security in that…ah …they do want …ah …ah

Tammy—parameters to be met like…

Mike—yah traditional topics to be covered and they do want something that will avoid

great big complaints from minority groups or something else of that kind so theirs more

concern with avoiding something that they might be accused of then saying something in

that really examines racial issues

 (laughter)

Mke—it's a big business

Tammy—yah but it speaks to the ah it makes me respect the authors who make an effort to give us more …I respect this guy even more

Mike—um hum

Tammy—because he does enter into the world of controversy a little bit easier than these two

Mike—yah

Christine—is he…is he the guy that was dropping things?

Tammy—he's no I think that's DeVito the stealth dropper…but this one take on some topics differently I don't know now I really appreciate him even more

Christine—you have to be really…i mean just think about it professors you have to be not only knowledgeable…but um … really careful if you've got a book that's got a lot of controversy in it or something to navigate those waters you know you cant' be really um uninvolved instructor like some that I've had

Tammy—well you're definitely making a decision when you want to get real radical in the class definitely

Mike—in some places even the instructor doesn't choose the book

Christine—well that's true that's true

Mike—some instructors will they insert things on their own and plan into things but ah..

Tammy-I have a friend who teaches at a university and she wasn't able to choose her own textbooks. Are their many places like that out there?

Mike—I suspect for big introductory courses like something that all the students have to take where they use lots of grad assistances and part timers to teach than I think very

often the decision is made by a committee or something like that ah…more advanced courses typically where instructors are full timers they get to choose their own book and some of that is just you've got to order books for enough ahead of time and often you hire and fire people a the last minute so that certain amounts of standardization you know that every student will have covered certain issues that happens a lot

Tammy—she doesn't even get to decide her weekly schedule

Christine—that' like high school

Tammy—I mean yah I didn't think that that happened

Mike—well it does…another thing that happens that I don't know anything about because I retired soon enough to not have to worry about it is that increasingly these books come with a the book is not just a book but theirs video clips, instructional things that are part of the overall package

Christine—oh the QR things in here I mean

Mike—at first dvd's were mostly just multiple choice questions so teachers wouldn't have to write their own tests but gradually they started adding stuff additional modules and things so in a way the package becomes not just the books but more than that

Tammy—that's the problem I had with doing the pedagogy thing because this book came with a hard copy manual like the old fashioned chapter by chapter here's samples and stuff

Mike—um hum

Tammy—and these two books came with access to a web cite that had different little things that you could use in teaching but their were …the activities were more like ice breakers things and more general to all the books published by that publisher…real basic

and they were good activities but it was interesting that these…this is now edition 13 and this is edition 2 but they used similar web cite information

Mike—you might expect sometimes publishers would have three different interpersonal textbooks for the different kind of teachers out there for schools, different levels, different expectations but…it's a little harder to identify what is actually going in to the classroom experience you know that flunking classes interviewing teachers all of these thins is just far beyond your scope…

Christine—qr questions in this book…

Mike—do you have a scanner on your phone so we can see what it says'…QR questions are a socio-economic thing

(laugther)

Tammy—right the technology needed to use the additional info that comes with these books is another thing…these two books came with access to a web cite this is text 13 and this is text 2

Mike—you might experience where two publishers use the same web site if it's a similar course

Tammy—that's what this was here

Christine—have you figured out how to use these qr things yet?...I'm not going to worry about it

Tammy—I can't because I'd have to buy a phone to figure it out

Christine—oh

Tammy—some of these books had it

Christine—an app for a smart phone all you do is aim your phone at that and it gives you something

Tammy—ok which is complicated because what if you an interpersonal communication teacher and you discourage computers and phones in your class

(laughter)

Christine—everyone pull out your smart phones and point

(laughter)

Fran—that could be a SES thing too what if you don't have a phone…

Mike—hopefully they will take the book home once in a while

Fran—what if they only have a dumb phone

Mike—that may be more of an age thing than a socio-economic thing

(laughter)

Fran—true true my grand daughter has a smart…

(end of tape)