ED 465 174   CS 510 997

AUTHOR   Hardeman, Keith T.; Jefferson, Kurt W.
TITLE   Team Teaching Political Communication: The 2000 Campus U.S.
                Presidential Campaign.
PUB DATE   2002-04-04
NOTE   11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central
                States Communication Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 3-7,
                2002).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Elections; Higher Education; Instructional Innovation;
                Political Science; *Presidential Campaigns (United States);
                Speech Communication; *Student Participation; *Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS   *Capstone Programs; Course Development; *Political
                Communication; Westminster College MO

ABSTRACT
        The closeness of the 2000 presidential election clearly
demonstrated that the country was divided philosophically and politically.
The authors of this paper, a speech communication professor and a political
science professor at Westminster College in Missouri, capitalized on that
division based upon their diametrically opposed political views by
collaborating to team teach a course in political communication. The paper
touches upon a unique approach in teaching such a course and focuses on the
capstone assignment--an on-campus presidential campaign leading up to the
November election. It explains the campaign assignment, discusses how
students were prepared, reviews media use for dissemination of messages, and
evaluates the project. The paper also offers some general thoughts on team
teaching and gives an overview of the political communication class, where
the educators' goals for their students included development of skills and
competencies in campaign development, persuasion tactics, audience analysis,
and public relations. (NKA)

Team Teaching Political Communication: The 2000 Campus U.S. Presidential Campaign

Keith T. Hardeman
Assistant Professor
Speech Communication
Westminster College

Kurt W. Jefferson
Associate Professor
Political Science
Westminster College

The 2000 presidential election was one of the closest and most controversial in U.S. history. Pregnant chads, confusing ballots, accusations of voter fraud and media bias, a questionable Supreme Court decision, and a popular-vote winner ultimately losing the election contributed to a memorable and bizarre outcome. It clearly demonstrated that the country was divided philosophically and politically. While no one could have predicted the end result, national polls preceding the election indicated all along that it would be a close and fiercely contested match. The authors of this article, a speech communication professor and a political science professor, were able to capitalize on that division based, at least in part, upon our own diametrically opposed political views by collaborating to team teach a course in political communication. The purpose of this article is to touch upon a unique approach in teaching such a course and to focus on our capstone assignment--an on-campus presidential campaign leading up to the November 7, 2000 election.

One result of requiring students to participate in a group election campaign project is an awareness of timely political issues and respective party platforms. This awareness, therefore, can enhance abilities to better articulate and defend ideological and political positions. Our goals for the students in Political Communication included development of skills and competencies in campaign development, persuasion tactics, audience analysis, and public relations. In this article we will explain the campaign assignment, discuss how students were prepared, review media use for dissemination of messages, and evaluate the project.

GENERAL THOUGHTS ON TEAM TEACHING

Team teaching is a multifaceted endeavor. Goetz (2000) defines team teaching as "a group of two or more teachers working together to plan, conduct and evaluate the learning activities for the same group of learners." According to Maroney (1999), several categories of this pedagogical

approach exist based upon the division of work and classroom responsibilities. We chose the traditional mode:

> . . . traditional Team Teaching [takes place when] both teachers actively share the instruction of content and skills to all students. . . . In Traditional Team Teaching both teachers accept equal responsibility for the education of all students and are actively involved throughout the class period (Maroney).

Since both of us were fairly knowledgeable regarding current political issues and the two candidates' respective positions, significant class time was spent with our co-leading discussions as opposed to straight individual lecture (though each of us did occasionally resort to the latter for the sake of coverage and perspective from our disciplines of political science and speech communication). These discussions often led to informal class debate, which also included participation from both instructors. We believed this was beneficial as the students were put in a position of having to assess the logic of their own arguments.

Other issues that arise with team teaching include dealing with the differences of teaching philosophies, decisions on learning outcomes, and how the material should be synthesized, analyzed, applied, and graded (Davis, 1997). These concerns were addressed by way of thorough preparation, discussion, and negotiation well before the semester began. We found quickly that, unlike our political views, our teaching styles and philosophies were very similar which immensely simplified the process. We would add, nonetheless, that differing pedagogical ideals need not interfere with the educational procedure. Regardless of whether there are similar or contrasting styles and beliefs between the professors, team teaching offer several advantages:

> Team teaching can open a student's eyes to accepting more than one opinion and to acting more cooperatively with others. . . . Exposure to the views of more than one teacher permits students to gain a mature level of understanding knowledge; rather than considering only

one view on each issue or new topic brought up in the classroom, two or more varying views

help students blur the black-and-white way of thinking common in our society, and see

many shades of gray (Goetz, 2000).

AN OVERVIEW OF THE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION CLASS

Because of the timing of our course offering, we focused the much of the course content on

presidential political communication--public speaking, debates, commercials, the media, public

relations, and group communication. During presidential campaigns, C-SPAN periodically airs

presidential and vice-presidential debates from past elections that we taped and used for various

class assignments. We also obtained a number of political ads from previous years to analyze and

compare to the present-day ads.

The first day of class began with students completing our survey to determine political

affiliations, preference of candidates, positions on issues, and some basic knowledge of national and

Missouri State government. The students of Westminster College tend to lean in the conservative

direction. Since we assumed the class would overwhelmingly favor Bush, our original plan was to

break students into four five-member groups, each charged with campaigning for one of the top four

national candidates--Bush, Gore, Ralph Nader, and Pat Buchanan--whether the students personally

supported them or not. We were ecstatic to find, however, our questionnaire revealed that the

twenty students who enrolled in Political Communication seemed to be as divided in their political

opinions as the rest of the country. The results indicated 45% of our class planned on voting for Al

Gore, 45% supported George W. Bush, and 10% were undecided (Political Communication class

survey, 2000). Therefore, we concluded it would be best to allow the students the luxury of

campaigning for the candidate they actually supported, and that such an approach could promote a

more intense effort for this assignment. Both "undecided" students chose to join the Bush camp.

Presidential politics can dizzy constituents with a breadth and depth of topic areas that can be overwhelming to the average American citizen. Our survey asked students to rank the six most important political issues facing the candidates. For the sake of feasibility (and sanity), the campaign assignment would be limited to the top six as chosen by our students. Each side was broken into two smaller subcommittees with each taking three of the issues. They were, in no particular order, abortion, education, taxes, crime, environment, and guns.

THE ON-CAMPUS CAMPAIGN ASSIGNMENT

Our assignment was created to help students understand and experience the process of researching, framing, and implementing a political campaign through various campaigning techniques. Since much of politics parallels public relations, we used John Marston's (1963) four-step PR campaign process of RACE--Research, Action and Planning, Communication, and Evaluation--as a general template for the student campaigns to follow. Obviously, a huge difference between PR and political campaigns would be that all-important electoral outcome. A primary goal of public relations is to facilitate a positive public opinion (Baskin, Aronoff, & Lattimore, 1997) while the political campaign seeks not only to actuate the public to vote for a particular candidate, but also to persuade other members of the public to do the same (Moffitt, 1999).

The assignment was broken into two parts: a written team report explaining and demonstrating implementation of the RACE process, and an oral segment, a public debate in support of the groups' respective candidates the day before the election. The written and oral sections were each worth 50% of the grade. Students were evaluated individually for the debate while the report yielded a single group grade.

While following the RACE process, the written team report was to contain the following:

(a) research--surveys and their results along with interpretations of those results,

(b) action and planning--a written report previewing the group's plan of action,

(c) communication--a portfolio with demonstrations of that plan: original copies of

published opinion pieces or news stories, copies of reports, memos, posters, etc., sent to

or made available to the campus community,

(d) evaluation--surveys and their results, interpretations of these results regarding the

success of actions taken as a campaign group,

(e) a bibliography of all published sources consulted/cited, and of all interviews conducted

In preparation for this task we provided our students with examples of campaign strategies

through various media outlets. As previously stated, we presented, discussed, and analyzed videos

of television ads beginning with the Eisenhower years through the current Bush-Gore commercials.

In addition, students were exposed to news and editorial tactics of print and Web site information.

Campaign slogans on posters, buttons and bumper stickers were also discussed. We then invited

Eric Feltner, campaign manager for 9th District (MO) Congressman Kenny Hulshof, to address our

class about proactive, reactive, and negative campaign strategies.

Group Research

Before conducting an effective campaign, the students needed to assess how members of the

Westminster College community felt about the candidates and the six issues that would be covered.

Our Gore camp found that 35% favored Bush with Gore a close second at 33%, but with 24% still

undecided (Jones, Ladley, Murphy, & Tsaloufis, 2000). Predictably, the Bush team's poll had Bush

ahead of Gore by a wide margin, 56-39% (Hixon, Hoffman, McConnell, Ritter, Ryel, &

Vaquerano, 2000). In spite of this, the same survey indicated liberal attitudes on several of the six

campaign issues. For example, 75% of campus Republicans supported hate-crime legislation, and

68% favored handgun licensing (Hixon et al, 2000). According to this survey, the campus Bush

supporters agreed more with Gore's positions but did not like Gore, the man. Since Bush was the campus front-runner, clearly, character was an issue the Gore camp needed to confront.

Planning

Both camps devised general plans to communicate their positions to the Westminster College community. Since this was an on-campus campaign (and with only 700 students, Westminster is a very small campus), the modes of reaching students, faculty, and staff were limited, yet effective. Posters, e-mail, flyers, and articles in *The Columns* (Westminster's student newspaper) would be obvious tools for the student groups to get their respective messages across. The groups researched their respective candidates' positions on the six class issues and readied themselves for proactive messages, a little negative campaigning, and reaction to the negative communication.

Communication

During the last week of September numerous "Bush" and "Gore" posters and flyers began to surface in strategic locations and high-traffic areas such as the student union, classroom buildings, restrooms, and on the windshields of automobiles. At first, there were simple recognition posters. Soon after, e-mails and flyers outlining the candidates' positions were distributed, and an issue of *The Columns* contained several news stories and opinion pieces--almost in point-counterpoint fashion--written by students in our class representing both candidates. By the start of October, the negative campaigning began as posters and flyers attacking opponents' positions became more prevalent.

Such methods of message distribution were common until the election. However, thanks to an October campus visit by Republican Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney, our students became even further involved with their respective campaigns.

Ever since Winston Churchill's famous Iron-Curtain speech ("The Sinews of Peace") on March 5, 1946, Westminster College has attracted numerous world leaders--from Ford to Reagan to Gorbachev to Thatcher to Walesa. As a result of a special invitation from College President Fletcher Lamkin, on Wednesday, October 11, Cheney came to Fulton for a campaign speech. (It should be noted that Democratic VP candidate, Joseph Lieberman, was also invited for the same purpose, but declined.) Our class Bush camp got involved with helping in the setup wherever possible. The Gore camp participated in organizing a campus "counter statement" during which time students and faculty would hold signs and distribute literature promoting Gore's candidacy while Cheney's campaign speech took place in the historic Westminster Gymnasium.

Naturally, Cheney's visit got a lot of local media attention while the dozens of "protesters" got some extended coverage as well. Stories and pictures on both aspects of Cheney's visit appeared in the *Fulton Sun-Gazette*, the *Columbia Daily Tribune*, and the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. In addition, local TV stations KMIZ (ABC) and KOMU (NBC) of Columbia each led with both the speech and protest during their 6 p.m. newscasts that day. A couple of our class students were quoted in several newspapers while the two television stations interviewed another.

As the campus campaign wound down, our class featured, as part of the assignment, a public debate on November 6, the day before the election. For two hours, a 30-member audience watched our students answer questions and provide rebuttals on why audience members should vote for the groups' respective candidates. Again, the media found this to be newsworthy as the debate story was covered by local TV (KRCG, the Columbia CBS affiliate). The *Fulton Sun-Gazette*, *The Columns*, and the Westminster Web site also featured articles and/or pictures of the event. It should be noted that both sides were obviously well prepared as they defended and championed their candidates' proposals and views admirably.

Evaluation

Obviously, a campaign is judged most on the success of its outcome. Our students completed their assignments by conducting another poll just before the national election. As was the case with the initial survey, the numbers differed. The Bush camp's survey indicated that 60% planned to vote for Bush with 31% for Gore (Hixon et al, 2000). This was an increase in Bush support from the 56% in the September campus poll. The Gore camp's post campaign poll showed Bush ahead 46% to 41 % (Jones et al, 2000). The latter seemed to be a more realistic result as the college's online election yielded a 48%-40% Bush victory. However, both sides concluded that while minds didn't change much, the interest level increased dramatically. According to one student who was not a class member, "I thought it was a good idea to get students involved in the presidential campaign. I've never seen other students participate so actively in a political campaign before, which got me interested in what was going on, too." (Jrolf, 2000)

FOLLOW-UP

We earlier stated that our pedagogical goals in this assignment were for students to become familiar with the processes of preparing, implementing, and evaluating a political campaign. We believe that was accomplished right down to the frustrations our students experienced when their posters had been removed or vandalized. But the assimilation of speech and political science along with critical-thinking skills was, in our opinion, equally important. This concept was addressed by one of our students in an article printed in *The Columns*:

> I don't think our campaigning changed many votes. But I do think it helped the class
>
> become more involved in learning about the platform issues. Researching for the debate
>
> strengthened my political positions by forcing me to become educated about the opponents'
>
> side (Jrolf, 2000).

It was also a new experience for most of the students to enroll in a team-taught class. A student summarized the experience by stating, "Having two professors was difficult at first. But it was helpful for this particular subject to have professors that are knowledgeable about politics and have differing viewpoints" (Jrolf, 2000).

We will continue to make progress toward improving the political communication course. We believe, however, that our general approach of team teaching from an interdisciplinary and ideological perspective coupled with the hands-on technique for student campaign involvement has been proven to be an extremely successful method of teaching this course.

Works Cited

Baskin, O., Aronoff, C., and Lattimore, D. (1997). Public relations: The profession and the practice 4th ed. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.

Davis, J. R. (1997). Interdisciplinary courses and team teaching. Phoenix: American Council on Education/Oryx Press Series on Higher Education. Retrieved September 1, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.oryxpress.com/scripts/book.idc?acro=ICTT&sect=excerpt

Goetz, K. (2000, August.1). Perspectives on team teaching: A semester I independent inquiry. Egallary [On-line]. Available: http://www.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html

Hixon, G., Hoffman, R., McConnell, T., Ritter, R., Ryel, L., Vaquerano, S. (2000, November 3). Presidential campaign project: George W. Bush Decision 2000. Student Political Communication assignment packet.

Jones, D., Ladley, A., Murphy, J., and Tsaloufis, E. (2000, November 3). Campaign strategy and evaluation: Gore-Lieberman 2000. Student Political Communication assignment packet.

Jrolf, A. (2000, November 17). Political communication opens the floor for debate. The Columns, (Westminster College student newspaper, Fulton, MO) p. 3.

Maroney, S. A. (1995, September) Some notes on team teaching. Available: http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfsam1/TeamTchg.html

Marston, J. (1963). The Nature of Public Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moffitt, M. A. (1999). Campaign strategies and message design: A practitioners guide from start to finish. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
Reproduction Release (Specific Document)

ERIC
Educational Resources Information Center

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:	" Team Teaching Political Communication: The 2000 Campus U.S. Presidential Campaign "
Author(s):	Keith T. Hardeman & Kurt W. Jefferson
Corporate Source:		Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of t following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *SAMPLE* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *SAMPLE* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *SAMPLE* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ [✓]	↑ [ ]	↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproductic and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Keith T Hardeman	Printed Name/Position/Title: Keith T. Hardeman, Assistant Professor of
Organization/Address: Speech Dept, Westminster College, Fulton, MO 65251	Telephone: 573-592-5263	Fax: 573-592-5191	Speech Communication
	E-mail Address:	Date: 5/10/02	

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another

hardemk@jaynet.wcmo.edu

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.) ·

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org