

2013-01-01

Bureauspeak: Discovering How Elected Officials Perceive Municipal Employees' Dis/respectful Rhetorical Practices

Teresa Quezada

University of Texas at El Paso, tquezada2@utep.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Quezada, Teresa, "Bureauspeak: Discovering How Elected Officials Perceive Municipal Employees' Dis/respectful Rhetorical Practices" (2013). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 1706.
https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/1706

BUREAUSPEAK: DISCOVERING HOW ELECTED OFFICIALS PERCEIVE
MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' DIS/RESPECTFUL RHETORICAL PRACTICES

TERESA QUEZADA

Department of English

APPROVED:

Beth L. Brunk-Chavez, Ph.D., Chair

Evelyn Posey, Ph.D.

Richard Pineda, Ph.D.

Benjamin C. Flores, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Copyright ©

by

Teresa Quezada

2013

Dedication

To my family:

Mamá y Papá, gracias por impulsarme y apoyarme siempre. Les debo mi entusiasmo por todo lo escrito. Papá cómo te extraño! Quisiera que pudieras compartir todo esto conmigo.

Tessy and Luis, you have made me a better, more mindful speaker, teacher, and person. I pray that I have had some impact on you.

Bob, you have been my rock and strongest supporter. I could not have accomplished this without you.

I love you all.

BUREAUSPEAK: DISCOVERING HOW ELECTED OFFICIALS PERCEIVE
MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' DIS/RESPECTFUL RHETORICAL PRACTICES

by

TERESA QUEZADA, B.B.A., M.B.A., M.P.A.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2013

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements almost always omit individuals who have impacted the author and so are difficult to write. Knowing this, I include many individuals in my acknowledgements because my dissertation is a compilation of many conversations held throughout my policrat career and doctoral studies and is also the culmination of support from many sources. First I thank my dissertation director, Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez. Without her guidance and support I could not have completed this work. Beth, I could not have asked for a better director; your help allowed me to tease out and express ideas that were originally muddled, work when I thought I could work no more, and aspire to be a scholar. My committee members, Dr. Evelyn Posey and Dr. Richard Pineda, were instrumental in helping me refine my ideas. Thank you both for your comments and encouragement throughout the process. Richard, your course, Political Communication, helped me begin framing my analysis – thank you. The faculty in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS) program has been encouraging and supportive throughout my doctoral studies. Every faculty member has somehow impacted this project – I thank you for your openness in allowing me to find my way in our discipline and your commitment to the success of doctoral students.

My doctoral work took a non-traditional trajectory; I worked as a policrat during the first part of my studies. This path allowed me to be a member of various cohorts. Discussions and interactions with colleagues across cohorts enriched my studies. My colleagues listened, challenged, and contributed to my work. Their insight and support is reflected in this project. Ms. Jalaine Lindsley, my transcriptionist worked tirelessly to decipher the recorded interviews; her work allowed me to further review and analyze my interviewers' comments; Mr. Lou Herman helped capture the videos used in my interviews which made the interviews more efficient and professional – thank you both. Dr. Theresa Donovan, my office-mate, encouraged me during the final stages of the dissertation writing and provided valuable insights into the process. Thank you Theresa for reminding me that I could do this.

During my work as a policrat, I was blessed with mentors and supervisors who nurtured their employees. These individuals provided guidance, support and critiques that allowed me to learn and flourish in my municipal career. Their advice prompted me to question how bureaucrats can prepare to maintain their professional and ethical ethos and be respected as professionals while working effectively within the local political system. These initial discussions led to the more specific research questions I probe in my dissertation. I also appreciate the support my department heads provided as I navigated both the policrat's and doctoral student's fields.

In addition to the support and guidance from RWS faculty, the Graduate School provided invaluable advice through a number of workshops addressing everything from mentoring to job-hunting and completing the dissertation. These workshops demystified the academic process and expectations. I appreciate the additional preparation these workshops provided. The Institutional Review Board and Ms. Athena Fester were also particularly helpful in assisting a novice researcher; I thank them for working with me. I am grateful to Dr. Patricia Witherspoon, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Dr. Maggy Smith, Chair of the English Department and Dr. Brunk –Chavez for supporting my research during the summer of 2013 by awarding me the College of Liberal Arts Dissertation Fellowship.

Finally, I am grateful for the time the interviewed elected officials afforded me. Their candor surprised me and allowed for frank discussions during the interviews. Their thorough and complete answers provided me with robust data to both begin answering the complex questions that are invariably associated with democratic political systems, political actors, and the rhetoric employed by these actors in the political arena and recognize how the transactions in the political area are complicated, intricate, and intertwined.

Abstract

Bureauspeak analyzes bureaucrats' rhetorical practices within municipal governments. This project asserts that respectful rhetorical practices have always been implicit in traditional notions of rhetoric, but have not been explicitly addressed. This project describes the *political epistemic field* (PEF), formed by discourse, audience, reality and rhetor, that is created within a municipal environment where policy deliberations occur. The PEF allows for interactions among the four elements and results in changes to all the elements as the interactions occur. The policy-making audience in the PEF expects their bureaucrat-rhetor to enact respectful rhetorical practices, but in many instances those expectations are also implicit and may change from topic to topic and discussion to discussion. Thus, this project seeks to discover how bureaucrats' practices are perceived by local elected officials in the El Paso, Texas region, which practices are perceived as respectful, disrespectful, neutral or contingent on the situation, and what the significance of these perceptions means for future municipal administrators.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	x
Chapter One - Introduction	1
Study Organization	5
Chapter Two – The Political Epistemic Field	9
The Epistemic Field in Rhetoric and Writing Studies	9
Local Governments	15
Public Administration Descriptions of the Political Epistemic Field Elements	18
Summary	51
Chapter Three - <i>Ethos</i> and Respect	54
Governing Gaze	54
Ethos	56
Expertise	67
Respect	71
Summary	76
Chapter Four – Bureauspeak and Locally Elected Officials’ Perspectives	79
Methodology	79
Responses	94
Data Analysis	111
Implications	116
Chapter Five: Comity, Civility, and Invitational Rhetoric - Making Respect Explicit	119
Comity and Civility	119
Respect and the Popular Press	126
Invitational Rhetoric	128
Respectful and Respected Policrats	137
Invitational Rhetoric and the <i>Political Epistemic Field</i>	141

Works Cited	144
Appendix A – Institutional Review Board Approval & Consent Form.....	151
Appendix B – Student Survey.....	156
Appendix C - Interview Protocol for Elected Officials	160
Vita.....	166

List of Tables

Table 1 - Interviewees' Demographic and General Information	92
Table 2 - Behaviors and Word Usage with no Clear Majority Responses	104

Chapter One - Introduction

Concepts of political rhetoric or political discourse elicit visions of politicians, either in office or vying for an elected post, and of citizens advocating policy changes. As Bernard L. Brock, Mark E. Huglen, James F. Klumpff, and Sharon Howell note in *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy* (2005), this discourse requires a set of rhetorical skills in two distinct groups: the political leaders and the citizens. These skills “define public situations, justify choices of response to them, construct a consensus supporting such actions, and direct the successful implementation of those decisions” (63). However, as described by Brock et al., the bi-partite discourse community of politicians and citizenry excludes another set of actors who must also master these skills and yet maintain an expected and acceptable distance from the political environment: on-staff professionals or bureaucrats. Members of this third group frame policy discussions, propose and justify choices available to elected officials, promote consensus in a variety of settings, and, ultimately, implement adopted policies. As paid experts, their discourse must appear objective, apolitical, and measured. Most importantly, because public servants are expected to be subject matter experts, their discourse must also demonstrate expertise to support policy implementation and execution. These government professionals must employ persuasive rhetorical strategies that are not overtly emotional; they do not share this limitation with either the elected officials, who can express indignation, frustration, or anger and promise sweeping changes, nor do they share it with the public, who can also make emotional appeals that demand policy change. Nonetheless, this group of government professionals, career administrators, public administrators, bureaucrats, and civil servants, occupy a political space, participate in policy making, and employ rhetorical practices as they impact political decisions. Not quite politicians, more rhetorically adept than

stereotypical bureaucrats, yet separate from the citizenry, I call this set of actors *policrats* and their rhetorical practices, *bureauspeak*. My goal in this project is to explore politicians' perceptions of policrats' *bureauspeak*. I argue that these practices have not been analyzed through the double lenses of the policrats' policy-making influence at the local level and through the perceived enactment of respectful behavior. Further, I argue that rhetorically adept policrats are characterized by their respectful *bureauspeaking* and that these respectful behaviors are foundational to their career-long success.

Public administration scholars, acknowledging the political nature of their environment, have studied the extent of government employees' impact on policymaking since the 1980s. Ezra N. Suleiman, in his 1984 edited volume *Bureaucrats and Policymaking: A Comparative Overview* argues that the advent of merit civil service placed bureaucrats

particularly those occupying the top posts in the bureaucracy, in an ambiguous situation. They had protection against political intrusion. Yet, they owed loyalty – and often their appointments – to the government of the day (3).

Further, Suleiman argues, politicians feed this ambiguity: “They have generally wanted civil servants to be neutral yet responsive to the party in power” (4). The politicians' relative power position determines how policrats are expected to behave. If the politicians are in power, then they expect the bureaucrats to serve as an instrument of policy implementation. If the politicians are in opposition, then they seek neutrality in the public administrators. According to Suleiman, these expectations are cross-cultural (4). Suleiman's summation relies on his contributing authors' exploration of policrats' influence on politics and the political process in the United States, Italy, Japan, France, Great Britain, Germany, Norway, and Chile. He also unequivocally

states that “civil servants have a hand in shaping public policies” (4). The authors of the other chapters in *Bureaucrats and Policy Making* similarly build their analyses on the assumption that the policrat plays a role in policymaking. The assertions that civil servants impact policymaking support the categorization of policrats as a third group of actors within the political discourse community. As such, they too require the specific set of rhetorical skills Brock et al. identify.

Policrats must possess an expanded rhetorical skill set that effectively composes texts and discourses, analyzes and addresses the specific political audiences and exigencies, and considers the rhetor’s own experience. Policrats must recognize the roles and expectations their audiences bring to political exchanges. At the very core, the policrats’ political environment is composed of elements that are similar to those James A. Berlin (1982) describes when he discusses the concept of an *epistemic field*. Berlin’s seminal article in rhetoric and writing studies, “Contemporary Composition: the Major Pedagogical Theories,” provides the framework for analyzing political communication elements and firmly grounds my analysis in rhetoric and writing studies. Each element, text/language, audience, reality and writer is complicated and nuanced within the policymaking environment, identified in this project as the *political epistemic field* (PEF). This study builds on the assertions that policrats impact the policymaking process and are thus a component of the political discourse community that produces knowledge used in policy deliberations. Rhetorical theory positing that rhetoric is epistemic provides additional theoretical infrastructure to this project. Public deliberations are one of the specifically indicated instances where certainty is elusive and both the presenters and the audience must rely on experience, expertise and probabilities, essential factors for knowledge-producing rhetoric (Lucaites and Condit, 2).

Sociology and psychology scholarship provides an emergent field of study when analyzing *respect*, its description, developmental acquisition in different cultures, and enactment. The rhetor's *ethos*, including credibility, nature, soul, experiences, character and even physical characteristics have long been interrogated within Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS). However, *respect* as enacted in rhetorical practices seems to be either implicit or tacit in traditional discussions of *ethos*, audience and text or, more broadly, in discussions of the *political epistemic field* elements. Rhetors are expected to know and respect their audiences in their produced texts and discourses – but definitions of respect and discussions of specific respectful practices appear to be missing from the discussions. I posit that *respect*, as a set of perceived behaviors or attitudes, imbues the polibrats' *ethos*, impacts other elements of the political epistemic field, distinguishes persuasive polibrats from less rhetorically adept ones and as such should be made explicit in discussions within RWS.

Intertwining rhetorical theory, public administration notions and concepts of respect from sociological and psychological perspectives, I explore the following:

- How are the elements of the *political epistemic field* that polibrats navigate described by public administration textbooks? Do these descriptions impact a polibrat's rhetorical practices and resulting *ethos* as perceived by their bosses and primary audience, the elected representatives? How is *respect* described and perceived as enacted? How can *respectful rhetorical practices* be described? What constitutes *respectful rhetorical practices*?
- How are polibrats' *respectful* rhetorical practices described by local politicians? What are the attitudes or set of behaviors exhibited by polibrats that distinguish respectful rhetorical practices?

- How do elected officials describe policrats' respectful rhetorical practices? Is respectful rhetoric perceived as more persuasive than neutral practices? Does the elected official believe he/she is better informed by a respectful policrat? Do respectful rhetorical practices attach themselves to a rhetor's *ethos*?

STUDY ORGANIZATION

The following chapters address these research questions in greater detail as outlined below.

Chapter Two - The Political Epistemic Field. Chapter Two further describes the *political epistemic field* and its components: texts/discourse and language, audience composed primarily of elected officials, reality or context and policrat. This study focuses on the *political epistemic field* at the local level in the United States. While studies involving cross-cultural, federal or national, high-profile public servants exist, local government interactions have not received much attention. Municipal governments are, by definition, smaller with long-time public servants easily recognized by the politicians as much as the politicians are well-known to the policrats. The intimacy of municipal government context will likely impact the transactions within the *political epistemic field*. In this chapter I probe:

- How does a municipal government environment further nuance the *political epistemic field*?
- How are the *political epistemic field* elements described within public administration scholarship? Are these elements implicitly or explicitly considered a system with ongoing interactions or are the elements considered independent components?

Chapter Three: Ethos and Respect. Chapter Three reviews discussions of *ethos*, its effect on the policrat, her audience and its impact on the political epistemic field. The chapter reviews how

policrats are encouraged to build credibility and trustworthiness in their interactions with politicians. Particular attention will be paid to how and when respect is included in existing scholarship and how it intertwines with the concept of an effective political persona for policrats.

This chapter responds to the following questions:

- How can traditional notions of *ethos* be applied to the local policrat?
- How do notions of expertise complicate the political epistemic field?
- What are common notions of respect?

Chapter Four: A Case Study of Locally Elected Politicians. Chapter Four details the methodology used to obtain and analyze data from El Paso, Texas' local elected officials' interviews and explores the elected officials' descriptions and definitions of *respectful rhetorical practices*. In this chapter I analyze the data collected from local policy-makers as they respond to Texas policrats' bureauspeak. The elected officials' reactions and perceptions will be categorized to determine markers of both respectful and disrespectful rhetorical practices. My review of the interviews will respond to these questions:

- How do elected officials describe respectful rhetorical practices in the El Paso, Texas metropolitan area?
- What are markers of *respectful rhetorical practices*?
 - Oral Markers to include intonation;
 - Physical/Behavioral Markers including non-verbal communication that is visible to the policy-making audience such as facial expressions;
 - Phrase tags meaning specific phrases the policrat incorporates into her speech.
- Are respectful rhetorical practices perceived as more persuasive, and if so, in what ways?

- Are similar practices perceived as both respectful and disrespectful by different persons?
If so, what appears to account for this contradiction?
- How does a political audience's notions of respect impact perceptions of *ethos* and respect?

Chapter Five: Chapter Five: Comity, Civility, and Invitational Rhetoric - Making Respect Explicit. *Comity*, *civility*, and *invitational rhetoric* are concepts that RWS scholars have explored and that appear to be the most closely associated with concepts of *respect*. I review common notions of the first two concepts and their descriptions within RWS and link to Sonya K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin's concept of *invitational rhetoric* since the PEF seems to lend itself to this rhetorical approach. *Invitational rhetoric* differs from traditional concepts of rhetoric because it seeks to create understanding and invites the audience to participate in the knowledge-making. Within the PEF, the policrat often must create understanding of specific and technical expertise within the policy-making body. An invitational approach removes the policrat from a privileged position and may mitigate the tension that appears between expert policrats and authority-wielding politicians. Foss and Griffin's specific recommendations are examined to determine their applicability to the PEF and their interrelationship with respectful rhetorical practices. I review terms that may have been used in the rhetorical tradition in lieu of *respect* and propose approaches to make discussions of respect explicit. Based on the interview analyses, this chapter poses these questions to promote further research into the interrelationship between respect, *ethos*, and political rhetoric

Other questions explored in this chapter include:

- How are *civility*, *comity* and *invitational rhetoric* described by RWS scholars? How are these concepts related to each other and to concepts of *respect*?

- How does *invitational rhetoric* integrate traditional rhetorical concepts including *ethos* with notions of *civility* and *respect* to create an epistemic field where understanding can occur? How can this be applied to the political epistemic field?
- How do the interviewed politicians' comments relate to concepts of *civility*, *comity* and *invitational rhetoric*?
- How can the politicians' expectations and rhetorical theory help policrats develop rhetorical practices that are more likely to be perceived as respectful and potentially effective within the municipal PEF?

My intent in this project is multi-faceted. First, I explore policrats' rhetorical practices within a local government environment, an area that has not received much attention within either political communication studies or public administration studies; secondly I probe *respect* as an assumed but unexplained component of rhetoric; and thirdly, I propose making respect explicit, particularly within the public sphere of local government and public administration. A rhetorical perspective on respect may not replace descriptions or frameworks from other disciplines, but it responds to underdeveloped topics and even gaps in existing scholarship. Further, an explicit consideration of respect, its impact on the political epistemic field and its rhetorical deployment not merely at the delivery stage but starting with the policrat's inventive process may impact both the policrat's pursuit for a professional and effective *ethos* as well as improve the nature of the public exchanges at the municipal level.

Chapter Two – The Political Epistemic Field

Policrats, as political actors, occupy a specific space in political deliberations; they are not policy-makers yet they must recommend policy to policymakers and defend approved policy to constituencies; they do not approve budgets yet they must deliver services within fiscal constraints; they are not elected yet they must execute policy and report its effectiveness to both policy-makers and the public. Their role is complex and complicated, not merely by what they are expected to accomplish, but by how they are expected to communicate with their bosses: the elected officials. Unlike managers in the private sector who can make their reports at private meetings, policrats are expected to report everything from long-term plans to routine actions at public meetings. The public meetings may remain public in a number of ways; for example, the meetings may be covered by news outlets and may become part the governmental unit's video archives. This chapter explores the multiple moving parts that impact the rhetor and her¹ public, political environment.

THE EPISTEMIC FIELD IN RHETORIC AND WRITING STUDIES

Brock, Huglen, Klumpff, and Howell limit rhetoric to a skilled performance or exhibition by political actors in their work *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy* (2005); yet despite this apparent reduction, the authors' recognize that these political actors *define* situations by using their rhetorical skills. *Defining* is an epistemic act; it creates knowledge and forms a reality that will, in turn, shape future interactions. Further, definitions and, situations are mutable; once a situation is defined differently, the resulting interactions are also changed. In the political sphere, defining situations creates fertile ground for debate,

¹ Throughout this project I refer to singular policrats as female.

consensus, policy-making and ultimately governance. Defining a situation, or *framing the question*, may also establish the probable consequences or outcomes based on the policrat's experience and expertise. Thus, a policrat may set the parameters and limits as to the solutions, outcomes, and probabilities debated by politicians and stakeholders. Although political rhetoric suffers from a negative connotation that implies it is meaningless and lacks substance, political rhetoric not only has the potential but also the effect of setting the foundation for how we are regulated at all levels of government. Political rhetoric exemplifies rhetoric's longstanding assertion that articulating arguments in public creates knowledge specifically because these discussions occur in public venues through open government meetings and oftentimes continue in the public sphere through news media reports and the agency's own devices such as streaming video which makes the initial interaction available to the public long after the exchange occurred. Recognizing that political actors' and policrats' rhetoric, in particular, often produces knowledge has broad implications to our view of their contributions to the political system and about the impact and influence of policrats and their rhetorical skills.

Political communication studies have long focused on how politicians and the public interact; public administration textbooks discuss the policrat's role as a manager in a government agency and the policrat's contribution to policy-making. However, the interplay between the policrat and the other political actors and the ethos-building process of the policrat at the municipal level is, as yet, underexplored. Also underexplored is the defining process that occurs in policy-making deliberations and the rhetorical practices enacted by policrats during these discussions. To begin exploring the specific rhetorical practices that build a policrat's ethos and how those practices are received and interpreted by the politicians, who are simultaneously the

policrats' bosses and audience, I initially draw from discussions of rhetoric as knowledge-building and productive.

Robert Scott's 1967 seminal article "On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic" has fostered ongoing discussion as to rhetoric's role in discussing truth as relative and contingent rather than fixed and discoverable. Theorists have not always agreed as to rhetoric's epistemic capabilities, and notions of knowledge and discussions about rhetorical situations, contingency and reality have been complicated since the late 1960's. This project relies on Scott's conclusion that "in human affairs...rhetoric...is a way of knowing; it is epistemic" (138). Rather than debating rhetoric's epistemology, I posit that policy discussions in modern political environments are similar to those occurring in the Greco-Roman tradition and focus on the "*public, persuasive and contextual* characteristics of human discourse in situations governed by the problems of *contingency*" (Lucaites and Condit, 2). If political rhetoric has the potential to create knowledge and foster understanding, then we must continue to probe how policrats, critical actors in the political environment, can create rhetorically adept and effective *bureauspeak* that occurs publicly, is meant to persuade and deals with probabilities and contingencies.

Barry Brummett (1979) makes sweeping statements about rhetoric's epistemology when he states that "rhetoric creates all of what there is to know. Discourse does not merely discover truth or make it effective. Discourse creates realities rather than truths about realities" (4). By taking this view, Brummett inverts Aristotelian concepts of discourse and reality. Reality is neither static nor does it exist independently of discourse; it is transacted by the writer and her resulting discourse. Subsequent theorists analyze the communication elements to advance Brummett's argument and explore the nature of and links between discourse, language, audience, reality, and writers/rhetors.

James A. Berlin and Robert P. Inkster (1980) also discuss the interrelatedness of communication elements: discourse, audience, reality, and writer, and urge scholars to “acknowledge – even to embrace – the assumption that the knowledge and meaning are tentative, problematical, elusive and partial” (13). By re-characterizing or reinventing rhetoric as a heuristic procedure, one where knowledge is produced, and by introducing the probable nature of knowledge and meaning, Berlin and Inkster advance rhetoric as productive. Rhetoric does not merely reflect and articulate a known and knowable reality, it also creates multiple, probabilistic discourse that constantly interacts with and precipitates changes among all the communication elements. The political sphere is especially rife with multiple definitions of issues, causes and solutions; thus, to be persuasive, polycrats must be aware of the complicated, protean reality they both inhabit and help to create. The overarching assumption that knowledge and meaning are evolving and partial and that the communication elements, create knowledge is the starting point for this analysis of polycrats’ discourse.

Although James Berlin’s initial discussion of the *epistemic field* in “Contemporary Composition: the Major Pedagogical Theories” (1982) is merely a footnote to his comparison of the theories that informed composition instruction in the early 1980s, the recognition that language, audience, reality, and writer, “determine what knowledge will be knowable, what not knowable and how the knowable will be communicated” (767) is foundational to understanding the interconnectedness of these different elements and acknowledging that their interplay creates knowledge and defines issues. The *epistemic field* also provides a systematic method for analyzing specific or particular environments or discourse communities where the characteristics of each element combine to create different knowledges. The knowledge created within a particular arena, or the truths that are described, “are operative only within a given universe of

discourse, and this universe is shaped by all of these elements including the audience” (Berlin, 775). Other Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS) scholarship further illuminates the system’s interconnectedness and thus provides useful descriptions of the elements that can be adapted to evaluate policrats’ rhetorical practices.

For instance, in their epilogue to the 1980 compilation *Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition*, Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle summarize rhetoric’s emerging epistemology by echoing Berlin and Inkster: “The interrelationship between the writer and the audience, an element entirely ignored during the dominance of the current-traditional paradigm, is recognized as crucial in contemporary discussion of the rhetorical act” (182). Freedman and Pringle argue that in the early 1980s, RWS was changing how it viewed traditional rhetorical elements such as audience, reality, and speaker as interactive components rather than as static, independent elements.

Janet Emig describes the epistemic field in terms of transactions and advocates a multi-disciplinarian approach to writing research. She traces the transactive, and thereby interactive, nature of the communication elements in her article, “The Tacit Tradition: The Inevitability of a Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Writing Research” (1980). Emig’s argument relies on Rosenblatt’s definitions of transactionalists as those who view “‘knowing [as] the transaction between a particular individual and a particular environment’” and of a transaction as “‘an ongoing process in which the elements of factors are ... aspects of a total situation each conditioned by and conditioning the other.’” (13).² Rosenblatt, in effect, describes an interrelated and interconnected system where rhetor and reality are no longer fixed, but impact

² Janice Lauer, in Chapter 4 of *Invention in Rhetoric and Composition*, cites several theorists who, while not using the term “transaction,” advocate that the writer is as impacted by the discourse as reality and audience are impacted by the discourse. They describe on-going transactions among the components of the communication elements Inkster and Berlin describe in the quoted article.

one another. This conceptualization of a mutable speaker and reality allow Emig to conclude that “The learner/writer therefore is an active construer of meaning in her transactions with experience” (15). These early works in RWS advance the concept of an epistemic field that no longer compartmentalizes discourse/text, language, audience, reality, and rhetor as discrete elements, but conceptualizes an interactive, transactional, evolving system where elements are mutable and mutating, and persuasive rhetors must be adaptable to the recurring, and, at times, fast-paced mutations. In this project, I borrow Emig’s term and use “transaction” to describe the interactions between communication elements in the political environment.

I overlay the political environment on Berlin’s concept of the *epistemic field* to explore how knowledge is created and shared by policrats through their texts/discourses with their audiences in their particular political reality. I term this specific set of transactions the *political epistemic field* (PEF). This field includes texts/discourse and language used within them, audience, reality and writer/speaker, and their interactions within a *political* environment. Transactions within the PEF create the knowledge discussed in policy-making environments and shape the political decisions that affect citizens. The specific political environments analyzed in this study are the local government forums where discussions and decisions regarding the allocation of public resources are held. The policy-setting environment and political system involve the policrat, the politician and the government structures and practices designed to vet public policy and make public decisions. As Emig (1982) and Berlin (1982) indicate, describing the particular environment where transactions occur is important. Although political contexts share commonalities at various government levels, the local or municipal government creates a different field from the other levels. I discuss these differences in the following sections and highlight the differences in the discussions of each PEF element.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

While RWS scholarship describes transactions within epistemic fields in general, public administration studies further complicate the *political epistemic field*. Public administration, the field that prepares individuals to manage budgets, staffs, and regulations in the public sector also provides its students and practitioners with descriptions of expected policrat behavior, skills, knowledges, roles, communication practices and transactions within a political environment. Analogous to managers in the private sector, public administrators are taught to understand the constraints that exist in the public sector and to manage public resources, including human resources, within those constraints. Given my assertion that the PEF elements are components of a dynamic system, the discussion of the individual elements as separate components is an arbitrary and artificial division. Some public administration scholars combine several elements of the PEF further complicating the discussion. However, separating the elements allows me to interrogate when elements are presented as independent components and when public administration and communication scholars intertwine several elements to describe policrats and their communication practices.

Public administrators are present at all levels of government: federal, state, and local, and most public administration textbooks acknowledge these different levels. However, not much research is available regarding municipal or local governments and the interrelationships between local elected officials and local policrats. Although public administration is recognized as “intimately tied to politics – the struggle over the authoritative allocation of social values and resources” (Bent and Rossum, 4), edited volumes dedicated to reviewing local, municipal or urban government do not discuss this relationship in great detail. Robert Cantine (1976), in his chapter describing how local policrats view themselves exposes a lone policrat recognizing that “[a]t the local level there is a striking difference in the amount of face-to-face contact an urban

administrator has with his public. It is not necessarily there at the state level, and seldom there at the federal level” (21). Aside from this single comment, the other chapters in Alan E. Bent and Ralph A. Rossum’s collection (1976) focus on the “instruments through which ...reform and change are intended to be effected, i.e., the administrative apparatus of ...urban centers” (3) that is, the urban administrators or policrats but not on the interactions between these administrators and the politicians.

More recent textbooks on public administration continue to minimize the policrat’s communication with other political actors. Terry Cooper (2006), for example, explains that responsibility to and communication with policy-makers and constituencies are infrequent and “less proximate” than the relationship and responsibility policrats have to their organization and superiors within their chain of command (82-3). It is unclear how Cooper comes to this broad and incomplete conclusion. As Cantine indicated, infrequent communication with policy-makers may be the case at the state and federal level, but at the local level, the policrat is expected to be responsible and responsive to elected bodies and stakeholders on a frequent, regular, and proximate basis. For example, many smaller municipalities may meet only once a month, but larger municipalities or local governments such as the City and County of El Paso, Texas meet on a weekly basis. These weekly meetings include various policrats presenting and interacting with the locally elected officials on a variety of issues on a regular and consistent basis. Further, Cooper’s analysis also appears to ignore the local politicians’ roles as the policrat’s superiors regarding policy-direction. While local policrats usually report to a county administrator or city manager, they are nonetheless held accountable by the elected officials. In many instances, the policrats and politicians interact with such proximity and frequency that they become familiar

with one another and communicate frequently to address routine issues outside of the formal public meetings.

The differences in the frequency, regularity and nature of exchanges between political actors as impacted by the level of government and type of agency are briefly discussed by Steven Cohen, William Eimicke and Tanya Heikkila (2008). These authors recognize that local governments and line departments play a different role from administrative or headquarter organizations. The latter, for example budget offices and legal counsel, “frequently emphasize process over product” (27) are also called overhead departments since they provide administrative services to an entire level of government and thus desire uniformity in procedures used by line or service departments. Line departments, such as sanitation or street departments, which provide direct services to constituents, on the other hand, have greater direct contact with clients and stakeholders and therefore “do not have the luxury of emphasizing analysis over action” (27). Similarly, because local governments have more direct contact with their constituencies than state or federal entities, citizens and policymakers alike demand greater responsiveness from their local government units and from local policrats.

The local government then, although not always the topic of detailed discussion in public administration textbooks, is recognized as impacting the types of transactions that occur among the political actors who operate at this level of government. Although underexplored, the proximity, frequency, and regularity of the potential interactions create a different environment that permeates the relationships that result. With that in mind, I now explore the other elements of the PEF and their descriptions in public administration textbooks.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DESCRIPTIONS OF THE POLITICAL EPISTEMIC FIELD ELEMENTS

Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS) addresses the *epistemic field* elements as components in a system, however, these elements are usually addressed separately in public administration texts. Reviewing those discussions allows me to identify how policrats are initially exposed to the environment they must navigate.

Text, Discourse and Language

The policrat's product, her text or discourse, and the language used in her communiqués are so intrinsically linked in public administration and technical/professional writing discussions that I have combined them for this review. Dutch researchers, in particular have scrutinized public documents for factors such as comprehensibility, a characteristic that describes both the text as a whole and the language used in that text. For example, Daniël Janssen (2001) recognizes that, while services are a government agency's primary output, a secondary but critical and visible output is the governmental agency's communication through various texts. Thus government texts impact the citizens' perception of the organization's quality (106). Since an agency's communication impacts how it is perceived, Janssen evaluates the quality of this secondary output and reviews Dutch policrats' letters and policy papers in his study. These texts, written by subject matter experts who have not had formal writing instruction, are not pre-tested on target audience samples as other mass government communication documents, so Janssen believes that these "unpolished" texts better exemplify government texts and policrats' writing styles and rhetorical practices (106). Janssen distinguishes the professional writer, who is specifically prepared to draft documents for mass consumption from the policrat, who is typically a subject matter expert. According to Janssen, subject matter expertise negatively impacts text quality and comprehensibility for a layperson audience. He states "[r]eaders – citizens and members of parliament – in general complain about the incomprehensible,

impersonal, unappealing, obscure, and esoteric nature of public documents” (106). His study, designed to determine the effects of selected policrats’ participation in a semester-long writing program, used professional writers to evaluate policrats’ texts on rhetorical elements including “total quality,” “effectiveness,” “comprehensibility,” and “difficulty,” and at the sentence level, on “difficulty” and “grammaticality” (113). Although study results indicated statistical improvements in the policrat’s writing, Janssen questions whether these professionally-assessed improvements would be detected by the everyday reader. Since the “grades” for the improved texts clustered around the equivalent of a “C,” he argues that program participants “still failed on ‘effectiveness’ after the course, even though that aspect was considered very important by the trainers” (115). Janssen argues that the governmental organization’s overall environment impacts the policrats’ texts, the policrats’ perception of their writing, and their need to modify those compositions. As such, it appears that Janssen recognizes the transactions that occur as policrats compose texts within a given governmental unit. Those transactions involve the policrat, her attitude toward the writing task, and the organization’s bureaucratic hierarchy and in many instances may result in poor text quality.

Another Dutch researcher focused on the role of argument quality within public information documents. Hans Hoeken (2001) attempted to determine “to what extent a text is convincing” (149) and how to develop an approach that helps policrats compose such a text. Hoeken’s study is particularly helpful in this project because rather than conducting a document analysis, he aims to develop a heuristic to teach policrats to compose persuasive government documents. Two main determinants of argument quality in a policy setting emerged: 1) the desirability of the policy consequences; and 2) the probability that these consequences will actually arise as a result of policy implementation (150). These determinants, however, imply

that the probability and desirability of all proposals is readily available and can be evaluated and compared by the decision-makers. Assuming that is the case, Hoeken then discusses the dimensions of argument quality. Argument strength is audience-dependent and based on the arguments' "subjective probability that the object of the attitude is associated with some outcome or consequence" (150) and on the audience's desire for that outcome. Hoeken links the argument's effectiveness to the audience's predisposition or their assessment of the proposed outcome's probability thus acknowledging the interrelationship between text and audience. Hoeken's argument is also implicitly linked to the rhetor's ethos since her past experience in a particular field or in implementing a similar initiative to the current proposal and her ability to express it will influence the audience's perception of the proposal's subjective probability. Hoeken posits that the more probable and more desirable a policy implementation, the more convincing the argument should be, but the desirable consequences will have to be supported with evidence (151). As Hoeken analyzes previous studies regarding the persuasiveness of evidence, he describes three types of arguments that rhetoricians would classify as *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* but he describes these as

1. Argument by authority: where a "credible" person presents testimonial evidence (*ethos*);
2. Argument by analogy: where anecdotal evidence is presented (*pathos*). To be effective, however, it is critical that the audience perceives the similarities between the two events; and
3. Argument by generalizability: or statistical evidence (*logos*).

The Reinard study (1988) Hoeken uses to undergird his own studies concludes that including evidence enhances the persuasiveness of an argument, but not all types of evidence are equally

persuasive (151-152). Hoeken thus begins his analysis by discussing argument, or text, as an independent element that does not interact more intensely with audience, reality, and rhetor.

Quoting the Baesler and Burgoon study on argument quality (1994), Hoeken indicates that based on their own results these scholars speculate anecdotal evidence is more vivid and concrete than statistical evidence thus making it more persuasive. But, when controlled for vividness, statistical evidence based on multiple instances is more persuasive than evidence based on a single instance such as an anecdote (154). Anecdotal information allows for greater and perhaps more intimate and impactful transactions among text, audience and rhetor, particularly if the arguments are delivered orally. Unlike the obtuse, “incomprehensible, impersonal, unappealing, obscure, and esoteric” text that Janssen’s readers complained about (106), illustrating an argument with an anecdote allows the policrat to present her *ethos* by becoming a story-teller; the audience is invited into the story-telling and can interact with both the discourse and the policrat. Hoeken concludes that “[t]he perceived relevance of the similar anecdotal evidence is as high as the statistical evidence” when the argument addresses outcome probability (163). When the argument shifts to address outcome desirability, statistical evidence was rated as more relevant (163). Hoeken explains the apparent contradiction to Basler and Burgoon’s conclusion by stating: “[t]he greater vividness of anecdotal evidence should be more persuasive when the pallid statistical evidence prevents the audience of getting the full picture of the consequences of a policy” (167) and concludes that “[p]eople are more likely to spot the strengths of arguments supporting a desirability claim than to spot the strengths of arguments supporting a probability claim” (168-9).

Although Hoeken’s conclusion seemingly contradicts previous studies, the gist of his analysis is that evidence, whether utilizing appeals to *ethos*, *pathos* or *logos* must be strategically

deployed and presented. Anecdotal evidence appears to strengthen arguments addressing the policy's desirability since it helps the audience understand why they would or should want such consequences. Statistical evidence, or the use of *logos*, seems to be effective when addressing the policy's probable outcome since the audience evaluates others' experience and seems to intuitively rely on those previous results as an increased probability for similar local consequences. Hoeken's chapter lends credence to the policrat's need for rhetorical adeptness since the type of evidence presented in a text or discourse depends on whether the policrat is addressing the desirability or outcome probability of the policy. Hoeken focuses on text and discourse; however, context, purpose and the policrat's ethos are implicit components of this discussion. For example, if the policrat is presenting a new initiative, then anecdotal evidence may be the preferred appeal; if the discussion shifts to program outcomes, then statistical evidence may be the most effective approach. It is thus important for the policrat to understand the purpose of her presentation or text and begin the composing process with the audience's predisposition to different types of evidence depending on the stage of program implementation. Hoeken's focus on argument quality within text or discourse highlights the transactions that occur within the PEF. Although he does not explore those interactions, Hoeken's study indicates that the difference in argument construction and effectiveness depends heavily on the PEF: the purpose, the audience's pre-disposition, and the policrat's skill in adapting her argument to these factors.

Cohen, Eimicke and Heikkila (2008) similarly discuss different approaches a policrat must take when they describe the policrat's communication practices as "projecting" and differentiate between information needed to "sell an organization" and information "needed to run an organization" (198). However they do not discuss why the information, knowledge or

resulting text/discourse a policrat must “project” is different. The authors discuss basic communication principles for external communication. They state that “[e]xplaining [the] organization’s tasks to an outsider involves summarizing the administrative details in nontechnical language with a minimum of jargon. This type of information should be the easiest type ...to project and obtain” (198). While the information may be easily acquired, communicating, or projecting it may not be as easy as Cohen et al. indicate. Despite Cohen et al.’s dismissal of all but the substance of the message, their recommendations for presentation to an external audience is valid: the discourse should be comprehensible to a layperson audience who is not steeped in the agency’s jargon and communication shortcuts.

Cohen et al. advise against reporting *outputs* and recommend instead that policrats focus on *outcomes* particularly when composing a message to an audience that is external to the agency. These scholars may be recommending outcome reports to the public at large, however, this strategy may be just as effective when communicating with the policy-makers who, although internal to the organization, represent the public’s interests and are not necessarily subject matter experts. Outcomes are, for example, cleanliness of the streets; outputs are number of streets swept (Cohen, Eimicke and Heikkila, 218-219). Cohen et al. urge the policrat to

become personally involved in the framing of external messages...[because she is the] most accountable for the messages that are transmitted [and must place herself] in the path of outgoing messages without becoming a bottleneck (223).

Communicating higher expectations within the organization “is a continuing process of teaching, listening, and communicating with the people who work for you and with you” (Cohen et al., 274). In this statement, Cohen et al. astutely encapsulate the recursive nature of policrats’

bureauspeaking and the need to create understanding. “Higher expectations” describe important policy considerations such as master plans for development and growth in a community, capital improvement programs that outline multi-million dollar investments into infrastructure, and annual budgets. These overarching policies require communication not only with a policrat’s subordinates and colleagues, but critical presentation with policy-making bodies: the city councils who are both the policrat’s bosses and are the elected officials charged with making the final decisions. Although Cohen et al. discuss communication, they seem to subordinate listening as a critical component to the communication process by placing it in the rhetorically weakened second position and privileging teaching as the most important task in the process. In doing so, they seem to tacitly favor subject matter knowledge and expertise – a common theme in public administration scholarship. As explored in chapter 3, favoring public administration expertise may pose a hazard to novice administrators who may misconstrue the transactions in the PEF and may rely on developing a “teaching” approach to an audience that may conversely believe is better-equipped to educate the policrat.

Government texts and discourse are a secondary but critical output of governmental agencies particularly within municipal governments. Policrats must be acutely aware that this output reflects on their specific department or agency and the municipality as a whole. When composing their texts, policrats must be aware of several rhetorical concepts: the purpose of their communication, the effectiveness of different types of evidence given the purpose, the experience and expertise the policrat brings to the situation, and their audience’s predisposition to both the topic and to the policrat herself. I explore how this policy-making audience is described in public administration textbooks in the next section.

Audience(s)

Public administration recognizes multiple audiences for the policrat. Since the policy-makers are the primary audience for this study, I review how policy-makers in particular are presented to students of public administration. The limited early public administration scholarship focusing on municipal or urban elected officials is practically dismissive in defining elected officials as a policy-making audience with the authority to implement policies affecting social change. Bent and Rossum (1976) describe policymakers as naively motivated to solve problems without much concern as to how the problem is defined or how the proposed solutions are to be evaluated. Solutions are matters “of urgency and leadership – good intentions” (5). Bent and Rossum do not advise policrats, their very readers, to define objectives, construct discourse that defines problems, or productively discuss potential solutions to the problems. Instead, the authors imply that the policrats’ enthusiastic audience is unwilling to devote the time necessary to engage in productive dialogue. The result of this dismissal seems to contribute to the tensions between policrat and politician discussed throughout this project.

Cohen et al.³ indicate that

projecting the type of information you need to defend your performance can be quite difficult. Developing a strategy for presenting a problem usually involves making choices from existing data...The best way to project the kind

³ I rely heavily on Cohen et al. in this section on audience(s) because two of the chapters in their textbook initially appeared promising for this study: Chapter 4 – Developing Effective Working Relationships and Chapter 11 – Communicating with the Public, the Media and Stakeholder. Chapter 4 however, focuses on communicating with a boss, staff, unions, and even in difficult situations such as dealing with unhappy staff members, but it completely ignores communicating with the elected bodies. Although the textbook emphasizes federal actions, it also mentions the incredibly rapid growth of state and local governments as compared to the federal government since the 1960s (35) and yet it does not discuss interpersonal relationships at the local level. Chapter 11 focuses on the appropriate goals for communication, but does not provide specific guidance regarding how to prepare for on-going communication with elected officials that results in policy direction.

of information you will need to defend yourself to outsiders is to be in constant communication with customers, the media, elected officials, opinion leaders, academics and the general public (198).

Cohen et al. describe a traditional rhetorical approach: a defensive/offensive posture thus advising would-be policrats to stand firm and embrace their expert role without any consideration to the hierarchical overlay of politicians.

Cohen et al. recognize that the policrat must foster external communication particularly if the policrat's work "involves a great deal of contact with legislatures, interest groups, or the media" (201). This statement seems to ignore local policrats who, almost by necessity deal with policy-making bodies, constituents, and the media on a daily basis.

Cohen et al. regard legislatures as important sources of information that should be considered in the decision-making and thus information-filtering process. Although an accurate perspective because policy-making bodies provide crucial information to policrats, these authors view politicians as external sources to be mined for information rather than as elements in the PEF that must work together to share information, create understanding and arrive at decisions. Cohen et al. do not consider elected bodies as the policrat's audience(s) and thus do not indicate how to cultivate a respectful relationship with them.

Cohen et al. discuss "constant communication" with a variety of stakeholders; however, these authors advise that the policrat adopt a defensive posture and privilege communication with citizens and media instead of fostering understanding or communication with elected officials. These authors seem to advocate that the policrat circumvent her policy-making body and argue her case directly with the public. They echo Brock et al.'s assertion that political actors define situations when they recommend that policrats must choose strategically from the

data available, but they assume that the policrat can and should mobilize public opinion quite independently of the elected officials. Policrats may be quite capable of mobilizing stakeholders, but such a strategy may come at a high price to their *ethos*. At the local level, elected officials might perceive such a tactic not merely as disrespectful, but as the policrat's attempt to usurp the politician's authority and may significantly and permanently damage a healthy working relationship between politician and policrat.

Interestingly, Cohen et al. seem to value professionals in the news media more than the elected officials. They advise public administrators "[i]f you accord people in the media the same respect you would other professionals inside and outside your organization, you will have conquered the most difficult task in media relations" (298). These statements appear to be Cohen et al.'s sincere guidance for policrats to establish an amicable and professional relationship with news sources and thus convert the media into an ally particularly when the policrat plans to deal directly with the public and interested stakeholders. Their mention of respect is important primarily because they use it as a noun. Public administrators are to offer respect to the media. In contrast, they seem to subordinate respect to an adverb when discussing interactions between the policrat and politicians.

When these authors shift their attention to dealing with elected officials, they concede that

Legislators, council members, and board members often demand special treatment, and in many respects they are entitled to such treatment. They are elected by the people and you are not. You need to let them know that you think they are important. When they need information from your organization, treat their requests respectfully and answer them quickly (307).

Although this statement recognizes the authority vested in elected officials by virtue of the democratic process that elected them to office, Cohen et al. seem to consider interactions with elected officials infrequent, extremely formal, yet entirely manageable by the policrat. Rather than recognizing that the legislators are the authorities who have the power of either accepting or rejecting policrats' recommendations, Cohen et al. advise policrats to let policy-makers know the policrats "think [the politicians] are important." The author's word choice indicates the authors themselves do not believe the politicians are important or that all policrat/politician exchanges build the politician's perception of the policrat's *ethos*. Further, by characterizing these interactions as infrequent, Cohen et al. miss an opportunity to explore how prompt and respectful responses build the policrat's *ethos* and impact future interactions between the policrat and the politician. Instead, the authors continue to view interactions with elected officials as unidirectional and serving only to provide information to the policrat. Cohen et al. recommend that policrats view the elected officials' *staffs* as colleagues rather than opponents and concede that policrats depend on politicians (308). However, identifying elected officials' staffs as colleagues reduces the elected officials' roles and transactions with the policrat. Undoubtedly, staff will communicate with the elected official and transmit a summary of the nature and substance of interactions with the policrat; yet these staffers are policrats too. They are neither the decision-makers nor the audience to whom the policrat may have to present in a public setting. At the local level, a council member's staff may consist of administrative staff rather than policy analysts, or professional staff. While building an effective network with these specialized staff is important to the local policrat, it does not substitute for an awareness and respect for the elected official and the PEF.

Cohen et al.'s chapter on communication for the public administrator also addresses the secondary audience in the PEF: the public. The authors strongly urge policrats to explain issues and initiatives clearly and succinctly. Although they do not specifically mention rhetorical skills or awareness, they do advise policrats

to keep information simple. Prepare clear and direct statements about your organization's position on an issue and on your plan of action. Avoid bureaucratic jargon, acronyms and vagueness. It is not necessary that the public understand all the elements of an issue. Your responsibility is to identify the most important aspects and educate the public about them. Nothing is too complicated to explain to the public (Cohen, et al., 317).

Although this advice may sound pompous, their message is clear: policrats must learn to communicate with citizens even if that communication must deal with ambiguities. Regardless of the topic's complexity, Cohen et al., indicate that the policrat is responsible for delivering a clear, concise message that is free from jargon, acronyms and that appropriately identifies those elements that matter most, or are of greater importance to the audience. In effect, Cohen et al. advise that the policrat know her audience, purpose and create a message that considers the PEF.

Reality

According to Cohen et al., "[g]overnment's role in our social and economic life has always been greater than American mythology would admit" (25) and Americans have a love-hate relationship with their government that allows politicians to run on platforms where they heavily criticize the existing bureaucracy. Further, "[p]ublic officials have little prestige and are seriously underpaid" despite the primarily federal requirements for higher levels of scientific and engineering expertise (Cohen et al., 40-41). Despite the love-hate relationship, Cohen et al.

indicate the American people have with their government, they also assert that “whenever our society faces a significant problem, we look to government for its solution” (40). Thus, although policrats must endure the public’s criticism, they must work within the governmental structure and negative public opinion to develop policies and programs that play a critical role in “regulating, lubricating and mediating the private economy” (Cohen et al., 40). These authors also caution that political pressure to slow down program implementation is a perennial constant (Cohen et al. 25). Nonetheless, Cohen et al. encourage policrats to foresee changes in political priorities that emerge from the pressures and, at times, antagonistic tensions. Along with the public’s expectations and the politicians’ agenda, Cohen et al. also remind policrats that government organizations provide more services than ever before. It is precisely the complexity and fluidity within government organizations that provide public managers with opportunities to positively impact public policy (Cohen et al., 36). Since the environment or reality is constantly changing, policrats must adapt to the changes and not merely foresee changes in political priorities, but they must anticipate appropriate responses and develop these responses knowing that governments, like all organizations “are not machines to be fueled and lubricated; they are organisms to be fed and nurtured” (Cohen et al., 29). Cohen et al.’s characterization of government organizations as living organisms further highlights the need for policrats to understand the PEF; organisms involve complex systems and interactions, and changes introduced into systems impact all elements of the system and the system’s functioning.

While the overriding reality for policrats is the popular public perception that “government is incompetent,” Cohen and colleagues’ textbook presents a different reality that favors the policrat while devaluing the politician (xi). According to these authors, the “aggressive, outcome-oriented public manager must strive to overcome” the fear of decision-

making within the public fishbowl in which she operates and inside the *political epistemic field* where politicians may point to ineffective management rather than admit the complexities of the public sphere and its accompanying legal and bureaucratic limitations that are frequently established to provide accountability (19-20). As Cohen et al. indicate, without the harsh realities of profitability, market share and return on investment to stockholders, measuring public agencies' and public managers' effectiveness is difficult; policy goals are ambiguous and thus elude measurement (23). The reality thus described is similar to Berlin's representation of reality as ambiguous and probabilistic.

Cohen et al.'s description of the policrat's environment is appropriately complicated by public perception, politician's goals and the very nature of large bureaucratic organizations where these "are constrained primarily by an extremely inflexible set of rules and procedures" (42). Although this apparently contradicts the fluidity and opportunities for policrats, the writers explain that despite these rules,

managers have substantial influence over the design of their programs because the policies enacted by our elected leaders are typically vague, ill-defined, and open to substantial interpretation. Given this lack of precision, managers have no choice and must establish and instill a vision and operational path (Cohen, et al., 253).

While this is may be the case at the federal level, Cohen et al. ignore the effect local policrats have on the actual development of the enacted policies. At the local level, policrats are part of the conversation and may be required to develop programs, anticipate outcomes, and then report on a feedback loop thus becoming more active participants at the implementation level. Rather than becoming recipients of ill-defined policies, local policrats may have helped develop the

policies, thus they may build more or less ambiguity into those policies. Regardless of policy's level of ambiguity, the local policrat may have to defend that level at the time of adoption and may have had to determine the opportunities such ambiguities will provide as policies are implemented.

Effective policrats must impose order from the conflicting interests and political signals that constantly assault government agencies and strategic planning is key to sorting out the chaos (Cohen et al., 257). Thus, policrats must deal with ambiguity and determine the best course of action based on a vision, mission or value statement that allows for multiple possible scenarios and courses of action. Although Cohen et al. do not specifically align their statements this way, the “order out of chaos” means that the effective policrat must deal with these ambiguities.

While Cohen et al. provide valuable insights into the policrat's reality, they imply a manager-centric system exists with managers viewing the system in two fundamental directions: up to policymakers, and down to the rest of the organization (269). When looking up, the manager's functions are to (1) obtain resources and (2) defend the organization (Cohen et al., 269). When looking down, the manager's functions are to 1) “infuse the organization with value, (2) develop the organization's distinctive competence, (3) distribute incentives, and (4) structure and mediate internal conflicts” (Cohen, et al., 269). This is a traditional hierarchical view that does not recognize the constant, recurring, interactive aspects of the PEF. While a bi-directional perspective may be an accurate description of federal policrats, it misleads readers into believing that all levels of government operate in this fashion. Policrats at the local level may be required to view their reality from multiple perspectives including those described by Cohen et al., but ultimately, these administrators must understand how the political pressures, public expectations, and governance laws impact their transactions with their texts and audiences too.

Bent and Rossum (1976) identify two elements impacting the reality in which the policrat operates: “pressure for increased citizen involvement” (9) and the constraints inherent in large hierarchical organizations that limit accomplishments; thus an on-going tension exists “between administrative efficiency and citizen satisfaction and worker self-actualization” (13). Other factors impacting the local policrats’ reality in the mid-1970s were service delivery complaints such as street maintenance and trash pickup, deteriorating urban centers, and uncontrolled and unplanned growth in urban areas. These concerns were so overwhelming that Bent and Rossum describe them as an urban crisis (3).

Although not currently an “urban crisis” these pressures have evolved from the 1970s and continue to plague policrats. The demand for effective fiscal management and service delivery has transformed into pressure for functional consolidations. Local governments continue to compete for overlapping tax bases and argue about providing similar services through separate jurisdictions in the same geographic area. For example, Texas law mandates that counties, not municipalities, are responsible for law enforcement, usually through sheriff departments managed by a county-wide elected sheriff. Municipalities also enforce laws through municipal police departments that are overseen by an appointed police chief. Other instances of similar functions performed by different political entities include park departments, housing authorities as well as a myriad of administrative functions such as information technology, human services, budget and finance, and purchasing. These examples of separate entities providing similar services through separate jurisdictions, taxing authorities, and bureaucracies perpetuate the argument that jurisdictional overlaps diminish effective fiscal management.

Forty years ago, pressures for regionalized local government existed. Federal regulations mandating regionalized planning, as now exists for transportation, for example, had not yet

occurred, and the prevailing wisdom at the time was that a reconfiguration of local government would result in comprehensive, regional plans that allocated local resources more efficiently. At the time, scholarship regarding intergovernmental relationships was new. Currently, transactions among different levels of governments are important to both local policrats and politicians. Local governments are neither isolated from other levels of government nor from neighboring municipalities. Policrats must be adept in dealing with external governmental agencies, policrats within these outside agencies, and in keeping their policy-makers abreast of developments and opportunities for cooperation in this arena. The multiple and overlapping layers of government that local policrats must navigate also distinguish them from federal or state policrats who primarily deal within their respective government level. State and federal policrats who must interact across government levels are more likely to be specialized staff, who are specifically prepared to work across jurisdictional boundaries and designated to do so as their sole workplace responsibility. For local policrats, intergovernmental relations may be an additional duty to their day-to-day responsibilities. As Cantine states, urban administrators “occupy a varied and complex world” (22). This complexity existed in the early 1970s and continues today.

The last chapter in the Bent and Rossum’s edited collection is Bent’s “Administration of the Urban Nation,” a clear appeal for centralized, national policies in the administration of urban centers. Despite its age and a different national outlook on urban areas, his discussion regarding the policrat’s urban reality continues to be valid. Regardless of Congress’s legislated national initiatives or federal agencies’ regulations, “the actual implementation of these goals has had to be executed by the officials in the country’s myriad communities” (Bent, 362). Further, the various levels of government, or Cantine’s varied and complex world, is a political system “characterized by a diffusion of decision centers which occasions the existence of several

feedback loops, possibly contradictory, operating in the same system simultaneously” (Bent, 363). Although particular decision centers and feedback loops may change with time and priorities, their existence permeates the policrat’s reality and adds levels of complexity and knowledge that she must navigate today.

The Rhetor

Critics of bureaucracies like James H. Boren in his satiric 1972 handbook *When in Doubt, Mumble* describe policrats as self-serving mumblers and division chiefs or bureau directors as “prodigious ponderer[s] who may scrutinize but need not finalize, who may systematize but need not organize and who may articulate but need not state” (Boren, 23). Although Boren’s critique does not provide specific guidance for effective *bureauspeak* – it illustrates how negatively policrats and their rhetorical practices are perceived by the public at large, and at times by their bosses, the policy-makers. Boren critiques both the policrat’s use of rhetorical elements and appearance of sincerity, and “advises” policrats to maintain eye contact, make facial expressions “that reflect knowledgeability and sincerity,” (20) and utilize “resonant tones” that similarly “cast an aura of rhetorical integrity and confident authority” (25). Boren’s most damning criticism is that policrats “should never seek to inform or educate their constituency and the use of logic is dangerous” (59). In effect, Boren criticizes bureaucrats for their failure to create knowledge or understanding when they speak and/or compose. He is scathingly critical of the policrat’s language which he describes as “thesauric,” (8) and peppered with jargon and abbreviations that cloud the meaning to the public at large. Current *bureauspeak* is also peppered with acronyms that frustrate politicians and constituents alike. These audiences disparagingly describe the incessant use of acronyms as “alphabet soup.” Boren also criticizes the policrats’ communication style when he characterizes bureaucratic mumbling by its cumbersome sentence

structure. This structure he argues is yet another stylistic tool designed to hide the responsible party, (grammatically known as the subject) and obfuscate the action (verbs) by stringing prepositional phrases. Richard Lanham (2007) describes this type of communication as the “official style” and similarly describes it as long strings of prepositional phrases ending in “shun” words that cloud who the actor is and what action is being taken. Boren highlights deficiencies in *bureauspeak*, and the astute policrat would recognize that she is to practice the very opposite of Boren’s recommendations. Although this book is dated since it was published in 1972, bureaucratic self-preservation and mumbling continues. The public’s expectations regarding policrat’s practices may have changed and those changes are reflected in more recent public administration texts, but clear guidance regarding the policrat’s critical role in knowledge creation within the *political epistemic field* is not always clear. While Boren’s critique initially focuses on the policrats’ text and discourse, I include it in the section discussing the policrat/rhetor because it highlights how the text/discourse is perceived to impact on the policrat’s intentions. Boren focuses on visible and audible manifestations of what he believes indicate the policrat’s attempts to evade responsibility and cloud understanding. For Boren, a policrat’s text and discourse manifests the policrat’s inability to make a decision or recommendation, present it clearly to her audience and then accept the consequences of that decision. This characterization of policrats stands in stark contrast to those described in public administration scholarship.

Clear, understandable communication from public officials is an international pursuit, as evidenced by Daniël Janssen and Rob Neutelings’s edited volume (2001) designed for “communication researchers, scholars and technical writers” (6). Janssen and Neutelings bring together the work of Dutch researchers studying the quality of public documents and the

potential for improving these documents. Like Boren, they list characteristics that distinguish the language used by policrats as impersonal, complex, diffuse and traditional with texts that include passive constructions and fewer verbs (4)⁴. Although the collection focuses exclusively on written texts, Janssen and Neutelings acknowledge that *how* an entity communicates impacts on its credibility – its collective *ethos*. The government becomes a monolithic author, impersonal, difficult to understand and distant from its stakeholders; the policrat, through her texts and discourse becomes an extension of that entity. How a policrat communicates impacts not only on her *ethos*, but also on the entity’s credibility with the citizens and stakeholders, the secondary audience in the PEF. As indicated in the section on text, the adept policrat must understand that she stands as a representative of her department and municipal entity when she communicates both with her politician bosses and the public.

According to Daniël Janssen’s chapter “Improving the Quality of Public Documents: or: Why Training Public Writers Often Doesn’t Work,” (2001) policrats in the Netherlands do not believe they are ineffective communicators. They communicate in the “official style” because they do not perceive a need for greater rhetorical adeptness and do not believe a different style would be valued by their specific agency or would establish the consensus they are seeking to achieve (108, 116). Their writing competence is borne out by their ability to address a less-educated reader when specifically tasked to do so. However, since these policrats view politicians as their primary audience, they do not shift their writing styles to broader audiences in their day-to-day composition practices. Janssen astutely recognizes that his subjects’ writing is impacted by the environment, or this project’s description of reality in the PEF. He supports his explanations for policrats’ underperformance with Rothwell’s 1996 analysis of “four levels that

⁴ This characterization echoes Lanham’s “official style” as well. According to Lanham, the “official style” uses different conjugations of “to be” verbs, hides the action in words ending in “tion,” and strings those together with prepositional phrases.

influence a worker's (and thus a writer's) performance: the organizational environment, the work environment, the work process and the worker" (118). This analysis recognizes the rhetor's reality and describes three sub-levels: the organization's environments, the policrat's specific work environment and the work process; the worker is analogous to this project's *rhetor*. As indicated when describing Janssen's assessment of text, the policrats he studied did not consider themselves to be writers, "but rather policy designers or legislators" (120). Thus, their own view of their role, even when producing text, is influenced by their perceived broader or higher goal. Janssen's subjects did not seem to realize that designing legislation is only the first step to enacting social change. To effectively implement legislation requires communicative acts. These communication transactions may be written or verbal, but regardless of their medium they must be composed rhetorically. Policrats must be mindful of the PEF so their texts and discourses aid them in achieving their ultimate design goal.

As opposed to the policrats in Janssen's study who view their roles more concisely, Bent and Rossum, in their 1976 text, recognize the many and often conflicting hats the policrat wears and the many roles she is expected to play, and play well.

The urban administrator is often required to identify community needs, plead for various causes, serve as a salesman for his ideas – in brief, become an active participant in determining how the issues will be processed through the political system. Yet, at the same time, he is responsible for the effective, efficient, and sensitive delivery of service (11).

When addressing the delivery of vital services such as education, housing, transportation and planning, they further state "[t]he political nature of these service areas underscores the

frustrations of resolving the urban crisis by rational, administrative means” (12). Bent and Rossum do not offer their readers, the local policrats, further guidance to define problems. Although these authors identify a crisis environment in public administration in the mid-1970s, they do not probe what urban administrators can do, or how they can compose dialogue that meets the rational decision-making environment they describe. “Administrative means” implies subject matter expertise, but does not address the communicative aspects of implementing change. By ignoring the value of policy-makers and the necessary communication exchanges between policrats and policy-makers, Bent and Rossum may lead students of public administration to believe that these two factors are unimportant. Rationality and administrative skill are privileged, but the means of effectively discussing proposed policy with the legislators is subsumed.

When specifically introducing the section on the policrat, or *urban administrator*, Bent and Rossum state that to carry out their myriad responsibilities, local policrats

must devote most of [their] time and talent to establishing and maintain[ing] a sensitive information-gathering system of the world around [them]; setting and planning objectives; working to achieve consensus among [their] superiors, subordinates, and the community; promoting and selling those values and actions they believe to be in the public interest; arbitrating conflicts; promoting the fiscal integrity of [their] agency; and orchestrating the governmental machinery to accomplish the tasks at hand (17-18).

This early, herculean self-analysis de-emphasizes the policrat’s role as a communicator and her need for effective rhetorical practices and adeptness. Although achieving consensus throughout a bureaucratic hierarchy and with community stakeholders might imply

communication, these authors do not make it an explicit or a contributing element to the policrat's success in her other roles. Further, policrats are advised to *gather* information, but not necessarily communicate it at any other level thus making the information flow, and by extension knowledge creation, almost entirely unidirectional. Bent and Rossum imply that the policrat gathers information, processes it, manipulates it to achieve her other objectives, but does not necessarily communicate frequently, regularly or consistently within the bureaucracy, with politicians or with the community. Subsequent texts on public administration incorporate the role of communicator in the policrat's many responsibilities; however, this inclusion may come too infrequently and only implicitly to be understood as important and critical to the policrat's overall success.

Robert Cantine (1976) analyzes the survey responses of 70 "urban administrators" or local policrats. This chapter in Bent and Rossum's edited volume is particularly rich with self-descriptions of the roles, skills, abilities and knowledges policrats possessed in the 1970's and their expectations of the skills and knowledges that would be important to future policrats. Cantine acknowledges that his study is not an exhaustive view; his goal is to guide public administration educators as they reassess the curriculum necessary to effectively prepare the next generation of policrats. Cantine's respondents characterized themselves as administrators who must have a good feel for social problems and a sense for the politically feasible (20). When comparing policrats to their private sector counterparts, these policrats indicated that administrators in both sectors must possess analytical skills and "'people-oriented' management skills" (20). It is interesting that the focus on people is set off by quotations as though Cantine undervalues this skill, even though his own subjects noted its importance. Within the public sector, Cantine's respondents commented that while the "skill or technique of urban

administration is transferable” the substance or the specific area of expertise is not (21). Cantine leverages this distinction to encourage public administration programs to provide different options or tracks to prepare future policrats in specific topics further privileging subject matter expertise. This may be the ideal development for future urban administrators; however, many local administrators hold degrees within their specific areas of expertise rather than in public administration thus decreasing the potential impact of an updated public administration curriculum. It is nearly impossible for doctors, veterinarians, engineers or attorneys, who subsequently become public health authorities, zoo directors, public works directors or city attorneys to foresee their careers’ complete trajectory. Thus, these individuals specialize in their substantive area of expertise, but not necessarily in the skills that are transferable and applicable to administration in a political environment. Since not all policrats are public administration program graduates, focusing solely on public administration programs to deliver transferable skills leaves practicing policrats with gaps in their formal training. This is another reason to describe and evaluate effective rhetorical practices and make best practices available to subject matter experts who are building their rhetorical skills within the PEF.

According to Cantine’s respondents, seven major tasks, other than the day-to-day activities that “get the job done,” demand the majority of a policrats time and talent: 1) information gathering and sensing problems or opportunities; 2) planning and setting objectives; 3) initiating change; 4) orchestrating the governmental apparatus; 5) building consensus; 6) arbitrating and managing conflict; and 7) managing the organization’s budget and finances (28). These tasks describe the vast majority of current demands as well; however, rhetorical adeptness, essential to successfully carry out these responsibilities, is either absent or minimized in Cantine’s discussions. When Cantine discusses information gathering, he means information

that comes in the form of cues rather than through formal channels. Thus the policrat must be aware and keenly analytical since the information is also “fragmentary, disguised, isolated or indirect [and] it is the administrator’s skill at ‘reading meaning into events...’ that permits him to identify and define problems and exploit opportunities” (23). To gather this information, the policrat must “work actively to establish and keep open his contacts within the community” at other governmental levels and with the private sector (22). For Cantine, this elusive and perhaps intuitively gathered information sets the foundation to initiate change, one of the tasks identified as “finding the right things to do at the right time” (23). Information-gathering and the policrat’s analytical skills in distilling meaning from that information is critical; however, defining problems and exploiting opportunities is not an isolated event that the policrat can undertake independently. In fact, the policrat must exercise rhetorical adeptness precisely when she faces problems requiring complex solutions. She must understand her audience, the policy-makers, and develop both the proposed initiatives and her justification for them with a clear vision of who expects to use her information to determine policy. Cantine seems to imply that gathering information, analyzing data, and developing recommendations occur independently of discussion, consensus-building, and ultimately, policy direction from elected officials. The elected officials will not only adopt programs but also hold the purse strings that make problem-solving opportunities possible for the policrat and her agency. Thus, for a policrat to effectively carry out the major tasks that consume most of her time, she should not only be aware of the PEF, but must also know how to compose texts and discourse that provide her the resources she will need to manage a public entity.

Several of Cantine's surveyed administrators viewed the second demand, planning and setting objectives, along with considering the means to achieve these goals, as an ultimately personal goal with the policrat establishing a

personal set of goals – for himself and the organization he serves. Whether he reveals these goals through the sum of his actions over time or lays them all out at one time for examination, through some formal pronouncement, is a matter of individual style and the situation (24).

Again, this responsibility seems totally divorced from today's public and policy-makers' involvement in formulating an organization's vision, mission, goals and objectives. Goal-setting and plans to achieve these goals are an open and inclusive process involving public meetings with both the public and politicians. In many instances either or both groups may dictate the goal-setting and strategic planning process. The policrat is expected to respond clearly, succinctly, and completely to goal-setting and planning requirements. The time, place, style, and formality for goal examination may not be at the policrat's sole discretion or match her personal style. Since planning is such a public process, it too demands that the policrat possess rhetorical skills that permit the policrat to define her agency's situation, present her vision for her agency's future, and delineate a path that is appropriate from an administrator's perspective and politically feasible from a politician's perspective.

Cantine identifies three comments where policrats specifically viewed themselves as agents of change to include “persuad[ing] the community to move in a certain direction” (25). Interestingly enough, these policrats did not appear to value the policy-makers' role in or contribution to the process of instituting social change. Instead, they viewed their own positions as agents of change as independent of the elected officials and perhaps more influential than

these policy-making bodies would like. Although the administrators indirectly reference rhetorical practices by indicating that the policrat must *persuade*, I see another fissure with the PEF since the administrators imply they have direct access to the community as their primary audience. Absent a public involvement process, a policrat's most common opportunity for persuasion is with her policy-making body rather than the community at large. The community, or public at large may be a secondary audience, but the policy-makers are often involved in all aspects of a program's roll-out before the community is engaged in the discussions. Once again, the administrator's role as an agent of change is elevated; the politicians' role in implementing change is dismissed, and the policrat's need for rhetorical abilities is ignored.

The surveyed administrators seem to address their policy-making audience in the comments Cantine categorizes as "orchestrating the governmental machinery" (25) although he attributes these comments to the administrators rather than to the audience. Responses address the administrator's political nature and dealings with elected bodies such as "'working ...and dealing with the elected bodies who are our superiors requires a balance of informal relationships and strategies'" (25) and "'[t]here is a gap between the idealism of my staff and the political realities, represented by my Board'" (25). For Cantine, that meant that the policrat must become the interpreter and buffer between staff and elected officials (26). Perhaps a more appropriate description for this particular role is *facilitator*; the policrat must again demonstrate rhetorical and political agility by effectively expressing staff recommendations while understanding the political pressures that will influence technical recommendations.

The policrats in Cantine's study emphasized the importance of managing these sometimes conflicting perspectives when they listed the next two major demands on their time: consensus-building and managing conflict. According to Cantine, building consensus is the

policrat's "most universal and time consuming role" (26). In this role, the policrat "must invoke his skill in persuading others to accept a proposed action, or his ability to find an acceptable substitute agreeable to all parties. Perhaps among all his tasks, this is the responsibility for which his education and training have least equipped him" (26). Despite the 40 year time lapse since this comment was made, the policrat's lack of preparation for consensus-building seems to persist. To manage conflict, one policrat stated "'what we typically do is pull the threads off conflicting viewpoints and come up with what is practical, what is possible, what is achievable'" (27) again alluding to rhetorical adeptness. Cantine also indicates that conflict management is another area where policrats are under-prepared through their formal education and learn it primarily by "trial and error and picking up for [their] own use techniques [they have] observed being successfully employed by others" (27). However, Cantine seems to studiously avoid describing these techniques as rhetorical.

Cantine discusses public budgeting fundamentals but does not address how the budget process is itself a critical communication and persuasion challenge for policrats. Not only does an agency's budget presentation outline its upcoming financial requirements, it provides the department head with an annual opportunity to highlight her division's mission, goals, and objectives and thus involves many of the tasks previously identified as consuming the policrat's talents and time. Cantine does not discuss the policy and goal-setting that occurs when policy-making bodies emphasize and support certain initiatives by funding them and, diminish others by either reducing those budgets or simply de-funding them. Despite the respondents' clear indications that their formal educations failed to equip them with critical communication and persuasion skills, Cantine relegates rhetorical adeptness and communication skills to "salesmanship." He ignores the impact effective communication has on both the policrat's

individual career, the public's perception of her agency, and the agency's ability to serve as expected.

Terry Cooper (2006), writing forty years after Cantine's published self-assessment of policrats, continues to emphasize the multiple and competing obligations a *responsible* administrator must manage (283). Cooper emphasizes that a responsible policrat must adhere to laws and regulations rather than personal preference, thus perpetuating the ideal of public administration's objectivity. When describing the three collective groups to whom the policrat is responsible, Cooper spends more time addressing the policrat's responsibility to superiors and subordinates – that is, parties internal to the organizational structure– than responsibility to the policy-makers or to the citizenry (84-93). Although Cooper effectively discusses externally and internally imposed obligations and responsibilities that lead to the policrat's ethical behavior, he does not address the policrat's ethical or responsible communication practices with policy-makers.

Cooper appropriately complicates the policrat's nature when he acknowledges that the two roles policrats play simultaneously, administrator and citizen, cause tension because they can “give rise to conflicts between obligations to the citizenry and the organization established to serve the citizenry” (284). Within a local government reality, this conflict may be more acute because both the policy-makers and the policrats are aware of the additional constituent/representative relationship that overlays the policrat/politician transaction and the responsibilities inherent in each party within the dual context. The politician may be more likely to ignore or pretend to ignore the constituent-representative relationship in a public space, and focus on the politician-policrat transaction. Focusing on a single relationship may reduce its complexities for the politician, but may create an even greater conflict for the policrat.

Exploring this complexity is beyond the scope of this project. However it is noteworthy because it further enriches the rationale for studying policrats' rhetorical practices and their transactions in the PEF.

Cooper's emphasis on responsible policrat behavior yields two concepts that are important to this project. First, when discussing the two types of responsibilities that impact policrats, Cooper indicates that *objective responsibility* is externally imposed and includes "responsibility to someone else for something" (81, emphasis in original) while *subjective responsibility* is internally imposed and rooted in policrat's own beliefs and values. Some of the policrat's values may be externally imposed at the outset of a career, but "become internalized over time through training and socialization" (93). Thus, teaching administrators to value their audience, whether it is made up of constituents, policymakers or both can be a public administration responsibility imposed at the outset of a career, through public administration programs, or through professional development workshops. Respectful rhetorical practices can begin as external requirements for an effective presentation that the policrat internalizes so that as the policrat's career progresses, they become a subjective responsibility – but a responsibility nonetheless. Secondly, Cooper argues that a policrat's ethical identity "emerges incrementally from the pattern of decisions that [she] make[s] over the course of a career" (284). I argue similarly that a policrat's respectful rhetorical practices develop incrementally from continuous and sustained exchanges with policy-makers. Because such exchanges create a pattern, single, isolated instances of either respectful or disrespectful exchanges do not identify a policrat as respectful or disrespectful. The policrat's respectful *ethos* emerges incrementally, just as her overall credibility emerges incrementally as she operates within the PEF on a regular basis.

Further,

[b]ecause political interests determine the goals of public organizations, public managers often face shifting priorities. The most effective public managers are those who learn to adjust programs rapidly to reflect changed priorities. Effective public managers learn to foresee changes in policy direction and build agile organizations capable of rapid redirection (Cohen, et al., 21).

This agility is difficult to achieve within bureaucratic structures precisely because legal and hierarchical limitations and concerns for accountability frequently require adherence to specific procedures for change. Although Cohen et al. encourage administrators to be alert and thus foresee changes in policy, they assume that the effective policrat is completely unable to impact policy direction and can only hope to react nimbly to it. This lopsided description ignores the transactions within the PEF.

Cohen et al. recommend criteria for finding and keeping effective policrats in one chapter of their textbook. Their criteria for evaluating hires includes

- Intelligence
- Experience, training, and expertise
- Demonstrated performance and organizational skills
- Social and group skills and overall personality
- Professional reputation
- Attitude, energy, and enthusiasm
- Written and spoken communication skills (57)

The last three characteristics reflect the policrat's ethos and rhetorical adeptness. Cohen et al. may inadvertently perpetuate the inherent tension between the elected body and the policrat when they list expertise as a high priority criterion for evaluating new hires. An administrator's

subject matter expertise cannot be ignored, but recognizing that a policrat's success demands more than specialized education would more closely align a new hire's skills and abilities with the demands that public administrators have recognized in Cantine's study. While none of the Cohen et al.'s criteria specifically indicates that a prospective hire should be respectful, "attitude" is an ambiguous characteristic frequently used to describe the interviewee's goodwill and fit with an organization. Once again, respectful behaviors appear just below the surface of discussions involving policrats.

Cohen et al. also identify traits or practices that may indicate a policrat is beyond saving in her position. If a public employee

- possesses poor listening skills – never seems to understand the last point made[,]
- is disliked by the rest of the organization[,]
- is pitied by the rest of the organization[,]
- is unable to explain or defend a product[, or]
- undercuts members of his or her own staff (79-80)

then she should be fired. Cohen et al. identify other traits, but the ones listed above align neatly with Aristotelian concepts of ethos and descriptions of respect discussed in Chapter Three.

When discussing effective working relationships Cohen et al. focus on communicating with a boss, staff, unions, and address difficult situations such as dealing with unhappy staff members, but they completely ignore communicating with the elected bodies. Although the textbook emphasizes federal actions, it also mentions the incredibly rapid growth of state and local governments as compared to the federal government since the 1960s (35), and yet it does not discuss interpersonal relationships at the local level. The authors emphasize that "communication, time management, motivation, negotiation, conflict resolution, and empathy"

(89) are critical to establishing effective working relationships and thus recognize communication and empathy – or the policrat’s ability to place herself in her audience’s shoes, or create goodwill but they do not indicate how empathy is enacted or communicated.

“The ability to delegate is one of the most important attributes of the successful manager” (Cohen et al., 124), and is also one of the most difficult traits to develop. Effective delegation requires “trust, teaching skill, a willingness to tolerate error, and it involves hard work” (Cohen et al., 123). A willingness to tolerate error indicates comfort with ambiguity, one of the foundational aspects of Berlin’s epistemic field that I also believe is inherent in the PEF. Teaching indicates that the policrat is able to create understanding and trust implies that the policrat both trusts and is trusted. I argue that these factors, which Cohen et al. identify as important to a policrat’s success, involve rhetorical adeptness and respectful rhetorical practices. Current textbooks complicate and nuance the policrat’s role at all government levels. For example, Cohen et al. indicate

Public service in the twenty-first century requires public managers trained in e-government, contract management, and management innovation, as well as in all of the traditional functional management tools discussed...: budgeting, human resources management, political management and information management (323)

However, rhetorical principles, rhetoric in general, and the policrat’s need for rhetorical skills and strategies continue to be implied rather than addressed.

Public administration textbooks seem to focus on policrats who enter the PEF with a public administration degree in hand. The reality, however, is that many local policrats do not undergo such preparation. The policrats envisioned in this study are subject matter experts in a variety of disciplines: engineering, municipal planning, finance, accounting, medicine, and law

to name a few. The individuals who present to city councils may be mid-level to upper executives in departments such as Transportation, Engineering, Sanitation, Municipal Planning, Comptroller's Office, Budget and Management Office, Purchasing, Health Departments, and City Attorney's Offices. Some of these policrats may be public administration program graduates, but a number may be engineers, planners, accountants, doctors and lawyers without public management experience. They may have significant management experience in the private sector or in other not-for-profit organizations and may bring that expertise to the local government forum. However, they may have operated under the neo-traditional rhetorical principles where they believe that their audiences or clients will hold positions of potentially less authority because they do not hold the same subject matter expertise. Within the PEF, however, these technically competent individuals retain their subject matter expertise, but their expert performance must be delivered in a different environment, one where the audience holds greater power and authority. The policy-making audience is aware of the uneven distribution of formal authority and power and expects the subject matter expert to utilize her expertise to inform and educate the policy-makers but allow the audience to arrive at their own conclusions and adopt policies that the audience believes will be politically feasible.

SUMMARY

Public administration textbooks do not appear to value the policy-maker either as the ultimate decision-maker in the local PEF or as an important component of the political system in which the policrat operates. Politicians are portrayed, at best as the policrat's opponent, or at worst, as naïve and unwilling to dedicate the time necessary to arrive at issue comprehension. Public administration texts do not view elected bodies as policy development partners or as audiences that must be analyzed, persuaded, and treated respectfully. Bent and Rossum, in

particular, draw the lines between “us”, the public administrators who must enact the legislative policies and “them”, the policy-makers who are foolishly optimistic that administrative solutions can be located simply because a problem exists and the politicians are demanding a solution to it and thus exercising leadership. This biased view of both the policrat and her audience may begin to explain the roots of the policrat’s undervaluing or downright disrespecting the policy-makers who inhabit a similar space as the policrat: the local government. Cantine’s urban administrators displayed a complex understanding of the demands on policrats, but Cantine chose to exclude critical elements of the PEF, such as the policy-making audience and the interrelationship between the policrat and the elected officials in his analysis. Although Cantine focused on the policrats’ and their skills and abilities since his goal was to influence public administration educators, omitting the administrator’s relationship with elected officials perpetuates the policrat’s under-preparedness in dealing with them. Despite his efforts to augment the policrat’s formal skills, this omission negatively impacts the policrat’s performance and effectiveness. Cantine looks inward and concludes that the “urban administrator is a person of action. He is instinctively analyzing, developing strategy, searching for and seizing upon opportunities and working the system to insure successful execution” (29-30) – a very favorable conclusion especially in light of Boren’s contemporary and more widely held critique. Cohen, Eimicke and Heikkila (2008) understand the competing demands politicians, agencies and the public place on policrats:

- innovation within an effective, and efficient agency that does not bust the public budget;
- the public’s need for government services; and
- citizens’ unfavorable perception of public administration and policrats in particular.

These authors strive to identify the problems that policrats must face and to address these issues including communicating with “the outside world” (xvii); the authors provide advice on how to “maintain a professional reputation” (xvii). One of the recurring themes in their book is that “management is largely the art of influencing people” (xviii). Communication, persuasion and maintaining a professional ethos are rhetorical concepts yet it is interesting, that the authors studiously avoid making any reference to rhetoric or rhetorical skills, although they clearly value persuasiveness and credibility as critical characteristics for an effective policrat.

As a whole, public administration scholarship and curriculum understand the nuanced and complex environment the policrat inhabits. This field of study recognizes the many skills a policrat must master to succeed in her government career. However, public administration discussions refer to the policrat’s discourse, her elected official audience(s), or her reality, as separate elements rather than system components that I argue constitute the PEF. The public administration textbooks I reviewed do not discuss the interrelationship among these elements and their impact on the policrat herself and thus miss the reiterative nature of exchanges and the impact of the overall PEF on the policrat’s ethos. Communication and persuasion are mentioned as components of policrat’s duties and responsibilities, but they are subordinated to both subject matter expertise and management skills. Policrats are not encouraged to consider the rhetorical construction of their texts, the impact of these texts on their audiences, the impact of regular, ongoing presentations to policy-making bodies, or the influence that discourse and audience exert on the policrat and her professional ethos. Since the textbooks used to prepare policrats neither acknowledge nor explain that knowledge can be created through the communicative acts that policrats simply cannot avoid, the policrats continue to be under-prepared for effective *bureauspeak*.

Chapter Three - *Ethos* and Respect

As explored in Chapter 2, public administration textbooks address policrats' *ethos* in a limited fashion, primarily by encouraging these political actors to build their credibility through subject matter expertise and managerial skills. However, these textbooks do not address rhetorical aspects of credibility-building such as analyzing an audience to develop an understanding of politicians' goals, values and objectives within a specific topic or analyzing the politicians' previous experience both as policy-makers and professionals within the politicians' respective fields of expertise. Neither do these textbooks address invention and delivery considerations that impact on the audience's goodwill toward the policrat. This chapter begins to discuss the concept of respect as it relates to the policrat's *ethos* and her ability to build a professional, respectful relationship with her audience.

GOVERNING GAZE

Janet Emig introduces the notion of a *governing gaze*, a steady way of perceiving actuality" (65) in her article "Inquiry Paradigms and Writing" (1982). According to Emig, perception is a complex and selective process. The *governing gaze* is informed by expectations and experiences. Although her discussion specifically relates to investigators' approaches to their questions of inquiry when researching within Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS), it provides a useful concept to explore *bureauspeak*. According to Emig, there are no more than three governing gazes: positivistic, phenomenological, or transactional/constructivist. (65) I have discussed her description of the transactional/constructivist gaze in Chapter 2. In her 1982 work, Emig focuses on comparing positivistic gazers, who rely on the scientific method, focus on facts and do not consider the context in which the facts or phenomena occur, and

phenomenologists, whose “focus upon the phenomenon must include acknowledgment of the field” (66). For Emig, these two types of gazes are “diametrically different” with the transactional/constructivist mediating between the two extremes. I propose to use Emig’s term in a slightly different way. Although not exactly researching in the academic sense, politicians may be seeking potential solutions to policy concerns and social issues during public deliberations. Thus, they too develop a *governing gaze* when they are the policy-making audience reviewing and analyzing recommendations on policy matters. I posit that, although the concept of governing gaze as expressed by Emig is applied to the researcher’s perception, it can also apply to a policy-making audience who is analyzing a presentation for facts and political feasibility. A politicians’ *governing gaze*, formed by expectations and experiences will inform their perceptions of respectful policrat presentations. As with the different approaches to inquiry, politicians may prefer to receive only technical information to shape their decisions, or they may prefer a presentation that makes recommendations based on both political reality and technical information and best practices within a social context, or like the transactionalist/constructivist, they may question how implementing a particular policy interacts with the context, changing both the context and the actors within the context. Regardless of their preferred approach, they expect that the rhetorically adept policrat will recognize the differences in her audience and develop discourse that meets the audience’s needs.

Since the elements discussed in chapter two are in constant interaction, a factor outside the communication sphere must exist that provides stability or constancy to the interactions within the *political epistemic field*. The audience may subscribe to any of Emig’s three governing gazes, and the perception of respectful rhetoric within each of the gazes may or may not vary depending on the experiences and expectations the audience brings to the political

epistemic field. However, recognizing the existence of the politician's *governing gaze(s)* and how the perception of respect interacts and informs the PEF may explain why a policrat's recommendation may be dismissed on one issue but may become the implemented policy on another topic. I argue that respect is a core component of the politicians' governing gaze which, in turn, interacts with the complexities of the policrat's *ethos* and the other elements of the PEF. Whether or not a policrat and her *bureauspeak* are perceived as respectful will impact on the *political epistemic field* (PEF) and continuing interactions within it. The complexities associated with the policrat's *ethos* and descriptions of *respect* and *respectful rhetorical practices* are addressed in this chapter.

ETHOS

Respect and the *ethos* of a public speaker such as a policrat appear intrinsically linked even in the earliest discussions of *ethos*. An exploration of Aristotle's *On Rhetoric* yields implicit and tacit understandings of respect between speaker and audience. Much like enthymemes, unstated premises that both the speaker and the audience know and understand, Aristotle's discussions of the elements in the *epistemic field* presuppose that his own audience had a similar understanding of the role *respect* plays in public discourse and that it was a *governing gaze* at that time. Aristotle discusses *ethos*, and its particular importance in public deliberations in several places in *On Rhetoric*. He first mentions *character*, which Kennedy translates to *ethos*, in Book One when he asserts that persuasion occurs "through character whenever the speech is spoken in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence" (38). According to Aristotle, whenever the issue being discussed is in doubt, when it is being deliberated, "fair-minded" (38) people are believed more readily than others. At this point, Aristotle focuses on the speech itself rather than the rhetor or the audience's previous

experiences with him⁵; thus, the speech is persuasive as opposed to the speaker, and each speech must stand on its own as either persuasive or not. Kennedy expands this notion of independent persuasiveness by clarifying that “Aristotle thus does not include in rhetorical ethos the authority that a speaker may possess due to his position in government or society, previous actions, reputation for wisdom, or anything except what is actually contained in the speech and the character it reveals” (note, 38).

The absence of status or position based on previous experience or technical competence in discussions of *ethos* may appear foreign and artificial, particularly in the government sector where subject matter experts are specifically hired to provide technical information and recommendations to policy-making bodies. The PEF assumes that status and expertise transfer from one interaction to others, and that the audience will consider its previous experience with a policrat, the policrat’s status and technical competence along with the audience’s own personal, professional, and educational experience. Politicians and policrats working in municipal governments have the opportunity to become familiar with each other through on-going, sometimes weekly, public interactions as well as through meetings, briefings and interactions that include politicians, policrats, and constituents. The policrat’s rhetorical practices become familiar to the politician, and the policy-makers learn the policrat’s style, expertise, and even specific budgetary and policy demands that plague the policrat and her department. These experiences and knowledge about the policrat transfer from one interaction to the next regardless of whether those interactions are intimate, occurring in the politician’s office or public, occurring at public meetings. In other words, the interactions among PEF elements are continually occurring, evolving and impacting on each other.

⁵ In my discussions of Aristotle, I refer to the speaker as “he” since public speakers contemporary to Aristotle would have been male.

For example, politicians, the policrat's primary audience, bring varied levels and types of experience and education to the policy-making process. At the municipal level in particular, city council members may be self-made business-owners, engineers, attorneys, medical doctors, educators, military retirees, or homemakers. These politicians may argue that their competence in policy matters derives not from technical or subject matter expertise, but from lived experience and proximity to their constituencies that the policrat cannot duplicate. Further, politicians may have dealt with professionals in the same fields as their staff; in their professional or day-to-day life, elected officials have likely consulted with accountants, financial experts, attorneys and doctors and bring expectations from these experiences onto the decision-making dais. They also remember previous interactions with the policrats themselves; although the topics may vary, the politicians bring expectations based on these previous experiences to the current interaction. The rhetorically adept policrat will be cognizant of these expectations and use them to create a credible and trustworthy *ethos* for herself.

Aristotle provides policrats with a primer to create and enact a credible and trustworthy *ethos* in Book Two. He addresses rhetoric's role in deliberations and the effective rhetor's projection of his persona to favorably dispose his audience toward him and toward the purpose of that specific speech. Aristotle indicates,

[S]ince rhetoric is concerned with making a judgment (people judge what is said in deliberation, and judicial proceedings are also a judgment), it is necessary not only to look to the argument that it may be demonstrative and persuasive but also [for the speaker] to construct a view of himself as a certain kind of person and to prepare the judge; 3. for it makes much difference in regard to persuasion

(especially in deliberations but also in trials) that the speaker seem to be a certain kind of person and that his hearers suppose him to be disposed toward them in a certain way [favorably or unfavorably to him]. 4. For the speaker to seem to have certain qualities is more useful in deliberation; for the audience to be disposed in a certain way [is more useful] in lawsuits; for things do not seem the same to those who are friendly and those who are hostile (Kennedy, 120).

The rhetor should represent himself so as to elicit friendliness and goodwill in his audience, and Aristotle discusses the audience's feelings in his section on emotions. Wisdom and virtue form *ethos*, but goodwill is characterized as the *pathos* in the audience. Thus, Aristotle argues that the rhetor *demonstrates* wisdom and virtue but is responsible for *eliciting* the audience's goodwill. The audience responds to the rhetor based on how the rhetor represents his own nature. Aristotle's treatise on *ethos* focuses on the audience's character and how the rhetor can adapt his speech given the audience's character. In the *ethos* section of Book Two, Aristotle segments his male audience into age groups: the young, the old and the prime. He also categorizes the audience into other dichotomies: wealthy/poor, educated/illiterate, healthy/sickly and powerful/without influence. By creating this implicit association between the speaker's *ethos* and the audience's characteristics and socio-political and socio-economic status, Aristotle recognizes the interactions between two elements of the PEF: rhetor and audience. The rhetor must craft discourse that is appropriate for the audience and that will elicit goodwill given the audience's specific characteristics. Rhetor and audience interact and the discourse changes based on these transactions. Although this interaction is not explicitly stated, Aristotle creates a precursor to the transactions that Berlin describes in his discussions of the *epistemic field*. By

recognizing that the rhetor must adapt his discourse to the audience, Aristotle is acknowledging that the speech is not static and that the rhetor must know his audience's characteristics, monitor their reactions based on these characteristics, and adapt his discourse to be effective. Although Aristotle's recommendations appear to indicate unidirectional transactions, the rhetor and his discourse impacted by the audience, they nonetheless indicate that interactions occur and that the elements are not independent, isolated, and immutable.

Given Aristotle's recommendation that the speaker should appear to have certain qualities and that he should attempt to elicit certain disposition(s) from his audience, his explanations of emotions are particularly useful as this study explores *respect* within the PEF transactions. Aristotle provides descriptions of negative behavior that are analogous to modern descriptions of disrespect and disrespectful behavior. For example, Aristotle describes three manifestations⁶ of belittling that can cause anger in the audience: contempt, spite, and insult (Kennedy, 125). Belittling approximates the opposite end of the respect spectrum since it supposes another's subordinate social position, or, in an extreme case, worthlessness (Kennedy, 125) while descriptions of respect include high esteem or regard for another. Aristotle lists rhetor's characteristics which may elicit friendly feelings and thus foreshadows proposed respectful markers and desired polycrat behavior during PEF transactions. According to Aristotle, and audience will feel friendly towards those who

- are disposed to do good to others in regard to money and safety;
therefore, they honor generous and brave people;
- are just;
- are self-controlled;

⁶ Aristotle discusses "species" of belittling. I prefer the term *manifestations* since the species are observed by the intended recipient as behaviors that would be manifested in the interactions between the speaker and the target audience.

- are pleasant to deal with...good tempered and not critical of people's faults and not contentious or quarrelsome;
 - are ready to make or receive a joke...able to be kidded and kidding in good sport;
 - are neat in appearance and in dress and in all their way of life;
 - long for the same things when it is possible to share them at the same time;
 - join in doing good, unless greater evils are going to result for themselves;
 - are not deceitful with them; such are those who even tell them their faults;
 - are not intimidating and with whom we [as the audience] feel secure
- (Kennedy, 135-7).

This partial list of characteristics, although, in many cases, describing a “state of being” for the presenter, can only be observed and determined by a policy-making audience through on-going interaction with polibrats both during formal deliberations and informal exchanges. These characteristics can be mined for markers of respectful behavior in modern-day public deliberations.

Thus far, Aristotle has described rhetor's and audience's characteristics without addressing the manner in which the messages are delivered or mentioning *respect*. He does, however, specifically mention respect when he addresses style in Book Three. He indicates that the style⁷,

⁷ Kennedy describes *lexis* as style to include word choice and sentence structure and composition. (Glossary, 317).

1. The *lexis* will be appropriate if it expresses emotion and character and is proportional to the subject matter. 2. Proportion exists if there is neither discussion of weighty matters in a casual way nor shoddy things solemnly and if ornament is not attached to a shoddy word. Otherwise, the result seems comedy...3. Emotion is expressed if the style ...in the case of admirable things, [if they are spoken] *respectfully* (235, emphasis added).

Thus, for Aristotle, style, *ethos*, and *pathos* intertwine to create a persuasive speech buttressed by the rhetor's respectful behavior and demeanor.

While Aristotle claimed that the rhetor established his *ethos* in each speech without any transference from one instance to another, Roman culture had a high regard and respect for authority, both within the family and in other socio-political structures, so Roman *ethos* was established differently and attached itself to the rhetor based on his social status and also from one speaking situation to the next. To acquire authority, dignity, glory, and a worthy reputation, "a Roman had to prove, by means of his own actions or his ancestors', that his ethos deserved to be respected" (May, 7). Thus, James May's *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* highlights respect as transacted between the speaker and his audience. May discusses the importance of *ethos* in the social, political, and judicial environments of Republican Rome and credits Cicero with restoring the *pisteis*⁸ and *ethos* in particular (3). Because Roman judicial practices, unlike Greek courts, allowed for representation, opportunities for *ethos* multiplied as

⁸ Aristotle based his rhetorical system on three *pisteis*, or sources of rhetorical persuasion: *ethos*, the speaker's moral character; *pathos*, setting the audience in a particular state of mind; and *logos*, the logical argumentation of the speech itself. The three *pisteis* or sources refer to three elements in the *political epistemic field* discussed in this project: speaker, audience and speech. According to May, Aristotle afforded the three *pisteis* equal weight (2).

additional actors entered the speaking space and so “ethos in Roman oratory can only be expected to have taken on a greater significance, played a larger role, and admitted more artistic application than its counterpart in Greek oratory” (May, 10). *Ethos* provided “the chief source of proof in the speech” and permeated the entire rhetorical structure of the speech often allowing for tangential discussions that further supplemented and supported the case (May, 11 and 47).

While a policrat may be burdened with the negative bureaucrats’ reputation⁹ that appears prevalent in US society, and she therefore does not operate in the same realm where the audience respects her authority, Ciceronian and Roman rhetoric aids modern discussions of *ethos* because it diverges from Aristotelian thought and introduces the concept that *ethos* follows the orator from speech to speech and interaction to interaction. May concedes that Cicero’s use of *ethos* may seem inappropriate and inadequate in today’s courts because our society is not steeped in the unchanging character of a man or of his pedigree. However, Cicero’s adept manipulation of *ethos* and full understanding of the socio-political structures that influenced his audience continue to be important concepts for today’s orator.

Even Kennedy, Aristotle’s translator, criticizes Aristotle’s attempt to reduce the impact of the audience’s familiarity with a speaker and his *ethos*. Charles Marsh quotes Kennedy’s 1996 critique: “Perhaps the most conspicuous lack in the *Rhetoric*, given Aristotle’s own conception of the subject, is its failure to take account of the role in rhetoric of the authority and prestige of the speaker” (176). Marsh argues that orality-literacy scholars have described a condition termed *oral spell*, “a phenomenon capable of mesmerizing both speaker and audience” to such

⁹ Although the public administration textbooks reviewed in this project call for increased professionalism in civil service and note the increased educational expectations for public administrators, as Chapter 2 indicated, politicians consider texts produced by policrats as unclear. Boren’s analysis goes beyond criticizing texts and castigates policrats for failing to create understanding, purposely muddling issues, and only appearing concerned yet not providing any effective proposals. “Red tape” is continually mentioned by politicians and the public during policy deliberations thus indicating the frequent and generalized poor conceptions of policrats and their discourse/texts which spill over to perceptions of their *ethos*.

an extent that the audience's critical thinking is suspended. Quoting several of Plato's texts, Marsh shows that Plato declared himself spellbound by orators of his time. Socrates is described as breaking the spell by interrupting the orator. Such admissions by Socrates and Plato may indicate that Aristotle's discussion of a pristine *ethos* meant that an effective rhetor in an oral society could so affect the audience that they no longer remembered *who* was speaking, but became enamored with *what* was said. A skilled rhetor could become transparent to the audience and force their attention to the spoken word. It is unclear if polycrats can weave such a spell. Politicians may hold certain topics very dear to them and will focus on the discourse; further, the polycrat's and politician's respective expertises and previous experiences with one another and with the topic under discussion may prevent the phenomenon Plato described. Expertise is a complex construct dealing both with attributed knowledge and skill and the audience's perception of expertise; I explore this concept further in this chapter.

Romans, in their republican, civic context, over-emphasized the audience's respect *for* the rhetor; modern rhetorical discussions privilege the rhetor's expertise and status as presenter. However discussions regarding the respectful practices an adept orator deploys and the impact of such strategies on the rhetor's effectiveness or interactions with the audience are not readily available. For example, Helen Constantinides, in attempting to "extend Aristotle's civic concept of *ethos* to the scientific forum" finds that

"it loses its specificity. . . [and]. . . is reduced to a vague sense of credibility"

(61). She argues that Aristotle's feature of "good character and wanting the best for others...is an insufficient description of the scientific character, as well, in that it fails to account for the vaunted objectivity of the scientist" (61).

Constantinides analyzes four scientific texts and argues that the “relationship between social norms and textual analysis provides a precise definition of scientific ethos” yet she also concludes that practice has outstripped theory and further research is necessary to harmonize the two (71). This definition of a scientific *ethos* may have Aristotelian roots, but is divergent enough to warrant new theoretical formulations in contexts or realities that differ greatly from those Aristotle contemplated including the municipal PEF.

Aristotle’s theory may prove inadequate to fully describe *ethos* in every situation, however, I argue that the unifying perspective Constantinides identifies as lacking in rhetorical analyses of scientific texts (71) may be a more prevalent gap that is not particular to the scientific realm. Social norms, as Constantinides indicates, will impact a specific rhetorical situation and both the enactment and perception of the rhetor’s *ethos*. However, the unifying perspective may very well be the rhetor’s ability to enact a respectful *ethos* both in writing and orally.

Ülkü D. Demirdögen’s 2010 article “The Roots of Research in (Political) Persuasion: Ethos, Pathos, Logos and the Yale Studies of Persuasive Communications,” a recent analysis of Aristotelian concepts of *ethos*, explores political *ethos* and persuasion and looks to Aristotle’s treatise to trace modern views of *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* to Greek roots. Demirdögen bases his analysis on the research conducted at Yale in the 1950s which he describes as a scientific attempt to estimate the importance of Aristotle’s *pisteis* in persuasive discourse. Demirdögen is relevant because he also establishes that persuasion is the “central aim of political interaction” (190) thus, “the political process typically involves elements of persuasion in order to reach a final decision” (191). Although this is not a new concept, Demirdögen’s explicit recognition that persuasion, and thus rhetoric, are present in the political processes highlights that policymakers who are involved in these processes must be rhetorically adept and aware of their role in reaching policy decisions.

When discussing *pathos* and its use within political communication, Demirdögen echoes Aristotle and cautions that before using emotional appeals the rhetor has to “assess the emotional state of ... [the] audience – an ability or skill which might be called as empathy or emotional intelligence in contemporary terms” (192). This awareness creates the exigency for strategic shifts in rhetorical appeals based on the rhetor’s assessment of the audience. The rhetor’s ability to quickly and effectively assess the audience and deploy different strategies requires a nimbleness that includes both an understanding of the audience’s emotional state, the newly appropriate appeal given this state, and the audience’s *governing gaze*: their perception of respectful rhetorical practices.

Demirdögen utilizes a set of characteristics identified by social psychologists in the 1990s that influence acceptance of persuasive communication as “(1) the source of the persuasive communication, (2) the characteristics of the message, [and] (3) the characteristics of the receiver and the context of the message” (194). Although Demirdögen likens this set to Aristotle’s *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*, the characteristics are more closely aligned to elements in the *political epistemic field*. Demirdögen’s *source* is analogous to the speaker/writer; the *message* more closely approximates the text or discourse, and the *receiver* and *context* bear greater similarities to Berlin’s concepts of audience and reality as discussed in Chapter Two. For Demirdögen, the context includes the medium in which the message is delivered and is therefore impacted by technology. However, the medium as well as other contextual factors can be more generally classified as Berlin’s concept of reality.

According to Demirdögen, “both expertise and trustworthiness emerge as basic dimensions of credibility because only when these two aspects exist together can we have reliable communication” (194). This modern description of *ethos* is relatively unchanged from

Aristotle's description. Credibility combines subject matter expertise and a sense of trust; however the actual demonstration of these characteristics, their effective enactment for persuasive communication, relies on assumptions from both the rhetor and the audience. Both rhetor and audience expected to understand how the presenter must convey her expertise and trustworthiness to the audience. Demirdögen concedes that while the Yale group's research did not establish definitive laws of persuasion, it "led to a greater understanding of persuasion" (199). Establishing credibility and trustworthiness is the policrat's responsibility. She is expected to establish her credibility by analyzing her audience and achieving technical competence. However, the PEF demands a flexibility and dexterity in the effective policrat that requires an understanding of how the audience will react to both the policrat's characteristics, and the respectful style incorporated into the message. Since expertise permeates discussions of *ethos* regardless of the context, it is important to briefly explore what expertise means and how it is attributed to rhetors in general.

EXPERTISE

A policrat's subject matter mastery, her technical knowledge and experience are key components of her *ethos*; public administration textbooks emphasize this knowledge. Discussions of *ethos*, however, combine this mastery and knowledge, with experience to create *expertise*. Johanna Hartelius's *The Rhetoric of Expertise* plumbs the "concept's fundamental rhetoricity" (3) and further nuances the PEF. Hartelius argues that any definition of expertise carries with it "social, political, and material implications" and that bestowing expert status on a person generates considerable influence (4). Thus, when policrats represent themselves as subject matter experts, their audience implicitly understands that they are seeking an elevated status vis-à-vis the policymakers and the public in general. Elected officials may resist this

implicit request for power by arguing a different type of expertise: that gained through lived experience and constant communication with constituents most impacted by enacted policies. Although this project focuses on the policrat's *ethos* and the role *expertise* plays in creating a professional policrat's *ethos*, it is important to understand the tension between the rhetor's and audiences' expertises that may exist within the PEF.

To further explain expertise's impact, Hartelius' distinguishes between autonomous and attributed expertise. Autonomous expertise, she argues, makes recognition from others irrelevant (4); it exists independently of an audience's perception. Attributed expertise "exists only as a symbolic relationship" and is present when an individual is recognized as an expert based on his performance and *persuasiveness* but not necessarily on whether or not he possesses superior knowledge (4, emphasis added). Hartelius recognizes that attributed expertise remains a concern for political scientists as they study elected officials who must rely on professional experts.

Politicians can no more maintain expert knowledge in all matters than can their constituents. When making decisions, they too must defer to the content-specific expertise of political interest groups and research agencies. When experts are constructed as a class of political advisers, expertise emerges as a product or service, whereby those who own the products can provide them for those who do not. There exists, in other words, an unstated economy in which expertise is a personal asset (6).

Hartelius in effect endows policrats, and other experts in the PEF such as consultants,¹⁰ with different personal assets from the politicians when these rhetors are either perceived or

¹⁰ *Consultants*, in this study, are subject matter experts who specialize in a field of municipal government but are not employed by the municipality. They are contracted by the local government to provide advice on specific matters. For example, a city may hire outside engineers and architects, financial analysts, and legal counsel to prepare and execute legal, financial and design tasks in a capital project such as the construction of a stadium.

presented as *experts* during policy deliberations. Perhaps intuitively policrats and politicians recognize that the personal and socially-attributed assets they both bring to the discussion create tension within the *political epistemic field*. Attributing superior technical knowledge to individuals would normally increase their trustworthiness and augment a professional *ethos*. However, in the political sphere, politicians also cling to their *ethos* as the public's elected representatives and their constituents' voice; they claim an expertise that policrats cannot. Thus, both parties in the PEF may have autonomous and attributed expertise in different ways and these expertises may collide during public policy discussions. Hartelius' key proposition is that "individuals can only exercise expertise and enjoy expert status to the extent that they can motivate an audience to assent" (9). Hartelius seems to follow a conquest perspective of rhetoric when she further argues that "experts use both their 'real' knowledge and experience in a specific field *and* their rhetorical prowess to persuade an audience" (9, emphasis in original). By choosing the term "prowess" as opposed to "skill," "agility," or "adeptness," Hartelius perpetuates rhetoric's long-standing assertion that the experts' ability to forcefully convince an audience is a valued and expected outcome in expert/audience interactions. This traditional expectation is in stark contrast to the underlying principle in *epistemic fields* that the constant and recurring interactions among elements allow knowledge creation and foster understanding. Despite her traditional measure of a rhetor's effectiveness, Hartelius's study highlights critical characteristics of the adept policrat in the PEF: experience and agility. A novice public administrator, regardless of her technical expertise might not be considered an expert under Hartelius's definition because she would lack experience and rhetorical ability.

These consultants work with policrats to deliver the projects as approved by the policy-makers, but their relationship with the politicians is different from that of the policrat. Nonetheless, their expertise complements policrat presentations; they are another set of experts within the PEF.

Hartelius explicates expertise as a rhetorical strategy and thus finds elements that individuals hoping to craft an expert persona can utilize. Without minimizing superior subject matter knowledge, Hartelius argues that “[e]ffective rhetors rely on multiple means [to persuade]; the more [means] they have at their disposal, the more likely they are to be viewed as experts” (9). Relying heavily on Aristotelian concepts of artistic and inartistic means of persuasion, Hartelius nuances the artistic dimension which she indicates “is fundamentally context- and audience-contingent [and] requires more adaptation to an audience than does the inartistic dimension” (9). The artistic dimension seems to tacitly include respectful practices since the rhetor must adapt to the audience’s perception including the audience’s *governing gaze* during deliberations. Expertise’s rhetorical performance demands subject matter knowledge, experience, and an understanding of the PEF and the interactions among PEF elements.

Hartelius argues that to be persuasive, the expert must perform expertly (10). This statement raises a distinction between expert knowledge and expert performance. While the two are different with expert performance, referring to the delivery, enactment and interaction with an audience, and expert knowledge referring to superior experience and subject matter mastery, the two concepts are intertwined and their relationship can become complex. Expert performance depends on and is evaluated by the audience. However, without expert performance and rhetorical adeptness, according to Hartelius, the rhetor cannot persuade. I argue that without adequate rhetorical adeptness the rhetor cannot generate knowledge or create understanding. Whether the rhetor seeks to persuade or create understanding, the rhetor must plumb her specialized knowledge and experience from the time she begins preparing a presentation to her final delivery. Her inventive process, idea-generating methodology, and

delivery or performance are constant interactions between experience and knowledge that allow the rhetor to demonstrate her expertise and share her knowledge with the audience expertly.

Hartelius ties expertise to *ethos* when she states “source credibility, or *ethos*, redefines expertise as a combination of the expert’s knowledge and competence and her perceived trustworthiness and goodwill” (11). Hartelius does not explicate trustworthiness or goodwill beyond her explanations of expertise despite noting that they are components of the *ethos* created; however she recognizes that they form the expert’s overall *ethos*. Creating trustworthiness and goodwill, although linked to specialized knowledge and experience, are also separate elements that the expert must somehow elicit in the audience. I argue that respectful enactment of expertise allows the policrat to construct a perception of trustworthiness and goodwill in her audience.

RESPECT

A working description for *respect* is necessary if it is used as a critical component of the politician’s *governing gaze*¹¹ that marks effective policrat’s *bureauspeak*. Various common definitions of *respect* highlight that it is a relatively usual term with observable attitudes and behaviors. No definition is brief. Typical definitions include esteem, consideration, and courtesy, or “polite or good behavior toward s[omebody] or s[omething] that shows you recognize their importance, admiration for somebody because of something impressive they have done, to treat s[omebody] or s[omething] well to show you admire them or believe they are important” (Kernerman English Learner’s Dictionary); “to regard with special attention; to regard as worthy of special consideration; hence, to care for; to heed” (Webster’s Dictionary). Most common definitions describe behaviors and attitudes on the part of the person showing

¹¹ *Governing gaze* refers to the politicians’ constant or steady way of perceiving presentations, particularly those provided by policrats.

respect that recognize another individual's importance and consequential treatment with courtesy, consideration, and care. Some definitions specifically mention the audience's or recipients' status as another factor in demonstrating *respect*. In other words, the individual exhibiting *respect* is aware of her audience's importance and has incorporated this awareness in her demeanor and behavior. *Respect*, as commonly described, is overarching, observable and recognized by both the respectful individual and the respected audience. While politicians must be mindful of the elected officials' status in any communication, public administrators must also realize that policymakers are not the sole audience. The public is an ever-present audience, and they too, must be considered when the presentation is created and delivered. It is important to note that while both the rhetor and audience appear to be aware of respectful behaviors, it is the audience's perception that governs whether or not the rhetor achieves respectfulness. The rhetor's respectful intentions are not sufficient; the audience must perceive those intentions as respectful. Respect is thus transacted; it is not unidirectional. Respect must emanate from a source and be received as respectful by the intended recipient. Absent this transaction, the rhetor has not met the audience's expectations for a respectful exchange.

Common definitions for *respect*, however, do not address what constitutes a respectful attitude in communication or how a respectful relationship is forged through rhetorical practices. Sociology and psychology provide points of departure, but research into *respect* and *disrespect* is an emerging field of study in these disciplines as well as in RWS. Psychologists David W. Shwalb and Barbara J. Shwalb in the introductory chapter to their edited volume *Respect and Disrespect: Cultural and Developmental Origins* (2006) acknowledge that although respect has powerful social ramifications and "is essential in a civil society and crucial to positive human relations" (2), it "has been the target of very little systematic research" (1). Since research is

sparse, scholarly definitions for respect and disrespect are evolving and are complicated by issues of measurement, context, culture, and value (2). Shwalb and Shwalb invite their contributors to explore how *respect* and *disrespect* are associated with “other relevant psychological constructs such as morality, prosocial behavior, altruism, obedience, and liking for others.” (2) This exploration may yield information about observable behavior or traits that can be reviewed as part of the career administrator’s *ethos* and her rhetorical practices within the PEF. The psychological constructs Shwalb and Shwalb describe are also reminiscent of Aristotle’s list of characteristics that elicit friendliness in an audience or in the recipient of respectful behaviors.

Shwalb and Shwalb describe respect as the “belief that enables one to value other people, institutions, and traditions” (2). While these researchers explore respect in general, valuing people, institutions and traditions is critical within the PEF. A respectful policrat demonstrates her regard and understanding for her primary and secondary audiences (people), the government and its democratic processes including public involvement practices (institutions), and the context, including constituents’ values, cultures and beliefs, in which policies will be implemented (traditions). Although researchers use different terms for these intertwined elements, they too are describing elements that are analogous to those in the PEF. People are the audience and institutions and traditions may be considered sub-categories of the rhetor’s reality. Shwalb and Shwalb caution against considering disrespect as the polar opposite of respect even though it “may be one reason for incivility and polarization between individuals and between groups” (2) and probe whether “respectful and disrespectful behavior, thinking, and traits” are specific to a situation or if they are dependent on giver or recipient” (3). They further complicate respect by conceding that an individual’s public actions may be respected while his private

actions are disrespected. Although they do not set this duality within the political context, it can certainly be applied to the PEF. The reality that rhetor and audiences occupy may be rife with knowledge about both the policrat and politician's public and private actions. Within the intimacy of a municipal environment where politicians, public and policrats know each other, borders between the public and private spheres may become blurred or permeable and may further complicate both the enactment and perception of respectful rhetorical practices in a public setting.

Richard Sennett explores *respect* from a sociological perspective¹² and laments its paucity in his 2003 book *Respect in a World of Inequality*. Similarly to the common definitions of *respect* and to Shwalb and Shwalb's descriptions, Sennett considers synonyms associated with respect including "status," "prestige," and "honor" but settles on "taking the needs of others seriously" as a working definition of how respect is enacted (52). He argues that status and prestige are inadequate definitions because an element of superiority is introduced that dictates "whose needs count and who gets recognition." (53) Further, Sennett argues that both prestige and status are missing a mutuality which is essential for recognition to occur. Recognition, in turn, "means respecting the needs of those who are unequal" (54) and requires expression and enactment. Mutuality, although not specifically described, must be performed according to Sennett (59). One of the ways society shapes character "so that people earn, or fail to arouse, respect" is by respecting others (64). Sennett argues that this expression is the most important because self-development and self-sufficiency, the two other ways society shapes character, do not develop the mutuality he has described as necessary for respect

¹² Although not explicitly stated, Sennett's work could also be considered Critical Race Theory. He studies the relative political power of those who are respected and those who are expected to be respectful within a critical analysis of othering based on racial markers.

Sennett also describes respect in terms of “giving back to others” (64) indicating mutuality exists. This attribute is also similar to Aristotle’s notion that a rhetor desires good for his audience. Sennett views respect in American society and not within specific organizations so hierarchical and relative positions do not apply as they would within a government agency. His explanations advance the notion that respect is enacted; however, he does not describe the specific behaviors or actions that constitute respect. While Shwalb and Shwalb ponder if respect is giver- or recipient-dependent, for Sennett, respect emanates from the giver, and, although the giver may recognize inequality in the recipient, she nonetheless does not belittle her audience. This is an important concept when superimposed in a context where expertise is either implied or made explicit. An expert, respectful policrat acknowledges her potentially superior technical knowledge, but she does not compose or deliver presentations in such a manner as to diminish or belittle the less technically savvy audience.

Robin L. Harwood, Alev Yalcinkaya, Banu Citlak, and Birgit Leyendecker explore cross-cultural markers of respect in their chapter “Respect Among Turkish and Puerto Rican Migrant Mothers” and base their research on Harwood, Miller, and Lucca Irizarry’s concept that “[r]espect is a multidimensional construct” (9). For Harwood, Miller, and Lucca Irizarry, three dimensions of respect emerged from their work with Puerto Rican mothers both in Puerto Rico and in Connecticut. The most applicable dimension for a broader setting such as the PEF is the first one: “1) proper interpersonal behavior that is important to harmonious relationships,” including politeness and manners (9). The two other dimensions deal with the individual’s recursive respectful behavior fostering feelings of respect from the immediate and extended family group and the immigrant community. In this particular article, Harwood et al. focused on respectful interpersonal behaviors” (15) but did not articulate what constitutes these behaviors.

They added terms such as “proper demeanor,” “obedient,” and “receptive to authority” when describing the expectations of appropriate behavior in the two focus groups studied (10-11). Their work within specific cultural groups adds to Shwalb and Shwalb’s argument that respect is culturally situated and constructed and can vary from subculture to subculture (Shwalb and Shwalb, 2005, and Sugie, Shwalb and Shwalb, 2005) and changes through an individual’s development (Shwalb and Shwalb, 2005, 68). However, the overall social construct embodied in respect, “transcends culture” (Sugie, Shwalb and Shwalb, 2005, 39). Respect is perceived through a *governing gaze* that is informed by cultural notions, but as a concept remains constant. An adept policrat will then recognize that while the context or reality in the PEF may change due to cultural aspects, she must nonetheless harmonize those cultural expectations with her presentation and delivery to display culturally acceptable respectful rhetorical practices. Shwalb and Shwalb argue for this cultural transcendence, particularly in Americans, in their chapter “Concept Development of Respect and Disrespect” (2005) when they indicate that “there is an overall consensus within American society about the general meaning of the words respect and disrespect” (68). Despite this assertion about a general consensus, respect’s meaning and enactment, especially within overtly hierarchical contexts, appears to be implicit, tacit, and observable, but difficult to define.

SUMMARY

In general, *respect* and *ethos* appear intrinsically linked since the earliest conceptions of western rhetoric. Aristotle’s discussions of *ethos* imply that to be effective or persuasive, the rhetor must display a respectful attitude when addressing his audience. The rhetor’s credibility depended on the audience’s perception that the rhetor was addressing them with a desire to accomplish good and with an attitude that valued the audience’s characteristics and

predispositions. Although for Aristotle each speech stood on its own and credibility did not transfer from one rhetorical event to another, the Romans understood *ethos* to include not only the rhetor's pedigree, education, and family, but also his continued display of exemplary oratory which also seems to implicitly include respecting and valuing the audience during each interaction.

Modern rhetors and policrats in particular may not enjoy the same prestige that ancient orators accrued; however, policrats should recognize that audiences remember previous experiences with the policrat and bring those expectations to subsequent interactions. These interactions then form the basis for the audience's perception of the policrat's *ethos*. As Hartelius indicates, *ethos* has become increasingly complicated to include not only subject matter expertise but also the performance of that expertise in a public venue. For a policrat, subject matter expertise must be balanced with the expertise the policy-makers bring to public discussions. Policrats who attempt to demonstrate their subject matter knowledge at the expense of their primary audience or by making that audience feel belittled may find that their expert status is not valued and their recommendations face scrutiny, not necessarily because of their merits, but because the policrat's delivery has predisposed the audience negatively.

Adapting Emig's concept of the *governing gaze* to the PEF supports Cohen et al.'s comment that politicians expect to be respected¹³. However, recognizing this expectation and how it is implicit in discussions of rhetorical principles is only the starting point for policrats. Definitions of respect are elusive, context-bound, and focus on the recipient's perception. Fostering respect appears to be a continuing process where the rhetor must intentionally practice respectful behaviors. Further, the audience must perceive and accept such behaviors as respectful. Policrats must also understand what constitutes respectful rhetorical practices and

¹³ I discuss this aspect of policy-making audiences in Chapter Two.

weave these behaviors into all their transactions in the PEF. Chapter Four begins to explore the elected officials' *governing gaze* and their conceptions of respectful and disrespectful rhetorical practices.

Chapter Four – Bureauspeak and Locally Elected Officials’ Perspectives

The *political epistemic field* (PEF) that local policrats occupy and the *ethos* they are expected to bring to public discussions create a unique and understudied discursive space. The policrats, subject matter experts within their respective fields, must navigate a public forum where their audience has the policy-making authority and the policrats albeit, experts and authorities in their field, do not wield the formal power to determine the final policy outcome. The primary audience, composed of policy-makers, is fully aware of the hierarchical structure in the discursive space and individual policy-makers bring expectations not only regarding the topic and desired outcome of the interactions, but also regarding the appropriate delivery and *ethos* the policrats must enact. Frequent and ongoing interactions between these two groups of political actors both form and inform their transactions. While this recursive pattern sometimes submerges the policy-makers’ role as an audience in their own perspective, I believe it is important to remind the policy-makers of their rhetorical role as an audience to then tease out the knotted expectations they have of their paid, in-house experts.

METHODOLOGY

To ascertain the elected official’s governing gaze and descriptions of respectful rhetorical practices, I conducted interviews of elected officials in the El Paso, Texas region based on an interview protocol reviewed by the University of Texas at El Paso Institutional Review Board (IRB). ¹⁴As per IRB requirements, I obtained written consent from the participants to 1) participate in the study; 2) record the interviews; and 3) use their name and/or position within the government or to maintain it confidential. To maintain participant confidentiality, I identified the participants with a code number. The first character in the code is the letter “M,” followed by the

¹⁴ Copies of IRB approval including the consent form presented to the interviewed elected officials are included in Appendix A.

last 2 digits of the calendar year in which the interview occurred, a dash and then a four digit code that identifies the sequence in which I interviewed the participant. Thus, politician M12-0004, for example is the fourth municipal elected politician I interviewed in 2012. I use these codes to quote and refer to politicians' responses throughout this project. I relied heavily on grounded theory to tease out themes from the interviewees' responses and begin theorizing perceptions of respectful rhetorical practices. I discuss the elements of my study in greater detail in the sections that follow.

Municipal Context

Since I have speculated throughout this study that the municipal government context sets a different tone for the interactions in the political epistemic field, I specifically sought to interview elected officials who were currently serving as locally elected officials or had previously served as locally elected officials in the El Paso/far west Texas region. El Paso, Texas, shares an international border with Cd. Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico. Together, the two sister cities form a region of over 2.7 million people and are considered "the largest bi-national, bilingual workforce in the Western Hemisphere" (Wikipedia). El Paso is the county seat for El Paso County. According to the US Census Bureau, the county's population is estimated at slightly over 825,000. Approximately 672,000 or 81% of the population in the county reside in the city. El Paso is the 19th largest city in the United States. Almost one third of the county's population is under 18 years, and about 81% of the population is "Hispanic or Latino." Approximately one fifth of the county's population hold a bachelor degree or higher; the median household income is \$38,259, or about \$12,000 less than the median household income for the State of Texas; one fourth of the population is below poverty level. Almost three quarters of the county's population speaks a language other than English at home (EP County Quick Facts from

the US Census). Whether or not these socio-economic factors impact on perceptions of respect by the community's elected officials is as yet undetermined; however, these factors: the population's youth, ethnicity, language use and financial condition, impact on the elected officials' governing gaze as they consider policy.

The majority of the elected representatives interviewed are current or former city council members for the City of El Paso, Texas. The City of El Paso transitioned from a strong mayor form of government to a city manager-council form of government in 2004 when El Pasoans approved the shift through a city-wide charter election. El Paso is the most recent major city in Texas to make this transition. This shift is significant because it means that the distance between high level bureaucrats – this study's policrats – and the elected officials becomes more pronounced. With a strong mayor form of government, the mayor is the municipality's chief executive officer. He or she is responsible for the executive branch of the municipal government and is, in effect, the policrats' direct boss. A mayor in this type of local government structure serves as both a legislator when working with the rest of the council members and as the executive ultimately responsible for implementing the policies adopted by the council. A mayor in a manager-council form of government serves solely as a legislator. For the City of El Paso, the mayor is the only city-wide elected official on the Council and vote solely to break ties. El Paso's mayor is considered the lead intergovernmental liaison. As a border city, this means El Paso's mayor deals not only with other mayors, the Texas governor, state and federal legislative delegations and state and federal agencies, but also with agencies involved in international issues such as the International Boundary and Water Commission, the Department of State, and with mayors and governors from Mexico.

The city representatives for the City of El Paso serve one of eight single-member districts; El Paso does not elect any at-large council members¹⁵. The eight council members and mayor form the city council and their only employee is the city manager who is appointed by the council and serves at their pleasure¹⁶. City managers are typically recruited through national searches with very public hiring processes. City manager applicants must demonstrate a proven track record of municipal government leadership and administration and meet the community's expectations for specific leadership qualities, vision and abilities. City managers navigate both the political sphere because they are hired by the city councils and the executive/expert sphere because they must bring an administrative skill set to their position. They must recommend policies to the elected officials, implement adopted policies, and manage the municipality's workforce.

The city manager is the top professional bureaucrat and the head of the executive branch of the municipal government. Ultimately, all city employees report to this individual. El Paso's city manager, her entire management team and staff are the in-house experts who usually make presentations to the policy-makers. The manager is the top policrat; her staff are policrats as well. El Paso's city manager oversees a total budget of over \$800 million, 27 departments, and almost 6,100 employees (City of El Paso & OMB, FY 2014 budget information). El Paso's city manager is responsible for developing a budget that addresses the City's basic functions as well as the policy direction council has provided for quality of life initiatives, debt management, capital project construction, new facility staffing and operations, and new program implementation by June of each year; the City Council then deliberates during the entire summer

¹⁵ At-large council members are elected in other Texas cities including Socorro, TX, a smaller municipality neighboring El Paso. These members are elected city-wide. Their purpose is typically to provide a city-wide approach to policy deliberations as opposed to focusing on the issues impacting the geographic area they represent.

¹⁶ City managers usually have employment contracts that specify causes for dismissal and any compensation due to the manager upon departure.

to approve the final budget levels before September 1st of each year. As with other cities, El Paso's needs outnumber the available resources. However, by state law, Texas cities are required to adopt balanced budgets where prudent revenue estimates meet or exceed anticipated expenditures. Thus, the manager must address the needs and policy direction at the budget process outset to provide the policy-makers with a fiscal plan that meets their basic needs and advances their vision for the community. The municipal context for El Paso then is one where some of the elected officials interviewed for this study remembered and had operated under the strong-mayor form of government and made the transition to manager-council form. Others had only operated under the manager-council form of government.

External Factors – Respondents' Reality and Policrats' Context

El Paso has had just one city manager, Joyce Wilson, since it transitioned from the strong-mayor form of government to manager-council form. Wilson's tenure has, by necessity, been one change for El Paso's municipal government. She hired deputy city managers, organized city departments into functional portfolios that reported to their respective deputy city manager, and reorganized city departments to fit the policy expectations of the Council. She proposed and advanced major capital project programs focusing on storm water infrastructure and then championed the creation of a storm water utility to collect fees and build upon the plans developed thus ensuring that the City did not experience the major damage it suffered during several extraordinary storm events in the summer of 2006. She proposed and advanced transportation programs that included both infrastructure and operational changes to the City's mass transit system. Her proposals usually received strong council support.

During my interview period of late September 2012 through April 2013, however, Wilson came under attack and disrespectful practices by high ranking policrats took center stage

in the El Paso region. Wilson's e-mails describing opponents to the City's initiative to build a downtown triple A baseball park as "crazies" and several council members as exhibiting signs of dementia became public. Offended council members called for her resignation; her supporters deflected disciplinary action (Kappes, 2012). Regardless of their individual positions, Wilson's discourse catapulted policrats' rhetorical practices to prominence for El Paso elected officials and the public. Whether or not the interviewees referred to the e-mails and the entire episode which had been labeled as disrespectful behavior by some including Wilson, I can only assume that policrats' rhetorical practices had become a concern for the elected officials and that they were acutely aware of this incident when they responded to my questions.

Interview Protocol

My first step to begin discerning patterns of respect in the PEF tapestry was to develop a survey of respectful behaviors. I developed the survey included in Appendix B and administered it to students in my second semester first-year composition course. The survey was strictly voluntary and administered close to the end of the spring 2012 semester in accordance with UTEP's IRB policies and procedures. My goal was to beta test the descriptors of respectful/disrespectful behavior and identify other behaviors not initially included. My expectation was that this initial survey, although administered to a much younger and inexperienced group than the anticipated group of politicians, would identify behaviors or phrase tags that were obvious to some, but that I had missed. The results of this beta test did not significantly alter my ultimate interview instrument. Although the beta test did not yield noteworthy changes to my proposed interview protocol document, administering the survey and evaluating the results provided me with additional insight to add phrases and behaviors to the

final interview questions. The interview protocol used for the politicians and the associated consent form as approved by the IRB are included in Appendix C.

The interview protocol is a set of questions regarding the politicians' opinions and perspectives about polibrats' rhetorical practices that I used as a guide for my interviews with the elected officials. Once I obtained the participants' consent to the interview, and to an audio recording of the interview, I proceeded by asking the questions on the protocol. I used the document to guide my questioning and to maintain consistency throughout the interviews. Depending on the interviewees' comments, I either followed the protocol strictly or adapted to address questions they had not already addressed through general comments. The interview protocol consists of three separate sets of questions designed to capture different types of information. The first set of questions focused on demographic information including the length of time in public office, and highest educational level attained.

The second set of questions asked the interviewees to identify behaviors, language use and rhetorical strategies as *respectful* or *disrespectful*. Selected questions from this part of the interview protocol include physical behaviors such as making eye contact with audience; listening actively; and nodding affirmatively. Language use presented to elected officials for their identification included phrases such as saying "sir" or "ma'am" when addressing audience; using the audience members honorific title when addressing him/her ("representative," "mayor," "judge," "commissioner," "Madam/Mr. chair); using slang; and saying "with all due respect." After the first interview, I combined similar behaviors into one question by asking the interviewee if he/she believed a particular behavior was *respectful*, *disrespectful*, or *neutral* rather than repeating the questions to determine how the interviewee categorized that particular behavior.

These questions provided valuable insights to the politicians' perspectives. However, the politicians responded to descriptions of behaviors without any context or without observing an interaction where these behaviors were enacted. I believe that the behaviors I described in the protocol, while based heavily on both my experience as a policrat and Aristotle's description of characteristics that either created or failed to create goodwill in an audience, did not allow the politicians sufficient opportunity to expose more aspects of their *governing gaze*, the politician's expectations and experiences that inform his/her perception of a respectful policrat presentation. Thus, I developed a third set of questions that are more open-ended and based on three separate video interactions between local policrats and their policy-making bodies. The interactions viewed are described below and the questions posed to the elected officials were based on those videos were the last section of the interview protocol. I sought politician/policrat exchanges where the interviewees were neither participants nor knowledgeable of the participants to obtain the politicians' reactions to the exchanges at other municipalities. I searched on-line, archived interactions between policrats and their respective governing bodies. Early in my project development, I decided against showing El Paso interactions since the interviewees would very likely know those policrats and could very well be participants themselves. Further, I believed such interactions, where the politicians could have been the initial live audience, would result in comments and reactions that did not necessarily focus on the interaction itself but could be permeated with other interaction factors that I could neither easily isolate nor discuss openly with the politicians.¹⁷

To bridge the gap between the questions that I asked about politicians' perspectives on behaviors, language use and rhetorical practice outside of a context, I selected three recorded

¹⁷ As I discovered through my interviews, the elected officials were rather willing to specifically name local policrats who they believed exemplified either respectful or disrespectful rhetorical practices.

interactions between policrats and their respective City Councils. My expectation was that by viewing interactions in a different PEF the elected officials could provide richer descriptions and insights about policrats' practices. Two of the selected videos took place in Laredo, Texas, and the third was in Dallas, Texas; the videos of these interactions were played for the local politicians and they answered the third set of questions regarding the elected officials' overall perception of the interactions both in terms of respect and persuasiveness. I chose interactions in Texas cities for two principal reasons. The first and most important reason was that other Texas cities would share a similar legal structure with the municipalities in the El Paso region. This means the interviewees would be familiar with underlying municipal responsibilities and legal framework for the issues being discussed. Secondly, cities within Texas provided the adequate distance from interactions in El Paso, but would not appear too foreign. Another selection criterion was that the Council members and the policrat had to interact; the presentation could not be one-sided. In each of the three selected presentations, Council members ask questions and request answers specifically from staff; staff then provides responses. I believed a conversation, a transaction, had to occur to illustrate how policrats handled questions that they might or might not have anticipated. Further, the selected interactions feature both male and female policrats and both Hispanic and Anglo policrats and Hispanic and Anglo politicians. The three interactions were edited for time, but no substantive discussion or exchanges between the politicians and the policrats were excluded from the videos that the interviewees observed.

The first interaction the interviewees watched was the presentation of Laredo's Comprehensive Plan to the Laredo City Council on September 6, 2011. This discussion exemplifies the higher expectations Cohen et al. describe in their work (274). This interaction, with minimal editing, was approximately 6:36 minutes long and featured Laredo's interim

planning director and city manager answering questions from the city councilors regarding Laredo's 30-year forecast for land use and potential international bridge locations. Laredo City Council members focused on the international bridge discussions that were anticipated at the time of the presentation and thus asked both the planning director and the city manager specific questions that the city manager primarily fielded.

Participants then viewed the Dallas City Council considering the purchase of several properties for right-of-way use at their June 27, 2012 City Council meeting. This discussion, also minimally edited was 2:38 minutes long and featured an unidentified staffer answering questions from one particular city councilor. Although not a broad policy consideration, this exchange typifies routine exchanges between politicians and policrats and may be more indicative of how a policrat's ethos is perceived by her audience. Because these types of exchanges are ad hoc and extemporaneous, the policrat runs the risk of appearing un- or under-prepared. Without adequate preparation and/or experience, the policrat may also appear informal or dismissive of the politician's concerns because the policrat expected the policy-making body to consider an issue routine.

The third interaction presented to the elected officials was Laredo's July 2, 2012 adoption of its annual Community Development (CD) budget from the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) federal agency for the 2012-2013 fiscal year. CD funds are closely monitored by HUD and their expenditures must meet strict federal guidelines. Laredo's CD director answered questions from several city representatives in her six-minute exchange with the council. This exchange again typifies a higher expectation; however the questions council members asked pertained to specific issues associated with CD programs, schedules, expenditures, and outreach to potential CD program beneficiaries.

I recognize the recorded interactions and the resulting responses from politicians are limited; the videos do not replicate the discursive space where politicians and policrats interact. Although these videos provide a more robust context for questions about rhetorical effectiveness and respectful rhetorical practices, and the politicians may be able to empathize with the initial primary audience, the interviewees are nonetheless removed from the live situation. They cannot view the entire space where the discussion took place since they see only what the camera lens captured. Further, since the interviewees are not the actual audience and the topics do not pertain to their city or their specific representative district, this distance may allow them to view behaviors with greater disinterest. Should a similar situation arise within their community and a policrat respond as the policrats in the videos responded, the interviewed politicians' *governing gaze* may scrutinize the policrats' rhetorical practices more carefully because more is at stake for the politician.

Another artificial factor present with video use is that it removes the elected official from the live situation in which the PEF transactions usually take place. During routine interactions with El Paso policrats, the politicians may overlook terms that they detected in the videos. Additionally, because they had already answered a series of questions and because they knew they would be asked questions regarding the videos, some may have paid greater attention than they would to regular exchanges with El Paso policrats. Alternatively, because the interactions did not involve their community, they may have allowed themselves to be more distracted and sought to gain only general impressions. While video use introduces the ability to "re-play" the event when questions about word usage or specific answers arise this may also add another

element of artificiality¹⁸. Two interviewees took advantage of this ability and requested to see a specific interaction or word choice again. The remainder made their comments based on a single viewing of the video. Despite these constraints, I believe the interview questions included in the protocol and the inclusion of the videos provide a solid foundation to begin exploring local politicians' attitudes about policrats' respectful rhetorical practices. The interviews allowed me to begin describing the politicians' *governing gaze* specifically as it pertains to respect. The interviews averaged approximately one hour – the time I had originally requested for each interviewee. One interview was only approximately 35 minutes long due to the politician's time constraints; the longest interview was almost two and a half hours.

Interviewer

One of the motivations for this study is my former career as a policrat; I worked in the El Paso city government for over 20 years. I began my career as a staff person and by mid-career I was making the types of presentations I now planned to analyze. My career as a policrat allowed me greater access to the interviewees than I believe would have been possible to another researcher simply because I knew most of them or knew their administrative staff who could help me schedule adequate time with the politicians. I have long recognized that I cannot nor do I desire to achieve complete objectivity on this project. The very perspectives and reactions I seek to explore are subjective. I believe my familiarity with the interviewees allowed me to obtain candid, thoughtful, and sometimes embarrassingly honest assessments of respectful and disrespectful practices. I expect the interviewees' candor will help me describe respectful patterns in the PEF tapestry.

¹⁸ Although elected officials cannot “replay” a live interaction with policrats, they can certainly ask policrats to repeat a particular point. However, such a situation will be different from an exact replay and will be more interactive than merely viewing what was specifically stated in a recorded exchange again.

Interviewees

I sought to isolate specific expectations politicians bring to their decision-making dais by asking them which behaviors they believed marked respectful and disrespectful rhetorical practices when their staff made presentations in a public forum. Since politicians are the specific audience whose perceptions I planned to capture, I requested interviews from the nine City of El Paso City Council members and three other officials who are either municipal officials in smaller communities in the El Paso metropolitan area or who hold a different office now but held municipal offices at one point in their political careers. I selected these interviewees because they are experienced in municipal government and the *political epistemic field*. The elected officials brought their perspectives from ongoing weekly interactions with polibrats and, I expected, could answer my questions based on that pool of experience.

I interviewed my last subject in April 2013. The elected official was a former El Paso City Council member and freshman U.S. Congress representative who had just served his first 100 days. The interview was the shortest of the group due to the Congressman's time constraints. He did, however, answer most of the interview protocol questions and viewed the Laredo Comprehensive Plan exchange. He also was in a unique position to make comparative statements regarding local polibrats and national polibrats.

The interviewees ranged from newly elected politicians to politicians who had served for more than twenty years. They had achieved different levels of education, were male and female, and were primarily either Hispanic or "Anglo/Caucasian."¹⁹ Although I did not ask about military service, two interviewees mentioned it during the interviews. Of the three politicians

¹⁹ I used the ethnicity/race descriptions from the US Census and in doing so apparently missed an adequate category for those who self-identified as "Anglo/Caucasian." The interviewees who used this term would likely check the "white" ethnicity race description in US Census forms without any other indicator of a different race or ethnicity. The Census Bureau indicates that "OMB requires five minimum categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" (US Census – "Race"). I use the term the respondents themselves used in the demographic description.

with graduate degrees, one is a medical doctor and another is an attorney. A brief overview of the interviewees' demographic information is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1 - Interviewees' Demographic and General Information

Gender	Male	Female				Total
# of Respondents	8	4				12
Age	26 to 35	36 to 45	46-55	56-65	66 - 75	Total
# of Respondents	1	4	1	4	2	12
Length of Texas Residence	15 – 20 years	More than 20 years	Lifelong			Total
# of Respondents	2	7	3			12
Ethnicity/Race	Latino/ Hispanic	Black/ African American	Anglo/ Caucasian	Other		Total
# of Respondents	3	1	7	1		12
Length of Elected Service	1 to 2 years	2 to 4 years	4 to 8 years	8 to 12 years	12 and more years	Total
# of Respondents	2	1	6	1	2	12
Education Level		Some College	Bachelor degree	Some graduate work	Master or professional degree	Total
# of Respondents		3	5	1	3	12

Two of the interviewees were mayors of their respective communities. One politician had been a policrat prior to her election and indicated she made *very frequent* presentations to policy-making bodies with *very frequent* defined as more than once per month. A second politician, and one of the mayors interviewed indicated that as a professional engineer, he made *infrequent* presentations to elected bodies; *infrequent* meant that he presented to policy-makers fewer than

three times per year. One of the interviewees served as a city council member and is currently a long-time state representative.

Data Capture

To capture as much of the interview data as possible, I recorded interviews as soon as I received the participant's permission to do so. I also took extensive notes regarding their responses. The recordings were transcribed so I could then analyze the comments from a textual perspective. I coded my notes in two ways. I created a survey instrument from the interview protocol in SurveyMonkey, an automated survey service. I also captured specific quotes and began teasing out common themes from my notes. I used Strauss and Corbin's *grounded theory* principles for my analysis. I first reviewed the texts to discover emerging core categories along with perceptions of respectful and disrespectful practices. At this point, I wanted to use definitions, concepts, and perceptions the interviewees had specifically expressed so I could use the interviewees' terms rather than my own themes or categories. SurveyMonkey was particularly helpful in analyzing the interviewees' demographic information and capturing the broad categorization of respectful and disrespectful behaviors. By converting the close-ended questions in the interviews to a quasi-survey, I was able to focus on the outlying answers and on the behaviors that interviewees contextualized before categorizing them as either respectful or disrespectful.

Aside from reviewing my notes and coding them through SurveyMonkey, I reviewed the interview transcriptions and, independently of my notes, teased out themes, definitions, concepts and perceptions that had been captured on the audio recordings. After reviewing the interviews from both my notes and the transcriptions I developed the categories and observations described in the Data Analysis section.

Theoretical Framework for Data Analysis

I utilized Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin's conceptions of *grounded theory* discussed in *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (1998) to categorize ideas articulated by the interviewees. Strauss and Corbin build on the theory developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss to provide social scientists a methodology for conceptual ordering and creating knowledge (x). Grounded theory has been used in fields like education, nursing, business, social work and communication (Strauss and Corbin, 9). Although RWS is not one of the fields specifically mentioned by Strauss and Corbin, I believed this approach was applicable since my study focuses on communication practices within a socio-political environment. Grounded theory's focus is to allow the researcher to develop theory from "data [that] is systematically gathered and analyzed through [a] research process" by developing nuanced categories that emerge as the researcher delves into the data. Further, one of the grounded theorists' characteristics Strauss and Corbin list, sensitivity to the words and actions of respondents, seemed particularly important for this research (7). I made every effort to categorize the themes that emerged from my interviews in the respondents' words rather than imposing my structure onto their reactions. The data collected from the politicians' interviews may be categorized in multiple ways. This study only begins to explore the emerging themes and categories to provide an initial framework for additional research. Grounded theory focused my coding and provided structure to my theorizing as I begin to translate reactions to politicians' behaviors into rhetorical concepts.

RESPONSES

The interview protocol was divided into three main categories of questions. The first category dealt primarily with demographic information to help identify the elected officials. Most of that information is presented in the section entitled "Interviewees." The second category

asked the interviewees to identify behaviors and rhetorical practices as *respectful*, *disrespectful*, or *neutral*. These questions were close-ended by design, but I asked the elected officials to expand on their answers as the interview proceeded. Many respondents preferred to nuance the categories provided and responded that the specific marker had to be considered in context rather than identified in the dichotomy presented; their responses in these cases were “it depends.” I have categorized these responses as *contingent* and discuss the markers that were specifically identified as contingent in the sections that follow. In this section of the interview, I further subdivided the markers as *behavioral*, meaning specific actions the policrat may take without speaking, *oral* to include specific phrases that could be used by the policrat in her presentation to the policy-makers, and *rhetorical* to describe the arrangement and types of presentation content. The third category of questions included open-ended questions that asked the politicians their perceptions of the videos they saw. Since the interview protocol served as an interview guide rather than as a strict survey, not all questions were answered by each of the twelve participants. The responses I review below in some instances total fewer than twelve but are indicative of the responses received for the specific question.

Identification of Respectful Behaviors

Some behaviors were consistently identified as respectful by the respondents. Eleven of the twelve respondents identified making eye contact with the audience and listening actively as respectful. The single respondents who did not find these behaviors respectful identified them as either neutral or contingent on the situation respectively. Two thirds of the politicians believed smiling was respectful; the other third found it disrespectful. Ten of the twelve interviewees found that when the policrat said “sir” or “ma’am” or used an honorific title to address her audience she was respectful. In each instance, two respondents found these behaviors contingent

on the context. Almost two thirds of the 11 respondents to the question regarding titles indicated that the policrat's use of "Mr., Ms., or Mrs." was respectful. Two found it disrespectful given that the audience can be addressed by an honorific and two others found its use contingent on the context and indicated that an emphasis on this title could be meant as disrespect. If the title is used to emphasize a lack of standing, then its use could be construed as a marker of disrespect. The example provided by one respondent was that a tonal stress to indicate the speaker does not recognize the person's official capacity as an elected official would indicate disrespect. Ten of the eleven respondents indicated that keeping a level voice tone is respectful and one found it contingent on the context.

Of the twelve respondents, nine found that the policrat's explanation of technical terms, concepts or jargon before using them in a presentation was respectful to the policy-making audience. Two found this behavior either neutral or contingent on the context. One found it disrespectful. This particular politician indicated that such behavior indicated the policrat assumed the politician was not knowledgeable if she believed she had to explain the terms. The politician found this assumption presumptuous and, thus, offensive.

Since several interviewees volunteered more robust discussions of policrat presentations throughout the interview, not all politicians were asked the specific questions in the section regarding rhetorical strategies. Only six to nine interviewees were asked the questions in this section of the interview protocol. Interestingly, those who were prompted to answer specific questions seemed to be in agreement as to respectful organization and content presentation. Five of the seven respondents to the question indicated that a presentation which included the social impact of a proposed policy was respectful. Six respondents agreed that a presentation that

acknowledged objections to a proposal and provided background on how objections were incorporated into staff's proposal were respectful.

Identification of Disrespectful Behaviors and Contingent Behaviors

Respondents seemed uniform in their perceptions of disrespectful behaviors. One hundred percent of the respondents found that a policrat rolling her eyes when a member of the policy-making audience comments or asks a question is disrespectful. A heavy sigh or noticeable exhalation by the policrat when she begins an explanation or provides additional information in response to a question or comment was similarly viewed as disrespectful by ten of the eleven respondents to this question. The eleventh interviewee found such behavior contingent on the situation. While most respondents (58%) indicated that a policrat's apology after interrupting an audience member was respectful, five specifically indicated that interrupting a public official during his comments was disrespectful and four out of six indicated that a policrat's attempt to provide information before the politician has finished making his point is similarly disrespectful.

Nine respondents specifically addressed a policrat's use of sarcasm and all of these respondents indicated that it was disrespectful. Saying "Let me explain so you understand" or "one more time" was also identified as disrespectful by eight of the eleven respondents. One of these found it a neutral practice, and two found it contingent on the situation. Three out of four politicians who responded to the question regarding a policrat's use of simplistic terms in her presentation found such a practice disrespectful. The fourth politician indicated such a practice was contingent on the context.

Although I initially provided interviewees with only three selections to identify behavior or language use: *respectful*, *disrespectful*, or *neutral*, in many instances the respondents indicated that the behavior was contingent on the situation or context and responded with "it depends."

Only one behavior, laughter, received a majority of the respondents' reaction as entirely context-bound. Laughter was heavily considered dependent on the situation; eight of the ten respondents to this question indicated laughter was contingent on the context. If the laughter was appropriate for the particular situation, then it could be respectful, but if the policrat was laughing *at* the elected officials' comments or at the elected official and intended as derisive, then it was considered disrespectful.

Split Decisions

In this section, I discuss the behaviors and phrases that were classified in a variety of categories and did not receive a strong majority categorization. I include in this section some behaviors where half of the interviewees responded with one classification and the other half were split among other classifications. Since policy-making audiences in the municipal context are generally small groups, I believe behaviors where no clear majority agrees on the classification should be highlighted because policrats will have to be cognizant of those behaviors' multiple interpretations. A number of behaviors fell into the split decision category; I summarize those results in Table 2 below.

The justification for the resulting classifications provides insight into the politicians' perceptions of policrat behaviors, or more specifically, word use. For example, nonverbal communication or body language such as nodding affirmatively or keeping a neutral expression was predominantly classified as respectful. However, either half or more of the respondents found that these behaviors were not specifically respectful. The second highest number of respondents in each case found that either nodding or keeping a neutral expression was contingent on the situation. Respondents found that nodding affirmatively could be manipulative (M12-0002); a sign of the policrat's frustration (M12-0006); or potentially sarcastic (M12-0008).

Keeping a neutral expression had a variety of comments attached to the individual respondent's characterization. Interviewees commented that keeping a neutral expression

- was not necessary for the policrat to be respectful (M12-0002);
- could signal authority, confidence and expertise (M12-0004);
- was “not helpful” to politicians trying to gauge the policrat's confidence in her presentation (M12-0006);
- could represent that the individual (policrat) is “resentful” and does not want to be questioned further or told she is wrong (M12-0008);
- was contingent on the situation and so interviewee M12-0010 made allowances for a more expressive presentation if the policrat was defending a position; however this politician also cautioned that politicians should beware of a neutral expression when the policrat is “false.”

A policrat's use of the word “respectfully” in her presentation was almost evenly split among the four categories. Three respondents found that using “respectfully” in a presentation was respectful; another three found it disrespectful, two found it neutral and four indicated that it was contingent on the circumstances. One politician indicated it was respectful because she frequently used the phrase in her own statements (M12-0001). Similarly, four respondents found that a policrat stating “with all due respect” was respectful, three found it disrespectful, one found it neutral and three stated it depended on the situation. In several instances the respondents stated that either of these phrases, “respectfully” or “with all due respect,” signaled that the speaker was about to disagree with the audience. Thus, rather than serving as a marker of respect, it signaled disagreement and potential conflict. One respondent, M12-0002, stated that she found both phrases “rude.”

Two different phrases signaling a policrat's apology were presented to the interviewees: saying "excuse me/pardon me" after interrupting a member of the audience and saying "I apologize." In the first, case seven interviewees found the phrase respectful, none found it neutral. Saying "I apologize" was identified as respectful by only six of the twelve respondents. However, several politicians cautioned that interruption should be avoided. Respondent M12-0008 indicated that neither the politicians nor the policrats should interrupt one another. Interviewee M12-0011, a former city representative and current state representative indicated the interruption is only acceptable if a question of fact is being discussed and interpreted incorrectly or if the politician's subsequent comments are based on incorrect information and the policrat's interruption is meant to clarify or dispel misunderstandings. Interviewee M12-0010 echoed these comments and indicated that interrupting to clear up misconceptions or misunderstandings was appropriate and respectful to *other* audience members. A policrat's apology is respectful when it is perceived as sincere. Half of the respondents found that specifically saying "I apologize" was respectful; however almost the other half found it contingent on the situation. Apologizing was perceived as respectful if the policrat was sincere (M12-0002 and M12-0003), or was apologizing for a mistake (M12-0008).

Using slang was interestingly not classified as disrespectful by a majority of the respondents; as many found it disrespectful as contingent (four in each case). Interviewee M12-0007 provided one of the most telling comments regarding the use of slang; he indicated it was "risky for bureaucrats" to use slang in a formal presentation. Interviewee 12-0008 added that slang use could be professionally inappropriate for a policrat.

Policrats use the phrase "this is just housekeeping" most often to refer to changes in municipal regulations that are not substantive changes to city policy. The politicians viewed this

comment as either neutral or contingent and only two respondents found it respectful. Respondent M12-0010 immediately considered the local context in El Paso²⁰ and indicated that staff should be cautious when using this phrase and be willing to “tell the whole story.” Interviewee M12-0011 also considered that the policrat could be either “hiding something” or condescending to the audience when she used that phrase. For interviewees M12-0002 and M12-0009 such phrasing became a trust issue and could trigger them to pay closer attention to the presentation. Similarly Interviewee M12-0007 indicated the phrase was a red flag, and he would then want to understand the full context of the policrat’s presentation. The phrase had just the opposite effect for M12-0003 who lost interest in the presentation if the policrat prefaced it with this phrase. Interviewee M12-0006 indicated that saying “this is clean-up” was a better phrase than using the term “housekeeping.”

Rushing through a presentation was not found to be respectful by any respondent; however, it was not necessarily perceived as disrespectful. Only three respondents found it disrespectful and the other eight were equally divided between neutral and contingent. Interviewee M12 -0002 indicated that the policrat should provide equal time to all members of the audience apparently indicating that the policrat should balance the time devoted to answering questions from the audience with the time dedicated to the formal presentation. Further, this politician indicates that allowing all politicians equal time to ask questions is yet another element of a respectful presentation. Politician M12-0003 found it difficult when policrats rush through their comments. She indicated that the policrat must achieve a balance between completeness in the presentation and brevity. The complexity of the topic or presentation was the determining

²⁰ Local political context in El Paso during this time also included political corruption and cheating scandals. Two former County Judges were indicted for receiving financial benefit for various votes on county contracts and the school superintendent of one of the major school districts in the El Paso area was also indicted and found guilty of channeling contracts to business partners and orchestrating a wide scale cheating scheme to improve the district’s performance on the state’s mandated student assessments.

factor for Respondent M12-0004. If the topic under discussion was simple, then rushing through the presentation was not considered detrimental, but if the topic were more complex, then not dedicating adequate time to the presentation could pose a problem. Interviewee M12-0010 hearkened to audience analysis and indicated that the policrat should understand where the presentation occurred in relation to other discussions on the meeting agenda and “with forethought” considering “the audience’s time and attention span” could compress the presentation. Respondent M12-0009 also indicated that although not disrespectful, rushing through a presentation was “poor form” that could indicate that the policrat had not adequately practiced her presentation and made time allowances for questions.

While six of the ten respondents to the question regarding the policrat’s use of the politicians’ first name categorized such practice as disrespectful, another three indicated it was contingent on both the individual and the level of familiarity and is a “two-way street with staff” (M12-0002 and M12-0010 respectively), or was acceptable in a one-on-one situation (M12-0003) but never appropriate for a public meeting (M12-0004). One politician (M12-0007) indicated that the use of first name was acceptable because the politician will not be an elected official “forever.”

The policrat’s use of five phrases or word tags, although garnering a plurality of characterizations as “disrespectful,” had an almost equal number of characterizations as “neutral,” or “contingent.” These phrases are “as I said;” “again,” “it’s technical,” “it’s complicated/complex,” and “it’s simple.” Two phrases, “as I said” and “it’s technical” were considered disrespectful by six of the twelve politicians interviewed. However, the other six thought these phrases were either neutral or contingent on the situation. Politician M12-0001 indicated that depending on the number of attempts the policrat had made at an *explanation* and

the tone of voice used when making the statement “as I said” determined whether or not it was disrespectful. Participant M12-0002 identified policrats who are engineers as the most likely to use the phrase “it’s technical” thus reflecting this politicians perception that engineer policrats rely more heavily on technical expertise rather than considering public impacts. Interviewee M12-0010 indicated that the actual technicality of the topic determined whether or not this phrase would be interpreted as respectful or disrespectful. The current state representative who was interviewed indicated that a policrat could say either “it’s technical or “it’s complicated/complex” if the phrase was included in a context of “other people” thus lessening the impact on any one member of the policy-making body. He recommended policrats use phrasing similar to “this may be technical/complicated/complex for some of our audience” and then proceed with an appropriate explanation. Interviewee M12-0010 responded to a policrat’s use of “it’s complicated/complex” as he had to “it’s technical;” if the discussion topic was in fact complicated or complex then he believed the phrase was acceptable, but he also recognized the phrase could be used sarcastically. Although a policrat’s use of “again” in her presentation was characterized by seven of the twelve respondents as disrespectful and the other five found it either neutral or contingent, no respondents provided additional comments regarding their classification. Only five of eleven respondents found “it’s simple” as a disrespectful phrase for policrats to use. One respondent found its use sarcastic (M12-0010) and another (M12-0011) indicated that the policrat’s inflection when she said this phrase determined how he would perceive its intent.

Table 2 - Behaviors and Word Usage with no Clear Majority Responses

Policrat's Behavior/Word Use	Number of Respondents Classifying this Behavior/Word Use as				Total Number of Respondents for Question
	Respectful	Disrespectful	Neutral	Contingent	
Nodding affirmatively	6	1	2	3	12
Keeping a neutral expression	5	0	2	4	11
Saying "respectfully"	3	3	2	4	12
Saying "excuse me" or "pardon me" after interrupting a member of the audience	7	3	0	2	12
Saying "I apologize"	6	0	1	5	12
Using slang	1	4	2	4	11
Saying "with all due respect"	4	3	1	3	11
Saying "this is just housekeeping"	2	1	4	4	11
Rushing through a presentation or explanation	0	3	4	4	11
Using first name only (when addressing member of the audience)	0	6	1	3	10
Saying "as I said"	0	6	2	4	12
Saying "again"	0	7	3	2	12
Saying "it's technical"	0	6	3	3	12
Saying "it's complicated/complex"	0	4	4	3	11
Saying "it's simple"	0	5	2	4	11

Respondents' Definitions and Descriptions

Throughout part two of the interview, I asked respondents to expand on terms that either I had used in the interview protocol prompts or that the politicians themselves had used. I believe that understanding how the policy-makers describe a particular term also provides insight into their *governing gaze*.

Listening Actively

The first term interviewees were asked to describe was *listening actively*. The following are some of the descriptions that according to the interviewees indicated the policrat was listening actively when the audience spoke:

- Asking questions of the policy-maker (M12-0001 & M12-0004);
- Allowing the audience member who is asking a question to finish (M12-0002 and M12-0007) and taking a breath before starting to answer (M12-0002);
- Looking at the person speaking (M12-0003 and M12-0005) and focusing on the questions asked (M12-0003);
- Anticipating questions from the audience (M12-0004 and M12-0009); placing self in audience member's shoes and answering from their perspective (M12-0004);
- Clarifying a question from the audience to ensure understanding (M12-0006);
- Refraining from doing something else and instead concentrating on the discourse underway (M13-0001); and generally as
- Paying attention to the audience (M12-0009).

Interviewee M12-0010 provided a cautionary comment for policrats. Rather than describing active listening, he cautioned that active listening is difficult when a presentation has been prepared, and that the policrat may fail to grasp nuances embedded in the policy-makers' questions. He advised policrats to set aside preconceived responses and participate in an active relationship with the audience to avoid a "canned" response.

Neutral Tone

No context was provided when interviewees were asked about *neutral tone*; instead they were asked to describe what it meant. Interviewee M12-0001 indicated a neutral tone was

monotone and, at times monotonous, “going on and on.” She did indicate that such a description might just identify the speakers and be part of their personality rather than be a specific rhetorical strategy. Interviewees M12-0002, -0003 and -0011 allowed for positive deviation from a neutral tone to allow the policrat to express “enthusiasm” thus implying that a neutral tone refrains from expressing emotion. A voice tone that never changed could be problematic for respondent M12-0011. Respondent M12-005 addressed both body language and voice; a neutral tone is one where the policrat does not visibly demonstrate bias in favor of one option and does not raise her voice. Politician M12-0006 indicated she looked at all aspects of a policrat’s presentation rather than merely voice intonation. This policy-maker characterized the policrats’ presentations as “sales” and expected the policrat to believe in her own recommendations so the politician looked at the overall presentation to gauge the level of the policrat’s commitment to the proposal. Although politician M12-0006 did not specifically address voice tonality, she seemed to expand upon the concept of tone by incorporating verbal and non-verbal communication to determine the policrat’s and her presentation’s overall tone. Interviewee M12-0009 also referred to voice levels when describing a neutral tone and indicated that such a tone is characterized by a “soft but audible voice” that indicated neither “sarcasm nor disgust.” He also allowed for variations in tonality and indicated that he could distinguish the policrat’s intent based on both tone and body language.

Sarcasm

Another term that was used in the interview protocol without any explanation or description was *sarcasm*. Once respondents characterized the use of sarcasm, they were asked to describe how they could describe or distinguish it. This appeared to be the most difficult term to describe with several politicians initially indicating they “could just tell” by hearing it in the

presenter's voice and seeing it in her face (M12-0006 and M12-0007), or that experience allowed them to identify it (M12-0004). Interviewee M12-0008 indicated that whatever the policrat's specific behavior, if the policrat's intent is sarcastic, then the behavior appears insincere and both body language and gestures indicate sarcasm. Alternatively, the policrat may avoid eye contact (M12-0008 and M12-0003). After further discussion, several descriptions emerged to include:

- Making unnecessary comments without knowing the full context of the subject (M12-0001);
- Using irony (M13-0001);
- Embarrassing other(s) in public (M12-0004); and
- Making light of a subject or engaging in hyperbole - either extreme could become sarcastic (M12-0005, M12-0009, and M12-0010).

Interviewee M12-0010 also indicated that sarcasm is condescending and demeaning. Interviewee M12-0011 provided the richest description for sarcasm. He indicated that effective use of sarcasm resulted in a delayed audience reaction. For him, sarcasm was insulting without allowing the audience to initially detect the insult and crafting a comment where the meaning is ambiguous.

Respect

Although respect was discussed throughout the interviews, I made every effort to keep from describing or defining it to the policy-makers. In some interviews, descriptions of respect emerged as the interviews proceeded. Those comments included:

- Respect is the recognition of multiple perspectives; arrogance is not valuing those different perspectives (M12-0001);

- Respect is speaking in language that is accessible to the audience and listening to the questions that arise from the presentation (M12-0002); and
- Preparation is key to appearing respectful (M12-0006).

Reactions to Videos

The interviewed elected officials viewed videos of three different exchanges between local policrats and their respective city councils.²¹ I have ordered the discussion of videos based on the level of agreement among interviewees. The third interaction depicting a policrat in Laredo's Community Development Department presenting the annual department budget and then responding to specific council member questions was deemed respectful by the most politicians; seven of the eleven interviewees described it as *respectful*. The remaining four respondents classified this presentation as neutral, neither respectful nor disrespectful. The interviewees' justification for a *respectful* designation included comments regarding the policrat's greeting and introduction as she approached the podium and her level of preparedness. The policrat's knowledge and her ability to answer council members' specific questions about her department and its processes, were also noted by the interviewed elected officials and justified their description of the overall exchange as respectful. Although two politicians noticed that this policrat interrupted council members as they were speaking, her behavior was termed "overeager" and perceived as an extension of her competence and desire to answer questions. This exchange was also perceived as persuasive by more of the interviewed elected officials than the other videos; however, only three interviewees identified it as persuasive without any other qualification. Two respondents identified the presentation as not persuasive. Other interviewees

²¹ The final interviewee, M13-0001, had limited time for my interview in April 2013. Due to his time constraints, he only viewed the first exchange. Thus comments about exchanges two and three are described based on the feedback from the other eleven interviewees.

used terms such as “useful” (M12-0002) “moderately persuasive” (M12-0009), and “semi-persuasive” (M12-0008). Respondent M12-0011 indicated the presentation, as a factual one, need not be persuasive.

The interaction receiving the second highest number of respectful marks was the first video the politicians viewed and the only one which all twelve participants viewed. The interaction depicting both the Laredo interim planning director and city manager presenting that municipality’s comprehensive plan to the city council was described as respectful by half of the twelve respondents. The justification for this description included comments that the presentation did not involve any “real controversy” (M12-0001). Other descriptions were that the information was delivered in what appeared to be an unbiased way and the council members’ questions were answered (M12-0007). The strongest endorsement for this presentation came from respondent M12-0011 who applauded that the Laredo city manager “left the policy-making to City Council.” This same respondent, who has experience both at the local and state level also noted that the speakers’ inflection was appropriate. Two respondents found it disrespectful indicating that the policrats failed to prepare a better presentation; one respondent found the policrats “dismissive and rude” (M12-0002). Another respondent indicated that the use of “guesstimate” by the planning director was unprofessional and “weak” (M12-0003). This exchange ranked third in persuasiveness based on the number of respondents who found it persuasive. Only one respondent found the presentation persuasive; four found it unpersuasive. Most comments regarding the presentation’s persuasiveness centered on the planning director’s lack of preparation for public comment and failure to disseminate information to the council members prior to the meeting. Respondent M12-0002 who did not find the presentation persuasive remarked that the policrats seemed to ignore the importance of the topic and did not anticipate or

seek policy-makers' input during the presentation. Respondent M12-0010, the mayor of a small community in El Paso County, recognized that two policrats, the Laredo city manager and the interim planning director spoke and he indicated the city manager's exchange was persuasive but not the planning director's. The mayor speculated that the planning director was not expecting discussion on the Comprehensive Plan and was therefore underprepared to field city council's questions.

The interaction between an unidentified Dallas City policrat and the Dallas City Council where the council is considering the purchase of several properties for right-of-way²² was the shortest interaction viewed and the one perceived as respectful and persuasive by the fewest number of policy-makers. Only three of the eleven politicians who viewed this exchange found it respectful; four found it disrespectful, and four classified it as neutral. Interviewees who found the presentation either respectful or neutral indicated the policrat effectively differentiated between "old" and "historic" buildings when she responded to the city councilor posing questions as to the property purchases (M12-0003). Respondent M12-0009 indicated that he found the policrat as helpful as possible in the circumstances and chastised the elected official for not adequately preparing herself to ask questions. Respondent M12-0006 described the policrat as "cavalier" and "snide" based on her facial expressions; Interviewee M12-0010 also characterized the policrat's body language as disrespectful and her attitude as dismissive toward the elected official. Interviewee M12-0006 also believed the staff was frustrated and was therefore not forthcoming with information; Respondent M12-0006 doubted the policrat's sincerity. Similarly, Politicians M12-0007 and M12-0008 noted that staff did not answer the councilor's questions directly. One of the most telling remarks was made by Respondent M12-

²² *Right-of-way* is the term used by governmental agencies to describe real estate that is purchased for use as roadway including medians and turn lanes and the abutting sidewalks and parkway.

0002 who indicated that despite the media attention that the action had received prior to the council's consideration, the policrat was not prepared with a presentation or with visuals; this policymaker viewed such lack of preparation as emphatically disrespectful. Six of the respondents found this presentation unpersuasive; two found it persuasive and one indicated it was neutral. Most of the comments justifying the unpersuasive description centered on the lack of preparedness and the policrat's apparent inability to anticipate questions and thus present professionally (M12-0006 and M12-0005). Interviewee M12-0007 indicated that the presentation was not persuasive because no understanding was created.

DATA ANALYSIS

The interviewed elected officials were candid in their responses and provided rich descriptions of their perceptions. Their comments allowed me to identify the broader themes that underlie perceptions of respectful rhetorical practices and persuasiveness within the *political epistemic field* at the municipal level.

Emerging Themes

The interviewed officials identified behaviors as *respectful* or *disrespectful* that do not differ from those expected in general presentations. Elected officials expect the policrat to listen to their questions, address them with either an honorific title or "Mr.," "Mrs.," or "Ms." and explain technical terms, concepts or jargon prior to using it in their presentation. Policy-makers also agree on specific disrespectful behaviors such as rolling eyes, sighing heavily, and using sarcasm. Based on their descriptions, a relative short listing of "Dos and Don'ts" could be developed. However, a much larger number of behaviors and word language is contingent as described by the elected officials. These contingencies may become a rhetorical minefield for the novice bureaucrat. Exploring those behaviors which are contingent on the situation reveals

that policrats should be aware of them and develop a repertoire of rhetorical practices that positively match the situation so politicians may view them as respectful or neutral rather than as disrespectful.

Tone and Body Language

In most instances the policrat's tone and body language indicate the policrat's intent according to the interviewed politicians. Thus, it is not simply *what* is said, but *how* it is said. Politicians expect policrats to hold their negative emotions in check, and while enthusiasm is an acceptable inflection, frustration, condescension, anger and sarcasm are unacceptable. Facial expressions similarly express more of the policrat's intent – and elected officials are observing the entire presentation, not merely listening to the spoken words or absorbing information from a PowerPoint presentation.

Public/Private Space

Elected officials are acutely aware of the public space both they and the policrats occupy during public deliberations. While some may accept being called by their first names, the honorific is the first indication that the policrat similarly recognizes the public space and the hierarchical structure and is thus preferred by most politicians. A policrat may be on a first-name basis with the politician and that may be acceptable in a private or one-on-one meeting, but the best way for a policrat to proceed in a public deliberation is to err on the side of formality and refer to all elected officials by their honorific title.

Authority and Expertise

Politicians are acutely aware that they are the duly elected authorities and decision-makers, and they also recognize that policrats are subject matter experts. A presentation's organization and a policrat's rhetorical strategies appear to address the tension between authority

and expertise either positively or negatively. As Respondent M12-0001 indicated, presentations are viewed as respectful if the policy-making audience is allowed to reach their own conclusions and if the presentations are balanced or present both the benefits and costs or potentially negative outcomes of the proposals. Balanced presentations are more respectful because they are unbiased and implicitly indicate that the policrat recognizes and values that the elected officials will determine the policy. When policrats present the social impact of the proposal, then the presentation was considered “more thorough” by Politician M12-0001, the former policrat, and Interviewee M12-0003. Respondent M12-0002 indicated that a policrat presentation that presents the social impact of a proposed policy is “helpful” and provides balance; establishing a context provides guidance to policy-makers even if no single solution exists and is thus respectful. Interviewee M12-0003 indicated that providing the order or rank of proposed alternatives within a presentation helps policy-makers arrive at a technically sound determination. This interviewee also indicated that when a policrat is specifically asked for her preference among the recommendations, then she “must” express it. Respondents M12-0004 and M12-0005 indicated that the perceived respectfulness of providing a recommendation is contingent on the issue under discussion. If the issue is a technical one, then Politician M12-0005 preferred a recommendation from staff; if the issue was “more general” then he preferred to arrive at his own decision. Interviewee M12-0009 summarized the goals for policrat presentations in this manner “presentation should be grounded in political reality” and not in “politics.” He described “politics” as tied to persons and teams that can create a confrontational environment.

As indicated in the section discussing the reaction to videos, the Laredo policrat who was best able to answer the council members’ questions, even though they were not part of her prepared presentation was described as “knowledgeable,” “responsive,” and “competent.”

Although the interviewed elected officials did not describe this policrat as “an expert,” they nonetheless described elements of expertise. As Johanna Hartelius has discussed it, expertise is intrinsically tied with both knowledge and the ability to communicate that knowledge to an audience. The interviewed politicians expect policrats to be knowledgeable within their specific field and perform expertly thus communicating that knowledge and fostering understanding.

Based on their comments, the interviewed politicians are acutely aware that they hold the formal authority and that their staff holds the technical expertise. They expect respectful policrats to differentiate between technical decisions where the policrat’s expertise is privileged and social policies where technical expertise must be effectively woven with political reality to develop an acceptable initiative or solution for the specific context. In the latter case, the politicians expect to receive the full benefit of the policrat’s knowledge and experience, but the elected officials do not want to be told what to do – they want advice so they can make the decision themselves. The elected officials did not demonstrate any acrimony toward expert policrats. They appeared to view them as resources, provided that the policrat understood how technical expertise was to be presented during policy deliberations.

Audience Analysis

Throughout their comments, the elected officials alluded to their expectation that the policrat know her audience and adapt her presentation to it not only during its preparation but also during its delivery. Policrats must know when a PowerPoint presentation will be “overwhelming” (M12-0002) and when visuals will aid in clarifying a technical point (M12-0002); where they appear on an agenda and how that will interact with the politicians’ desire for both brevity and completeness; what has been discussed in the media and how that will impact the information the audience will require; and whether the issue is technical requiring a more

prescribed recommendation or whether it has broader social implications and must be presented with several options. The policrat is expected to anticipate her audience's questions and be prepared with either visuals or answers that help explain the situation and the potential outcome of the recommendations. Failure to understand these factors could result in the politicians perceiving the policrat's presentation as incomplete, disrespectful, and unpersuasive.

Creating Understanding

Despite the negative perceptions of elected officials described by the public administration texts discussed in this project, the elected officials interviewed indicated that they expected policrats to provide enough information to help the elected officials formulate policy decisions. Elected officials want to understand both the context in which the problems are occurring, the problems they must address, and the proposed solutions which should be based on the policrat's experience and expertise and on the analysis she has conducted to arrive at those recommendations (M12-0008). Policy-makers also want the policrat to understand that the recommendations must be implemented in a political environment (M12-0009). Politicians indicated that they desire both to understand and to be understood.

Respect as a Continuum and Contingent Behaviors

Although I did not provide gradations of respect as an option to the interviewees, some added their own comments indicating certain behaviors were "less respectful" (M13-0002) or "dangerously disrespectful" (M12-0006). Thus, it appears that perceptions of *respect* are dynamic within the PEF and seem to fall within a continuum rather than fitting the dichotomy of *respectful* or *disrespectful*. Elected officials view the policrat's entire performance and delivery to gauge levels of respectfulness and assess the presentation's persuasiveness.

IMPLICATIONS

While the list of behaviors and phrases perceived as respectful and disrespectful is not surprising, the long list of contingent behaviors indicates that individual behaviors, rhetorical practices, and word phrases may be perceived differently at different times by the policy-making audience and that policrats must tread carefully when using these practices. Policrats must be cognizant that their own perception of a presentation or behavior as neutral or respectful must be evaluated within the overall context of the presentation and may have to be suspended so it may be assessed from the elected officials' point of view. It is the policy-makers' perspective, their *governing gaze*, that will determine how the presentation is received and may impact how the recommendations included in it are evaluated and implemented. Policrats must know the purpose of the presentation. Although this recommendation may appear reductive and simplistic, the elected officials interviewed indicated that the purpose determined whether or not the policrat was expected to state a recommendation based on technical information or recommend multiple options with the social implication of each and not volunteer a recommendation unless specifically asked to make one. Thus, knowing the purpose determines how much preparation the policrat must undertake to develop a complete presentation that is respectful and persuasive.

Regardless of the import and impact of the presentation, appropriateness is critical for some behaviors particularly those that indicate stronger emotions such as laughing. As Interviewee M12-0005 summarized, respectful policrats dress appropriately for the occasion, value their staff and develop thorough and complete presentations. This comment further highlights how the policy-making audience is constantly observing the policrat's behavior and demeanor, even when the policrat is not necessarily delivering a presentation. Politicians expect expertise and authority to interplay at public hearings so that public policy can be formulated with technical advice and political savvy.

The politicians' expectations appear straightforward and deceptively simple. However, to achieve the interplay and the understanding that the audience expects, policrats must demonstrate their competence by knowing their subject matter – to include administrative aspects of their entire department or organization, and must know their audience and its expectations regarding the specific topic under discussion. Politicians expect the policrat to be rhetorically aware, astute and agile – able to deploy various presentation tactics to *appropriately* respond to politicians' questions. As the Dallas video and the elected officials' reactions to it indicated, a technical or routine topic may not have traditionally warranted a presentation or preparation of visuals; however, if the news media have focused attention on such an agenda item, then the policrats must adapt to the changing situation and anticipate that policy-makers will ask questions at the public meeting to seek clarification for themselves, for the public in general and most likely, for both audiences. The policrats in both the Laredo Comprehensive Plan and the Dallas right-of-way purchase discussions were perceived as under-prepared by a number of the elected officials because they did not have visuals for the elected officials to review. The interviewees believed visuals would have aided the discussions and facilitated understanding. Despite the difference in the breadth of the topics, Laredo's presentation was a higher expectation, a long-term issue and Dallas was a project specific item, policrats should be familiar with precedents on similar issues; distinguishing elements that differentiate their issue from previous presentations; public and news media reactions to their topic; and formulate a presentation that is responsive to the concerns they have identified in their research. This preparation requires that the policrat mine her and her staff's technical expertise and superimpose the social implications onto her presentation. Thus, throughout her research and preparation, the policrat must remember that her audience expects a presentation that is complete, thorough, and appropriate, and allows the

audience to understand the issue, the recommendations, and the implications of those recommendations.

Chapter Five: Comity, Civility, and Invitational Rhetoric - Making Respect Explicit

Respect is an emerging topic of study in sociology and psychology and those disciplines understand its cultural situatedness. Popular literature has also begun discussing the importance of respect in the workplace. Concepts of respect appear implicit in Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS) although scholars have discussed it under different guises. For example, Theresa Enos and Kathleen Blake Yancey term it *comity*: “the attitude and ethos that distinguish the politics of a public society’ located in the space between the individual and the state” (Yancey, 289). *Civility* and *civil discourse* have also been used to describe a less confrontational rhetoric. Sonja K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin describe respectful rhetorical practices as a new type of rhetoric altogether and call it *invitational rhetoric* to distinguish it from neo-traditional rhetoric where the sole purpose is persuasion rather than understanding. As I close this study, I review these concepts including popular discussions of respect and review how the politicians’ reactions discussed in Chapter Four can help Rhetoric and Writing Studies (RWS) expand invitational rhetoric to the *political epistemic field*.

COMITY AND CIVILITY

I begin by reviewing the common definitions for *comity* and *civility* and briefly discuss how comity and civility have been addressed within RWS. *Comity* is generally defined as courtesy or consideration that results in social harmony. *Civility* is similarly described with terms such as politeness, consideration and courtesy, but may also mean “the minimum degree of courtesy” (Google) rather than a sincere expression of value and consideration. In both instances, *comity* and *civility* appear to be superficial behaviors that are required for civilized and polite society and which may indicate some deference or concept of mutuality. Stephen Carter, in

Civility: Manner, Morals, and the Etiquette of Democracy, however, places greater value on civility and describes different behaviors where respect is important to achieve civility within a democracy. For Carter, “politeness alone is no mark of civility” (110) and “[c]ivility assumes that we will disagree; it requires us not to mask our differences but to resolve them respectfully” (132). Carter established many of the foundations that Foss and Griffin and then Sonja K. Foss and Karen A. Foss used in their explications of invitational rhetoric so it is not surprising to find concepts of inherent value when Carter addresses issues of *listening* and *confrontational listening* which for Carter is disrespectful and fails to acknowledge that the ones in error may be the listeners. *Confrontational listening* is listening for politeness’ sake without truly valuing the speaker’s position and without any sense of respect (137-8). This type of listening seeks to refute the speaker’s position rather than attempting to understand.

Carter articulates rules for civility and several specifically mention respect or respectful behaviors as important to achieving civility. The clearest link between the concepts of civility and respect comes in the explicit rule: “*Civility requires that we express ourselves in ways that demonstrate our respect for others*” (162). However, this rule is somewhat buried in the traditionally rhetorical-weakened middle position of a 292-page book and does not address how respect is demonstrated. Carter addresses different types of speech after issuing this rule implying that respect is verbally demonstrate, yet this follows other rules that addressed listening as conveying a respectful attitude. Another of Carter’s rules indicates that “*Civility assumes that we will disagree; it requires us not to mask our differences but to resolve them respectfully*” (282, emphasis in original), but a more robust discussion of respectful resolution is not provided. Thus, although Carter’s work is foundational to invitational rhetoric, Carter seems to assume that *respect* and *respectful behavior* especially during disagreements, is easily understood, and

described and enacted uniformly by his audience. Further, he seems to imply that a respectful intent by the enacting party will also be perceived as respectful behavior by the receiving party.

The Institute for Civility in Government also describes *civility* as more than mere politeness within the political sphere. This organization, dedicated to “facilitating dialogue, teaching respect, and building civility in both the public and private spheres” (Mission & Vision page), describes civility as “disagreeing without disrespect, seeking common ground as a starting point for dialogue about differences, [and] listening past one’s preconceptions” even with those with whom one has deep-rooted differences. Although this organization targets both citizens and elected officials and their staffs while ignoring the polibrats, their very existence recognizes that civility is absent within the political sphere at all levels of government: local, state, and national. This organization’s definition does not address *respect* explicitly, but it does mention its apparent antithesis, *disrespect*, in its description of civility thus linking the concepts.

Theresa Enos explicitly calls for *comity*, “mutual courtesy, civility” (p. 207) in her seminal chapter “A Call for Comity” and laments the rise of incivility – “speech or action that is disrespectful or rude” (p. 207). In her chapter Enos laments that civility may be rendered “a Victorian concept not worth mentioning, much less practicing” (208) and admits that her call for comity may categorize her as a “retrograde” (209). Her goal however, is to “make our rhetorics more spacious,” allowing for both space and time to create understanding (210). This is a departure from neo-classical rhetoric that continues to privilege argument and “winning” and is characterized as the *argument culture* by Deborah Tannen. Neo-classical rhetoric imposes a dichotomy; “[w]hen we’re in an argument with someone,” Enos explains, “our goal is not to listen and understand but to use every available tactic we can find” to win the argument (210). Thus, the opposing results of neo-traditional rhetoric is either winning or losing the argument; no

other outcomes are possible. According to Enos, we demonstrate an active mind by criticizing and attacking rather than creating a space for understanding. Enos traces civility from ancient Greek and Roman concepts where it held a stronger sense of responsibility and respect for the community through the Middle Ages, the enlightenment and its apparent reduction to politeness and manners in Victorian England. During the Victorian era concepts of comity apparently lost their deep roots in public space deliberations and became the minimum level of courtesy as expressed in general definitions of comity and civility. Throughout her historicizing, Enos links comity and civility to notions of ethos and explains how a civil ethos allows for space within rhetorical practices.

Using Edward Shils' description, Enos refines her definition of *civility* or *comity*, describing the latter as a "more inclusive concept," and *civility* as "'the attitude and ethos that distinguish[es] the politics of a civil society.'" However, for Enos, "the space between the state and the individual" becomes the civil society so she seems to exclude discussions *within* the state as forming part of a civil environment (212). She expands on *civility* by quoting Stephen Carter and indicating that *civility* is composed of both "'generosity, even when it is costly, and trust, even when there is risk'" (213). Further linking concepts of *comity* and *civility* to ethos, Enos also reminds us that Cicero described ethos as "courteous and agreeable where authority springs from one's nature and character" (215). As she explores Richard Weaver's *The Ethics of Rhetoric* she highlights that for Weaver, "the way we habitually form an argument expresses our values; thus forms of argument characterize the user" or in this project, the policrat (222). As Enos explains, expressing an argument as an analogy or discussing the nature of things allows for spacious rhetoric because we eliminate the for-or-against dichotomy. This manner of presentation appears to be the specific arrangement that elected officials prefer when discussing

a broad policy issue; politicians want to understand the context and evaluate options rather than being told what they must do.

Enos also borrows heavily from Jim W. Corder's work and his insistence that "conscious attention to ethos and its generative capacity...can lead to a consciousness of comity" (228). Thus, the policrat's awareness and cognizance of comity allows her to construct a respectful policrat ethos and encourages the policrat to plan presentations that allow sufficient time for understanding to evolve as issues are discussed in the PEF. Corder lamented that modern society prefers the quick solution rather than taking time and space to reflect and understand. However, the politicians interviewed for this study tempered their need for brevity and conciseness by indicating that the policrat must balance the time spent delivering a presentation with the time necessary for her audience's attention and understanding. The policrat should neither rush through her presentation and ignore questions from her policy-making audience, nor should she dismiss the political reality of the situation which could very well demand a prompt analysis and timely recommendations.

Using Corder's work as her basis, Enos also indicates that jargon and specialized language limit communication because they "prohibit entry by a hearer into the speaker's discursive universe" (229). The interviewees for this study echoed this perception when they indicated that an explanation of technical terms is always helpful both to the immediate policy-making audience and to the public as a whole. Thus Enos appears to identify specific rhetorical practices that lead to greater understanding and that are generated by the speaker for her audience. Further she cautions that we must always "be cognizant of the ethos in our discourse" – an ethos that is formed by allowing understanding in both how the discourse is generated and

presented (232). Enos concludes that “[w]e don’t have to argue for a conflict-free society, but we can work toward more constructive and civil, ways of expressing opposition” (232).

Throughout her chapter, Enos calls for comity and links the magnanimity inherent in a speaker’s ethos to creating a “spaciousness of rhetoric” so that the speaker’s ethos is formed not only by what she says, but also by how she says it, how she organizes it, taking care to avoid dichotomies, and the time she allows her audience to absorb her comments. Enos’s chapter establishes comity as a rhetorical concern and goal – however, while she discusses elements that may lead to greater comity and their link to the speaker’s ethos, she does not address rhetorical practices that may foster comity.

Kathleen Blake Yancey reflects on Enos’s call for comity and recognizes that comity may become a negative rhetorical concern when it becomes a reason – or rather excuse – to avoid change (290) rather than actual civility. However, Yancey appears to shake off this digression by indicating that such a “refuge for privilege” is a false comity (291). Yancey concludes that we can maintain a sense of optimism that comity remains relevant in RWS. She points to four different indicators that, despite the differences in space, time and technology, including social media, signal that we continue to work towards comity. Yancey observes that we now

- Are less likely “to force a master narrative that in excluding undermines comity;”
- Design curricula with more connections in “physical and electronic, private and public spaces where we enact those curricula;”
- Share our concerns through “mass media, through collections of citizens, through information-sharing and consensus-building;” and

- Are more favorably disposed “toward comity as a desirable end [and toward] multiple spaces where such a desire can be enacted” (300).

Enos ventures into a deeper discussion of morals and virtues, and Yancey turns to pedagogical and curricular strategies that foster comity. They both discuss comity at a conceptual level, tracing its inherent nature in rhetorical tradition and history and demonstrating its continuing relevance. Their discussions of *comity* and *civil discourse* only mention *respect* in passing, as did early discussions of rhetorical canons and theory.

Respect, although consistently discussed as an important element to achieving *comity*, continues to pose definitional problems. Lauren Mackenzie and Megan Wallace (2011) state in their article “The Communication of Respect as a Significant Dimensions of Cross-Cultural Communication Competence,” that respect is “defined and understood only in human interaction,” is perceived as universal and “is simultaneously group and individually defined and oriented....However, the communication of respect is a complex concept going beyond simple politeness and courtesies” (12). Thus, *respect* seems to bridge the gap between comity and ethos. Comity and civil discourse appear to be the desirable goals for some forms of rhetoric; I argue that respectful practices are core components of a policrat’s ethos that allow her to foster a “spaciousness of rhetoric” and create a discursive space where understanding can occur. A policrat who practices respectful rhetorical behavior is cognizant of her ethos, of her audience, and of their shared goals. Such awareness, translated into specific actions, occurring repeatedly over multiple interactions can create both a respectful relationship and civil discourse in private and public spaces.

RESPECT AND THE POPULAR PRESS

Before exploring RWS concepts of comity, civility and respect further, I look to websites and popular magazines which call for increased respect in the workplace and publish helpful tips meant to help managers and employees practice respectful behaviors. Since discussions of *comity* and *civility* invariably include *respect* as a critical concept in the quest for civility but do not specifically address how respect can be enacted, it is likely that a novice bureaucrat may look to the popular press to discover how she can demonstrate respect through her public actions. About the same time Enos was discussing comity, human resource professionals were lamenting that “respect in the workplace is at an all-time low” resulting in productivity problems as reported in Michael A. Verespej’s “A Call for Civility” (2001, 17). Verespej reports that respect’s downfall in the private sector is fueled by employees’ sentiments that they are not valued by management and overwhelming experiences of having been “treated rudely, disrespectfully, or insensitively by a coworker” (17). Disrespectful behavior included name-calling, exclusion from work meetings, and questioning or undermining of the employee’s credibility or expertise. While this report pertains specifically to the private workplace and peer-to-peer disrespect, Verespej’s recommendation echoes my assertion that the speaker must emanate respect. Verespej urges companies to demonstrate they care about their employees – in effect, companies are encouraged to demonstrate goodwill – otherwise creativity and productivity will suffer since employees will be more hesitant to express their views. However, Verespej does not offer recommendations as to *how* companies can effectively demonstrate goodwill and would therefore, disappoint individuals seeking descriptions of respectful behavior.

More recent websites, designed to provide employees and employers with quick solutions to vexing problems provide tips to create respectful, civil workplace environments. Barbara Richman enumerates “Ten Tips” to create such a workplace. Her comments are reminiscent of

Aristotle's characteristics of rhetors who create goodwill in the audience, Enos's call for comity, and comments from the interviewed elected officials as she asks employees to

- "Consider the impact of [their] words and actions on others;"
- "Create an inclusive work environment;"
- "Self-monitor the respect...display[ed] in all areas of ...communications, including verbal, body language and listening;" and
- Become "a role model for civility and respect" (n.p).

However, her tips include *respect* within her listing of respectful behaviors. Thus the actual behavior remains shrouded in the perceived universality of respectful enactment and definitions.

Susan Heathfield is more specific in her ten tips designed to help individuals demonstrate respect in the workplace. She also discusses politeness and courtesy but then addresses deeper concepts of inclusivity and listening. She advises that employees

- "Encourage coworkers to express opinions and ideas;"
- "Listen to what others have to say before expressing [own] viewpoint. Never speak over, butt in, or cut off another person;" and
- "Do not nit-pick, constantly criticize..., belittle,...demean or patronize. A series of seemingly trivial actions, added up over time constitutes bullying" (n.p.)

Heathfield effectively avoids using the circular concept of respectful behavior within her advice and includes descriptions of more specific behavior that resemble concepts the interviewed politicians articulated. These popular, and primarily human resource-oriented, resources do not probe respect, but they do allow me to review how respect is described and discussed in sources where polistrats may first search as they attempt to develop a repertoire of respectful rhetorical practices. The sources provide a starting point, but a more robust theory of respectful rhetoric

must be developed to provide a deeper understanding of respectful practices and their impact on discourse, audience, and rhetor.

INVITATIONAL RHETORIC

Sonja K. Foss and Cindy L. Griffin's theorization of an alternative rhetoric as described in their 1995 article "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric" explicitly incorporates concepts of respect into discussions of rhetoric and also addresses the elements of the PEF. Foss and Griffin posit that within traditional rhetoric a rhetors' sense of worth emanates from their ability to "demonstrate superior knowledge, skills, and qualifications - in other words, authority - in order to dominate the perspectives and knowledge of those in their audiences" (3). Thus, for Foss and Griffin, this is yet another perspective on the rhetor, which may be particularly accurate for a novice public servant who may believe she needs to establish her expertise before her policy-making audience. By contrast, "[a]udience members are assumed to be naive and less expert than the rhetor if their views differ from the rhetor's own" (3). Although the policy-making audience may indeed possess less technical knowledge than the bureaucrat, this assumption may ignore the authority the politicians possess by virtue of their elected positions.

Foss and Griffin explain that invitational rhetoric is feminist not because it is used exclusively by feminists, but because it focuses on principles valued by feminists: equality, immanent value, and self-determination (4-5). However, these principles are also inherent in descriptions of respect and thus create a stronger and explicit link between a theory of rhetoric and concepts of respectful behaviors and attitudes. As Foss and Griffin proceed to describe each of the values, concepts of respect become increasingly visible. For example, equality within this context seeks to eliminate domination/elitism; self-determination is "[g]rounded in respect for

others, [and] ... allows individuals to make their own decisions ... involves the recognition that audience members are the authorities on their lives and accords respect to others' capacity and right to constitute their worlds as they choose" (4). Thus invitational rhetoric posits that when a rhetor recognizes that the audience members are also "experts who are making competent decisions about their lives, efforts by a rhetor to change those decisions are seen as a violation of their worlds and the expertise they have developed" (4). Immanent value is linked to Aristotelian principles of not disdaining others and encourages the rhetor to acknowledge other individuals' worth.

Invitational rhetoric also invites the audience to enter the rhetor's reality and view it from her perspective without judging or denigrating it.

Ideally, audience members accept the invitation offered by the rhetor by listening to and trying to understand the rhetor's perspective and then presenting their own. When this happens, rhetor and audience alike contribute to the thinking about an issue so that everyone involved gains a greater understanding of the issue in its subtlety, richness, and complexity...The stance taken by invitational rhetors toward their audience obviously is different from that assumed by traditional rhetors (5).

Invitational rhetoric recognizes the transactions that occur within the epistemic field created, and Foss and Griffin map the different types of transactions that they encourage within this theory of rhetoric. For example, instead of anticipating resistance or opposition in the traditional sense and preparing for it by countering with additional arguments, the rhetor identifies "possible impediments to the creation of *understanding* and seek[s] to minimize or neutralize them so they do not remain impediments" (6,

emphasis added). Foss and Griffin recognize the ongoing impacts the epistemic field produces on each of the elements when they state that

change occurs in the audience or rhetor or both as a result of new understanding and insights [and that the] internal processes by which transformation occurs also are different...rhetors recognize the valuable contributions audience members can make to the rhetor's own thinking and understanding...and affirm the beliefs of and communicate respect for others (6).

Foss and Griffin identify two major communicative options within invitational rhetoric: offering perspectives and creating conditions that allow presentation of other perspectives in an "atmosphere of respect and equality" (7). The authors include nonverbal communication such as the rhetor's attire and "all of the symbolic choices rhetors make that reveal their perspectives" in their discussion of communicative options (9). These communicative options challenge the traditional concepts of rhetoric and expertise; however they are closely aligned with the preferred presentation organization the elected officials requested – presentation of various options that allow the politicians, as the audience, to arrive at their own positions on policy determinations. Further, Foss and Griffin recognize, as did the interviewed elected officials that non-verbal communication conveys the politician's attitude toward the topic and audience whether or not the rhetor is aware of it. Equality is an overriding principle in Foss and Griffin's theory. Although inequality due to position is inherent in the PEF, the concept of equality between the expert rhetor and her audience is important to mitigate the tension between technical knowledge and elected authority that may exist in the PEF.

Perhaps the biggest departure from traditional concepts of rhetoric's ultimate goal to persuade and change the audience is Foss and Griffin's advice to the rhetor in her on-going transactions with text and audience. In invitational rhetoric

the audience's lack of acceptance of or adherence to the perspective articulated by the rhetor truly makes no difference to the rhetor . . . acceptance or rejection—is seen as perfectly acceptable by the invitational rhetor, who is not offended, disappointed, or angry if audience members choose not to adopt a particular perspective...the connection between the rhetor and the audience remains intact, and the audience still is valued and appreciated by the rhetor (12).

Such detachment by the policrat may prove difficult particularly if the policrat is the ethical and vested individual that public administration texts describe. However, if the policrat can adopt this perspective, it may facilitate on-going exchanges within the PEF that are characterized by respect. The difficulty is in finding the balance between an apathetic, ineffective policrat, and a fully vested one who takes her recommendations so much to heart that she cannot continue discussing other topics with the policy-makers while recognizing that they will make final determinations. Invitational rhetoric makes the policrat responsible for valuing her audience and recognizes “the potential of the audience to contribute to the generation of ideas” (16). If the policrat can recognize that her politician audience, and in some cases the public at large can bring valuable perspectives to the discussion, then she may expand the discussion to develop and create potentially improved policy recommendations that may, as one interviewed politician described, merge technical expertise with political reality.

Invitational rhetoric goes beyond delivery and perspectives. As Foss and Griffin indicate, “the privileging of invention in invitational rhetoric allows for the development of

interpretations, perspectives, courses of actions, and solutions to problems different from those allowed in traditional modes of rhetoric. . . [it] employs invention to discover more cases” (16). Invitational rhetoric makes respect an explicit factor in on-going transactions and views the rhetor/audience relationship as an on-going one that must be fostered and nurtured. This different approach also identifies elements of respectful rhetorical practices that the interviewed policy-makers identified as helpful and respectful. Although Foss and Griffin discuss invitational rhetoric in a broader context than the legal and political limitations inherent in the PEF, its explicit focus on value and respect and its recognition of the transactions that occur between discourse, audience, and rhetor establish invitational rhetoric as a viable rhetorical alternative and perspective for policrats to adopt.

Cindy L. Griffin’s textbook *Invitation to Public Speaking* (2006) utilizes invitational rhetoric’s principles to provide a more detailed roadmap for novice rhetors to enact respectful rhetorical practices. She emphasizes that a speaker must also listen to her audience and adapt her speech accordingly by adjusting the speed, explaining in more detail, omitting information or adding examples for clarity (61). With confused audiences, Griffin advises the speaker to provide a road map and use visual aids even if they were not originally part of the presentation (64). This is not always possible during public meetings; however this advice reminds the policrat to consider the topic’s complexity, the politicians’ questions and expectations, and the presentation’s goal. If the audience is “reloading” for the incoming volley, then the speaker can acknowledge the resistance or eagerness to speak and direct the questions to the end of the presentation so they can be discussed fully (64). This would only work if the audience is predisposed to be respectful – and some politicians discussed that just as a policrat should not interrupt a politician, politicians should not interrupt policrats – however, merging some of the

techniques identified by Interviewee M12-0011 in Chapter Four with this strategy could be useful. For example, the policrat could say, “I realize this topic is important to a number of individuals and my department has developed a plan with a number of points that may address the questions you have; I would like to present those to you and then we can discuss questions.” Alternatively, as interview M12-0008 indicated, the presiding officer could keep order during the meeting to allow the policrat to complete her presentation. The latter, however, might only occur once the policrat has established a respectful relationship with the policy-making audience.

Griffin also addresses language in her text and cautions that words do not have the same meaning for everyone, so it is important for the policrat to realize this when she is drafting her speech. “When [speakers] forget that people may share symbols, but not experiences with those symbols, they run the risk of confusing or alienating their audiences;” so Griffin advises that speakers use concrete, specific words and avoid abstract words that refer to concepts but not to specific objects (248). This may be prove challenging within the PEF, but her advice is useful to policrats who may digress into technical terms, legal concepts or jargon. Further, concrete words may assist in creating understanding when concepts are new, or when the issue is complicated and politicians desire a richer explanation to understand both context and consequences. Although Griffin’s work is grounded in invitational rhetoric, she acknowledges rhetoric’s persuasive character and reminds her readers that “[s]ome of our best efforts at persuasion have resulted in speeches that *respectfully* challenged an audience to think in new ways” (373, emphasis added).

Another textbook grounded in invitational rhetoric is Sonja K. Foss and Karen A. Foss’s *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World* (2003). In this text, Foss and Foss identify five rhetorical modes:

1. Conquest rhetoric – goal is to win and Foss and Foss identify this mode as pervasive in American culture particularly in political structures.
2. Conversion rhetoric – goal is to convince and change how the other thinks and behaves; advertising, sales, religion and activism are examples of this type of rhetoric.
3. Benevolent rhetoric – goal is to help others thus the benefit accrues to others rather than to the speaker.
4. Advisory rhetoric – goal is to respond to an implicit or explicit request for information and is thus reactionary.
5. Invitational rhetoric – goal is achieving understanding and is rooted in the notion of invitation rather than unsolicited rhetoric that best describes the first three modes Foss and Foss identify (4-6). “In invitational rhetoric, the speaker and audience jointly consider and contribute to thinking about an issue so that everyone involved gains a greater understanding of the subtlety, richness, and complexity of that issue” (7).

Public administration textbooks generally encourage policrats to engage in the first three modes: conquest, conversion and benevolent rhetoric. Policrats, as experts, can effectively convince the policy-makers and the public that their technical solution is best. However, as the interviewed politicians indicated in their responses, they perceive that policrats should be engaging in advisory rhetoric where the policrat presents information to the policy-makers. Although the interviewed politicians did not specifically identify invitational rhetoric as a strategy – possibly because it is so seldom enacted by policrats – they did specifically identify understanding as a

goal for exchanges within the PEF. Thus Foss and Foss's points regarding invitational rhetoric become increasingly important for a policrat.

In invitational rhetoric, you are a facilitator rather than an all-knowing expert...You may have access to knowledge or resources that those with whom you are interacting do not and that they may find helpful, but you do not claim that your experiences or your perspectives are superior to theirs (11).

Honoring and valuing others' viewpoints is "more respectful" and may result in greater change since Foss and Foss indicate that "[i]ndividuals are more willing to change when they do not feel coerced, and the changes that do occur typically are more thoughtful, better integrated, and longer lasting than ones produced in more manipulative ways" (30-31). Interacting in this fashion takes time as Enos and Corder point out, and in many instances policrats may perceive that politicians have neither the time nor the patience to participate in a lengthy process. Politicians apparently feel similarly about policrats and believe that the policrat is not always willing to spend the time necessary to create understanding. Neither set of political actors' perception is complete. While politicians indicate they want understanding, they have also indicated that the policrat must balance a comprehensive explanation with the politician's desire for conciseness. This demands that the policrat further analyze her audience to ascertain the time and resources policy-makers are willing to spend on a topic. As a number of the elected officials indicated in Chapter Four, that predisposition will likely be contingent on the nature of the topic.

Although *invitational rhetoric* appears uniquely appropriate for exchanges in the municipal PEF explored in this study and as an alternative rhetoric for policrats to embrace, it is not without criticism. Critiques have described invitational rhetoric as

gender-specific, grounded in essentialist principles, lacking agency, and disguising persuasiveness (Bone, Griffin and Scholz, 2008, 442- 5). Jennifer Emerling Bone, Cindy L. Griffin and T.M. Linda Scholz respond to these critiques and propose invitational rhetoric as useful in challenging situations but not appropriate in all interactions in their 2008 article “Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility.” Bone et al. highlight invitational rhetoric’s respectfulness when they suggest that “invitational rhetoric and civility are a means to create ethical exchanges in difficult situations” (435) and “[t]he interaction or relationship between those involved in the exchange is rooted in reciprocity and respect” (436). The authors refute that invitational rhetoric is gender specific by indicating that this theory “cracks the armor surrounding persuasion and suggests that expanding the focus of rhetoric to include efforts to understand complex situations is as important as changing them” (443). Understanding complex situations is certainly a common goal during discussions in the PEF which reinforces *invitational rhetoric’s* potential use as a productive rhetorical strategy in the municipal PEF. Further, Bone et al. argue, the desire to understand different perspectives that both rhetor and audience bring to interactions, and the dialogue that ensues facilitate agency because these desires and dialogue foster mutual understanding (446). As Bone et al. develop their responses to invitational rhetoric’s criticisms, references to the *epistemic field* appear more evident; the authors indicate “in invitational rhetoric rhetors may be as changed by an interaction as those with whom they communicate” (446). Bone et al. describe a “civil rhetor” as someone who recognizes overlapping discourse groups and venues and who is willing to enter into a conversation where “multiple perspectives may emerge” (448). The authors further suggest that

“rhetors can arrive at civility... when they are invitational” (448). While civility may be the destination, respectful rhetorical practices employed throughout interactions create the environment where multiple perspectives may be heard, considered, explored and potential solutions can prosper. As Bone et al. conclude,

When rhetors speak from a place of invitation, of civility, and a respect for a Western view of democracy, they cannot pretend that they journey alone, that others are unworthy or without voice, or that their view is the only ‘right’ view (448).

RESPECTFUL AND RESPECTED POLICRATS

RWS scholars have explored *comity* and *civility* and have theorized a new model of rhetoric to arrive at civility by creating a discursive environment where understanding occurs and the discourse, audience and rhetor are changed in the process. *Invitational rhetoric* discussions appear the most comprehensive since they recognize Berlin’s concept of the *epistemic field* as well as concepts of *respect* that yield *civility*. Discussions of *comity* and *civility* conflate the desired environment characterized by comity and civility with the rhetorical theory and practices that can help us achieve civil discourse. *Invitational rhetoric* however asks that the rhetor initiate the change in the *epistemic field* and utilize respectful strategies that, ideally, the audience will then reciprocate, thus creating the mutuality respect appears to require. Further, *invitational rhetoric* also asks the rhetor to maintain a healthy distance from the persuasiveness of individual exchanges while focusing on the long-term effects of respectful rhetoric and her relationship with an on-going audience. *Invitational rhetoric* emphasizes that the rhetor initiates the changes in rhetorical practices that will, eventually, lead to a transformed epistemic field. As such, *invitational rhetoric* appears to embody the expectations elected officials bring to the

political epistemic field and so should be of increased importance to both the novice and experienced public administrator. Just as Carter does not call for an end to disagreement and Enos does not call for an end to conflict in her call for comity, I do not advocate for the universal application of *invitational rhetoric* perspectives within the PEF, nor do I argue that respectful rhetorical practices will always lead to comity. However, the principles and practices proposed by *invitational rhetoric* seem uniquely appropriate for the PEF and can be useful to policrats who are seeking to create and foster a professional *ethos* that can transcend individual issues and discussions and the inevitable changes in municipal administrations.

The interviewees in Chapter Four expressed many of the principles and values that invitational rhetoric espouses. For example, Politician M12-0001, the former policrat indicated that “if the presenter is respectful,” the politician is more likely to listen to all of her presentations regardless of whether or not the politician agrees with the topic or the policrat’s recommendation. To further illustrate her point, Politician M12-0001 mentioned a specific El Paso policrat by name and indicated that this policrat presents both pros and cons of all issues and so the politician *respects* him and his presentations and finds his presentations more persuasive. She then contrasted this policrat to another El Paso policrat who is biased in his presentations and so she finds him disrespectful and is cautious about his proposals. This politician also stated that competence, or expertise as I have called it in this project, also plays a role in presentations, but Politician M12-0001 is looking for a combination of competence, integrity and honesty along with complete answers to the politician’s questions. All these factors influence how she begins to trust the policrat.

Similarly, Interviewee M12-0002 reminded me early during the interview that the purpose of policrat presentations is for the audience – meaning the policy-makers – and the

public to understand the topic. Honesty was also important for this official. If the policrat's words are not honest, then they are meaningless. However, Interviewee M12-0002 also discussed the perception that when the policrat's words are too "artful," then the policrat may be perceived as disrespectful. This elected official preferred "straight talk." As can be expected not all elected officials appreciate an informative presentation that does not include an element of persuasiveness. Politician M12-0006 stated that the policrat must "always be persuasive" and "never just informative." This is an extreme position that only this politician articulated and it is unclear if her perception of persuasiveness was intertwined with concepts of policrat's expertise and expert performance that is both convincing and confident. Politician M12-0006 commented that she did not feel having much confidence in the Laredo CD director, thus I speculate that she might be conflating the speaker's expertise and confidence with the resulting persuasiveness.

Interviewee M12-0007 echoed Politician M12-0001 and indicated that policrats are respectful when they present both the pros and cons of an issue and are disrespectful when two sides are not presented. If there is no debate, then there is only one biased position – which this politician viewed as disrespectful. Including the policrat's perspective or opinion in the presentation was also characterized as disrespectful by this politician. He summarized that a policrat should only offer her opinion if asked to do so. Interviewee M12-0008 further expanded that not accepting the elected officials' authority as elected individuals is disrespectful. This interviewee believed it was appropriate for policrats to be persuasive provided that they presented facts and organized their presentation so the "the bottom line was up front" and thus followed a military "BLUF" style where the proposed solution specifically solves the problem in El Paso²³.

²³ Politician M12-0008 indicated that policrats' recommendations solutions should be tailored to local concerns rather than applied wholesale from other communities which are likely different from El Paso. This official wanted

Audience analysis is an important consideration for policrats according to Politician M12-0010. He repeatedly indicated that explanations were respectful if prefaced appropriately, but he also indicated that the presenter must be able to gauge the audience and adjust the presentation to be effective; Politician M12-0010 then provided two examples of instances where explanations and adjustments were necessary. Presentations at the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)²⁴, for example are rife with acronyms and “alphabet soup” and so policrats may present almost exclusively with them to demonstrate their expert knowledge of the topic and yet fail to convey that knowledge effectively to the policy-making audience. The second example was of a particular public servant who proceeds with his prepared presentation without adapting for the audience regardless of how the audience is responding (or not) to the information. In each case, failure to analyze and adapt to the audience impacts the presenter’s ethos and may reduce her credibility because the presenter has not acknowledged her audience’s level of knowledge or attention. This politician, a long-time mayor in his community, also indicated elected officials usually prefer an explanation that includes both technical and social impacts because a technical solution is seldom the “full” solution. Further, the presentation must include “the negative” because to gloss over weaknesses or objections to a proposal is disrespectful. Politician M12-0010 emphasized that the policrat must first *understand* what her policy-making body is requesting and then *create understanding* in the audience through her presentation. This politician conceded that creating understanding and advocacy often become closely entwined.

to make sure that the policrat was cognizant of El Paso characteristics and had incorporated those effects into the proposal presented to the City Council.

²⁴ The Metropolitan Planning Organization is a regional agency governed by local and state elected officials that is responsible for regional planning. MPO’s nationwide are created by the federal government and through their governing board allocate federal transportation dollars to regionally significant transportation projects. MPO’s deal with planning and funding acronyms that come easily to regional and local planners, but can become overwhelming to elected officials. Many presentations are peppered with acronyms.

These comments further illustrate the policy-makers' willingness to understand difficult concepts provided the polycrat is respectful in explaining them and understands the political reality that the elected officials must navigate when deliberating technical issues. Politicians expressed their desire for polycrats to understand the elected officials' desire for conciseness and completeness as well as their time constraints. Further, policy-makers expect polycrats to understand the types of questions that polycrats must address through their presentations. Some politicians understand that presentations will be inherently persuasive since the polycrat has already sifted through technical information to arrive at the recommended solutions; however, in most instances, the polycrats do not desire outright advocacy on major policy issues and prefer to arrive at their own conclusions all while relying on the polycrats experience and expertise.

INVITATIONAL RHETORIC AND THE *POLITICAL EPISTEMIC FIELD*

Concern for lack of *comity* and *civility* transcends the borders of RWS and has been lamented in other disciplines as well as in the popular media. The creation of the Institute for Civility in Government is a clear indication that the political sphere is perceived as particularly rife with incivility. As scholars describe the merits of comity and civility, they argue in favor of their renewal and the benefits that such a sensibility can bring to public and private spaces. Their discussions seem to focus on questions of definition, policy or desirability. Authors not only lament the lack of *civility* and its potential causes; they argue that *civility* is necessary in a civilized society. *Invitational rhetoric* and discussions of *respect* expand these discussions by probing questions of theory and process. However, few have engaged in discussions of how we foster *civility* and more attention seems to have focused on spaces, physical, electronic, public, and private, that foster *civility*. Interrogating respectful rhetorical practices within *invitational rhetoric* provides polycrats with a theoretically framed heuristic that can assist them in

developing persuasive, respectful and respected practices that permeate their policrat ethos. I posit that respectful rhetorical practices bridge the gap between policrats' ethos and civility in public deliberations. However, it is critical to understand that *respect*, as a culturally situated, complex, human interaction is described as such by the audience rather than the rhetor or the policrat intending to employ respectful practices. The policrat must be cognizant of her respectful intent throughout the inventive process and at the time of delivery, but it is the impact of her presentation that will determine whether or not the policrat is described as respectful. Consistently respectful rhetorical practices will then transfer to other, on-going interactions in the PEF.

While other factors such as the organization's culture, morale levels, and leadership are likely impacts on policrats' respectful rhetorical practices, the interviewee responses collected and analyzed in this project provide an initial glimpse into policy-makers' *governing gaze*: their expectations and perceptions of respect in the municipal PEF. Making these expectations and perceptions explicit to the policrats should impact the policrats' inventive processes, information gathering, organization and delivery of their recommendations. If policrats are unclear as to the question(s) they should be addressing, they should ask for guidance. If they do not know how much their audience knows about a topic, they should prepare a presentation that can either provide a robust explanation or cut quickly to the issue under discussion. If the topic is a broad policy matter, they should prepare both technical and social implications of several proposals including best practices and adaptations to the local context. If they believe the policy-makers will need time to deliberate, they should advise the policy-makers that more time might have to be dedicated to the topic. Most importantly however, policrats should make every effort to

determine how their audience describes respectful rhetorical practices so the policrats can enact them.

Developing and incorporating respectful rhetorical practices into policrats' *bureauspeaking* requires that policrats

- Recognize the need for respectful rhetoric in their presentations and the effect on both short- and long-term outcomes; and
- Move beyond subject matter expertise and consider the “political reality” and social implications of a proposal.

These shifts are not easily accomplished. Most policrats, as subject matter experts, have been taught to express their recommendations within the neo-traditional rhetorical model that favors persuasion and winning the argument. If the policrats are degreed public administrators, they may have also been taught that politicians are not interested in investing time or effort into understanding contexts and recommendations. Reversing these ingrained patterns of thought will require that the highest levels of policrats commit to creating a civil municipal PEF where bureaucrats can become the adept administrators I have termed *policrats*. Some initial steps to foster this comity could be for an organization's top policrats, in El Paso's case the City Manager and her executive team, to express their desire to create a civil public space at public meetings, invite the elected officials to participate in creating this civil discourse, and then openly and explicitly discuss the expectations that the elected officials bring to the dais so that the policrats can be aware of these expectations. These actions are invitational, and I speculate that they would begin building the bridge between the policrats' respectful ethos and a civil El Paso PEF.

Works Cited

- Allison, Libby and Miriam F. Williams. *Writing for the Government*. New York: Pearson Education, 2008. Print.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. Print.
- Bent, Alan Edward. "Administration of the Urban Nation." Bent and Rossum 360 – 381.
- Bent, Alan E. and Ralph A. Rossum, eds. *Urban Administration: Management, Politics, and Change*. Port Washington, NY: National University Publications/Kennikat Press, 1976. Print.
- Bent, Alan E. and Ralph A. Rossum. "Introduction: Challenges to Urban Administration." Bent and Rossum 3-14.
- . "The Urban Administrator." Bent and Rossum 16- 18.
- Berlin, James A. "Contemporary Composition: the Major Pedagogical Theories." *College English* 44.8 (1982): 765-777. Print.
- Berlin, James A., and Robert P. Inkster. "Current-Traditional Rhetoric: Paradigm and Practice." *Freshman English News* 8.3 (1980): 1-4; 13-14. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. Print.
- Bone, Jennifer Emerling, Cindy L. Griffin, & T.M. Linda Scholz. "Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility." *Western Journal of Communication*. 72.4 (2008): 434-462. Print.

- Brock, Bernard L., Mark E. Huglen, James F. Klumpff, and Sharon Howell. *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005. Print.
- Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Social Construction, Language, and the Authority of Knowledge: A Bibliographical Essay." *College English* 48.8 (1986) 773-790. Print.
- Brummett, Barry. "Three Meanings of Epistemic Rhetoric." SCA Convention, November 1979. 1-10. Print.
- Cantine, Robert R. "How Practicing Urban Administrators View Themselves." Bent and Rossum. 19-30.
- Carter, Stephen L. *Civility: Manners, Morals, and the Etiquette of Democracy*. New York: Basic Books, 1998. Print.
- City of El Paso, Office of Management and Budget. "2014 Proposed Budget – City of El Paso." 17 Nov. 2013. Web. <http://home.elpasotexas.gov/omb/_documents/FY2014_PROPOSED-FINAL.pdf>.
- City of El Paso, "Quick Glance: Adopted Budget Fiscal Year 2014" 17 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://home.elpasotexas.gov/news-notice/documents/FY2014%20Budget%Fact%20Sheet>>.
- "Civility." *Oxford English Dictionary*. 25 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/33581?redirectedFrom=civility#eid>>
- "Civility." *Google*. 22 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://www.google.com/search?q=comity>>.
- Cohen, Steven, William Eimicke, and Tanya Heikkila. *The Effective Public Manager*. 4th Ed. Feldman, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008. Print.

“Comity.” *Google*. 22 Nov. 2013. Web. < <http://www.google.com/search?q=comity>>.

“Comity.” *Merriam Webster*. 22 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://www.meriam-webster.com/dictionary/comity>> .

Constantinides, Helen. “The Duality of Scientific Ethos: The Deep and Surface Structures.”

Quarterly Journal of Speech 87.1 (2001): 61-72. Print.

Cooper, Terry L. *The Responsible Administrator: An Approach to Ethics for the Administrative*

Role. 5th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2006. Print.

Demirdögen, Ülkü D. “The Roots of Research in (Political) Persuasion: Ethos, Pathos, Logos

and the Yale Studies of Persuasive Communications.” *International Journal of Social*

Inquiry 3.1 (2010): 189-201. *EBSCO*. Web. 26 Jan. 2012.

“El Paso, Texas.” *Wikipedia*. 6 Nov. 2013. Web. < [http://](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/El_Paso,_Texas)

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/El_Paso,_Texas>.

Emig, Janet. “Inquiry Paradigms and Writing.” *College Composition and Communication* 33:1

(1982): 64-75. Print.

---. “The Tacit Tradition: The Inevitability of A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Writing

Research.” *Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition*. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle.

Conway, AK: L & S Books, 1980. 64-75. Print.

Enos, Theresa J. “A Call for Comity.” *Renewing Rhetoric’s Relation to Composition: Essays in*

Honor of Theresa Jarnagin Enos. Eds. Shane Borrowman, Stuart C. Brown, and Thomas

P. Miller. New York: Routledge, 2010. 207-235. Print.

Foss, Sonja K. and Cindy L. Griffin. “Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational

Rhetoric.” *Communication Monographs*. 62 (1995): 2-18. Print.

- Finer, Herman. "Government and the Expert." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 12:9 (1956): 329-332. *EBSCO*. Web. 25 May 2012
- Foss, Sonja K. & Karen A. Foss. *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 2003 Print
- Freedman, Aviva and Ian Pringle, eds. "Epilogue." *Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition*. Conway, Arkansas: L & S Books, 1980. Print.
- Griffin, Cindy L. *Invitation to Public Speaking*. 2nd Ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2006. Print.
- Hall, Lauren K. "Impassioned Politics: New Research on the Role of Emotions in Political Life." *Politics and the Life Sciences*. 28.2 (2009): 84-9. *EBSCO*. 23 Sept. 2011.
- Hartelius, E. Johanna. *The Rhetoric of Expertise*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2011. Print.
- Harwood, Robin L., Alev Yalcinkaya, Banu Citlak, and Birgit Leyendecker. "Exploring the Concept of Respect among Turkish and Puerto Rican Migrant Mothers." Shwalb and Shwalb 9-24.
- Heathfield, Susan M. "How to Demonstrate Respect at Work" retrieved from About.com – Human Resources. 31 Oct. 2013. Web.
<http://humanresources.about.com/od/worrelationships/a/demo_respect.html>
- Hoeken, Hans. "Convincing Citizens: the Role of Argument Quality." Janssen and Neuterlings 147-169.
- Hyde, Michael J. Ed. *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press. 2004. Print.
- Institute for Civility. 22 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://instituteforcivility.org>> .

Janssen, Daniël. "Improving the Quality of Public Documents: or: Why Training Public Writers Often Doesn't Work." Janssen and Neuterlings 105-124.

Janssen, Daniël and Rob Neuterlings eds. *Reading and Writing Public Documents: Problems, Solutions and Characteristics*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001. Print.

Kappes, Hayley. "El Paso City Manager Joyce Wilson Review Moved Up: Emails Critical of City Reps, Ballpark Opponents Spur Action." *El Paso Times*. El Paso Times 17 Nov. 2012. Web. 23 Oct. 2013. <http://www.elpasotimes.com/ci_22015419/evaluations-wilson-moved-forward-after-emails-released?IADID=Search-www.elpasotimes.com-www.elpasotimes.com>.

Kaufer, David and Robert Hariman. "Discriminating Political Styles as Genres: A Corpus Study Exploring Hariman's Theory of Political Style." *Text & Talk*. 28.4 (2008): 475-500. EBSCO. 23 Sept. 2011.

Kinneavy, James. "A Pluralistic Synthesis of Four Contemporary Models for Teaching Composition." *Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition*. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle. Conway, AK: L&S Books, 1980. 37-52. Print.

Lanham, Richard A. *Revising Prose*. 5th Ed. New York: Pearson/Longham. 2007. Print.

Lucaites, John Louis and Celeste Michelle Condit. *Introduction to Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Eds. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit and Sally Caudill. New York: The Guildford Press. 1999. Print.

Mackenzie, Lauren and Megan Wallace. "The Communication of Respect as a Significant Dimension of Cross-Cultural Communication Competence." *Cross-Cultural Communication*. 7.3 (2011): 10-18.

- May, James M. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988. Print.
- Marsh, Charles. "Aristotelian Ethos and the New Orality: Implications for Media Literacy and Media Ethics." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 21.4 (2006): 338-352. EBSCO 25 May 2012.
- McLaren, Peter L. and Colin Lankshear. "Critical Literacy and the Postmodern Turn." *Critical Literacy: Politics, Praxis and the Postmodern*. Eds. Peter L. McLaren and Colin Lankshear. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993. 379-417. Print.
- "Respect." *Definitions*. 11 October. 2011. Web. <<http://www.definitions.net/definition/respect>>.
- Richman, Barbara. "Ten Tips for Creating Respect and Civility in Your Workplace." *Lorman Newsletter*. 31 Oct. 2013. Web. <http://www.lorman.com/newsletter/article.php?article_id=694&newsletter_id=150#at_pco=tcb-1.0&at_tot=5&at_ab=per-4&at_pos=0> .
- Scott, Robert L. "On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic." In *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caiudill. NY: The Guilford Press, 1999. 131-139. Print.
- Sennett, Richard. *Respect in a World of Inequality*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003. Print.
- Shwalb, David W. and Barbara J. Shwalb, eds. *Respect and Disrespect: Cultural and Developmental Origins*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006. Print.
- Shwalb, Barbara J. and David Shwalb. "Concept Development of Respect and Disrespect in American Kindergarten and First-and Second-Grade Children." Shwalb and Shwalb 67-80.

- Shwalb, David W. and Barbara J. Shwalb, "Research and Theory on Respect and Disrespect: Catching Up with the Public and Practitioners." Shwalb and Shwalb 1-8.
- Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998. Print.
- Sugie, Shuji, David Shwalb and Barbara J. Shwalb. "Respect in Japanese Childhood, Adolescence and Society." Shwalb and Shwalb 39- 52.
- Suleiman, Ezra N. Ed. *Bureaucrats and Policymaking: A Comparative Overview*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1984. Print.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. United States Census Bureau. "Quick Facts." 6 Nov. 2013. Web. <<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48/48141.html>>.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. United States Census Bureau. "Race." 2 Dec. 2013. Web. <<http://www.census.gov/population/race/>>.
- Verespej, Michael A. "A Call for Civility." *Industry Week*. Industry Week. 12 Feb. 2001. Web. 16 Apr. 2013. <www.industryweek.com>.
- Williams, Joseph M. and Gregory C. Colomb. *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. 10th Ed. Boston: Longman/Pearson. 2010. Print.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "In Search of Comity" in *Renewing Rhetoric's Relation to Composition: Essays in Honor of Theresa Jarnagin Enos*. Eds. Shane Borrowman, Stuart C. Brown, and Thomas P. Miller. New York: Routledge, 2010. 289-301. Print.

Appendix A – Institutional Review Board Approval & Consent Form



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
Office of the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects
Institutional Review Board
El Paso, Texas 79968-0587
phone: 915 747-8841 fax: 915 747-5931

FWA No: 00001224

DATE: May 1, 2012

TO: Teresa Quezada, MPA

FROM: University of Texas at El Paso IRB

STUDY TITLE: [325092-1] BureauSpeak: A Rhetorical Analysis of Municipal Employees' Professional Writing and Speaking

IRB REFERENCE #: 325092-1

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: APPROVED

APPROVAL DATE: May 1, 2012

EXPIRATION DATE: May 1, 2013

REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research study. University of Texas at El Paso IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a study design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This study has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the study and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the study via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported to this office. Please use the appropriate adverse event forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

Please report all NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this study to this office.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after termination of the project.

Based on the risks, this project requires Continuing Review by this office on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate renewal forms for this procedure.

If you have any questions, please contact Athena Fester at (915) 747-8841 or afester@utep.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

**University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects**

Protocol Title: BureauSpeak: A Rhetorical Analysis of Municipal Employees' Professional Writing and Speaking

Principal Investigator: Teresa Quezada

UTEP: English – Rhetoric and Writing Studies Program

In this consent form, "you" always means the study subject.

1. Introduction

You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision and feel free to discuss it with your friends and family. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

2. Why is this study being done?

You have been asked to take part in a research study of politicians' perceptions of respectful behaviors as expressed by municipal or county staff during staff presentations to your Council or Commissioner's Court. Approximately 15 will be enrolling in this study. You are being asked to be in the study because you currently hold or have held public office at the municipal or county level. If you decide to enroll in this study, your involvement will last about one hour.

3. What is involved in the study?

If you agree to take part in this study, the research team will: Ask you a number of questions that describe respectful and disrespectful behavior; ask you to view a short video of an exchange between a public administrator and a policy-making body; ask you questions about the exchange and your perceptions of respectful and disrespectful behavior exhibited in the video. The process is expected to take approximately 60 minutes.

Revised: 04/15/09

Page 1 of 4



Approved on: 05/01/2012
Expires on: 05/01/2013
Study Number: Quezada
325092-1

4. What are the risks and discomforts of the study?

There are no known risks associated with this research

5. Are there benefits to taking part in this study?

There will be no direct benefits to you for taking part in this study. This research may help us to understand what behaviors are perceived as respectful when making presentations to elected officials.

6. What other options are there?

You have the option not to take part in this study. There will be no penalties involved if you choose not to take part in this study.

7. Who is paying for this study?

Funding for this study is provided by UTEP Department of English.

8. What are my costs?

There are no direct costs. You will be responsible for travel to and from the research site and any other incidental expenses.

9. Will I be paid to participate in this study?

You will not be paid for taking part in this research study.

10. What if I want to withdraw, or am asked to withdraw from this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you do not take part in the study, there will be no penalty.

If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. However, we encourage you to talk to a member of the research group so that they know why you are leaving the



study. If there are any new findings during the study that may affect whether you want to continue to take part, you will be told about them.

The researcher may decide to stop your participation without your permission, if he or she thinks that being in the study may cause you harm.

11. Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may call Terry Quezada at 867-8670 or email tquezada2@miners.utep.edu

If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915-747-8841) or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

12. What about confidentiality?

Your part in this study is confidential. None of the information will identify you by name. All records will be coded by a participant code. Names and codes will be secured in a locked cabinet in a secure office on campus. Only the researcher and her dissertation chair will have access to the audio-recordings made during the interview. The recordings will be destroyed upon transcription by the researcher. Recordings are a necessary part of this study to minimize participant's time and compile a complete record of the comments and answers you provide to the researcher. The qualitative information gathered from your answers will be used in this study in aggregate form along with answers from other study participants.



13. Authorization Statement

I have read each page of this paper about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information on results of the study later if I wish.

I agree to be audio recorded:

☐

Yes

☐

No

I agree to allow my name and/or elected position to be used in the study and associated with my responses. Checking "yes" means the researcher may use your name and position when discussing your responses in her study findings:

☐

Yes

☐

No

Participant Name:

Date:

Participant Signature:

Time:



Appendix B – Student Survey

1. Male _____ Female _____

2. Age

- ☐ Under 25
- ☐ 26 -35
- ☐ 26 - 45
- ☐ 46 - 55
- ☐ 56 - 65
- ☐ 66 - 75
- ☐ over 75

3. Length of Texas Residence

- ☐ 0 – 5 years
- ☐ 6 – 10 years
- ☐ 10– 15 years
- ☐ 15– 20 years
- ☐ More than 20 years

4. Ethnicity/Race:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latino/ Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American or Alaska Native | <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro | <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

5. If Texas residence is less than 6 years, where did you live before? For how long?

6. Employed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

7. If yes, length of employment.

- ☐ 0 – 5 years
- ☐ 6 – 10 years
- ☐ 10– 15 years
- ☐ 15– 20 years
- ☐ More than 20 years

Markers of Respectful Rhetorical Practices

Actions presenter/speaker takes when addressing an elected body as his/her audience.

Physical

- ☐ Making eye contact with audience
- ☐ Listening actively
- ☐ Nodding affirmatively
- ☐ Smiling
- ☐ Keeping a neutral expression
- ☐ Laughing
- ☐ Other

Oral

- ☐ Saying “sir” or “ma’am” when addressing audience
- ☐ Using honorific (“representative,” “mayor,” “judge,” “commissioner,” “Madam/Mr. chair)
- ☐ Using “Mr., Ms., or Mrs.”
- ☐ Keeping level voice tone
- ☐ Saying “Respectfully...”
- ☐ Explaining technical terms/concepts or jargon before using them in presentation
- ☐ Saying “excuse me/pardon me” when member of audience was interrupted
- ☐ Saying “I apologize”
- ☐ Using slang
- ☐ Speaking in a neutral tone
- ☐ How is this described?

- ☐ Other

Rhetorical

- ☐ Presenting facts/technical solution exclusively

- ☐ Allowing audience to reach conclusions
- ☐ Presenting social impact of proposed policy
- ☐ Presenting a single recommendation with technical rationale
- ☐ Presenting multiple scenarios with strengths and weaknesses for each
- ☐ Presenting social impact of single recommendation
- ☐ Presenting social impact of multiple recommendations
- ☐ Acknowledging objections to proposal
- ☐ Providing background on how objections were incorporated into proposal
- ☐ Joking
- ☐ Other

Electronic/Textual

- ☐ Using correct grammar and punctuations (“correct English”) particularly in e-mail texts
- ☐ Other

Markers of Disrespect Rhetorical Practices

Actions presenter/speaker takes when addressing an elected body as his/her audience.

Physical

- ☐ Avoiding eye contact with audience
- ☐ Looking at electronic devices frequently (i.e. phone, iPad, blackberry)
- ☐ Rolling eyes when member of audience makes comment/asks question
- ☐ Sighing or noticeable exhalation when beginning an explanation or providing additional information in response to a question/comment
- ☐ Rushing through presentation or explanation
- ☐ Interrupting audience member asking question
- ☐ Attempting to provide information before audience member has finished making his/her point
- ☐ Nodding negatively
- ☐ Keeping a neutral expression
- ☐ Laughing
- ☐ Smiling
- ☐ Other

Oral

- ☐ Using “Mr., Ms., or Mrs.” instead of title (“representative,” “mayor,” “judge”)
- ☐ Using “Mrs.” instead of “Ms.”
- ☐ Using “Ms.” instead of “Mrs.”
- ☐ Using first name only
- ☐ Raising voice
- ☐ Using sarcasm in voice

☐ How is a sarcasm detected or described?

- ☐ Saying “As I said...”
- ☐ Saying “Again...”
- ☐ Saying “Let me explain so you understand/one more time...”
- ☐ Saying “Respectfully...”
- ☐ Saying “It’s technical...”
- ☐ Saying “It’s complicated/complex...”
- ☐ Saying “It’s simple...”
- ☐ Saying “This is just housekeeping...”
- ☐ Using jargon (in presentation or in text)
- ☐ Using simplistic terms
- ☐ Using technical terms without adequate explanation
- ☐ Saying “Respectfully...”
- ☐ Saying “I apologize”
- ☐ Completing audience member’s sentences/questions
- ☐ Using slang
- ☐ Other

Rhetorical

- ☐ Presenting facts exclusively
- ☐ Allowing audience to reach conclusions
- ☐ Presenting social impact of proposed policy
- ☐ Presenting a single recommendation with technical rationale
- ☐ Presenting multiple scenarios with strengths and weaknesses for each
- ☐ Presenting social impact of single recommendation
- ☐ Presenting social impact of multiple recommendations
- ☐ Joking
- ☐ Other

Electronic/Textual

- ☐ Using all capital letters in e-mail
- ☐ Using text or e-mail abbreviations in e-mail
- ☐ Other

Appendix C - Interview Protocol for Elected Officials

1. Interviewee Code : _____

2. Male _____ Female _____

3. Age

- ☐ Under 25
- ☐ 26 -35
- ☐ 26 - 45
- ☐ 46 - 55
- ☐ 56 - 65
- ☐ 66 - 75
- ☐ over 75

4. Ethnicity/Race:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Latino/ Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> Black/African American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American or Alaska Native | <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro | <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Identify if "Other"

5. Education Level

- ☐ High School
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ College Degree
- ☐ Some Graduate Work
- ☐ Graduate Degree
- ☐ Additional Graduate Work
(indicate additional hours or degrees) _____

6. Length of Texas Residence

- ☐ 0 – 5 years
- ☐ 6 – 10 years
- ☐ 10– 15 years
- ☐ 15– 20 years
- ☐ More than 20 years

7. If Texas residence is less than 6 years, where did you live before? For how long? Do you consider yourself a “southerner”

--

8. State or Local (Municipal) Office held:

State _____ Municipal _____

9. Size of Jurisdiction (for Municipal Elected Officials only)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 to | 29,999 Residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 30,000 to | 49,999 Residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 50,000 to | 99,999 Residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 100,000 to | 149,999 Residents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Over | 150,000 Residents |

10. How long have you held public office or for how long did you hold public office?

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 to 1 year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 to 2 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 to 4 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 to 8 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 to 12 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 to 20 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | more than 20 years |

11. Were you a public administrator before you were elected to office?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes |

12. If “Yes,” for how long?

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 to 1 year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 to 2 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 to 4 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 to 8 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 to 12 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 to 20 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | more than 20 years |

13. If “Yes,” did you make presentations to policy-making bodies

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | seldom (less than 3 times per year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | with some frequency (once per month) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | very frequently (more than once per month) |

Markers of Respectful Rhetorical Practices

Actions presenter/speaker takes when addressing an elected body as his/her audience.

Physical

- ☐ Making eye contact with audience
- ☐ Listening actively
- ☐ Nodding affirmatively
- ☐ Smiling
- ☐ Keeping a neutral expression
- ☐ Laughing
- ☐ Others

Oral

- ☐ Saying “sir” or “ma’am” when addressing audience
- ☐ Using honorific (“representative,” “mayor,” “judge,” “commissioner,” “Madam/Mr. chair”)
- ☐ Using “Mr., Ms., or Mrs.”
- ☐ Keeping level voice tone
- ☐ Saying “Respectfully...”
- ☐ Explaining technical terms/concepts or jargon before using them in presentation
- ☐ Saying “excuse me/pardon me” when member of audience was interrupted
- ☐ Saying “I apologize”
- ☐ Using slang
- ☐ Saying “with all due respect...”
- ☐ Saying “this is just housekeeping ...”
- ☐ Speaking in a neutral tone
- ☐ How is this described?

- ☐ Other

Rhetorical

- ☐ Presenting facts/technical solution exclusively
- ☐ Allowing audience to reach conclusions
- ☐ Presenting social impact of proposed policy
- ☐ Presenting a single recommendation with technical rationale
- ☐ Presenting multiple scenarios with strengths and weaknesses for each
- ☐ Presenting social impact of single recommendation
- ☐ Presenting social impact of multiple recommendations
- ☐ Acknowledging objections to proposal

- ☐ Providing background on how objections were incorporated into proposal
- ☐ Joking
- ☐ Other

Electronic/Textual

- ☐ Using correct grammar and punctuations (“correct English”) particularly in e-mail texts
- ☐ Other

Markers of Disrespect Rhetorical Practices

Actions presenter/speaker takes when addressing an elected body as his/her audience.

Physical

- ☐ Avoiding eye contact with audience
- ☐ Looking at electronic devices frequently (i.e. phone, iPad, blackberry)
- ☐ Rolling eyes when member of audience makes comment/asks question
- ☐ Sighing or noticeable exhalation when beginning an explanation or providing additional information in response to a question/comment
- ☐ Rushing through presentation or explanation
- ☐ Interrupting audience member asking question
- ☐ Attempting to provide information before audience member has finished making his/her point
- ☐ Nodding negatively
- ☐ Keeping a neutral expression
- ☐ Laughing
- ☐ Smiling
- ☐ Other

Oral

- ☐ Using “Mr., Ms., or Mrs.” instead of title (“representative,” “mayor,” “judge”)
- ☐ Using “Mrs.” instead of “Ms.”
- ☐ Using “Ms.” instead of “Mrs.”
- ☐ Using first name only
- ☐ Raising voice
- ☐ Using sarcasm in voice
 - ☐ How is a sarcasm detected or described?

-
- ☐ Saying “As I said...”
 - ☐ Saying “Again...”
 - ☐ Saying “Let me explain so you understand/one more time...”
 - ☐ Saying “Respectfully...”
 - ☐ Saying “With all due respect...”
 - ☐ Saying “It’s technical...”
 - ☐ Saying “It’s complicated/complex...”
 - ☐ Saying “It’s simple...”
 - ☐ Saying “This is just housekeeping...”
 - ☐ Using jargon (in presentation or in text)
 - ☐ Using simplistic terms
 - ☐ Using technical terms without adequate explanation
 - ☐ Saying “I apologize”
 - ☐ Completing audience member’s sentences/questions
 - ☐ Using slang
 - ☐ Other
-

Rhetorical

- ☐ Presenting facts exclusively
 - ☐ Allowing audience to reach conclusions
 - ☐ Presenting social impact of proposed policy
 - ☐ Presenting a single recommendation with technical rationale
 - ☐ Presenting multiple scenarios with strengths and weaknesses for each
 - ☐ Presenting social impact of single recommendation
 - ☐ Presenting social impact of multiple recommendations
 - ☐ Joking
 - ☐ Other
-

Electronic/Textual

- ☐ Using all capital letters in e-mail
 - ☐ Using text or e-mail abbreviations in e-mail
 - ☐ Other
-
-

Have elected official view video of exchange between San Antonio Policrat and Policy-making body.

How would you describe this exchange:

- ☐ Respectful
- ☐ Disrespectful
- ☐ Neutral

What made it so? (as described in question above)

Was the presentation persuasive? Why?

Have you changed your mind about the markers of respect? Which ones? Why?

Are there other markers of respect that we did not discuss? Which ones?

Do you know another elected official who would be willing to participate in this study?

Vita

Teresa Quezada was born in El Paso, Texas, the only daughter of Francisco Quezada and Evangelina Quezada. She attended El Paso High School and graduated with honors in 1982. She attended the University of Texas at El Paso and earned her Bachelor of Business Administration in May 1986 with a concentration in Accounting. She was the first U.T. El Paso graduate of the dual Master of Business Administration/Master in Public Administration program in December 1992.

Dr. Quezada completed more than 20 years of successful public service with the City of El Paso. She began working full-time on her doctorate degree in the fall of 2011 and began teaching as an Assistant Instructor in the First Year Composition Program. While in the Ph.D. Program, Dr. Quezada presented at various regional conferences and twice at the national Conference of College Composition and Communication. She was awarded the College of Liberal Arts Fellowship during the summer of 2013.

Dr. Quezada's dissertation, *BureauSpeak: Discovering How elected Officials Perceive Municipal Employees' Dis/Respectful Rhetorical Practices*, was supervised by Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez.

Dr. Quezada joined the faculty of the English Department in August 2013 as a senior lecturer in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies program.

Permanent address: 4313 Santa Rita
El Paso, Texas 79902

This dissertation was typed by Teresa Quezada.