1 - 3

March 5, 1973

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Lyle Vincent Staten, Jr. entitled "The Effects of Time and Quantity on Ad Hominem Satire as a Persuader: An Experiment." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Communications.

Willis E. Tucker
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

C. William H. Cornwell

Kelly Smith

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor for
Graduate Studies and Research

THE EFFECTS OF TIME AND QUANTITY ON AD HOMINEM SATIRE AS A PERSUADER: AN EXPERIMENT

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

Lyle Vincent Staten, Jr.

March 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Three persons have made significant contributions intellectually, as well as inspirationally, toward the completion of this thesis: W. H. Cormier, B. K. Leiter, W. C. Tucker. No thesis or dissertation student could go wrong with these three on his committee.

1070887

ABSTRACT

The effects of differential amounts of ad hominem satire (satire directed against a person) presented over a fixed time period on student attitudes toward university administrators was investigated using a pre-test post-test experimental design.

Sixty-four college students served as subjects in four experimental groups. The subjects were given a pre-test to determine their opinions of a particular campus administrator on a scale using the five propositions "very favorable," "favorable," "no opinion," "unfavorable," and "very unfavorable." During the course of a week one group was exposed to three newspaper columns satirizing the administrator, a second group was exposed to one ad hominem satirical column, and the two control groups were exposed to no ad hominem satirical columns. A post-test was administered and pre-test and post-test scores were compared to determine if there had been any attitude shift toward the satirized person.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant main effect produced by the interaction of experimental groups and satirized persons. The hypothesis that increased amounts of ad hominem satire presented over a fixed time period will produce similar increases in unfavorable opinion toward the object of the satire was not supported.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
	Humor	5
	Ad Hominem Satire	5
	Satire as Persuader	7
	Persuasion	8
	Conclusion Drawing	9
	Message Source	10
	Internal Validity	11
	External Validity	11
	Attitude Measurement	13
III.	METHOD	16
	Subjects	16
	Design	16
	Secondary Data	17
	Test Instrument	18
	Stimuli	19
IV.	RESULTS	23
V.	DISCUSSION	28

SECTION PAGE

Limitations of the Research. 28

Analysis of Results 30

Suggestions for Further Research 36

Implications. 40

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 42

APPENDIX. 46

VITA. 54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

A. Analysis of Variance for Variable Gain. 23

B. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test for Variable Gain for Experimental Groups. 24

C. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test for Variable Gain for Stimulus Persons. 24

D. Mean Gain Scores by Experimental Group and Stimulus Person. . 26

E. Mean Gain Scores by Stimulus Person. 27

F. Gain Scores for Primary Experimental Design--Stimulus Person Weaver. 34

G. Gain Scores for Secondary Experimental Design--Stimulus Person Boling. 34

H. Gain Scores for Stimulus Person Dykes 37

I. Gain Scores for Stimulus Person Pendergrass. 37

J. Gain Scores for Stimulus Person Knickerbocker. 38

K. Gain Scores for Stimulus Person Herndon. 38

L. Gain Scores for Stimulus Person Aldmon. 39

I. INTRODUCTION

The word satire comes from the Latin word satura, which meant "full" and later came to mean "a mixture of different things." The essence of the word was "variety." Ennius, an early Roman poet, first wrote poems and called them saturae. But even before that the Romans had saturae, variety shows on stage (Highet, 1962). The word satire has now come to mean "a literary work holding up human vices and follies to ridicule or scorn" (Webster's, 1963). But even this definition is unsatisfactory -- cannot human characteristics other than vices or follies be satirized?

Many attempts have been made to define satire. Author and critic Northrop Frye calls it "militant irony that demands at least a token fantasy and an explicit moral standard." Frye lists two essentials for satire: (1) wit or humor founded on a fantasy or sense of the grotesque or absurd and (2) an object of attack. He goes on to say, "satire is irony which is structurally close to the comic: the comic struggle of two societies, one normal and the other absurd, is reflected in its double focus of morality and fantasy" (Frye, 1962).

Swift scholar Edward Rosenheim says satire consists of an attack by means of manifest fiction upon historical particulars (Russell and Brown, 1967). Freud classifies satire as "hostile-tendency wit" and puts it in opposition to harmless wit (Freud, 1933). H. W. Fowler in A Dictionary of Modern English Usage devised a classification system for differentiating humor, wit, satire,

sarcasm, invective, irony, cynicism, and the sardonic. The four-part system lists the "motive" of satire as "amendment," the "province" as "morals and manners," the "method" as "accentuation," and the "audience" as "the self-satisfied" (Fowler, 1965).

Satire scholar Gilbert Highet explains a method of determining whether a literary work is satire. He says a work may be satire if the author names his genus as satire; quotes a satiric pedigree; has a theme that is concrete, personal, and topical; uses a "forcible" vocabulary and a varied texture; uses typical satirical devices; and has a satiric emotion present (Highet, 1962).

As is evident from this discussion, the definitions of satire are almost as numerous as the writers who have discussed the subject. As Russell and Brown (1967) have pointed out, it may be best to admit that the genre is simply too large to be contained in any one definition. The present study used the refinement of the various definitions by Russell and Brown that says "satire contains the elements of humor and attack" (Russell and Brown, 1967).

The purpose of satire has been discussed as much as the definition of satire. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote in To the Imitator of the First Satire of Horace, Book II (Bartlett, 1964):

> Satire should, like a polished razor keen,
> Wound with a touch that's scarcely felt or seen.

The feeling of some writers and philosophers is that satire has a loftier purpose

than merely to entertain. John Dryden said the true end of satire is the "amendment of vices by correction" (Highet, 1962). Horace said he told the truth with a smile so that it would not repel people but instead cure them of their ignorance (Highet, 1962). Satirist Jonathan Swift was not so kind. He said the aim of satire "is not to cure but to wound, punish or destroy" (Highet, 1962). Author George Gordon has categorized the humor of such contemporaries as Moms Mobley, Flip Wilson, Godfrey Cambridge, and Dick Gregory as a "means of criticizing and highlighting the incongruities in American society" -- as a general agent of social change. Gordon lists other comedians thought to be persuasive in today's society -- among them Pat Paulsen, the droll-faced parody presidential candidate of 1968, and Dan Rowan and Dick Martin of the TV show "Laugh-In" (Gordon, 1971).

Can satire persuade? Research indicates that when subjects are told the aim of the satirist, satire may persuade (Gruner, 1967). But the research on satire as a persuader is generally inconclusive (Gruner, 1965; Gruner, 1966; Gruner, 1971). Most of the studies center around satire directed at groups such as labor unions, Congressmen, and doctors. But the experience of the writer has been that most satire is person-focused, and in the area of ad hominem satire (satire directed against a person) little research has been done.

Previous studies have exposed subjects to satire in a one-time

presentation. This research experiment presented the stimulus materials over a period of time. Another feature of this experiment is the target of the stimulus columns -- the person in ad hominem was not a national figure but a campus figure assumed to be of more immediate interest to students.

The purpose of this study was to answer two questions: (1) Does editorial satire directed against a person and so perceived alter the attitudes of people toward the satirized person? (2) Does an increase in quantity of ad hominem editorial satire over time increase impact accordingly?

II. SUMMARY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Humor

The subject of "humor" has been speculated about at least since the time of Plato, some four centuries before Christ. Patricia Keith-Spiegel has listed 146 writers who have discussed the philosophical base of humor from Plato to Freud, Kant to Max Eastman, Ben Jonson to Stephen Leacock, Cicero to Charles Darwin (Keith-Spiegel, 1972). But little scientific research has been conducted in the field of humor. Levine has noted that humor has evoked little serious attention from behavioral scientists as an area worthy of research and theory (Levine, 1963). Jacqueline D. Goodchilds has termed the study of humorous persuasion one of the neglected areas of social psychology (Goodchilds, 1972). And George Gordon has called it a "wasteland" (Gordon, 1972).

"Ad Hominem" Satire

Extensive research turned up only three studies of persuasion using ad hominem satire, and they used three different media to carry the persuasive message. Gruner used the editorial column (Gruner, 1971), Cooper and Jahoda studied editorial cartoons (Cooper and Jahuda, 1947), and Berlo and Kumata studied a satirical radio program (Berlo and Kumata, 1956).

In his study "Ad Hominem Satire as a Persuader: An Experiment," Charles Gruner tried to determine whether differential amounts of ad hominem

satire would produce differential attitudes toward a stimulus person as measured on a self-reporting attitude scale. In a standard pencil-and-paper procedure, subjects were exposed to two, one, or no Art Buchwald columns satirizing Richard Nixon. They then completed a rating sheet validated to measure a person's perceived character and authoritativeness. Subjects did not differ on the authoritativeness scale, but ratings for character did differ, although insignificantly. The experimental group that was exposed to two columns rated Nixon's character lower than either of the other two groups; the group reading one column rated him second lowest; and the control group, which read no columns, gave him the highest character rating. The results were not statistically significant but Gruner thought they were promising enough to suggest further research.

Researchers Berlo and Kumata studied satire using a tape recording of a satirical Canadian Broadcasting Corporation show, "The Investigator," which satirized the hearings of Senator Joseph McCarthy's Investigating Committee. The study, which used a pre-test post-test design, found that the program had not significantly lowered the subjects' attitudes toward McCarthy and in fact had slightly increased their regard for the senator. But their attitudes toward congressional investigations had been significantly lowered. Berlo and Kumata suggested a boomerang effect had been produced toward McCarthy -- the subjects viewed the satire as a one-sided and thus unfair presentation and so

they slightly increased their regard for McCarthy.

Eunice Cooper and Marie Jahoda used a cartoon character called Mr. Biggott to determine the reactions of prejudiced people to what the researchers called "anti-prejudice propaganda." They found that prejudiced people evaded the issue of prejudice by a variety of methods, including "misunderstanding of the point of the cartoon," making the message of the cartoon invalid, changing the frame of reference, and missing the point of the cartoon altogether.

Satire as Persuader

The research on satire as a persuader has been limited: an extensive search of the literature turned up only three published studies, all by the same man. In "An Experimental Study of Satire as Persuasion" Charles Gruner (1965) exposed subject groups to a tape-recorded speech satirizing censorship. The experiment, which used a standard pre-test pro-test design, failed to show any significant shifts in subject attitudes toward censorship. One item on the test instrument indicated that the subjects did not understand the thesis of the satire, and so Gruner conjectured that this might have been one reason for no persuasive effect.

In a later study, "A Further Experimental Study of Satire as Persuasion," Gruner (1966) used the same tape-recorded speech; however, this time he told the subjects the thesis of the satire. Again neither the control group nor the experimental group as a whole shifted in attitude toward

censorship. When the pre-test scores were divided into subgroups of "strongly opposed," "mildly opposed," "neutral," and "mildly favorable," there was a significant shift among the "neutral" and "mildly favorable" groups. Gruner concluded that satire does not "produce attitude change generally."

Another still later study by Gruner (1967), "Editorial Satire as Persuasion: An Experiment," produced different results. In this experiment Gruner used columns by Art Buchwald satirizing labor unions and the United States policy toward Red China. The standard pre-test post-test design was employed, and the thesis of each column was specified in the directions handed out with the columns. The mean attitude change of the experimental group was small but statistically significant. Further analysis indicated that those least in agreement with a satirical thesis are those most likely to be influenced by it.

Persuasion

The effect of newspaper editorial matter on attitudes has been studied by Annis and Meier by printing favorable and unfavorable ad hominem editorials in a special press run of the campus newspaper (Annis and Meier, 1934). Over a period of time their subjects were exposed to either seven or fifteen planted editorials. They found a significant difference between subjects reading the favorable editorials and subjects reading the unfavorable ones in their attitudes toward the unknown stimulus person. However, they did not find

a significant difference between the group reading fifteen editorials and the group reading only seven.

Some researchers have studied persuasiveness of a message presented in various media. Brinkman studied the effects of related editorials and cartoons on attitude change and found that a cartoon and an editorial presented together will result in greater opinion change than the presentation of an editorial alone or a cartoon alone (Brinkman, 1968). He also found that an editorial presented alone will result in greater opinion change than a cartoon alone. Wall and Boyd also have produced results supporting the greater effectiveness of the written message in persuasion (Wall and Boyd, 1971). They found that presenting the same message in a written form produced a significantly greater attitude change than live or video-taped presentations.

Conclusion Drawing

Gruner's early studies on satire as a persuader documented the difficulty that many readers have in fathoming the thesis of a satirical speech or column (Gruner, 1965; Gruner, 1966). A study by Carl has produced similar results for the editorial cartoon (Carl, 1968). Subjects were given a number of cartoons by various syndicated cartoonists and asked to interpret the meanings of the cartoons. The results showed that 70 per cent of the respondents were in complete disagreement with the meanings the cartoonists said they intended.

Studies by Hovland and Mandell (Hovland et al, 1953) and Thistlewaite (Berlo and Kumata, 1956) have shown the effectiveness of drawing

conclusions for the subjects. Hovland and Mandell presented their subjects with arguments for and against devaluation of currency and found that twice as many subjects changed their opinions in the direction advocated by the communication when the conclusions were explicitly drawn as when they were left for the subject to draw.

Message Source

The source of a communication is another area relevant to the present experiment. Another study by Hovland and Mandell (Hovland et al, 1953) sought to determine whether the trustworthiness of a source affected the communicator's persuasiveness. They introduced the same message concerning devaluation of currency to two subject groups. One group thought the message came from a leading economist; the other group was led to believe it was the opinion of an importing executive who stood to gain if his views were adopted by the government. The researchers found that the communication produced no greater net change in opinions when it was believed to be the views of the economist (a nonsuspect source) than when it came from the importer (a suspect source). A study on the effects of newspaper bylines on attitude change also showed no difference between presenting a message without byline and presenting a message with a byline at the top, in the middle, or at the bottom. However, when the data were divided into subgroups, findings approached significance. These data showed groups exposed to a message with a byline at

the top were more affected than groups exposed to a message with no byline.

Internal Validity

The pre-test post-test method is so standard in the field of persuasion that it is often referred to in the literature as the "standard before-after" design. One of the best explanations of the experimental design is in Stanley and Campbell's Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (1963). They call the method "Design 4 -- a true experimental design," and present a table listing sources of invalidity. The table seems to indicate that this design controls completely for internal validity although the source of invalidity called "history" controls only for extrasession history. "Maturation" and "testing" are controlled in that they should be manifested equally in the control and experimental groups. "Instrumentation" is controlled through the use of a printed test form and a control group. "Selection" is controlled to the extent that randomization has assured group equality at the time for the beginning of the experiment. "Mortality" is troublesome because of the difficulty in determining whether lost cases might explain changes in scores from pre-test to pro-test. "Regression" is controlled as far as mean differences are concerned by randomly assigning experimental and control groups.

External Validity

Philosopher David Hume said that generalization is never fully justified logically (Stanley and Campbell, 1963). Some other writers have been

more emphatic. William Blake said "to generalize is to be a fool" (Cohen and Cohen, 1962). The pre-test post-test design is not as effective in controlling for external validity as for internal validity. Stanley and Campbell rate the design a minus in the source of external validity called "interaction of testing and X" (X is the experimental stimuli). This is because in some instances the existence of a pre-test will alert the subjects to the experimental stimuli to be presented. Stanley and Campbell use as an example the comparison of a movie audience seeing an anti-prejudice film immediately after having taken a 100-item anti-Semitism test with another audience seeing the same film without a pre-test.

Another barrier to external validity is the "interaction of selection and X." Psychology has been called the study of rats and college sophomores (Goldstein and McGhee, 1972), and this experimenter doubts that any effect produced on either of these groups is easily generalized to the population at large.

What Stanley and Campbell call the "interaction of instrumentation and X" is related to the so-called Rosenthal effect (Rosenthal, 1966). This interaction refers to both internal and external validity. The Rosenthal or experimenter effect concerns observers and other aides in the experiment, including the experimenter himself, and the fact that they may influence the results in the desired direction. A method of preventing such contamination is

the blind or double-blind experiment.

A related source of external validity called "reactive arrangements" deals with the patent artificiality of the experimental setting and the subject's knowledge that he is participating in an experiment. The "I-am-a-guinea-pig" attitudes are unrepresentative of realistic settings and hamper generalizations.

In the area of external validity, the present experiment was designed to meet the four criteria for measuring the real effect of communications in the real world as outlined by Haskins (1968): (1) Normal conditions existed with the normal spokesman presenting apparently relevant material over a realistic time period with subjects unaware of the specific research nature of the communication. (2) There existed no perceptible connection between the communication and the experiment. (3) Irrelevant causal factors (except for intrasession history) were either controlled or held constant. (4) The research design was accurately executed.

Attitude Measurement

One of the earliest methods for measuring attitudes was developed by Louis Thurstone (1970). Thurstone's method involved checking with a plus sign the statements in a list with which the subject agreed and with a minus sign those with which he disagreed. Each of the statements had been elaborately pre-tested and a value between one and eleven had been assigned to it. The score on the Thurstone scale was the sum of the values of all the statements endorsed.

An effort to improve on the Thurstone scale was developed by Rensis Likert (1970). In his scale the subject was asked to respond to a statement by circling one of five propositions -- "strongly approve," "approve," "undecided," "disapprove," "strongly disapprove." Each proposition was assigned a number from one to five, and the score was computed as the mean for each statement.

The most recent development in attitude scales has been the semantic differential originated by Osgood, Tannenbaum and Suci (Osgood et al, 19). The sematic differential, although originally developed to explore the dimensions of meanings, has become a standard in attitude research. Simply stated, the scale measures an individual's reactions to semantic objects on a rating scale defined by bipolar adjectives such as "good-bad," "pretty-ugly." Two factors have contributed to the widespread use of the semantic differential in attitude research. First, the scale is self-reporting, thus making it easy to incorporate into studies and reducing the necessity of subjective judgements by the experimenter. Second, research has established the stability of three dimensions in this procedure: (1) evaluative, (2) potency, and (3) activity. And evaluative responses to an attitude object are the heart of attitude research.

Sherif and Sherif argued that instructing the subject to classify items on a pre-determined scale such as the semantic differential bipolar objectives "good-bad" was arbitrarily imposing labels (Sherif and Sherif, 1970). They developed a method called "Own Categories Procedure" that allows the subject

to use his personal reference scale for appraising the stimulus domain in question. In the disguised method of the "Own Categories Procedure," the subject is told to place items into categories as objectively as possible in terms of how favorable or unfavorable they are toward the stimulus object.

III. METHOD

Subjects

Sixty-four students enrolled in beginning journalism courses at the University of Tennessee during the 1972 fall term served as subjects in two experimental and two control groups. The rating forms of ten subjects were discarded, four because they added the course after the pre-test was administered and six because they dropped the course before the post-test. Total N's were 14 and 15 in the experimental and 13 and 12 in the control groups.

Design

The experimental form was adapted from Design 4 of Stanley and Campbell's twelve experimental and quasi-experimental designs. Four subject groups were given a pre-test designed to measure their attitudes toward campus administrators. Then experimental group A was exposed to three stimulus columns, group B to one stimulus column and two non-related columns, and control group C_1 to three non-related columns. Control group C_2 did not read any columns. The subjects were then administered the post-test to determine whether their attitudes toward the stimulus person had shifted. The experimental design was as follows:

Group A	$O_1\ X_{R1}\ X_{R2}\ X_{R3}\ O_2$
Group B	$O_1\ X_{N1}\ X_{N2}\ X_{R3}\ O_2$
Group C_1	$O_1\ X_{N1}\ X_{N2}\ X_{N3}\ O_2$

Group C_2 O_1 O_2

O's are test instruments

X's are stimulus columns

The primary stimulus person was Dr. Charles H. Weaver, formerly chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville and now vice-president in charge of Continuing Education.

Each instrument in the design was administered during a separate class period. Total time for the experiment was two weeks. One class period for each group was skipped because of the illness of one instructor.

Secondary Data

The experiment was designed to obtain secondary data on attitude shift toward a second stimulus person. Instruments X_{N_2} and X_{N_3}, while non-related to the primary stimulus person, were both ad hominem satirical columns directed toward a second stimulus person. This second experimental design was as follows:

Group C_1 O_1 X_{N_1} X_{r_1} X_{r_2} O_2

Group B O_1 X_{N_1} X_{r_1} X_{R_3} O_2

Group A O_1 X_{R_1} X_{R_2} X_{R_3} O_2

Group C_2 O_1 O_2

In this design only X_{r_1} and X_{r_2} are stimulus columns and all others are non-related. The design is basically the same as the primary design

except that the experimental groups in this design receive two or one stimulus columns while the primary design provides for three and one stimulus columns.

The secondary data section was added because the primary ad hominem person was not well-known to freshmen and sophomore students and the experimenter thought the subjects might not become interested in reading the stimulus material about him. The ad hominem person in the secondary phase was Dr. Edward J. Boling, the university president, and it was assumed that all subjects would apply themselves to reading about him.

Test Instrument

The test instrument constructed for this experiment was titled "Survey of Student Attitudes Toward Administrators -- Fall 1972" and was mimeographed on stationery with the fictitious heading "The University of Tennessee, Office of University Relations" (see Appendix A). The instructions requested the subjects to circle the word that best described their "opinion" of each of the UT administrators listed. Both "opinion" and "attitude" were used on the test instrument because of discussions in the psychological literature debating the difference in the two words (McGuire, 1971).

In his experiments with satire, Gruner used the McCroskey scales for authoritativeness and character. Because of the small gains in this scale in past satire research, the present experiment used a more general measurement designed to be sensitive to any concept the subject self-reports as an

attitude or opinion. The test was adopted from the Likert scale using five propositions. "Very favorable," "favorable," "no opinion," "unfavorable," and "very unfavorable" were substituted to allow the subjects to use their personal reference scales rather than an experimenter-assigned scale (Sherif and Sherif, 1970).

Seven administrators and their titles (as found in the UT Graduate School Catalog for 1972) were listed. The primary stimulus person (Dr. Weaver) was listed fifth, and the secondary stimulus person (Dr. Boling) was listed first.

Stimuli

The instructors in each of the three groups receiving columns led their classes to believe that later in the term they would be studying the editorial column and editorial satire. The subjects were also deceived into thinking that the columns would be discussed later in the term but for the moment were to be read merely for enjoyment. The subjects were required to return the columns under the pretense that the copies would be needed for classes later in the day. Taking the columns back controlled for extrasession history by preventing the subjects from re-reading the material later and thus permitting some subjects to be exposed to more stimuli than others in their experimental group. The presentation of the columns to the groups stimulated a three-times weekly column, such as that of Art Buchwald or Russell Baker.

Each of the columns distributed had been printed in the UT Daily Beacon under the column head "Staten's Static by Vince Staten." The heads were left on the columns so the subjects would know the source. No measure was taken to determine whether the subjects considered the columnist a trustworthy source, but the research by Hovland and Mandell (Hovland et al, 1953) has indicated that a communication produces no greater net change in opinion when emanating from a nonsuspect communicator than when emanating from a suspect one. A study by Greenberg and Tannenbaum (Greenberg and Tannenbaum, 1961) found that a story with a byline at the top produced no greater opinion change than a story with no byline. However, their results did approach statistical significance.

The columns were intended by the author to be satirical. All contained the two essentials of satire of attack and wit as listed by Russell and Brown (1967). An informal survey of ten journalism students was conducted and all considered the columns satirical. (See Appendix B.)

The columns had appeared in the Daily Beacon prior to October 15, 1972. Each column was a Xerox copy and had an explanation of the thesis of the column on the same sheet. The explanation was included because of the inability of some subjects in Gruner's studies to grasp the thesis of the satirical column. In addition, a study by Hovland and Mandell (Hovland et al, 1953) indicated that persuasive messages are much more effective when the subjects

are given the thesis of the message than when they must draw their own conclusions.

Group A read "Chancellor's Secrets Revealed," a column satirizing former Chancellor Weaver by revealing a set of documents similar to the Pentagon Papers called the Weaver Papers; "Games and Other Mindless Things," a column satirizing some remarks the former chancellor had made about student protests by inventing a game named after him; and "A Local Case of Nostalgia," a column satirizing the former chancellor by associating his name with that of the television star Charlie Weaver. Group B read "Course Coach Says," a column satirizing interviews with football coaches; "Mr. Ed Whinies," a column satirizing the university president by comparing him with the horse of television fame; and "A Local Case of Nostalgia," the same column read by group A. Group C_1 read "Course Coach Says," "Mr. Ed Whinies," and "Mr. Ed and Mr. Cosby," a column satirizing the president by discussing sitting next to him at a Bill Cosby concert. Group C_2 read no columns.

At the class period immediately after presentation of the third column, the teacher told the students that the Office of University Relations had lost its first set of forms and the students were being asked to fill out the "Survey on Attitudes" forms again. The post-test was then administered.

All four groups were administered the pre-test during a two-day period, September 25-26, 1972, and the post-test during October 4-5, 1972.

The instructors reported no apparent apprehension on the part of the subjects about filling out the forms twice; nor did the instructors believe the subjects saw any connection between experimental stimuli and the testing.

IV. RESULTS

Raw data from pre-test and post-test forms were processed through the University of Tennessee Computing Center, and a one-way analysis of variance of gain scores was performed. The data are summarized in Table A.

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR VARIABLE GAIN

VARIABLE	df	SS	MS	F value	Probability
Between experimental groups	3	15.481682	5.16056069	8.69824	0.0001**
Between stimulus persons	6	8.841270	1.47354497	2.48369	0.0227**
Interaction between groups and persons	18	10.237956	0.56877532	0.95868	0.5078

**Statistically significant

Two gain score differences proved to be statistically significant (probability of less than 0.05) -- the differences between experimental groups

was significant to the 0.0001 level and the differences between stimulus persons was significant to the 0.0227 level. However, the interaction between groups and persons was not significant.

A Duncan Multiple Range Test was the follow-up test used to determine which gains were significant. The results are summarized in Tables B and C.

TABLE B

DUNCAN'S NEW MULTIPLE RANGE TEST FOR VARIABLE GAIN FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

GROUP	B	A	C_1	C_2
MEAN	0.49524	0.25510	0.10714	-0.04396

TABLE C

DUNCAN'S NEW MULTIPLE RANGE TEST FOR VARIABLE GAIN FOR STIMULUS PERSONS

PERSON	Boling	Weaver	Dykes	Aldmon	Herndon	Pendergrass	Knickerbocker
	0.42593	0.42593	0.24074	0.20370	0.16667	0.05556	0.00000

Experimental group B was significantly different from all other groups; group A was different from B and C_2; group C_1 was significantly different from B; and group C_2 was different from B and A.

The gains made from the pre-test to the post-test on stimulus person Boling were significantly different from persons Pendergrass and Knickerbocker but not from Dykes, Weaver, Herndon, and Aldmon. Gain scores for Weaver were also significantly different from those for Pendergrass and Knickerbocker but not from those for Boling, Dykes, Herndon and Aldmon.

Mean gain scores for all persons in all experimental groups are shown in Table D. Of the 28 mean scores, 22 groups shifted in the unfavorable (positive) direction, and six groups shifted in the favorable (negative) direction. Table E shows mean gain scores by person and by group. Only one group (group C_2) showed a gain score in the favorable direction.

TABLE D

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
AND STIMULUS PERSON

GROUP	PERSON	GAIN
A	Boling	0.64285714
A	Dykes	0.35714286
A	Pendergrass	-0.07142857
A	Knickerbocker	-0.07142857
A	Weaver	0.64285714
A	Herndon	0.28571429
A	Aldmon	0.00000000
B	Boling	0.80000000
B	Dykes	0.46666667
B	Pendergrass	0.13333333
B	Knickerbocker	0.26666667
B	Weaver	0.93333333
B	Herndon	0.20000000
B	Aldmon	0.66666667
C_1	Boling	0.16666667
C_1	Dykes	0.16666667
C_1	Pendergrass	0.08333333
C_1	Knickerbocker	-0.16666667
C_1	Weaver	0.25000000
C_1	Herndon	0.16666667
C_1	Aldmon	0.08333333
C_2	Boling	0.00000000
C_2	Dykes	-0.07692308
C_2	Pendergrass	0.07692308
C_2	Knickerbocker	-0.07692308
C_2	Weaver	-0.23076923
C_2	Herndon	0.00000000
C_2	Aldmon	0.00000000

TABLE E

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY STIMULUS PERSON

PERSON	GAIN
Boling	0.42592593
Dykes	0.24074074
Pendergrass	0.05555556
Knickerbocker	0.00000000
Weaver	0.42592593
Herndon	0.20370370

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

GROUP	GAIN
A	0.25510204
B	0.49523810
C_1	0.10714286
C_2	-0.04395604

V. DISCUSSION

Limitations of the Research

The size of the sample in this experiment -- although dictated by the unavailability of larger classes to use as subjects -- casts serious doubts on the experimental results. Fifteen subjects in each group are not enough to prevent one or two deviates from greatly influencing the experimental data.

The sample itself (predominantly college sophomores) may have a built-in bias. As E. E. Jones (1966) has pointed out, college sophomores will see things differently than will Army draftees or housewives. An academic environment will produce different responses than one would find in the home or in an industrial plant.

Another limitation of the sample involves the classes from which the subjects were drawn -- the groups used were all beginning journalism classes. Journalism students may have a different Weltanschauung from the population at large. Perhaps they are more avid readers of newspapers than other students. They also might read with an eye toward form and style rather than substance.

For total control seven experimental groups plus the control groups would have been needed to cover all possible conditions of presenting three stimulus columns. But so many groups would have produced a multitude of data that could have been confusing and virtually impossible to

interpret. The experimenter chose to present group B with the related column on the third day rather than the second or first day because some dissipation of attitude change from the first or second day to the time of the post-test would be expected. Presenting the related column on the third day should have had the same effect on group A and group B, and thus any difference in their performances on the post-test would be attributed to the different columns presented to them during the first or second time periods.

What Huff (1954) has referred to as the "post hoc fallacy" is a limitation in any experimental design. (The fact that A follows B does not mean B caused A.) The factors of internal and external validity discussed earlier show that no experimental design can control all possible factors other than experimental variables.

No post-experimental measure was taken to test source credibility of the author of the stimulus columns. Thus it is possible that the results of the experiment could be attributed to the ways the subjects viewed the source of the columns. The source could also influence the way they perceived the material -- that is, whether they saw it as classwork to be studied or as entertainment to be enjoyed.

Orne (1967) has described what he calls "demand characteristics of the experimental situation" as one of the two determinants of a subject's behavior (the other is the experimental variable). Orne says that the demand

characteristics will vary with the sophistication, intelligence, and previous experience of each subject and that the subject's performance in an experiment will be influenced by what he thinks is wanted. In this experiment there was no post-experimental inquiry to determine the demand characteristics, nor was any method used to determine these characteristics. Thus some of the results could be due to this uncontrolled factor.

Analysis of Results

The one-way analysis of variance summarized in Table A (page 23) indicates that the differences between experimental groups and between stimulus persons are significant; however, the differences in gain scores of groups and persons interacting are not significant, and thus the experimenter cannot conclude that increased amounts of ad hominem satire presented over a fixed period of time will produce similar increases in unfavorable opinion toward the object of the satire.

The group means for B, A, and C_1 (Table B, page 24) are all in the unfavorable direction, while group C_2 is in the favorable direction. This suggests that the mere exposure to ad hominem satire columns (all three groups read at least two ad hominem satire columns) may influence the subjects in the unfavorable direction.

Table B (page 24) shows the rank order shift from group B, which shifted almost half a point in the unfavorable direction, to group C_2, which

shifted less than five-hundredths of a point in the favorable direction. Groups A and B are significantly different from group C_2, and although group C_1 is not statistically different from group C_2, there is a numerical difference of fifteen-hundredths of a point between the gain scores of the two groups. The data are not conclusive, but they do suggest that the reading of ad hominem satirical material produces attitude shifts in the unfavorable direction.

The significant difference between group B and the other groups suggests that for some reason group B is different from groups A, C_1, and C_2. As was discussed previously (in the section on experimental design), this experimental design did not control for intrasession history, and perhaps part of this difference can be explained by intrasession history. In a debriefing session the instructor for group B noted that when the post-test forms were being passed out one class member said: "You mean we have to fill these out again? We just get more negative every time we do." Group conformity theory (Hovland et al, 1953, pp. 134-173) would predict that, given this oral cue from one member of the group (a classmate), other group members would be inclined to shift their opinions in the direction of the cue. Other factors such as valuation of group membership would determine the degree of the opinion shift.

Table C (page 24) shows that differences in gain scores between Boling and Pendergrass, Boling and Knickerbocker, Weaver and Pendergrass,

and Weaver and Knickerbocker are significant but all the other differences are non-significant. Here part of the gain may be explained by looking at the stimulus persons themselves. Boling, Dykes, Herndon, and Aldmon are all highly visible university administrators who deal more directly with more students than Knickerbocker (who was the new academic vice-president) and Pendergrass (who is a vice-president in the relatively small Institute of Agriculture). At the time of the experiment (the first of the quarter) many students would have had contact with these first four because of schedule changes, room changes, parking problems, and other matters of this nature. And of the four, Boling and Dykes were by far the most visible as president and chancellor of the university. Weaver was Dykes' predecessor and became controversial while serving during a period of student unrest. Although he is no longer in a visible post, the subjects in this experiment may have heard of him. And his name on the pre-test could have led them to other students for information about him (extrasession history). While the experiment was being conducted, Boling and Dykes were the subjects of several articles in the Daily Beacon, and Herndon and Aldmon were mentioned in announcements coming from their offices. Weaver, though not in the student newspaper at this time, had been the subject of numerous articles in the past. Thus extrasession history might have produced some attitude changes toward the visible administrators while not affecting the less visible Pendergrass and Knickerbocker. And similarly,

the attitude shifts for Boling and Dykes would be expected to be larger than for the less-publicized administrators Herndon and Aldmon.

Undoubtedly the stimulus columns had some impact, perhaps even producing a generalized anti-administrator feeling that could easily extend to other familiar administrators such as Dykes, Herndon, and Aldmon. So while the two primary stimulus persons in this experiment did show significant attitudinal shift scores when compared to two less-prominent administrators, their scores did not differ significantly from more visible administrators. Likewise, the administrators who were not the object of the ad hominem columns (Dykes, Herndon, and Aldmon) did not show significant attitudinal gain scores when compared to the lesser-known administrators Pendergrass and Knickerbocker. Rank ordering of the gain scores can be seen in Table C (page 24): first come the two primary ad hominem stimulus persons (Boling and Weaver), then the three visible administrators (with the most visible, the chancellor, having the largest gain score of the three), followed by the two lesser-known administrators (Pendergrass and Knickerbocker).

Tables F and G are key charts because they present the gain scores for the primary and secondary experimental designs. Although the gains did not prove to be significant, the magnitudes and directions of the gains are instructive.

TABLE F

GAIN SCORES FOR PRIMARY EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN --
STIMULUS PERSON WEAVER

GROUP	GAIN
A	0.64285714
B	0.93333333
C_1	0.25000000
C_2	-0.23076923

TABLE G

GAIN SCORES FOR SECONDARY EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN --
STIMULUS PERSON BOLING

GROUP	GAIN
C_1	0.16666667
B	0.80000000
A	0.64285714
C_2	0.00000000

For the primary stimulus person Weaver (Table F), group A, which read three ad hominem satire columns, shifted 0.64285714 in the unfavorable direction; however, this shift was not as large as the 0.93333333 gain of group B. Group C_1, which read no ad hominem columns directed against Weaver but did read two directed at Boling, shifted 0.25000000 in the unfavorable direction. The group that read no columns, group C_2, shifted -0.23076923, a shift in the favorable direction. What is suggested here is a boomerang effect -- one ad hominem column produced a larger shift than three ad hominem columns. Berlo and Kumata, who noted a boomerang effect in their research on satire directed against Joseph McCarthy, speculated that up to a point satire has a great effect in shifting attitudes in the unfavorable direction, but after that point is reached, the subject tends to view any further satirical attacks as unfair and shifts his attitude back in the favorable direction.

Table G, which summarizes the design for secondary stimulus person Boling, also hints at a boomerang effect, although not as strongly as the data for Weaver. In this secondary design, group A, which read three non-related columns, shifted more in the unfavorable direction than group C_1, which read two ad hominem columns directed against Boling. Again the group reading only one ad hominem column, group B, shifted the largest amount. And in this instance the group reading no columns did not shift at all.

The data for both experimental designs taken together might be partly explained by the generalization theory -- satire directed at one

administrator is generalized to the whole population of administrators. Group A, which read three ad hominem columns directed against Weaver, could have generalized the unfavorable attitude to Boling. Further evidence is that group A shifted the same toward Weaver as it did toward Boling (0.64285714). Similarly group C_1 shifted 0.16666667 toward Boling and 0.25000000 toward Weaver, and group B shifted 0.80000000 toward Boling and 0.93333333 toward Weaver. But the data are only suggestive of this generalization theory and by no means conclusive.

Perhaps the simplest explanation for the results of the experiment is that group B was different in makeup from the others. The reasons for such a difference are unclear, but perhaps persons who sign up for a Monday-Wednesday-Friday beginning journalism class taught by Ms. A are different from journalism students as a whole.

The gain scores for the persons on the rating form who were not the target of ad hominem satirical columns are summarized in Tables H through L. The gains for most were small except for group B-Aldmon and groups A and B-Dykes. None of the gains were statistically significant.

Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study are not clear-cut, but they are promising enough to suggest further research. A general trend by groups exposed to ad hominem satire to shift their opinions in the unfavorable direction was

TABLE H

GAIN SCORES FOR STIMULUS PERSON DYKES

GROUP	GAIN
A	0.35714286
B	0.46666667
C_1	0.1666666 7
C_2	-0.07692308

TABLE I

GAIN SCORES FOR STIMULUS PERSON PENDERGRASS

GROUP	GAIN
A	-0.07142857
B	0.13333333
Cl	0.08333333
C_2	0.07692308

TABLE J

GAIN SCORES FOR STIMULUS PERSON KNICKERBOCKER

GROUP	GAIN
A	-0.07142857
B	0.26666667
C_1	-0.16666667
C_2	-.07692308

TABLE K

GAIN SCORES FOR STIMULUS PERSON HERNDON

GROUP	GAIN
A	0.28571429
B	0.20000000
C_1	0.16666667
C_2	0.00000000

TABLE L

GAIN SCORES FOR STIMULUS PERSON ALDMON

GROUP	GAIN
A	0.00000000
B	0.66666667
C_1	0.83333333
C_2	0.00000000

noted. However, further research will be needed to determine whether ad hominem satire is persuasive.

A major suggestion for further research would be a theoretical replication of this experiment with a larger sample. The sample used was large enough to suggest that a general trend toward the unfavorable is produced by exposure to ad hominem satirical material. But the issue of whether larger amounts of satire will produce larger shifts in attitude was not decided. A simpler study with fewer stimulus persons to confound the data might determine whether a boomerang effect does operate in these circumstances.

This study also hinted that the unfavorable attitude shift produced by

ad hominem satire might touch other persons similar in some way to the stimulus person. A similar study that controlled for extrasession history could perhaps determine whether this generalization does occur.

In this study group B was the one that received one ad hominem satire column in each experimental design (stimulus person Boling and stimulus person Weaver). A future study in which the same group does not serve in the same capacity in two experimental designs will be needed to determine whether group B was merely a deviant group or whether a boomerang effect was responsible for the differences noted in this study.

A boomerang effect and a generalization theory have been suggested as explanations for the results of this study. While the ad hominem satire seems to have had some influence, the experimenter thinks that the significant differences produced were the result of extrasession history and a deviant experimental group (group B). Only further research in the field of satire as persuader can determine with certainty what the explanation is.

Implications

The effects of satire on attitudes is a subject of interest to persons in fields ranging from advertising to government. The myriad of public relations and propaganda implications are obvious. Can satire change a vote? Can satire be effective in changing a consumer's brand preferences? Can satire influence government policy-making? Can satire be more effective

in winning voters than personal attack? As with many experiments, this study has raised more questions than it can answer. The only answer lies in more research. As the Hindu sage Valmiki said in The Ramayana (Menen, 1954): "There are three things which are real: God, human folly, and laughter. Since the first two pass our comprehension, we must do what we can with the third."

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annis, A. D. and M. C. Meier. The Induction of Opinion through Suggestion by Means of Planted Content. Journal of Social Psychology, 1934, 5, 65-81.

Bartlett, John. Bartlett's Familiar Quotations. New York: Pocket Books, 1964.

Berlo, David R. and Hideya Kumata. The Investigator: The Impact of a Satirical Radio Drama. Journalism Quarterly, 1956, 33, 287-298.

Brinkman, Del. Do Editorial Cartoons and Editorials Change Opinions. Journalism Quarterly, 1968, 45, 724-726.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi- Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Carl, LeRoy M. Editorial Cartoons Fail to Reach Many Readers. Journalism Quarterly, 1968, 45, 533-535.

Cohen, J. M. and M. J. Cohen. (Eds.) Penguin Dictionary of Quotations. New York: Atheneum, 1962.

Cooper, Eunice and Marie Jahoda. The Evasion of Propaganda: How Prejudiced People Respond to Anti-Prejudice Propaganda. Journal of Psychology, 1947, 23, 15-25.

Fishbein, Martin. (Ed.) Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Fowler, H. W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Freud, Sigmund. Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious. (Authorized translation by A. A. Brill.) London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1939.

Frye, Northrop. The Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Goldstein, Jeffrey and Paul McGhee. (Eds.) The Psychology of Humor. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Goodchilds, Jacqueline D. On Being Witty. The Psychology of Humor (edited by Jeffrey Goldstein and Paul McGhee.) New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Gordon, George. Persuasion. New York: Hastings House, 1971.

Graduate School Catalog 1972. Vol. 75, No. 2, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1972

Greenberg, Bradley S., and Percy H. Tannenbaum. The Effects of Bylines of Attitude Change. Journalism Quarterly, 1961, 38, 535-537.

Gruner, Charles R. An Experimental Study of Satire as Persuasion. Speech Monographs, 1965, 32, 184-185.

Gruner, Charles R. A Further Experimental Study of Satire as Persuasion. Speech Monographs, 1966, 33, 149-154.

Gruner, Charles R. Editorial Satire as Persuasion: An Experiment. Journalism Quarterly, 1967, 44, 727-730.

Gruner, Charles R. Ad Hominem Satire as a Persuader. Journalism Quarterly, 1971, 48, 128-131.

Haskins, Jack. How to Evaluate Mass Communications. _____: Advertising Research Foundation, Inc., 1968.

Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Hovland, Carl I., Irving L. Janis and Harold H. Kelley. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Huff, Darrell. How to Lie with Statistics. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1954.

Jones, E. E. Conceptual generality and experimental strategy in social psychology, an unpublished paper presented to the International Congress of Psychology in Moscow, U.S.S.R., August 1, 1966.

Keith-Spiegel, Patricia. Early Conceptions of Humor: Varieties and Issues. The Psychology of Humor. (Edited by Jeffrey Goldstein and Paul McGhee.) New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Levine, Jacob. Humor. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Likert, Rensis. A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. Attitude Measurement. (Edited by Gene Summers.) Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1970.

McGuire, William J. The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change. Attitude Change. (Edited by Michael Malec.) Chicago: Markham, 1971.

Martineau, William. A Model of the Social Functions of Humor. The Psychology of Humor. (Edited by Jeffrey Goldstein and Paul McGhee.) New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Menen, Aubrey. The Ramayana. New York: Scribner, 1954.

Nafziger, Ralph C., and David M. White. Introduction to Mass Communications Research. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958.

Orne, Martin T. On the Social Psychology of the Psychological Experiment. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 776-783.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci and Percy H. Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Rosenthal, Robert. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1966.

Russell, John and Ashley Brown. (Eds.) Satire, A Critical Anthology. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1967.

Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn Wood Sherif. The Own Categories Procedure in Attitude Research. Attitude Measurement. (Edited by Gene Summers.) Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970.

Thurstone, Louis. The Measurement of Attitude. Attitude Measurement. (Edited by Gene Summers.) Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970.

Wall, Victor D., and John A. Boyd. Channel Variation and Attitude Change. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 363.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Co., 1963.

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
Room 6
Henson Hall
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

SURVEY OF STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD ADMINISTRATORS--FALL 1972

Please circle the word which best describes your opinion of the U-T administrators listed below:

Dr. Edward Boling President	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Archie Dykes Chancellor-Knoxville	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Webster Pendergrass Vice President for Agriculture	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Kenneth Knickerbocker Vice President for Academic Affairs	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Charles Weaver Vice President for Continuing Education	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Walter Herndon Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion
Dr. Howard Aldmon Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs	very favorable	favorable	unfavorable	very unfavorable	no opinion

When was your first quarter at U-T? _____

Thank you

Staten's static **By Vince Staten**

Chancellor's secrets leaked, or 'Chuckling Charlie strikes again'

With so much verbage flying lately about the "controversial Pentagon Papers," another equally important discovery has been practically overlooked.

I am, of course, referring to the controversial Weaver Papers. If you are one of the many who ha been misled by the biased news media who only print what fits their biases, then I shall give you some background on the Weaver Papers.

THE WEAVER Papers are the 47-volume study ordered by Chancellor Weaver concerning the history of the administration's entry into the Campus Conflict. The volumes, classified TOP EXCRETE, were kept under lock and key in the Chancellor's office. These confidential documents were leaked to the Beacon and myself by an heroic little old janitor who shall remain anonymous so that he may eontinue to scrape chewing gum off desks in Ayres Hall.

I have been studying these documents diligently since their leak and I am beginning today a series of articles based on the Weaver Papers.

The first 30 volumes of the Weaver Papers upon examination appear to be the *World Book Encyclopedia*. They include native costumes from around the world, a full color section on birds, biographies of all the presidents of the United States and EARTH, see also SOLAR SYSTEM.

VOLUMES 31 through 43 are rather curious. I spent considerable time looking through them and as best I can figure out, they're back issues of *Playboy* with the center folds removed.

Volume 44 is a book titled, "I Was a Teenaged Teenager" with little notes written in the margin in the Chancellor's handwriting. One of the notes says, "Look up the meaning of 'moronic.' And another says, "Look up the meaning of 'chancellor'." A note on the back cover says, "Ask Ed for raise." "Raise" was misspelled.

As far as I could determine, volume 45 is a copy of *The Sensuous Man*. I didn't bother to see if there were any notes in the margins.

VOLUME 46 is presuptuously titled, "The Assumptions of a Major University by Charles Weaver, Chancellor of the University of Tennessee." Someone had scribbled "noted" in front of "Chancellor." Inside are six bold face assumptions, with a note from the author saying, "That's all I can think of."

But by far the most important volume for our purposes is the final one. Titled "Personal Correspondence" this volume is the heart of the entire study. Now my intention is not to discredit or embarass the present or past UT administrations, but to carry through with the public's right to know. It is with this worthy intention that I shall print verbatim one of the classified documents of correspondence from the Weaver Papers.

You guessed it. It's a letter from Mama:

Dear Avis, (Mama always said Charlie would end up being number two.)

THINGS ARE fine in Mt. Idy. (She goes on. And on. And on.)

Ludlow Bean and his mother were over here today. My how that Ludlow has changed. He's been going to McCracken Welding School and since he's been there, he's grown a beard and long hair. Your father says to tell you he's also grown a foot and now has trouble finding shoes in a box of three. I told your father to give Ludlow one of his shoes. He doesn't need it, he's always got one foot in his mouth anyway.

Mrs. Bean asked about you and I just told her you're still teaching school. She sends her love. So does Ludlow. Which reminds me, there's something else different about Ludlow, but I can't tell you about it just now cause he's looking over my shoulder.

THEY'RE RAISING Mt. Idy taxes and your father thinks they should lower the Mt. Idy activities fee to make up for it. He says the fee is being used for a lot of things that he doesn't do. He says his fee has been used to pave some roads in town that he's never even been on. And they've also used it to put up some road signs and everbody in town knows your father can't read.

Your grandfather has taken up throwing the javelin. He says it's easier than checkers and besides it takes his mind off pretty girls. He and your father go down in the Crack's pasture and grandfather throws the javelin and your father tries to catch it. So far he hasn't. Your grandfather can't throw it far enough. But he said he's gonna shave cause he heard you can throw the javelin farther if you shave.

Well son, I'd better go. Your father just left to go down to the town wishing well. He took along a roll of quarters and I think I know why.

Love
Mama

Staten's static

By Vince Staten

Games & other mindless things



The party of today isn't what it used to be. Once upon a time it wasn't a good party unless at least one of the guests got muddled enough to run naked down Cumberland. I guess Cumberland just isn't the same anymore. Anyway most of the parties I get invited to anymore are affairs of the mind. Everyone just sits around discussing ecology or drugs or the cinema or Charlie Weaver. And not in that order. There's always music, but nobody dances. (There's always ice too, but nobody ever skates.) And sometimes there are other things.

Well this type of party is fine for a while, but I get tired of them all the time. I like a little more action. Perhaps I long for the good old days of junior high when parties were all games—"Post office" and "Seven minutes in heaven" and "drop the clothespin in the bottle." So I have devised some games to entertain myself at these parties.

THE FIRST IS called "Spiro Agnew" or "Go to the Rear of the Class" —named after our illustrious vice-president. Which reminds me, Millard Fillmore was once vice-president of the United States. And many people are hoping that "once" will also be enough for Spiro.

And this is how the game is played. We nabobs of negativism circulate throughout the party alliteratively alluding to anything in our attention area. For instance you go up to some guy you don't know and say; " I say, chap, who is that cormorant coquette?" He'll probably reply: "I don't know." Meaning either he doesn't know the fat broad who keeps throwing herself at all the guys or he doesn't know what you said. You keep circulating until you find a total stranger who has enough nerve to ask what in the hell "cormorant coquette" means. Score one point for every member of the silent majority who doesn't attempt an answer. Total your score and whisper it in your date's ear. A pocket Thesaurus is a handy item to have when playing this game—to solve arguments. But be discreet when playing, lest someone should call you a demented dipsomaniac—a wierd drunk.

The next game which I want to make perfectly clear to you is called "Richard Nixon"—named for our illustrious president. Which reminds me, Millard Fillmore was once President of the United States. And many people are hoping that "once" will also be enough for old Milhouse. And make no mistake about how this game is played. I believe—and I know you'll agree with me if I ever get around to telling you how the game is played—that we, the vast majority of the American people, who desire to cross that goal line don't want to talk about what's wrong with this game. It's time to stand up and talk about what's right about this game. And this is a great game.

TO PLAY THIS great game—and I know we all want to play this game because it is a great game—you walk around the party and answer questions which other guests have submitted to Bud Wilkinson and Billy Graham and which have been carefully screened to avoid putting you on the spot. And I'm working on a method to end this game—but this game must be ended honorably because the whole party is looking to us and we can't just back down. Because if we just pull out of the game, then some other guest is liable to move in and take over the games. We must work to slowly wind the game down—but don't worry, we have until 1972 to end this game. Have I made this game perfectly clear?

And one final game I have devised to play at parties is called "Charlie Weaver"—named for our illustrious Chancellor. Which reminds me Millard Filmore was never chancellor of UT.

And this is how the game is played. First you divide the party into "Your Friends" and "Your Enemies" by giving everyone there a chance to either throw a rock at you or to sue you. (HINT: friends sue.) Next check the ID's of all "your friends." Tell "your enemies" this is a closed game and they must leave. Your next task is to alenate "your friends." Tell them you are "It". Then tell them you are not "It." Then tell them there is no "It". Change the rules of the game to suit whatever the situation happens to be. Then change the situation. And if anyone complains, tell them they can quit because this happens to be your game. Now to figuring your score—you get one point for every one of "your (remaining) friends" and subtract one point for all "Your Enemies." If you score above zero, you lose. If you score below zero, you lose. If you score zero, you lose. Everyone who plays "Charlie Weaver" is a loser.

By Vince Staten

A Local Case Of Nostalgia

Author's note: I wrote this column before Chancellor Weaver decided that the Beacon was "anti-administration." His remark started me to thinking about all the stuff I had written and I really couldn't think of anything I'd ever said that was pro-administration. But then again, what has the administration ever done that was pro-Vince Staten?

When I was a kid, I used to sneak around and stay up late to watch the Jack Paar Show. Aside from such interesting guests as Jack Lescoulie, Jose Melis and Richard Nixon (before he became an evangelist), there appeared occasionally a decrepit old man named Cliff Arquette.

Arquette, or Charlie Weaver as he was known then, used to put us late night viewers to sleep reading his endless letters from Mama in Mt. Idy. I had forgotten all about the dirty old man of my childhood and assumed he had departed for the Great Jack Parr Show in the Sky. Then I found out Charlie Weaver is UT's chancellor—an ominnous title, but a bit misleading.

FROM MY SUNDAY School days (daze), I remember a chancel as the area around an altar. And an altar is the place where they conduct sacrifices... like offering up a bull, or a lot of bulls. So it would seem like a chancellor would be the guy who is in charge of bull sacrifices. But that isn't right. I looked it up in my dictionary and a chancellor is the secretary to a king.

Anyway, I wonder if Charlie Weaver is still getting letters from his mama....

DEAR RUFFIAN,

(Mama never liked it when Charlie played King of the Hill.)

Things are fine in Mt. Idy. (She goes on.)

You remember Elsie Crack, don't you? Well she came home from college yesterday with a letter from the dean saying for her not to come back until she had had a bath. Elsie's mother Leona said if the school's gonna keep Elsie in a dorm and tell her when to come in and where to eat, then they should tell her when to take a bath, too. Actually Leona said the college could tell Elsie when to do some other stuff, too, but your father is looking over my shoulder now so I won't include that.

LUDLOW BEAN AND his older brother Younger were here Sunday and asked about you. Ludlow is a census-taker now and he said that although the work isn't much, he gets a lot of vacation time. We justtold Ludlow that you were still a school teacher. He and Younger were heading over to Lompock to check out some books on explosives. Your father told them he hoped they got a big bang out of the evening. Your father didn't say much after he got back up though.

Grandpa Weaver and Great-Grandpa Weaver are out in the backyard playing checkers. But I don't think either one of them has made a move yet. They both say they've got their checkers where they want them and they're not about to mess them up. But your father says there's nothing wrong with this. "Many of the finest checker-players in Lompock County are one-positioned checker-players."

Lyman Fink's mother was expelled from the Mt. Idy Cooking Club this past week. She had been arrested by Sheriff Bean earlier in the day for improper conduct at the town wishing well (she said she wished she wasn't married and the easiest thing to do was to shove her husband in the well.) Anyway, the Board of Crusties of the club said the people of the county didn't understand how the cookie crumbled and that they would adopt a new policy to appease the crackers. So from now on the Mt. Idy Cooking Club is going to expell any members suspected of shoving their husbands in the wishing well until they can prove they didn't do it. It doesn't matter to me though, I haven't been able to get your father near the wishing well anyway.

Well, son, I have to go and help raise your father's bail money. He started out over to your campus to visit you and forgot to get his admission pass.

Love,

Mama

Staten's static *By Vince Staten*

'Course, coach says. . .'

OFFICIAL HANDBOOK
OF THE FOOTBALL COACH'S
COLLEGE OF ELOCUTION

Lecture One

All right, men. Gather round me. You all know why you're here at the College of Elocution. We're going to teach you to be football coaches. And I don't mean Wishbone-T, circles and x's, sprint-out type football coaches. Ain't gonna be none of that bull here, men. No, we're going to teach you the most important thing about being a football coach—how to talk.

So shape up.

FIRST OFF, are there any of you men from the North? All right, you all might as well quit now, cause there ain't never been a good football team from the North. And the rest of you is gonna to study pronunciation real hard. O-f-f is "awf." and "b-a-l-l" is pronounced "bawl." One of my boys will pass out the College of Elocution Handy-Dandy Guide to Pronunication among you men. And I want you to go home and study these here books. Now y'all may have some trouble 'cause there ain't no circles and x's in these books. Ain't even got no pictures in it. But I got faith in you men.

So shape up, men.

We'll begin with Lesson Number One Men, start every sentence with "course." Like "Course, we were hit hard by graduation." and "Course, State's got a fine bunch of boys."

SO SHAPE UP on that, men. And make the College of Elocution proud of you.

Lesson Number Two: Call everybody, especially those sports-writer fellows, by their first name. It's just a good rule of communication. And then when the fans see you on those TV interviews, they'll know that you're just common people. "Course, Chris, we were hit hard by graduation." "Course, Bud, we're just gonna run at 'em with our strength—nothing fancy."

Lesson Number Three: Players are boys. "Course, Jon, they've got that Reaves boy that's been having a fine season."

LESSON NUMBER FOUR: Players are from "down there in." "Course, Jon, this Watson boy from down there in Crossville's been playing with a hurt leg."

Lesson Number Five: Your opponent is always good. "Course, Jon, this Santa Barbara team has a lot of good junior college transfers and despite their big loss to Washington, we feel like they'll give us a real good game."

We at the College of Elocution want to be proud of you men. So take notes. And shape up.

LESSON NUMBER SIX: Play 'em one game at a time. "Course, Jon, we're not looking ahead to the Auburn game. We just play 'em one at a time, so I can't answer that question."

Lesson Number Seven: Kicking will be the key to every game. "Course, Jon, I think kicking will be the key to this game. I know Florida hasn't won a game this year and they have this Reaves boy who's got a real fine arm, but the key to the game will probably be kicking."

Lesson Number Eight: The other team will come out fighting. "Course, Jon, we expect Georgia Tech to come out fighting."

LESSON NUMBER NINE: Execution is the only thing stressed in practice. "Course, Jon, we've been stressing execution all week in practice. We plan to run our regular offense—nothing fancy."

Men, during this time out in the lecture, I want you to tell me what this is. No, it's not a pigskin. "Pigskin" is one of those sports-writer fellow's words. No, it's not a football. That's got too many syllables. Men, this is a ball. Now shape up.

Lesson Number Ten: The other team puts their pants on just the same as we do. "Course, Jon, Nebraska puts their pants on just the same way we do."

AND FINALLY, men, Lesson Number Eleven: This is always a rebuilding season. "Course, Jon, we didn't expect to beat Auburn. This is just a rebuilding season."

All right men, that's all for today. Tomorrow, same time, we'll discuss the Pre-Game Pep Talk. Good day. And good sports.

UNDERSTATEN' IT: Wednesday night I was refused admission to "student-owned and student-operated" Ike-and-Tina (or whatever the name of that little place is) because I didn't have my shirt-tail tucked in. Honest. The last time I had to tuck my shirt-tail in to go in some place was when I was in the eighth grade and the shop teacher made me tuck it in before I could go in to see Bob Brown's Science Circus.

Staten's static

By Vince Staten

Mr. Ed whinies and little else

I've heard there's a movie being made on campus called "Leave It To Beaver." It's a very appealing title and as you may remember "Leave it to Beaver" is my all-time favorite TV show.

But, I have one question: Who'll play Eddie Haskell? Eddie Boling? So I've decided on another old time TV show format to use for a campus movie. Here's the script and anyone who wants to film it has my permission.

THE MOVIE OPENS with a wide shot of the Hill (taken from a student's point of view in the valley). Slowly camera zooms past a student ID check in progress outside the Music Annex Building (students are not permitted to leave the building without an ID) to the front of the Administration Building where our illustrious president is standing.

Main theme can be heard in the background as sung by the Board of Trustees Chorus under the direction of Buford Ellington:

A horse is a horse, of course, of course,
And no one can talk to a horse, of course,
That is of course unless the horse
Is the famous Mr. Ed.

Go straight to the source and ask the horse,
He'll give you the answer that you'll endorse,
He's always on a steady course,
Talk to Mr. Ed.

Mr. Ed: I am Mr. Ed!

A clamor is heard in the background. Enter a group of dissident stable boys, shouting: "Open Barn Policy. Open Barn Policy." At this point Mr. Ed looks down to see if his barndoor is open.

A SPOKESMAN FOR the group—Carroll Bridle—steps forward.

Bridle: "Sire, why are certain non-stable boys not allowed in the Barnyard when come Saturday and the Big Race, every jackass in the county is permitted to enter?"

Mr. Ed whinies. In the background, the Chorus sings:

A horse is a horse, of course, of course,
And no one can talk to a horse, of course.

The stable boys leave.

But soon to arrive—being careful not to enter until the dissident stable boys made their exist—is the president of the Stable Boys Association (SBA) Johnny House. Johnny is surrounded by several stable cleaners—commonly called crap men.

Johnny: "Sire, why can we not reinstate crap men seating at the Big Race?"

MR. ED WHINIES. In the background the Chorus sings:

A horse is a horse, of course, of course,
And no one can talk to a horse, of course.

Johnny House and the crap men leave.

Enter Frank Guernsey and the staff of the Daily Bull Sheet.

Guernsey: "Sire, who invited the Billy Goat Crusade to our Barnyard?"

Mr. Ed whinies. In the background the Chorus sings:

A horse is a horse, of course, of course,
And no one can talk to a horse, of course.

Frank Guernsey and fellow Bull Sheeters leave.

The day of the Big Race—the Big Orange Derby—arrives and Neigh-land Stadium is full. Enter the jockeys. The Jocks do not talk or ask questions.

Mr. Ed speaks: "It's time to make like horse crap and hit the trail." In the background the Chorus sings:

Happy trails to you.

The curtain falls.

Staten's static ***By Vince Staten***

Mr. Ed and Mr. Cosby

I debated with myself throughout the entire Bill Cosby concert last weekend on whether to introduce myself or not. And in the end, wickedness won out. What happened was that through ignorance and /or drunkenness (on the part of the usher), my date and I were seated next to none other than President Ed Boling.

Actually, we got there first and when the big whig delegation arrived, they had to shuffle around and settle on their seats.

I HONESTLY think I was sitting in Chancellor Joe Johnson's seat because he kept looking at me and then back at his ticket. He ended up sitting one row back.

Anyway, the first thing Mr. Ed did was to eye me suspiciously. Then he jumped up and raced across the room to shake hands with someone more important.

I got to thinking how it must be to be president of the university. For one thing, everyone knows who you are so you're always on stage. The whole world is watching.

AND YOU have to shake hands with everyone and tell them how good it is to see them—even if it isn't. But worst of all would be meeting people and having to tell them how good it is to meet them—how can you tell someone you don't know that it is good to meet them? Actually, it may turn out that it was bad to meet them.

Then Bill Withers' back-up band came out on stage to warm up and Mr. Ed tapped his foot and slapped his knee in time with the music. Sort of. It was then that one of my many unanswered questions was answered. Contrary to popular opinion, there are no little diamonds on Mr. Ed's socks.

Out came Bill Withers, and judging by Mr. Ed's reaction, Mr. Ed came straight.

I WAS really enjoying Cosby too much to pay attention to Mr. Ed. But I did note that when Cosby talked about his brother Russell, calling him a big piece of fried do-do, Mr. Ed laughed. Although he did try to hide it with his hand. I saw, Mr. Ed. I saw.

Perhaps Mr. Ed never offered to shake my hand because I don't really look like the type who'll donate a building to the university. Perhaps Mr. Ed doesn't like anyone who doesn't have an insurance salesman's haircut. Perhaps he couldn't get his hand out of his coat from his Napoleonic stance. Perhaps he knew who I was.

But I don't think so.

SO MR. ED, next time you go to a pop concert, you'd better watch who you sit next to. It could have been Doug Dickey.

UNDERSTATEN IT: Seven years ago, Knoxville mayor Roy Rogers rode into town on a tall white stallion. And today many of the townspeople say that Mayor Roy has still not come down off his high horse. Recently Roy rode into the Carolyn P. Brown Memorial Non-Student Center and addressed the UT Appreciation Week luncheon. And for his brave statement, Roy is to receive the "Honesty in Government" award for the week.

Roy said (and I take it completely out of context) "I. . .I shudder to think what it would be like without UT to dilute the ignorance of Knoxville." Attorneys are currently at work on papers for UT's secession from Knoxville.

VITA

Lyle Vincent Staten, Jr. was born August 5, 1947 at Holston Valley Community Hospital in Kingsport, Tennessee. He attended Andrew Johnson Elementary School and Ross N. Robinson Junior High School and was graduated from Dobyns-Bennett High School in 1965. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology from Duke University in 1969 and the Master of Science degree in communications from the University of Tennessee in March 1973.

From 1969 to 1972, he was employed in the News Department of WBIR-TV in Knoxville. He lives at 1315 Forest Avenue with Lassie, his cat.